



Town of Brookline Massachusetts

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

PLANNING BOARD

Steven A. Heikin, Chair
Mark J. Zarrillo, Clerk
Andrea Brue
Shelly Chipimo
Linda K. Hamlin
Abigail Hiller
Blair Hines

BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES By Zoom Event January 20, 2022 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Mark Zarrillo, Linda Hamlin, Shelly Chipimo, Andrea Brue, Abigail Hill, Blair Hines

Staff Present: Victor Panak

Steve Heikin opened the meeting.

1) PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Steve Heikin highlighted the first public forum on the Housing Production Plan occurring on 1/26/22. Mr. Heikin also briefly discussed the establishment of a real-estate transfer tax.

2) BOARD OF APPEALS CASE (Tentative Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing Date) and relevant Precinct:

1290 Beacon Street – Convert building from office use (Use #21) to a veterinary clinic (Use #20A) requiring zoning relief for use and design review. (TBD) Pct. 10

Victor Panak described the proposal and described the zoning relief required.

Paul Mataras (owner/manager) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposal. Mr. Heikin clarified that the proposed use would not include any overnight boarding.

Ms. Brue asked whether the applicant expects most clients to arrive by vehicle or by walking. Mr. Mataras said they expect a mix.

Nicholas Capone (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the plans.

Mr. Panak clarified that the proposed signage would require a separate application under the Town's Sign/Façade Review process.

The Board and applicant briefly discussed proposed signage and exterior lighting.

Mr. Zarrillo asked for clarity regarding waste management and location of office space. Mr. Mataras explained waste management in the facility.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin stated he feels that it is a well-run operation.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site plan by VHB, dated 10/20/20, and architectural plans by Capone Architecture, dated 11/1/21, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect, and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Further control measures shall be undertaken if background noise levels are exceeded during the operation of the facility, or other odor or waste complaints arise in the future.**
- 3. Details on waste management shall be reviewed and approved by the Health Department prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.**
- 4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan, floor plans, and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-0-1 to approve the motion.

92 Sewall Avenue – Demolish existing inn and construct new three-story building with six dwelling units and 12 parking spaces requiring zoning relief for setbacks, parking design, design review, affordable housing requirements, and on-site fossil fuel infrastructure. (TBD)
Pct. 3

Victor Panak described the proposal and described the zoning relief required.

Bob Allen (attorney) introduced the design team and the proposal. He also reviewed the required zoning relief.

Christopher Flass (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Michael D'Angelo (landscape architect) reviewed the proposed landscape plan for the Board.

Mr. Heikin clarified that the automated parking stackers drop down into a pit.

Ms. Hamlin asked about access to the shared open space in the rear of the building and raised a concern with the visibility of the open space to the first-floor units. Mr. Flass indicated that access would be by walking around the building. The rear deck is lower in elevation and residents using the deck would not have direct views into the first-floor units.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that he felt that the open space in the rear of the building is not particularly usable. Mr. Zarrillo felt that the new building should meet the setback requirements. Mr. Heikin agreed and felt that all new buildings should meet setback requirements.

Ms. Brue also raised concerns about noise pollution from residents using the rear open space for evening parties. Ms. Brue asked for clarification on the use of fossil fuels on the property.

Mr. Hines clarified that the 12 parking spaces provided exceed the requirements of the Zoning By-law. He also echoed opinions by other Board members that a new building should meet the setback requirements. He expressed disappointment in the size of the units in the proposed building.

Mr. Heikin felt that the building and site are fairly well designed but emphasized his greater concern that the applicant is demolishing a historically significant on the site. Mr. Heikin expressed his hope that the owner would preserve the existing building and use the adjacent site in combination with the subject site for an addition to the existing building. The Board and Mr. Allen briefly discussed the possibility of a two-lot solution.

Ms. Hamlin stated that she does not like the design of the proposed building and feels that the design is “aggressive”.

Public Comments

Mike Sandman (115 Sewall Avenue) expressed opposition to the proposed building on the grounds that the design is not in keeping with the surrounding streetscape.

Lauren Elias (150 St. Paul Street) said she is concerned with demolition and construction activities on the street. She also asked about the timeline for demolition and construction.

Bryan Austin (143 St. Paul Street) stated he sold the building to the current owner and said he is supportive of the proposed project.

Julia House (143 St. Paul Street) expressed opposition to the project on the grounds that the Town should work hard to preserve historically significant buildings.

Susan Rittling (109 Sewall Avenue) asked if there is space in the waste room for composting. Mr. Klebaner stated that is something his team would look into. Ms. Rittling also asked whether the parking stackers could accommodate electric cars. Mr. Klebaner stated that is not currently part of the proposal but it would be looked at.

Cindy Goldstein (70 Sewall Avenue) expressed opposition to the proposed building feeling that the building is poorly designed.

Sharon Nicholson (114 Sewall Avenue) agreed with previous speakers in opposition because she felt that the proposed building is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Da Zheng (114 Sewall Avenue) also agreed with previous comments saying that the proposed building is not in keeping with the neighborhood. Mr. Zheng said he feels that significantly more public input is necessary before the project is approved.

Linda Pehlke (48 Browne Street) said she supports the notion of preserving and converting the building. She expressed concern with the removal of significant trees and the location of the curb-cut along St. Paul Street. She also felt that the building should provide less parking.

Elton Elperin (49 Monmouth Street) agreed with previous statements about preserving the existing building. Mr. Elperin also said he does not like the proposed architecture.

Barbara Steen-Elton (70 Sewall Avenue) also expressed a desire to have the existing building preserved. They also emphasized the need for accommodations for electric vehicles.

Elissa Tonkin (97 Sewall Avenue) said she is heartbroken to see the demolition of the Bertram Inn and Samuel Sewall Inn.

Mr. Heikin emphasized that he thinks new buildings should try their best to meet the zoning requirements.

Mr. Allen briefly discussed some of the alternative designs that had been considered and some of the zoning challenges.

Ms. Hamlin suggested that some of the other alternatives should be presented to the Board.

The case was continued to a later date.

63-65 Green Street – Demolish two-family dwelling and construct new three-family dwelling requiring zoning relief for design review. (1/27) Pct. 2

Victor Panak described the proposal and described the relief required.

Bob Allen (attorney) introduced members of the design team, briefly reviewed the proposal, and discussed the necessary zoning relief.

Alan Mayer (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin identified mechanical space on each residential floor and expressed his belief that the spaces should count towards the FAR.

Ms. Brue said she feels that the proposed architecture tries to connect with too many elements from surrounding buildings.

Ms. Hamlin asked about the visibility of the head house and how the head house provides access to the roof deck. She also agreed that the design is lacking focus.

Mr. Hines raised some minor objections to the proposed building design.

Ms. Chipimo asked about the distance between the proposed building and neighboring buildings.

Mr. Zarrillo said he would prefer the building to reflect the architecture of a building from across the street. He felt the design could use some improvement.

The Board continued to discuss details of the architectural design.

Public Comments

Susie Roberts (69 Green Street) opposed the proposed design and emphasized the ensemble of houses along Green Street.

Beatka Zakrzewski (59 Green Street) also opposed the proposed design and emphasized the ensemble of houses.

Elton Elperin (49 Monmouth Street) expressed support for a pitched roof design.

Mr. Hines said he thinks that the case should be continued.

Mr. Heikin suggested reusing the existing building. Mr. Allen said reuse of the building is not an option.

The case was continued to a later date.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes of 1/6/2022. Mr. Hines seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-0-1 to approve the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.