

WELLESLEY PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2015, 7:00 PM
TOWN HALL - GREAT HALL

MINUTES

Planning Board Present: Sara Preston, Deborah Carpenter, Catherine Johnson, Jeanne Conroy, and Harriet Warshaw

Staff Present: Michael Zehner and Imaikalani Aiu

Also Present: John MacDonald, Troy Sober, Rakesh Loonkar, Jean Boyle, Sheila Nugent, Deanni Sullivan, Elaine Elliot, Virginia Laurent, P. Laurent, Caitlyn McGoff, Diane Lapon, Helen Hegblom, Miguel Lessing, Pam Bacharach, Sarah Sullivan, Joellen Toussaint, Fred Wright, Pete Jones, Tom Kealy, Helen Turner, Elaine Pipes, Rose Anderson, Nancy Kuhn, Mary Bowers, Tess Griffin, Judy Keefe, Gerard Kelley, Kevin O’Leary, Marc Kaplan, Betsy Wise, Christine Crowley, Bill Murphy, Renate Olsen, Penny Post, Evelyn Lawrence, Shirley Quinn, David Hearn, Florence Hearn, Judy Murphy, Ron Murphy, John Schuler, Joanne Kilstonk, Alice McCourt, Diane Campbell, Steven Fessler, Barbara Pyles, Lee Mades, Marjorie Freiman, Jack Morgan, Gayle Thieme, Richard Thuma, Jim DeVellis, John Catlin, and Matt King

1. Call to Order

Ms. Preston called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Ms. Preston indicated that the meeting was being recorded for broadcast on the Wellesley Media channel. Ms. Preston noted that the Board had a full agenda for the meeting.

2. Continued/Previous Applications and/or Public Hearings

a. Consideration of Major Revision - LHR-14-04 - 21 Seaver Street

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled “Major Revision - LHR-14-04 - 21 Seaver Street,” dated May 28, 2015;
- Neighborhood Map;
- Original LHR-10-04 Approval Decision/Agreement;
- Letter from Michael Zehner, dated May 28, 2015;
- Letter from Jan and Paul Wright to the Planning Board;
- Wetlands Protection Committee Letter;
- Plan prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, titled “C-1 - Wright Residence - Stormwater Plan,” dated May 21, 2014 and last revised May 14, 2015;
- Plan prepared by Kirsti Moestue Landscape Design, titled “Sheet L-1 - Wright Residence Landscape Plan,” dated last revised May 27, 2015; and
- Originally approved Stormwater and Landscape Plans for the project noted “Originally Approved Plan”

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Zehner. Mr. Zehner reviewed the request for the Board, indicating that the property owner was out of the country and unable to attend the

meeting. Mr. Zehner explained that the applicant had requested several revisions which he determined to be minor, but that he had determined the proposed elimination of a rain garden to be major.

Ms. Preston asked if there were any public comments. Hearing none, Ms. Preston asked if the members of the Board had any comments or questions. Ms. Carpenter asked Mr. Zehner to review the timing associated with the requested revision. Mr. Zehner indicated that the Board had approved a Large House Review application previous to the approval of the Large House Review application in 2014. Mr. Zehner noted that prior to the original Large House Review application, the previous owner had received an Order of Conditions from the Wetlands Protection Committee with a plan that included a rain garden. Mr. Zehner indicated that the rain garden was shown on the plans for both Large House Review applications, but that in August of 2014 the owner had confirmed with the Wetland Protection Committee that the rain garden was optional given the infiltration qualities of the soil. Mr. Zehner indicated that this was noted in a letter from the Wetlands Protection Committee. Mr. Zehner stated that he was not aware of the intent to eliminate the rain garden until the applicant recently submitted a request for other revisions to the project.

Ms. Johnson asked how a diffuser would function differently than a rain garden. Mr. Zehner explained that both were associated with the overflow of stormwater from the infiltration system, that stormwater would be piped to the rain garden and be infiltrated into the ground, and with the diffuser, stormwater would be released into the yard. Mr. Zehner indicated that the Engineering Division found the use of the diffuser acceptable due to the soil conditions.

