Brookline Board of Appeals
February 23, 2016, 7:00 PM
Public Hearing

333 Washington Street
Town Hall Room 308

***Board Members Present**: Mark Zuroff (Chairman), Kate Poverman, Jonathan Book*
***Staff Present**: Jay Rosa (Planning Department)*

171 High Street (*cont.*)

Proposal: Construct a two-story rear addition
Zoning District: M-1.0 (Apartment House)
Precinct: 5
Board Decision: Relief request **granted**, subject to conditions

***Board Members Present**: Jesse Geller (Chairman), Mark Zuroff, Jonathan Book, Avi Liss*
***Staff Present**: Maria Morelli, Jay Rosa (Planning Department)*

21 Crowninshield Road

Proposal: ***Application for a Comprehensive Permit (40B)*** to construct eight residential units distributed between tow four-story buildings with a total of 16 parking spaces
Zoning District: S-7 (Single-Family)
Precinct: 8
Board Decision: Case continuance to **March 8, 2016**

Minutes shall be posted on the Town of Brookline website (http://www.brooklinema.gov/564/Zoning-Board-of-Appeals) upon approval. Draft minutes shall be made available upon request.

Decisions shall be posted on the Town of Brookline website (www.brooklinema.gov). Appeals, if any, shall be filed with land court or superior court within twenty days after the date of filing of such notice in the office of the town clerk.

Brookline Board of Appeals
February 23, 2016, 7:00 PM
Public Hearing

333 Washington Street
Town Hall Room 308

Board Members Present – Mark Zuroff (Chairman), Jonathan Book, Kate Poverman
Staff Present – Maria Morelli, Jay Rosa (Planning Dept.)

171 High Street (Continued from 12/17/15) – Construct a two-story rear addition

Board Chairman Zuroff opened the hearing and called case #2015-0040. Mr. Zuroff reviewed standard hearing procedure and stated that this proposal was previously heard by the Board so the intent of this hearing is to review any revision to the design of the addition itself and hold Board deliberation on the merit of special permit relief as requested.

The Petitioner's attorney, Robert Allen of the Law Office of Robert Allen Jr. (300 Washington Street, Brookline, MA) waived the reading of public hearing notice for the record and introduced property owner and architect Brett Bentson. Attorney Allen stated that Mr. Bentson and his family wish to move into the attached single-family structure at 171 High Street prior to the new academic school year in September of 2016. Attorney Allen stated that interior renovation and an exterior rear addition are proposed to improve the interior living space. At the prior hearing on this matter, abutting residents expressed concern about the overall size of the proposed rear addition on this undersized lot and the visual, drainage, shading, and construction related impact that may result if constructed. Following this initial hearing, Attorney Allen stated that the Petitioner consulted with adjacent residents and property owners to modify plans in an effort to alleviate these stated concerns.

Mr. Bentson reviewed proposed modifications to the rear addition including the reduction in total length from 15.9 feet to 7.5 feet. All cantilever privacy wall designs have been eliminated and a rear staircase providing access to a ground level patio has been reduced as much as permitted to still comply with building code requirements. Mr. Bentson further stated that the footprint of the revised addition is pulled away from the side lot line (northeast) to provide further separation from the property located at 165-167 High Street. Mr. Bentson compared potential impact on sight lines and shadow generation between the prior proposal and the reduced addition.

Attorney Allen stated that the Petitioner made clear concessions with the project design to address the concerns of abutting residents. Attorney Allen stated that a more narrow addition that extends along the southwestern side lot line may be permitted as of right but he believed the proposal currently before the Board is the most appropriate for the needs of the property owner and adjacent residents. Attorney Allen conceded that the location of the subject structure creates some difficulty because efforts to reduce impact on one side abutter may result in a shift of massing that more significantly impacts the abutting property to the other side.

Board Member Poverman requested that Mr. Benston further describe potential building materials and the issue of locating trash facilities in the front yard as discussed at the previous hearing.

