

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

Members Present: Ingrid Carls, Shelia Dinsmoor, Helen Robertson, Howard Raley
Staff: Erin Heacock, Michael Zehner
Also Present: Gary Lockberg, Bryan Sweeney, Tony DeBenedictis, David Himmelberger, Ardi Rrapi, Peter Smith, Pamela Campbell, Wesley Wirth, Joanna Travis

Ms. Carls called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices, 239 Washington Street, One (1) Wall Sign and One (1) Awning Sign, DRB 14-01S

Documents:

- Sign Application Form
- Awning Sign Plan, Prepared by FastSigns, undated
- Wall Sign Plan, Prepared by FastSigns, undated
- Property Owner Authorization Letter

Discussion:

Gary Lockberg, owner of the Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices, presented the proposed project. Mr. Lockberg noted that the real estate business was formerly a Prudential, which has been recently bought by Berkshire Hathaway. Mr. Lockberg noted that the materials provided were printed differently, and in fact, the color of the awning and the wall sign will be the same. He provided samples.

Mr. Lockberg explained that the awning will be recovered in place and the wall sign is an in-kind replacement.

Ms. Carls thought the project was straight forward. Ms. Dinsmoor agreed.

Ms. Dinsmoor moved to recommend approval of the awning sign and wall sign as presented. Ms. Robertson seconded Ms. Dinsmoor motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

8 Fuller Road Retaining Wall, 8 Fuller Road, By-Right Retaining Wall, DRB 14-02RW

Documents:

- Application for Design Review of Retaining Walls
- Project Narrative
- Plot Plan of 8 Fuller Road, Prepared by Metrowest Engineers, dated February 19, 2013
- Illustrative Site Plan, Prepared by Patrick Ahearn Architects, dated March 20, 2013
- Proposed Site Plan Retaining Walls, Prepared by Arthur Choo Associates, Inc, dated January 29, 2013
- Tree Protection Site Plan, Prepared by Metrowest Engineers, dated December 4, 2012
- Site Photographs

Discussion:

Bryan Sweeney, of Sweeney Custom Homes & Renovations, representing the property owner, presented the retaining wall project. The retaining wall is already constructed. The Building Department will not

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

issue Certificate of Occupancy until DRB review is complete. Mr. Sweeney explained that the retaining wall is needed to create the land to build the new home. On top of the retaining wall, a 42 inch fence is required for safety reasons as the wall at its highest is 11 feet. The fence will likely be a chain link fence. Mr. Sweeney explained that there will be landscaping in front of the fence, but at this time, landscaping is not part of his contract with the homeowner. The homeowner has explained that arborvitae will likely be planted.

Ms. Dinsmoor asked for more details on the fence. Mr. Sweeney explained that it will be either black or green chain link.

Ms. Carls explained that the property abuts the Cochituate Aqueduct. The wall is quite large and is visible from the path. Ms. Robertson agreed. It is not inconspicuous

Mr. Sweeney stated that he can provide screening. He mentioned that the homeowner was planning on planting something that would grow down the wall.

Ms. Dinsmoor stated she would like a more detailed plan. Mr. Sweeney agreed to prepare a plan. Ms. Dinsmoor asked to see rear and front planting and information on the fence.

Ms. Robertson added the plan should include plant sizes as the wall is quite high in some areas and the plants will need to match or at least have the chance to grow to the height of the wall.

Ms. Carls asked Mr. Sweeney to return to a future meeting with a landscape plan. Mr. Sweeney agreed.

98 Livingston Road, Large House Review, LHR 13-04

Documents:

- Large House Review Application Form
- Section XVID Review Affidavit
- Large House Review Statement of Intent, dated December 21, 2013
- Property Record Card – 98 & 92 Livingston Road
- Letter from Roger B. Sturgis & Associates, dated December 12, 2013, regarding Wellesley Tree Protection and Preservation Bylaw
- Neighborhood Delineation Plan, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated August 15, 2013
- Locus Plan, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated August 15, 2013
- Existing Lots Detail, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated August 15, 2013
- Proposed Lots Detail, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated August 15, 2013
- Proposed Addition Plan, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated June 28, 2013
- Base Tree Protection & Mitigation Plan, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated December 18, 2013
- Proposed Addition Layout Plan, Prepared by Cheney Engineering Co., Inc., dated December 18, 2013
- Sheet L1, Landscape Plan, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated July 10, 2013
- Sheet L2, Proposed Grading Plan, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated July 10, 2013
- Sheet L3, Existing Plantings, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated July 10, 2013