Ms. Preston suggested that the Board should have the applicant's engineer or someone from the Engineering Division attend a meeting of the Board to discuss the differences and functionality of the diffuser versus the rain garden. The Board discussed the request further, noting that the Engineering Division had indicated that the revised Stormwater Plan adequately addresses their comments and concerns.

Ms. Preston asked for a motion. Ms. Conroy made a motion to approve the requested major revision to eliminate the rain garden from the project, to be substituted with a diffuser (as indicated on the plan prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, titled "C-1 - Wright Residence - Stormwater Plan," dated May 21, 2014 and last revised May 14, 2015). Ms. Johnson seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved, 4-1 (S. Preston opposed).

Ms. Preston indicated that her opposition to the motion was based on a lack of information, rather than the merits of the request.

b. Consideration of Major Revision - LHR-10-04 - 26 Peirce Road

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled "Major Revision - LHR-10-04 – 26 Peirce Road," dated May 27, 2015;
- Neighborhood Map;

- Original LHR-10-04 Approval Decision/Agreement;
- Letter from Michael Zehner, dated May 27, 2015;
- Letter from Kevin Lagasse, dated May 22, 2015;
- Site Photographs;
- Plan titled “A-001 Hitch Bathroom Addition,” prepared by Morehouse MacDonald & Associates, Inc., dated March 13, 2015;
- Plan titled “A-002 Hitch Bathroom Addition,” prepared by Morehouse MacDonald & Associates, Inc., dated March 13, 2015; and
- Plan titled “Proposed Drainage and Utility Plan,” prepared by Metrowest Engineering, Inc., dated June 2, 2010

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Zehner. Mr. Zehner reviewed the request for the Board. Ms. Preston asked why the revisions needed approval by the Planning Board if the home had already received a Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Zehner stated that regardless of the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the project is still subject to the Large House Review decision and it is the Inspector of Building’s interpretation and his opinion that the Zoning Bylaw does not distinguish between revisions to projects under construction or those that have been issued a Certificate of Occupancy. Mr. Zehner further indicated that it is essentially no different than the modification of a project that has received Site Plan Review approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals, and asked the Board to consider whether it would be acceptable for a project to deviate from the approved decision the day after the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Ms. Preston recognized John MacDonald, architect for the project. Mr. MacDonald described the requested revision, indicating the location of the proposed dormer. Ms. Conroy commented that the change is very discreet given the landscaping on the property.

Ms. Preston asked for additional comments or questions. Hearing none, Ms. Preston asked for a motion. Ms. Johnson made a motion to approve the requested major revision to add a dormer on the west elevation of the home to allow existing attic space to be converted to finished space, adding 165 square feet of finished floor area to the home (as indicated on plans prepared by Morehouse MacDonald & Associates, Inc., titled “A-001 Hitch Bathroom Addition” and “A-002 Hitch Bathroom Addition,” both dated March 13, 2015). Ms. Warshaw seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

c. Consideration LHR-15-03 – Large House Review for 30/34 Wachusett Road

Documents

- Staff Report prepared by Imaikalani Aiu, dated May 28, 2015; and
- Memo from George Saraceno, dated May 28, 2015

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Aiu. Mr. Aiu indicated that this was the continued consideration of the application and provided the Board with an update on the status. Mr. Aiu described the revisions made by the applicant, but noted that the applicant had not addressed all changes requested by the Design Review Board.

Ms. Preston recognized the project representatives, John McDonald, architect (Morehouse & MacDonald and Associates), and Troy Sober, landscape architect (Greg Lombardi Design). Mr. Sober made a presentation, describing the project and the revisions. Mr. McDonald discussed the architecture of the home, specifically, the massing.

Ms. Johnson asked Mr. McDonald to confirm the height of the garage roof. Mr. McDonald indicated that the garage has a height of 22' to the ridge, stepping down from the main house.