Mr. Bentson stated that side walls of the addition would consist of panelized painted siding but the rear facing wall may be more decorative, perhaps a translucent polycarbonate material. Mr. Bentson also stated that trash will still be located in the front yard and does not present a zoning concern. Mr. Benston stated that an enclosed structure intended to screen the trash would require additional zoning relief, therefore he is proposing fencing or shrubs to screen this portion of the front yard.

Board Member Poverman questioned if the Petitioner considered the conversion of basement space to expand finished floor area. Mr. Bentson stated that the basement headroom does not sufficiently meet building code.

Board Chairman Zuroff called for public comment in favor of, or in opposition to, the Petitioner's proposal.

Attorney Scott Gladstone of 1244 Boylston Street, Chestnut Hill stated that he represents the immediate abutter of this proposal at 173 High Street. Attorney Gladstone stated that his client appreciated efforts made by Mr. Bentson to reduce the size of the rear addition. Attorney Gladstone state that concerns still remain regarding site access during construction, water runoff generated by the expanded structure, the location and sound associated with air conditioning equipment, and the location of any new or repaired fencing.

Attorney Jake Walters of 27 Harvard Street, Brookline, MA stated that he represents the immediate abutters of this proposal at 165-167 High Street. Mr. Walters stated that his clients appreciate that the proposal was "scaled back" and that modifications are intended to soften the impact on neighboring residents. Mr. Walters suggested that the Board consider conditions if approved that may limit future development at the site. Mr. Walters confirmed that his clients supported the requirement of a construction management plan and specifically stressed that water runoff should be considered during and after construction.

Thomas Veely of175 High Street stated that the rear yard of 171 High Street is only accessible if construction vehicles cross over surrounding private properties. Mr. Veely suggested that the property owner's solution to this challenge should be addressed publicly prior to Board approval.

Attorney Allen stated that he supports the submission of a construction management plan. Mr. Allen further stated that the scale of the construction project is not large and therefore frequent construction vehicle access should not be a problem. Mr. Allen stated that the foundation will be dug by hand and materials will be carried through the home to the rear yard.

Board Chairman Zuroff requested that Zoning Coordinator Jay Rosa review the findings of the Planning Board and the Building Department. Mr. Rosa stated that the Planning Board reviewed and recommended approval of the previous design of the rear addition that was referenced by Mr. Bentson. The current proposal is reduced in scope and requires identical zoning relief so revised plans were not heard by the Planning Board. Mr. Rosa stated that both the Planning and Building Department support the modified rear addition. The Petitioner directly incorporated design recommendations from abutting residents in order to reduce the potential impact of the addition. Mr. Rosa also commended area residents and the property owner for reaching a compromise on the design and overall massing.

Mr. Rosa further stated that the Building Department is not opposed to the recommended condition that a construction management plan be submitted if the Board does find that the standards for the grant of a special permit are met. Mr. Rosa did however state that any restrictions regarding private access to the rear of the lot or future additions to the property are beyond the scope of review for the Building Department.

Board Deliberation

Board Member Jonathan Book agreed that the reduction in size of the rear addition is a more appropriate design for this undersized location that is in close proximity to two abutting structures to the east and west. Mr. Book was in favor of granting the requested relief subject to conditions stated for the record. Mr. Book did not support development restrictions for the site as a potential imposed condition if relief is granted by the Board.

Board Member Poverman concurred with Mr. Books comments. Ms. Poverman further stated that she was satisfied that the standards for the grant of a special permit are met in accordance with Zoning By-Law Section 5.43 and 9.05.

Board Chairman Zuroff commended the parties involved for reaching agreement on several design aspects. Mr. Zuroff believed that requested zoning relief for the side yard setback in question is modest and the Petitioner reached a design that works within this somewhat dense and undersized area. Mr. Zuroff was not in favor of a restriction on future building at the property but did support the requirement that a construction management plan be submitted prior to the grant of a building permit.

Unanimous Board grant of requested relief, subject to the following revised conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan, floor plans, and elevations, subject to review and approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning depicting:

    a. Placement of any air conditioning condensers, which should be in the rear yard as much as possible;
    b. Placement of any gutters and the outlets of any new or relocated downspouts, which should be placed at least 5 feet away from the foundation of 173 High Street with water flow at the outlet directed away from 173 High Street;
    c. Placement of new fencing, showing its placement on applicant's property, which on the side abutting 173 High Street shall be of construction and design that will permit the passage of natural light and air and won't otherwise impact the ability of the resident of 173 High Street to maintain a vegetable garden adjacent to that fence line.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities, subject to review and approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.

