



Town of Brookline

Massachusetts

PLANNING BOARD
Steve Heikin, Chairman
Robert Cook, Clerk
James Carr
Linda K. Hamlin
Blair Hines
Matthew Oudens
Mark J. Zarrillo

Town Hall, Third Floor
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445
(617) 730-2130
www.brooklinema.gov

BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES **Room 111, Brookline Town Hall** **January 3, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.**

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Linda Hamlin, Bob Cook, James Carr, Matt Oudens, Blair Hines, Mark Zarrillo

Staff Present: Karen Martin

Mr. Heikin called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

275 Goddard Avenue – construct two story addition requiring relief for FAR and rear yard setback (1/17) Pct. 15

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Shayna Duff gave an overview and background on the case.

Architect Claudia Noury-Ello presented the architectural plans.

Mr. Hines asked where the driveway is located. The applicant explained that their driveway is located on an adjacent parcel owned by the abutting condo trust and that they have an exclusive use of way to access their property over it.

Mr. Heikin asked about the surrounding properties and stated that it would be useful to see a site plan with all of the abutting lots shown.

Mr. Hines agreed that the applicant's case would be stronger if the Board could see the full site plan. He asked what the FAR would be without the finished basement. (About .34).

Ms. Hamlin asked if the applicants have the condo association's support for this addition. The applicant replied that they do.

Mr. Oudens asked if the neighbor has a similar situation with their driveway. The applicant stated the neighbor shares a driveway with the condo association.

Ms. Hamlin stated that she has no concerns other than wanting to see a better site plan.

Mr. Carr stated that he thinks the FAR request is too high and the ask is too large. He pointed out that there are no room dimensions and that the Board often questions these types of cases.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that due to the surroundings, the size of the house and the open space, he doesn't have a problem with this. He asked who owns Lot 1A and who maintains it. The applicant replied that the condo trust owns it but they choose to maintain it.

Mr. Hines agreed that this is a peculiar arrangement and that he wants to see dimensions and a better site plan.

Mr. Oudens suggested shading the site plan to show the area in the applicant's control. He agreed that this is a unique site with no abutters.

Mr. Carr raised issues regarding the neighborhood character and the loss of open space as well as the long unbroken façade being proposed. The architect replied that it was hard to find a place to break the elevation and roof.

Mr. Heikin stated that he shares some of Mr. Carr's concerns and finds that 165% of FAR increasing to 220% is pushing a lot. He stated that the design is well thought out but the scale is large – there is an extra exercise room and mudroom, study and sitting room that could all be tightened up to avoid an unnecessary incursion into the rear yard. He suggested reducing the length of the addition.

Ms. Hamlin stated that she would prefer seeing this project voted on tonight.

The Board deliberated and a majority of the Board felt that the project should be approved due to the unique mitigating features of the site and the house's location.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Oudens seconded the motion.

Voted (5-2): Therefore, the staff recommends approval of the site plan by Joseph Small dated 10/5/2018 and the floor plans and elevations by Noury-Ello Architects dated 9/19/2018 subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan showing adjacent properties, floor plans and elevations subject to the review and approval of the

Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan, subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
3. 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: a) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; b) final floor plans and elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect or engineer; and c) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

*Mr. Heikin and Mr. Carr voted against recommendation.

74 Lawton Street – construct new mudroom, demolish and re-build garage requiring relief for side yard setback and open space (1/17) Pct. 9

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Jake Walters gave a brief overview of the case.

Mr. Heikin pointed out that there are no proposed elevations of the new garage. He asked if any existing walls could be kept and also asked about accessibility modifications that have been previously made to the house.

Ms. Hamlin stated that the new rear addition looks as cute as a button.

Mr. Hines pointed out the lack of dimensions on the plans and that the driveway is only 7.5 feet wide which is very narrow.

Mr. Carr inquired about the shadows on the elevations.

Mr. Hines stated that the counterbalancing amenity could include some type of pervious surface and permeable pavers.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (7-0): Therefore, the staff recommends approval of the site plan dated 11/15/2018 by Robert Staples and the floor plans and elevations dated 11/2/2018 by Siemasko & Verbridge, subject to the following conditions:

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

2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a landscaping plan subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
3. 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 building 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.