Mr. Sober reviewed the plans with respect to trees, discussing existing trees to be retained and those to be removed, and also identifying those trees determined to be either hazardous or unhealthy. Ms. Carpenter asked Mr. Sober to indicate where trees are being removed from the site. Mr. Sober indicated that the majority are being removed from the center of the two properties, the former buffer between the two homes, and generally where the new home is to be located.

Mr. Sober presented the elevations of the home and property from Wachusett Road and the rear property line. Ms. Johnson asked Mr. Sober to describe the trees and shrubs along Wachusett Road and the rear property line. Mr. Sober indicated that they were proposed to be a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees, along with evergreen shrubs. Ms. Johnson expressed concerns regarding the effect on stormwater associated with the removal of trees and their accompany roots. Ms. Johnson also stated that the presented rendering was not exactly accurate due to coloration.

Ms. Preston asked Mr. Sober whether the main house was on a higher elevation. Mr. Sober confirmed that it was. Ms. Preston stated that if she were a rear neighbor, that she would be looking up at the property. Mr. Sober discussed the view of the home from the rear property and the proposed landscaping on the rear property line. Ms. Preston asked the representatives to confirm the highest portion of the main house. Mr. MacDonald stated that the height would be 32' measured from median grade. Mr. Sober presented a section view of the proposed site and home, showing the changes in elevation from Wachusett Road to the rear property line. Mr. MacDonald further described the proposed home, indicating that many of the materials used have earth tone colors.

Mr. Sober discussed other comments contained in the staff report, noting that the revisions serve to save an additional seven (7) trees. Mr. Sober also described the lighting plan for the project.

Ms. Preston, noting the time, asked if there were any neighbors present that wished to make comments. Steve Fessler, an immediate abutter at 42 Wachusett Road, spoke, stating that he was not concerned with the design or size of the proposed home, but that he was generally concerned with impacts associated with the construction. Specifically, Mr. Fessler noted that he was concerned with the parking of vehicles during construction and suggested that a solid wood fence be installed along his property line during construction.

Ms. Preston stated that construction parking is an issue town wide, and asked Mr. Zehner to discuss past efforts. Mr. Zehner referenced past conditions imposed on Large House Review projects regarding the parking of vehicles associated with construction. Mr. Aiu described the input received from Deputy Chief Jack Pilecki with respect to the parking of vehicles along Wachusett Road.

Ms. Johnson asked about the expected length of construction. Mr. MacDonald indicated that he expected construction to last eighteen (18) months. Rakesh Loonkar, the property owner, stated that the number of trees limits the ability to park entirely on site, further indicating that on-site parking becomes a real issue during the landscaping phase of the project. Ms. Preston asked whether anyone had spoken to the builder about shuttling or carpooling. Mr. Loonkar stated that he had not, but that the builder may need to address. Marc Kaplan, Sanford Custom Homes, stated that the contractors generally self-regulate, and that gas is a consideration for car pooling. Ms. Preston stated that shutting to the site from parking lots in town is an option. Mr. Loonkar stated that they would look into options.

Ms. Preston stated that if there were no additional questions, should the Board agree to continue consideration of the application to the meeting on June 15, 2015. The members of the Board agreed. Ms. Preston indicated that the Board would consider the application further at the meeting on June 15, 2015.

3. New Applications and/or Public Hearings

a. Public Hearing - Consider Consenting to Hearing Reapplication for Tolles-Parsons Senior Center PSI

Documents

- Staff Report prepared by Michael Zehner, dated May 28, 2015;
- Letter from Barbara Searle (Chair, Board of Selectmen) and Matt King (Chair, Permanent Building Committee), dated May 6, 2015, reapplying for PSI Special Permit;
- Email from Dick Joyce, Municipal Light Plant, dated May 12, 2015;
- Memorandum from George Saraceno, Dept. of Public Works - Engineering Division, dated May 28, 2015;
- Wellesley Planning Board Decision Regarding Specific and Material Changes in the Conditions Upon Which the Denial of the Previous Application Was Based, dated "Received - Town Clerk's Office Wellesley MA 02482 - 2014 DEC 19";
- Tolles-Parsons Senior Center Project of Significant Impact Submission, received October 14, 2014;
 - a. Cover Letter from Board of Selectmen and Permanent Building Committee, dated October 14, 2014;
 - b. Project Description, prepared by Catlin + Petrovick Architects, PC;
 - c. Application Form for Review of Project of Significant Impact;
 - d. Zoning Summary;