3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a construction management plan, specifically detailing construction equipment access to the rear yard and impact mitigation strategies for abutting properties, subject to the review and approval of the Building

Commissioner.

4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final floor plans and elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Hearing Closed

Board Members Present – Jesse Geller (Chairman), Mark Zuroff, Jonathan Book, Avi Liss
Staff Present – Maria Morelli, Jay Rosa (Planning Dept.)

21 Crowninshield Road (Application for Comprehensive Permit) – Construct 8 residential units distributed between tow four-story buildings with a total of 16 parking spaces

Board Chairman Geller opened the hearing and called case #2015-0057. Mr. Geller reviewed hearing procedure for this application for a comprehensive permit in accordance with M.G.L. c.40B. Mr. Geller stated that the Board will hear a brief review from the Planning Department, the Applicant will present project details, the Applicant's Legal Counsel will discuss requested zoning waivers, and the Board will hear public comment on the matter.

Regulatory Planner Maria Morelli stated that the Applicant applied for and was issued a project eligibility letter from the subsidizing agency (MassHousing) for a proposal to construct a 20-unit residential building at 21 Crowninshield Road on April 19, 2015. Following the issuance of this letter, the Town drafted a formal response to this preliminary proposal that incorporated feedback from local boards, departments, and residents. The Town response expressed no opposition to the creation of affordable housing at the subject property but did not support the 20-unit building as designed because it is inconsistent with the scale and character of the existing Crowninshield neighborhood. Ms. Morelli further stated that the immediate neighborhood including Crowninshield Road, Elba St., Adams St., and Coply St. was designated as a local historic district in September of 2015.

Ms. Morelli asserted that MassHousing responded to these formal Town comments by directing the Applicant to work with the Town to revise the project design so that it may be more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Following this MassHousing directive, the Applicant worked with the Town through a design advisory team to organize public input and review design iterations. Ms. Morelli commended the property owner for this collaboration and stated that this 7-month process resulted in a clear directive that the community preferred a townhome style design to complement the surrounding neighborhood that consists primarily of single and two-family structures, and serve as a transition from this residential neighborhood to larger commercial and academic structures found along Commonwealth Avenue to the north. Ms. Morelli stated that the plans of record submitted to the Board of Appeals include a significant reduction from the initial 20-unit building to 8 townhouse-style residential units distributed amongst two separate buildings with a parking/motor court situated between. Ms. Morelli indicated that no modification to the previously submitted comprehensive permit application is required because these project alterations emerged from the design advisory process as requested by MassHousing. Ms. Morelli

commented that the organized neighborhood group in the immediate area has retained legal counsel but generally supports this 8 townhouse concept.

Ms. Morelli concluded her comments by stating that the state regulations for 40B projects such as this supersede the local historic district designation but because state funding would most likely be provided for this project, if approved, the Massachusetts Historical Commission will be appropriately notified and may comment on any potential adverse impact the project may generate on state register properties. Similarly, any imposed local demolition delay placed on the existing structure or detached garage located on the subject property would be lifted if a comprehensive permit is issued by the Board.

Board Chairman Geller confirmed that project plans were officially amended and the plans of record, dated January 6, 2016, include 8 total residential units. Mr. Geller further stated that the Board is required to close this public hearing within 180 days of the of today's date (2/23/2016). The Board may conduct open deliberations beyond that deadline but public comment may not be heard after that 180-day period. At the conclusion of Board deliberation, the Board may reach one of three possible decisions on this application including denial, approval, or approval with imposed conditions.