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

- Sheet L4, Proposed Planting Plan, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated July 10, 2013
- Sheet L-5, Lighting Plan, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated December 30, 2013
- Sheet L-6, Lighting Plan Cut Sheets, Prepared by Thomas Wirth Associates, Inc., dated December 30, 2013
- Front and Rear Elevation of Proposed 98 Livingston, Prepared by Campbell Smith Architects, Inc., dated January 6, 2014
- Sheet A.4, Renderings, Prepared by Campbell Smith Architects, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
- Sheet A.5, Front and Left Elevation of Addition, Prepared by Campbell Smith Architects, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
- Addition Alteration Plan Set, Prepared by Campbell Smith Architects
 - Sheet 1, Title Page, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 2, Demolition Plans & Exterior Views, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 3, First Floor Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 4, Second Floor Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 5, Front & Left Elevation, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 6, Rear Elevation, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 7, Building Sections, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 8, Wall Sections & Schedules, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 9, Details, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 10, Foundation Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 11, First Floor Framing Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 12, Second Floor Framing Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 13, Roof Framing Plan, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
 - Sheet 14, Area Calculation, dated May 13, 2013, revised May 16, 2013
- 3D Model of Proposed Addition
- Operations and Maintenance for Porous Pavement
- Porous Pavement Detail
- Email from Robert Wadsworth, 99 Livingston Road, regarding project at 98 Livingston Road
- Email from Matthew and Christine Schuldt, 88 Livingston Road, regarding project at 98 Livingston Road
- Email from Scott Sefton, 1 Ridge Hill Road, regarding project at 98 Livingston Road
- Email from Meredith and Jeremy Roy, 80 Livingston Road, regarding project at 98 Livingston Road

Discussion:

Attorney David Himmelberger introduced the project and consultant team. Atty. Himmelberger explained that the project is an addition to the left side of the existing home at 98 Livingston Road, which triggers Large House Review.

Ms. DeBenedictis provided a more detailed overview. The proposed project is the addition to the existing home at 98 Livingston Road. To accommodate the addition, the existing structure at 92 Livingston Road will be demolished, the two lots would be combined eliminating the shared property line, and the addition will be built across the former lot line. The proposed addition consists of a 3-car garage, a cabana, and a mud room. Interior modifications will also be completed. Portions of the existing garage will be modified to be part of the mud room and the kitchen. Upstairs will be a guest suite.

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

The proposed project required review by the Zoning Board of Appeals due to the side yard setback which was settled in December 2013. The proposed project has 5.8 percent lot coverage, far less than the maximum allowed lot coverage.

Mr. DeBenedictis explained that approximately 3,025 square feet of TLAG will be added to the existing home at 98 Livingston Road. The existing TLAG of the home at 98 Livingston is approximately 8,000 square feet, for a total of approximately 11,000 square feet post-construction. The project also includes the demolition of approximately 5,500 square feet of TLAG, mostly the existing home at 92 Livingston Road. The project will reduce density in the neighborhood and reduce impervious surfaces, particularly by the removal of the home and associated driveways at 92 Livingston Road.

Mr. DeBenedictis noted that the proposed home is around the average size of homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Raley asked for specifics on the sizes of adjacent homes. Mr. DeBenedictis directed Mr. Raley to the application materials and showed the DRB photos of adjacent homes.

Mr. Raley asked where the wetlands are located. Mr. DeBenedictis pointed out the edge of the wetlands and the extent of the 100-foot Buffer Zone. The entirety of the house is within the Buffer Zone and the project has received an Order of Conditions. Only the front yard is outside of the Buffer Zone. The wetlands have dictated the linear design of the project.

Mr. DeBenedictis explained that the addition does not have a basement. It will be on slab to avoid further disturbance to the Buffer Zone. He stated that the Wetlands Protection Committee found that the project reduced impervious surfaces and reduced roof runoff through the use of the porous pavement for the driveway court and a recharge system.

Mr. Raley asked if there were concerns from the abutters. Mr. DeBenedictis explained that all of the direct abutters are in favor. As evidenced in the letters and emails, the abutters favor the reduced density and the relocation of the driveway to the side of the home rather than the current front load garage.

Mr. Raley stated that the architecture is good, but at the same time, it appears that the house is swallowing up the entire lot. The linear nature of the home creates a very long length, of 150 feet or half of football field. He questioned whether during the design phase there was any minimization considered as it doesn't seem that has been any consideration.

Mr. Smith, architect with Campbell Smith, stated that throughout the process the design has been reduced. It is a large home, but the site is constrained by the front yard setback and the wetlands in the rear. Alternative layouts would either encroach on the front yard setback or would impact the wetlands more. He would have advised any client to avoid further wetland impacts.

Mr. DeBenedictis stated that the home is approximately 30 feet shorter than the residence across the street.

Atty. Himmelberger pointed out that the removal of 92 Livingston creates more uniformity along the street. The house at 92 Livingston, in addition to being elevated due to mounding, appears shoe-horned into the neighborhood.