- e. Municipal Systems Impact Analysis, prepared by DeVellis Zrein Inc., dated October 14, 2014;
 - f. Drainage Report and Stormwater Management Plan, prepared by DeVellis Zrein Inc., dated October 14, 2014;
 - g. Existing Conditions Plan C0, prepared by Precision Land Surveying, Inc., dated July 16, 2014;
 - h. Site Photometric Plan C0.0, dated October 14, 2014;
 - i. Layout and Materials Plan C-1, dated October 14, 2014;
 - j. Grading and Utilities Plan C-2, dated October 14, 2014;
 - k. Planting Plan C-3, dated October 14, 2014;
 - l. Site Detail Sheet C-4, dated October 14, 2014;
 - m. Site Detail Sheet C-5, dated October 14, 2014 ;
 - n. Domestic Water Service Calcs, prepared by VAV International Inc., dated October 8, 2014;
 - o. Fire Protection Narrative Report, prepared by VAV International Inc.; and
 - p. Abutters list and site aerial
-
- Tolles-Parsons Senior Center Transportation Study, prepared by Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc., dated October 14, 2014;
 - Tolles-Parsons Senior Center Transportation Study Appendix, prepared by Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc., dated October 14, 2014 (originally provided on CD; available online or by request);
 - Letter from Matt King (Chair, Permanent Building Committee) and Barbara Searle (Chair, Board of Selectmen), dated October 28, 2014;
 - M.G.L., Chapter 40A, Zoning, Section 16, Final unfavorable decisions by permit granting authorities; reconsideration; withdrawal of petitions for variance or applications for special permit;
 - www.masscases.com brief of John H. Shalby & another vs. Board of Appeal of Norwood & another. 6 Mass. App. Ct. 521 (1978);
 - Wellesley Planning Board Special Permit Decision and Detailed Record - Project of Significant Impact #13-02 - 496 and 485 Washington Street - Tolles Parsons Center, dated "Received - Town Clerk's Office Wellesley MA 02482 - 2014 NOV 18";
 - Plans for PSI-13-02, including Site Plan/Hardscape Plan, Site Utilities Plan, and Landscape Plan;
 - Brief of Ranney v. Board of Appeals of Nantucket, 11 Mass. App. Ct. 112 (1981);
 - BETA Traffic Peer Review Comments, dated October 17, 2014;
 - Memo from HSH responding to comments from BETA, dated October 29, 2014;
 - Board of Selectmen Recommendation, dated November 12, 2014;
 - Fire Department Recommendation, dated November 20, 2014;
 - Police Chief Recommendation, dated November 20, 2014;
 - MLP Recommendation, dated November 21, 2014;
 - Letter from Catlin + Petrovick Architects, PC providing supplementary information regarding impacts to municipal systems, dated November 24, 2014; and
 - Department of Public Works Review Comments, dated November 25, 2014

Ms. Preston opened the noticed public hearing. Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Zehner. Mr. Zehner explained the request, noting that due to the Planning Board's denial of the

original PSI Special Permit application within two (2) years, that the Board must first consent to hearing the reapplication; if the Board consents to hearing the reapplication, the Board must then find that there have been specific and material changes in the conditions upon which the previous denial was based before considering the PSI Special Permit reapplication.

Ms. Preston recognized Matt King, Chair of the Permanent Building Committee, reminding him that the current public hearing was to allow the Planning Board to consider consenting to hear the reapplication. Mr. King referenced the reapplication and requested that the Planning Board consent to allow the reapplication to be heard.