Jeff Engler of SEB, LLC stated that he represents the applicant as an affordable housing consultant. Mr. Engler stated that he has worked on a variety of 40B project resulting in the creation on nearly 15,000 residential units throughout 150 Massachusetts communities. Mr. Engler stated that the Applicant willingly volunteered to scale back the unit count for this project and was not specifically requested to do so by MassHousing. Mr. Engler also clarified that any involvement by the Massachusetts Historical Commission would occur following the grant of a comprehensive permit and therefore should not be considered as a possible condition for the grant of this comprehensive permit if approved by the Board. Mr. Engler described the current development proposal as having a 60% reduction in density from the prior 20-unit proposal and this represents a "very significant compromise" on the part of the Applicant.

Ms. Morelli agreed that the directive from MassHousing did not characterize the 20-unit proposal as being inappropriate and the general condition required the Applicant to work with the Town on the project design.

Mr. Geller stated that the nature of this 40B process is to alleviate some control provided by local ordinances to the extent that is mandated by state law in order to encourage the development of affordable housing. Mr. Geller stated that any granted comprehensive permit is still subject to state law, thus the Board has limited authority to require or waive any review by the Massachusetts Historical Commission.

The Applicant's Attorney, Robert Allen of the Law Office of Robert Allen (300 Washington Street, Brookline, MA) introduced project architect Jim Zegowitz of the MZO Group, landscape architect Philip Pryor of Stantec Consulting, and property owner Robert Basile jr. Mr. Allen stated that the Applicant has a long history of working well with community members and he takes pride in incorporating high quality landscaping, fencing, and overall property maintenance for his residential and commercial properties. Mr. Allen confirmed that the current proposal includes 2 designated affordable residential units and the plans of record include a 60% reduction in the number of total units, a 30% reduction in the lot coverage, a 15% reduction in gross floor area, a 13% increase in open space, a 19 inch reduction in maximum height, and an increase of off-street parking spaces per residential unit from the prior 20-unit proposal.

Mr. Allen stated that these modifications were intended to create a project that is more consistent with the existing neighborhood, however the incorporation of two separate structures does reduce the side-yard setback between the subject property and the adjacent property located at 25 Crowninshield Road.

Mr. Allen reviewed all requested waivers from the local zoning By-Law including the following:

Bylaw Section	Requirement	Requested Waiver(s)	Details of Proposal Requiring Waiver
§4.07(6) – *Table of Use Regulations*	Multi-Family Uses	Waiver to allow the property to be used as a multi-family dwelling for town houses, associated amenities and accessory parking.	The Development is a multi-family housing development containing 8 town houses. The Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B § 20-23.
§4.08	Affordable Housing Requirements	Waiver to allow multi-family uses within the S-7 zoning district.	The Development is a multi-family housing development containing 8 town houses. The Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B § 20-23.
§5.09	Design Review	Design Review requirements not applicable under M.G.L. c. 40B.	Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B § 20-23.
§5.20 & Table §5.01	Maximum Floor Area	Waiver from maximum ratio of gross floor area to lot area (0.35 in S-7 District)	The Development has 15,556 s.f. lot and will have a floor area ratio of approximately 1.17.
§5.30-5.32 & Table §5.01	Maximum Height of Buildings	Waiver from maximum building height limitations (35' in S-7 District)	The height of the Development will be 43.5' feet at its maxim.
§5.45	Traffic Visibility Across Corners	Waiver from visibility requirements across corners.	The traffic visibility across corners may be limited by an existing tree near the Right of Way.
§5.50 & Table §5.01	Minimum Front Yard (Crowninshield)	Waiver from 30' minimum front yard requirement.	The Development has two front yards and will have a minimum front yard setback of 6'-10."
§5.50 & Table §5.01	Minimum Front Yard (Passageway)	Waiver from 30' minimum front yard requirement.	The Development has two front yards and will have a minimum front yard setback of 10'-6."
§5.52	Maximum Fence Height Front Yard	Waiver from the maximum fence/terrace requirement of 6' in the front yard yards.	The Development has a minimum 8' fence.
§5.60 & Table §5.01	Minimum Side Yard	Waiver from 20' minimum side yard requirement.	The Development will have a minimum side yard setback of 10'-1."
§5.62	Maximum Fence Height Side Yard	Waiver from the maximum fence/terrace requirement of 7' in the side yard.	The Development has a minimum 8' fence.
§5.70 & Table §5.01	Minimum Rear Yard	Waiver from 40' minimum rear yard requirement.	The Development will have a minimum rear yard setback of 5'-7."
§5.74	Maximum Fence Height Rear Yard	Waiver from the maximum fence/terrace requirement of 7' in the rear yard.	The Development has a minimum 8' fence.
§6.04.4	Design of All Off-Street Parking Facilities	Waiver from the 20' driveway width requirement for two-way use.	The Development will have a minimum driveway width of 18 ft.
§7.04.4	Illumination	Waiver from the lighting requirements in the S-7 District.	The Development may have decorative lighting designed to illuminate walks, driveways, doorways, and outdoor areas.
Bylaw Section	**Requirement**	**Requested Waiver(s)**	**Details of Proposal Requiring Waiver**
§3.17	Department of Public Works	Waiver from the Department of Public Works site plan approval process, curb	Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B §