Mr. Raley stated that the neighborhood can certainly support larger homes as many of the lots are large as are the homes.

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

Ms. Dinsmoor indicated that when she considers Large House Review projects, her main concern is how the neighbors feel about the project. It sounds that the neighbors are supportive. Ms. Dinsmoor stated she felt the home fit in the context of the neighborhood. She understands that the consultant team has worked with constraints on the site.

Ms. Carls agreed with Ms. Dinsmoor.

Mr. Raley stated that the DRB strives to add value through the process. He would like the applicant to consider some minimization. He thought that the design has a few distinct sections of the house, clearly showing where it's been added to.

Ms. Robertson stated that old New England farmhouses also have that appearance of distinct portions being added on to create more space. She stated that typically it is done at the rear.

Ms. Robertson asked for additional information on where the wetland is located.

Wesley Wirth, landscape architect with Thomas Wirth Associates, explained where the wetland, associated buffer zone, and flood zone is located.

Ms. Robertson thought that it appeared there was some space at the rear of the home to build to the rear rather than linear.

Mr. Wirth stated he would have advised his client against building to the rear. Mr. Wirth stated he understands the criticism from the DRB regarding the length. However, it is irresponsible to infringe upon the wetlands any further.

Mr. Wirth explained the landscape plan. The impervious surfaces of the driveway at 92 Livingston will be reclaimed as lawn and landscaping. There is a continuous green strip along the front of the property. Some trees are being saved, and other plants will be harvested from 92 Livingston Road and transplanted. The landscape will provide scale to the property, but it will also screen the home from the road. At the rear of the property, the Wetlands Protection Committee has also required significant number of native plantings throughout the Buffer Zone to create wetland habitat. On the sides of the home, there are evergreen plantings.

Mr. Raley asked about the play structure referenced in one of the abutter letters. Mrs. Travis, the homeowner, stated it will be relocated onsite to the other side of the property. She mentioned that it will likely be removed from the property altogether in a few years due to her children's ages, but at this time, it will be relocated.

Ms. Carls wondered if the porous pavement area needs to be so large. Mr. Wirth explained that the area has been reduced. He explained that the turning radius is tight and any reduction entering or leaving the driveway would be difficult. His opinion is that it is not oversized.

Mr. Raley asked about roof runoff. Ardi Rrapi, engineer with Cheney Associates, described two, 6-foot diameter drywells proposed. The drywells will capture the first half inch of runoff from the roof.

Mr. Raley asked about materials. Some the materials have been identified but some have not.

Mr. Smith provided some description of the proposed addition. The roof line over the front farmer's porch breaks up the massing of the addition. It also creates a sense of scale, so that a person approaching

WELLESLEY DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 8, 2014; 7:00 PM
GREAT HALL, TOWN HALL

the porch does not feel like he is approaching a two story wall. The gable end extends the building. A grey copper metal roof will be used.

Ms. Carls asked about shingling and the roof. Mr. Smith stated that it would match existing.

Ms. Robertson stated that the proposed home is a series of smaller units. She thought that the columns were incongruous. Ms. Robertson suggested that the porch roof should be separated from the rest of the addition to clearly define that portion as a distinct unit. Therefore, there would be four distinct sections of the house. She thought that it would make the side door less obvious and front door would become more obvious.

The rest of the members in attendance did not agree with Ms. Robertson's suggestion. Ms. Dinsmoor appreciated how the roof line pulls the addition forward.

Mr. Raley asked if the applicant will use wood clapboards. Everything will match existing.

Mr. Raley asked if copper would be used all around. Mr. Smith suggested that it is a clean detail. Mr. DeBenedictis noted that it is expensive.

Mr. Raley made the suggestion to use copper all around for details. He also suggested that slate be used on the roof and clapboard siding to match be used.

Ms. Carls asked if there are two fireplaces for the two chimneys. There are.

Ms. Carls also asked if the cupola is accessible. It is not.

Mr. Raley asked where the AC condensers are located. Mr. DeBenedictis stated that there are three located behind the cabana.

Ms. Dinsmoor stated she is happy with the project.

Ms. Carls stated the property is large, but has a number of constraints. Ms. Carls stated that the home will be large but the lot is large and the neighborhood can support large homes.

Ms. Carls moved to accept the proposal as presented on the condition that the applicant returns to the DRB with a materials list. Mr. Raley seconded Ms. Carls' motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

Previous Minutes

Ms. Robertson moved to accept the minutes from December 11, 2013 with the addition of clarifying edits regarding her comments on the Bank of America project. Ms. Dinsmoor seconded Ms. Robertson's motion. The motion passed unanimously (4-0).

The Board adjourned at approximately 8:45 pm.

Erin L. Heacock, AICP
Planner

Minutes Approved: January 22, 2014