Ms. Preston asked for comments from the public; there were no public comments made.

Ms. Preston asked for a motion. Ms. Carpenter made a motion to consent to hear the PSI Special Permit reapplication for the Tolles-Parsons Senior Center. Ms. Warshaw seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0. Ms. Preston noted that the question required a supermajority vote (at least 4 affirmative votes), which it received. Ms. Preston closed the public hearing.

b. Public Hearing – Consider Finding Specific & Material Changes in the Conditions Upon Which the Previous Denial of the Tolles-Parsons Senior Center PSI Were Based

Documents

- PowerPoint presentation titled “Tolles-Parsons Senior Center Project of Significant Impact,” dated June 1, 2015, presented at the June 1 Planning Board meeting; and
- *See Documents listed under “Public Hearing - Consider Consenting to Hearing Reapplication for Tolles-Parsons Senior Center PSI”*

Ms. Preston opened the noticed public hearing. Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Zehner. Mr. Zehner explained the request, noting that given the Planning Board’s consent to hear the reapplication that a supermajority of the Board must now find that the reapplication demonstrates specific and material changes in the conditions upon which the previous denial of the application was based before considering the PSI Special Permit reapplication.

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. King. Mr. King briefly introduced the reapplication, stating that he would be turning the presentation over to the project’s manager, Richard Thuma. Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Thuma. Mr. Thuma conducted a PowerPoint presentation for the Board, noting changes to the project from the 2013 application. Mr. Thuma clarified that the 2013 application was that which was denied by the Planning Board, while the 2014 reapplication and design is currently pending before the Board.

Mr. Thuma presented what he characterized as specific and material changes in the project, discussing the effects of the consolidation of the site on traffic and pedestrian safety and stormwater management concerns previously expressed. Mr. Thuma indicated that Town Meeting’s approval of the acquisition of the adjacent property allowed the

consolidation of the site, thereby reducing vehicular circulation between the former sites, eliminating the need for the HAWK signal, and eliminating the need for off-site parking.

Ms. Johnson asked to see a specific slide that Mr. Thuma has shown pertaining to intersection traffic volumes. Mr. Thuma indicated that he would email the presentation to be distributed. Ms. Preston asked whether the Howard/Stein-Hudson traffic report had been updated based on the VHB follow up traffic report issued for the Wellesley High School project. Mr. Thuma stated that he would like to present such data and the eventual PSI public hearing. The Board agreed that this information could be presented at the next phase of the application.

Ms. Carpenter asked Mr. Thuma to elaborate on what “background growth” is with respect to traffic. Mr. Thuma responded that background growth is new development not necessarily associated with the site, but affecting the corridor and intersections. Ms. Johnson stated that in statistics it is frequently possible to eliminate background noise. Mr. Thuma stated that he welcomed the opportunity to have the projects professionals present such information.

Mr. Thuma further presented aspects of the reapplication, discussing travel mode shares and the expansion of the area accounted for in the 2014 traffic study. Mr. Thuma recognized Jim DeVellis to discuss stormwater management. Mr. DeVellis stated that there had been specific and material changes in the design of the drainage system. Ms. Preston asked Mr. DeVellis if he was able to comment on the engineering associated with the 2013 project and how it has changed. Mr. DeVellis reviewed that stormwater aspects of the project related to untreated stormwater, flow rate, recharge, suspended solids, a construction plan, and an operations and maintenance plan comply with regulations but exceed the 2013 design.

Mr. DeVellis discussed that the design has been revised to address additional stormwater suggestions made by the Board, including the further reduction of runoff, providing sustainable and green design, providing a system that incorporates longevity and ease of maintenance, and exceeding engineering standards. Mr. Thuma stated that there had been an emphasis on sustainable design in the redesign of the project, noting that the project was LEED certifiable, incorporated rain gardens, reduced energy consumption, reduced water consumption, and improved stormwater. Ms. Johnson asked whether the applicants intended to actually apply for LEED certification. Mr. Thuma stated that a decision on that aspect of the project had not been made.