		cut procedure, tree removal, and construction and maintenance related parking permits.	20-23.
§5.3	Demolition Delay	Waiver from the Preservation Commission requirements for demolition delay for the demolition of historically significant buildings.	Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B § 20-23.
§5.6.6	Local Historic Districts	Waiver from the Preservation Commission requirements for buildings located in the Crowininshield Local Historic District.	Comprehensive Permit, as may be granted by Zoning Board of Appeals shall provide all local permits per M.G.L. c. 40B § 20-23.

Project Architect, Jim Zegowitz reviewed the proposed site plan, floor plans, elevations, and parking details with the Board. Mr. Zegowitz highlighted the site location and vehicular circulation at the site. All parking is situated on the interior courtyard with a garage and surface parking space provided for each residential unit. The two front-facing units are accessed directly from Crowninshield Road while the remaining six units are accessed by front doors that also face the interior court area. Fencing is proposed to surround the entire site with additional fencing to partially enclose rear patio areas for each residential unit. All residential units are laid out in a similar manner including garage and storage space at the ground level, a living room and kitchen located at the second level, 3 bedrooms located at the third level, and an open loft area at the fourth level. All floors include an 8 foot ceiling height resulting in the maximum building height of 43.

Mr. Zegowitz further stated that the exterior design directly incorporates features that are inspired by neighboring structures. These features include front-facing bay windows, upper story dormers and chimneys, window muntin/sash bar design, and 10 to 12 roof pitches. The overall construction is a standard wood frame construction with a brick base veneer and clapboard above. Mr. Zegowitz concluded his comments by again illustrating the progression of structural scale from Crowninshield road to Commonwealth Avenue.

Board Member Avi Liss asked whether the parking spaces are tandem or not.

Mr. Zegowitz confirmed that surface parking spaces are located directly behind interior garage spaces in a tandem fashion.

Board Chairman Geller requested that Mr. Zegowitz clarify the dimensions for proposed ground level office space and functional loft space.

Mr. Zegowitz stated that ground level office space included in all residential units are 13.5’ x 8.5’ and the functional area of loft space is 15’ x 13’-6” with additional storage space under the areas of roof pitch that do not meet the height requirement for habitable space.

Landscape architect Philip Pryor stated that proposed wood fencing located along side and rear lot lines will be 7 feet tall at the sides and 8 feet tall at the rear. Privacy screening between rear patios for each residential unit will consist of 4 foot tall solid fences with 2 foot tall lattice material above, for a total of 6 feet. A 4 foot tall brick partition will be installed along the front lot line to enclose the parking courtyard and screen vehicles parked in surface spaces.

Mr. Pryor described various landscaping features intended to beautify the property and serve as visual screening. Mr. Pryor stated that he worked closely with the abutting property owner at 25 Crowninshield Road to specifically soften the potential impact of the project on that neighboring resident. Evergreen plantings (Norway Spruce) will be located along side and rear lot lines with various flowering trees (cherry, dogwood, birch, sunset maple, honey locust) to complement these evergreen hedges. Mr. Pryor

further described foundation plantings (rhododendron, azalea, yews, holly) to be located at the base of both structures. Mr. Pryor stated that these decorative plantings tend to thrive in urban areas and are found throughout the Crowninshield neighborhood.