217 Wolcott Road – construct new single family home requiring relief for FAR, height, lot width and design review (1/31) Pct. 15

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Adam Barnosky gave an overview of the case and the proposal.

Philip Baker, architect, presented the architectural plans and went over the height calculation used.

Mr. Heikin asked if there is basement access to the deck. The architect replied that there is not.

Mr. Hines stated that he believes this is a work-around and that they are putting more space into the basement in order to ask for more FAR.

Mr. Oudens stated that pushing the house further back on the sloping site increases the size of the basement.

Mr. Heikin stated that there is no site plan to see where the house is on the lot. The architect showed that he does have a site plan.

Mr. Oudens asked why they pushed the new house back further.

Mr. Carr suggested that programmed space could be put in the lower level and to see the lower level as opportunity space. He stated he would ask the applicant to come back and get within the FAR.

Mr. Heikin stated that it is a relatively modest house but has a full extra story underneath.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that the applicant does not understand the topography of the site at all. He stated that the house should be pulled forward and shrunk slightly. He suggested that the house be pushed into the site and lowered.

Mr. Oudens also suggested having a look at the context and showing other neighborhood houses and the elevation compared to other surrounding homes.

Ms. Hamlin agreed that the house should not be pushed back and that it doesn't fit on the site and wasn't designed for the lot.

Mr. Heikin pointed out that the garage could be in the basement level.

Public Comment

Craig Goldstein (210 Wolcott) stated that the neighbors are suffering and just want some house built on the lot.

Cornelia Van Der Ziel (100 Wolcott) stated that she would like something built and a conclusion to this process.

Neighbor at 211 Wolcott stated that he is appreciate of the design and pretty happy with it.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that the Board's concerns are related to the site location.

The Board continued this case to a future date to be determined.

DESIGN REVIEW FOR PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ZBA CASE

800/808 Washington Street – final review of plans and landscaping for conversion of single-family house to two-family and construction of new single-family house Pct. 13

Mr. Heikin asked the applicant if there have been any changes since the Planning Board's review of these plans.

Jonathan Raisz, applicant and architect, replied that there are now two new 3rd floor casement windows and some refining of grading and walkways. He also stated that there are minor fenestration changes to the rear addition on 808 Washington that add privacy for the abutter.

Mr. Heikin asked if the landscaping plan was done in consultation with the neighbors. Mr. Raisz replied yes and that some plantings are proposed on the neighbor's lot for added privacy.

Ms. Hamlin asked if there are outside lights proposed. Mr. Raisz stated that he sees no need, but if he were to use any, they would be low, solar lights.

Ms. Hamlin asked about the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Raisz described it as a battered wall of interlocking blocks and showed a photo example to the Board. The Board was supportive of the look.

Public Comment:

Ed and Linda Musmon (left abutters) stated that they didn't know this meeting was to review more than the landscaping. They asked for the Board's input on an appropriate size for the proposed arborvitae. The Board felt that 7-8 feet is appropriate.

Mr. Heikin motioned to approve the final plans.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (7-0)

DISCUSSION

Design guidelines for counterbalancing conditions for large projects – discussion and possible vote to adopt

Mr. Carr asked how “large project” will be defined – will it pertain to commercial districts or unit sizes or mixed use projects?

Ms. Hamlin suggested that graphics could be useful.

The Board discussed that it will be necessary to be specific that these counterbalancing conditions are in the public realm and that on-site improvements may still be required.

Mr. Carr suggested a miscellaneous category that could include public art, wayfinding, historical plaques, etc.

The Board discussed how this relates to the counterbalancing amenities required of smaller projects and agreed that additional consideration should be given to how those counterbalancing amenities could be improved.

A few Board members provided written edits to the language of the draft. Mr. Hines stated he would incorporate the edits into the guidelines.

Mr. Heikin motioned to approve this draft of the conditions.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (7-0)

OTHER BUSINESS

Planning Board Minutes – 1/3/19

The Board voted (6-0) to approve the minutes of the December 6th meeting. Mr. Zarrillo abstained.

Materials Reviewed During Meeting: Staff Reports, Zoning Texts, Site Plans, Elevations

The meeting was adjourned.