Mr. Thuma summarized, comparing the aspects of the 2014 proposal related to traffic, pedestrian safety, stormwater, and site design, to the 2013 project. Mr. King concluded remarks on behalf of the Permanent Building Committee.

Ms. Preston asked whether the Board would like to ask questions. Hearing none, Ms. Preston requested that Mr. King email the presentation to the Board. Ms. Preston asked for questions and comments from the public.

Ms. Preston recognized Janet Giele. Ms. Giele commended the Planning Board for opening the hearing, and noted that the presentation was impressive. Ms. Conroy agreed.

With no other members of the public requesting to speak, Ms. Preston asked the Planning Board whether they wished to discuss the reapplication and the question.

Ms. Carpenter stated that the reapplication is substantially different and improved, that the differences between the 2013 and 2014 project are marked, clear, and responsive to the expressed concerns and meet the criteria for allowing the reapplication.

Ms. Preston stated that she would likely consider closing the public hearing if there are no further questions or comments. Ms. Conroy stated that she agreed with Ms. Carpenter's statements, and further indicated that if there are concerns, that the Board should share those. Ms. Preston suggested that the applicants review the VHB Wellesley High School follow up traffic study, that they have Liz Peart with Howard/Stein-Hudson review the study. Ms. Johnson stated that she agreed that there is a difference in the project, but that her big concern is with traffic, that the High School had changed the traffic at the intersection of Kingsbury, State, and Washington streets.

Ms. Warshaw stated that she agreed with her colleagues on the Board, that the presentation clearly delineates changes from the 2013 to 2014 application, resulting in significant changes. Ms. Preston stated that the presentation was very targeted.

Ms. Johnson suggested that if the hearing is closed that the Board vote at the next meeting. Ms. Preston recognized Tom Kealy, who asked whether there would be any additional discussion on this matter if the public hearing was closed. Ms. Preston confirmed that was the case, but that there may be an opportunity for additional comments during the public hearing on the PSI Special Permit, if the Planning Board determines that there have been specific and material changes. Mr. King asked why the Board would not choose to vote that evening. Ms. Preston and Ms. Carpenter explained that the Board needed to consider findings when voting on the matter, and those needed to be drafted by staff based on the input received during the public hearing.

Ms. Preston asked for a motion to close the public hearing and continue consideration of an action on the matter until the Board's meeting on June 15, 2015. Ms. Warshaw made such a motion. Ms. Conroy seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0. Ms. Preston noted that the Board would consider action on the matter at the meeting on June 15.

c. Review and Issue Recommendations for June 4, 2015 ZBA Cases

Documents

- Staff Report prepared by Annie Ryan titled "Planning Staff Recommendations - June 4, 2015 ZBA Commercial Cases," dated May 21, 2015;
- Staff Report prepared by Imaikalani Aiu titled "Planning Staff Recommendations - June 4th, 2015," dated May 27, 2015; and
- Copies of Zoning Board of Appeals applications 2015-47 (37 Dana Road), 2015-48 (25 Washington Street), 2015-49 (231 Forest Street), 2015-50 (231 Forest Street), 2015 -51 (9 Washburn Avenue), 2015-52 (15 Kirkland Circle), 2015-53 (104 Fairbanks Avenue), 2015-54 (55 Fiske Road), and 2015-55 (14 Tappan Road)

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Aiu. Mr. Aiu reviewed the cases for the Board, explaining that Ms. Ryan had prepared the recommendations for the commercial cases, and that he had prepared the recommendations for the residential cases. Mr. Aiu indicated that he would first review the recommendations for the commercial cases.

2015-47 (37 Dana Road): The Planning Board recommended the ZBA grant the Site Plan Approval based on the Board's opinion that the project satisfies the requirements of Site Plan Approval. The Board further recommended that the ZBA impose the conditions recommended by the DRB. The Board agreed that there appears to be no proposed alteration to site conditions affecting vehicular circulation, driveways, or vehicle queuing lanes, that the proposed addition appears to feature stormwater runoff mitigations that will capture water runoff from the terrace so that peak rates of runoff post-development are equal to or less than current runoff rates for the site, and that the project appears to be compatible with surroundings.