Mr. Pryor concluded his comments by describing printed and/or colored asphalt paving to encourage resident pedestrian use of the courtyard and modest fences to screen HVAC equipment located near rear patio areas.

Board Chairman Geller stated that the Applicant should produce final and accurate open space calculations to determine if a zoning is required for this dimensional requirement included in the Zoning By-Law (Section 5.01).

Board Member Book asked whether all proposed plantings are new or if existing trees will be maintained. Mr. Book also requested additional detail regarding the caliper of proposed plantings and the anticipated height of mature plantings. Mr. Pryor stated that existing trees on the property have all been removed therefore all proposed planting is new. Existing street trees will remain and will be unaltered by construction. Mr. Pryor further stated that plantings that are specifically intended for screening and shading purposes will have a 3 inch caliper at the time of planting and are anticipated to grow to approximately 20 feet.

The Applicant, Robert Basile Jr., stated that all trash/recycling facilities are located within the interior garage and will be collected up to twice a week by the property management company. This collection will include large items and will not require collection vehicles to park on Crowninshield Road. Mr. Basile also confirmed that snow removal will also be the responsibility of property management.

Chairman Geller requested additional information regarding any design strategies or drainage plans to mitigate water runoff.

Attorney Allen stated that stromwater management is less concerning with the smaller 8-unit proposal. Mr. Allen noted that "breaks" in the courtyard asphalt paving do provide moderate greenspace to assist with water collection. Attorney Allen and Chairman Geller agreed that both the project engineer and the Director of Engineering and Transportation should be in attendance at the next scheduled hearing on this matter to address water runoff mitigation strategies. Mr. Geller noted that these strategies are not required to be finalized but should provide clear evidence that water runoff will not increase from the existing condition.

Chairman Geller requested that the project team discuss shadows generated from the height/massing of the proposed structures. Mr. Zegowitz stated that the most immediate single-family dwelling located at 25 Crowninshield Road is located to the south so newly created shadows will not impact this abutting property. Mr. Zegowitz stated that the maximum height of the proposed structures 43 feet and the maximum height of the single-family dwelling at 25 Crowninshield Road is 35 feet (8 foot differential).

Mr. Zegowitz displayed a three-dimensional rendering (Sketch-Up) of the proposed development. Mr. Zegowitz specifically highlighted preliminary building materials including hardy blank lap siding and both double hung and casing windows.

Board Members Liss and Geller requested that Mr. Zegowitz confirm the width proposed between two front entrance pillars (entrance driveway width). Mr. Zegowitz stated that the total distance between pillars is 22 feet but the paved portion of this entrance driveway is 18 feet wide. This distance sufficiently allows for two-way traffic.

Ms. Morelli stated that the Fire Chief reviewed the current configuration of the structures as well as the entrance driveway and confirmed that his fire equipment will not be required to enter the interior courtyard in order to adequately access rear portions of the structure for fire suppression purposes. Ms. Morelli also noted that an existing passageway along the northern lot line also serves to provide emergency access to rear portions of the proposed structures. The Fire Chief did recommend that both buildings include NFPA designed sprinkler systems and direct alarm notification to the Fire Department headquarters.

Chairman Geller requested that the project team describe the driveway turning radius, any roof top mechanical equipment, and utility connections.

Attorney Allen stated that adequate turning radius is provided to allow parked vehicles to back out of surface parking spaces. A small hammerhead is included to provide adequate turning radius for the westernmost residential units (#7 & 8). Mr. Allen confirmed that there is no proposed roof top mechanical equipment and all utilities will be connected underground.