2015-48 (25 Washington Street): The Planning Board recommended that the ZBA grant the Special Permit based on the Board's opinion that the project satisfies the requirements of a Special Permit Signage finding. However, the Board did note that the ZBA should consider whether the sign at the Washington Street entrance would obstruct the view of vehicles exiting to Washington Street, and whether the order of the business names included on the sign should be reversed ("Surgery Center" before "CVS/Pharmacy") to avoid any confusion.

2015-49 (231 Forest Street): The Planning Board recommended that the ZBA grant the Special Permit based on the Board's opinion that the project satisfies the requirements of a Special Permit Antenna finding.

2015-50 (231 Forest Street): The Planning Board recommended that the ZBA grant the Special Permit based on the Board's opinion that the project satisfies the requirements of a Special Permit Antenna finding.

2015 -51 (9 Washburn Avenue): The Planning Board voted 4-1 (C. Johnson against recommendation) to recommend that the ZBA deny the Special Permit, requiring instead that the garage be reconstructed in a conforming manner. The Board noted that should the ZBA consider granting the Special Permit, that the ZBA consider whether the location of the proposed gable should be reoriented. In opposition of the motion, Ms. Johnson noted that there is a 20' Dogwood tree to the interior of the lot, next to the garage, that limits the garage location and expansion.

2015-52 (15 Kirkland Circle): While noting that the proposal likely meets the findings allowing for the issuance of Special Permit, the Planning Board was of the opinion that the proposed addition may otherwise trigger Large House Review (TLAG over 3,600 sf and addition greater than 10%). Therefore, the Board recommended that the ZBA defer action on the Special Permit until the applicant submits a TLAG affidavit.

2015-53 (104 Fairbanks Avenue): Noting that the proposed renovation is within the existing footprint and not significantly larger or more massive than the existing structure, the Board recommended that the ZBA approve the Special Permit.

2015-54 (55 Fiske Road): The Board recommended the ZBA grant the Special Permit.

2015-55 (14 Tappan Road): The Board recommended that the ZBA defer action on the application. The Board indicated that the proposed addition may otherwise trigger Large House Review (TLAG over 3,600 sf and addition greater than 10%). While the Board indicated that they recognized that TLAG calculations were included on the plans, these calculations exclude the entire basement despite the fact that photographs show the basement to be partially above grade. The Board was of the opinion that it would be prudent to verify the building area and therefore recommended that the applicant submit a TLAG affidavit.

4. Old Business

a. Consider MWRC/MAPC Route 9 Enhancement Study & Plan Phase 1 Scope of Work and Contract

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled “MWRC/MAPC Route 9 Enhancement Study & Plan Phase 1 Scope of Work and Contract,” dated May 29, 2015; and
- Draft “Agreement for Services By and Between Wellesley Planning Board and Metropolitan Area Planning Council”

Ms. Preston recognized Mr. Zehner. Mr. Zehner indicated that he had provided the Board with a draft copy of the Contract for Phase 1 of the Route 9 Enhancement Study & Plan, as prepared by staff from the Metrowest Regional Collaborative and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council. Mr. Zehner indicated that the Contract had been provided to Town Counsel for review as well.

The Board discussed changes and revisions to the Contract that Mr. Zehner should propose. These included generally referencing Phase 2 of the Study & Plan, elaborating on the membership and role of the Stakeholder Group, broadening the means by which public input will be sought and collected, clarifying the project timeline, and clarifying the provision allowing for the Consultant to refer to or quote from Study & Plan materials.

The Planning Board indicated that they approved of the Contract in concept, with the changes as discussed, and granted Mr. Zehner the authority to execute the Contract as revised on the Board’s behalf.

b. Discuss Town Government Study Committee Recommendations

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled “Town Government Study Committee Recommendations,” dated May 27, 2015; and
- Town Government Study Committee PowerPoint presentation titled “Roll-Out of Draft Recommendations,” dated May 11, 2015

The Board discussed that the Town Government Study Committee (“TGSC”) recommendations should be discussed further at the June 15 meeting and the Planning Board’s Annual Retreat. The Board discussed whether they should be responding to the TGSC’s recommendations. Ms. Carpenter stated that the Board should wait for the forthcoming revised recommendations. Ms. Preston asked Mr. Zehner to forward those to the Board as soon as they are received, and asked the Board to begin thinking about their recommendation.

Ms. Warshaw asked whether the Board should be meeting more frequently. Ms. Preston suggested that the Board could discuss the idea at the Retreat, but that the Board needed to review assignments and consider more work-focused teams. Ms. Preston suggested that the Board begin the June 15 meeting at 6:30pm, and the Board agreed.

5. New and Other Business

a. Consider Support for NRC Open Space and Recreation Plan

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled “Support for NRC Open Space and Recreation Plan,” dated May 27, 2015;
- Memo from Brandon Schmitt to Michael Zehner titled “Open Space and Recreation Plan 2015,” dated May 6, 2015; and
- Draft Open Space and Recreation Plan 2015 - 2022, provided online

The Board discussed the Draft Open Space and Recreation Plan. The Board expressed concerns that the Plan comes across as *siloe*d, that the town and boards should be working to further a collaborative spirit. Members of the Board referenced the discussions that the NRC had been having with MassBay Community College (as noted in the Plan) as an example of this. The Board generally suggested that the Plan reference the NRC’s support for a more collaborative approach, integrating the Plan and the NRC’s efforts with the anticipated update of the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Preston suggested that Mr. Zehner encourage Mr. Schmitt and the NRC to listen to the Board’s comments on the Plan and submit a response.

b. Planning Director’s Report

Documents

- Memo from Michael Zehner to the Planning Board titled “Planning Director’s Report,” dated May 29, 2015;
- Letter from John Choi, 5 Polaris Circle, dated May 22, 2015 regarding the North Star Estates subdivision;
- Letter from Donna Brewer to Michael Lane, dated May 21, 2015; and
- Letter from Chris Heep, dated May 21, 2015, and filed Stipulation of Dismissal in the matter of Growth Homes Elm, LLC/910 Washington Street

Mr. Zehner reviewed the Planning Director’s Report for the Board, discussing upcoming meetings, the anticipated agenda for June 15, the status of the North Star Estates

subdivision, and the status of litigation pertaining to 978 Worcester Street and 910 Washington Street. Mr. Zehner asked the Board if they would be open to him using professional services funds for the planned stormwater workshop, which the Board indicated was acceptable. Mr. Zehner also has the Board sign a letter pertaining to their previous approval of major revisions associated with the Large House Review at 15 Croton Street. The Board discussed the High School follow up traffic study and requested that Mr. Zehner coordinate a meeting of the involved parties before the matter returns to the Board.

6. Minutes

a. May 4, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes

Documents

- Draft May 4, 2015 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Preston asked the Board if they had any edits or corrections to the minutes. Ms. Johnson and Ms. Carpenter pointed out typographical corrections that were needed. Mr. Zehner indicated that he would make the corrections.

Hearing no other comments, Ms. Preston asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Warshaw made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Conroy seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

6. Public Comments on Matters Not on the Agenda

Ms. Preston asked if members of the public had any comments on matters not on the agenda. No members of the public wished to speak.

7. Adjourn

Hearing no other business, Ms. Preston asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Carpenter made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Conroy seconded the motion. Ms. Preston called for a vote. The motion was approved unanimously, 5-0.

Meeting Adjourned: 10:19 p.m.

Next Meeting: June 15, 2015

Minutes Approved: August 3, 2015

Note: A recording of this meeting is available from the Planning Department.

Michael D. Zehner, AICP
Planning Director