Chairman Geller asked whether a traffic analysis was conducted. Mr. Engler stated that a traffic analysis was developed for the prior 20-unit proposal and was deemed to be sufficient by the Director of Engineering and Transportation. A new analysis was not produced for the reduced 8-unit proposal because traffic generation associated with the development will be reduced from the prior proposal. Mr. Engler further stated that this reduced proposal also relocates the entrance driveway away from Adams Street, which is perpendicular to the subject property. Mr. Engler stated that he would request that any traffic analysis or mitigation related conditions allow for peer review by the current transportation consulting firm

Ms. Morelli concurred with Mr. Engler's comments and further stated that the Director of Engineering and Transportation suggested that new signage intended to reinforce the one-way traffic flow along Crowninshield Road be located in any of three possible locations including the driveway entrance, on public property located directly across the street (Crowninshield Rd.) from the entrance driveway, and in close proximity to the private passageway located directly to the north of the subject property.

Ms. Morelli stated that the Planning and Building Departments drafted a letter to the Board that incorporates comments from relevant town boards and departments. This letter also includes a draft of potential comprehensive permit conditions. Ms. Morelli confirmed that full letters from these pertinent department heads are included as attachments to this Board letter. Ms. Morelli also confirmed that the Board is provided the opportunity to seek independent technical assistance if any traffic, engineering, etc. related documents are beyond the technical expertise of local Town officials. This potential technical consulting is provided under M.G.L. c.40B regulations.

Chairman Geller restated that 40B regulations do not mandate the submission of final plans prior to a final Board finding on this comprehensive permit application. Mr. Geller confirmed that preliminary plans may suffice but the Board must be satisfied that potential adverse impacts may be adequately addressed and or mitigated.

Chairman Geller called for public comment in favor of, or in opposition to, the Applicant's proposal. Mr. Geller also stated that the Applicant will be offered the opportunity to rebut following any public comment.

John Sherman, of 12 Adams Street, stated that he is a member of the Crowninshield Neighborhood Committee that consists of approximately 20-22 neighborhood residents. Mr. Sherman stated that this organization supports the 8-unit proposal before the Board but within

the context that it is an improvement from the prior 20-unit proposal. This reduction in scale is far more preferable from the abutters' perspective and Mr. Sherman stated appreciation for the efforts made by the Applicant as well as Town representatives. Mr. Sherman briefly described the historic character of the Crowninshield neighborhood as one of the first residential subdivisions in Brookline. The neighborhood is saddened by the potential demolition of the existing arts and crafts stucco but do appreciate the architect's efforts to incorporate an overall design that is more compatible with the historic neighborhood. Mr. Sherman concluded his comments by stating that the neighborhood supports efforts and or conditions to more strongly enforce the one-way traffic flow.

Kate Poveman, of 39 Adams Street, stated that she is an associate member of the Board of Appeals but she is speaking as an immediate abutter of the 21 Crowninshield Road property. Ms. Poverman concurred with the previous statements that the neighborhood was highly involved in the establishment of the Local Historic District and the design advisory process. Ms. Povermen commended the Applicant for producing a more paletable project that fits much better with the surrounding neighborhood and may attempt to provide somewhat of a buffer from larger commercial activity along Commonwealth Avenue. Ms. Poverman agreed that issues related to traffic flow, safety during demolition/construction, and building materials still need to be refined. Ms. Poverman concluded her comments by speaking on behalf of Janice Bellows, of 25 Crowninshield Road. Ms. Bellows appreciated the efforts of the project team, particularly landscape architect Philip Pryor. Ms. Bellows communicated that she is not opposed to the current proposal but she is not happy about demolition of the current structure and the overall massing of the proposed 8-unit townhomes.

No members of the public spoke in opposition.

Chairman Geller requested that Building Commissioner Daniel Bennett address any comments raised by the public. Mr. Bennett stated that he will provide more formal comments at the next scheduled hearing on this matter but he did state that standard collaboration between the Building Department and the Health Department does occur whenever demolition occurs particularly if lead or asbestos may be involved.

Chairman Geller stated that the next scheduled hearing on this matter will focus on any revised proposal elements, more detailed discussion or engineering/drainage related strategies, comments from pertinent town officials, discussion of proposed comprehensive permit conditions, and further Board deliberation.

Board Chairman Geller suggested Tuesday, March 8, 2016 at 7:00pm as the continuance date to re-open this hearing.

The Board unanimously agreed to reopen the hearing on this matter on Tuesday March 8, 2016 at 7:00pm.

Hearing closed.