

Minutes of Newbury Architectural Subcommittee Meeting

February 3, 2020

(SEE ATTENDANCE SHEET)

1. Draft Design Guidelines: The Committee discussed Derrick Choi's comments on the Draft guidelines, Version 2. Version 2 incorporates Steve Heikin's comments on the original draft. The Welltower team will edit and revise the Guidelines.
 2. Community Outreach: Jennifer Gilbert reported that the Welltower team had held a meeting on Saturday, January 31 with Olmsted Hill abutters, including residents of the multifamily component and single family residences. They discussed site buffering options for the south property line, including fencing, landscaping, and berming. The installation of electric charging stations along the south property line is being considered as a way to reduce the amount of gas vehicle parking and exhaust fumes being generated in this area. The location of garage venting was also discussed in this respect.
 3. Preservation Staff Comments: Initial comments from the Preservation Commission staff were reviewed. A key request was that the project employ the use of traditional materials rather than "technological materials." Sarge Gardiner of RAMSA responded (by phone) that the firm sometimes has to use contemporary ("technological") materials for several reasons, including cost-effectiveness and code compliance. These issues and others raised by the Preservation staff will need to be reviewed further with the staff and Commission.
 4. Draft Zoning Overlay District: Steve Heikin's initial comments noted that the draft zoning was fairly limited in scope, addressing primarily setbacks, height, and FAR. He wanted to review the scope of other recent overlay districts, such as Emerald Island and Waldo-Durgin, to see whether there were other aspects of the development that might be subject to the Zoning Overlay. He also noted that the proposed height limits in the zoning overlay seemed more than was necessary to accommodate the proposed massing of the project, while taking into account the topography of the site, and wanted the design team to confirm the needed height limits.
- Public Comment: Judy Rosow, Fisher Hill resident, noted that Assisted Living residents sometimes have full-time aides, and wanted assurance that there was

enough parking to provide for such staff in addition to Balfour staff. She also asserted that the Fisher Hill neighborhood was created with covenants to keep it a single-family neighborhood, and noted that, although this had changed with the creation of the college campus, the Welltower project was going further away from that direction. She asked if there were any existing covenants that would supercede a zoning change and require that the site remain single-family. Jennifer Gilbert responded that the due diligence process found no such remaining covenants.

Ingrid Johansson informed the Subcommittee that the residents of the nearby Olmsted Hill Condominium (developed by New Atlantic) have outstanding concerns about the craftsmanship and quality of original work completed at the site. While the residents of Olmsted Hill support the Town's efforts to increase the supply of housing for low/moderate income levels, they do not believe it is just to burden individuals with replacing infrastructure/equipment that may not have been appropriate for initial installation. The residents of Olmsted Hill are preparing a formal letter detailing their concerns and hope these concerns will be taken seriously so that the residents of future developments of low/moderate income housing are not adversely impacted.

5. 125 Holland Presentation: The New Atlantic/Utile team (Brian Goldson and Bill Madsen-Hardy/Matthew Littell) presented their initial concepts for a possible mixed-income multifamily condominium redevelopment of the 125 Holland site. This is one of the two alternatives to meet the affordable housing requirement of the Welltower development, with a cash contribution to the Brookline Housing Authority to help fund the redevelopment of the Colonel Floyd site being the other.

This presentation was previously given to the Housing Advisory Board at a meeting on January 28. The HAB favored the Holland Road option by a 2-1 vote, with several abstentions and a recusal. One concept preserves the existing Holland Hall structure, and adds a new wing to the east side of the structure. The other concept involves demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new building. Both concepts create 18 one-bedroom units, each about 700 net square feet, and remain within an FAR of 0.5. The new construction option, according to New Atlantic, is more cost-effective and creates slightly more affordability at the high end (units at 120% AMI for new construction vs. 150% for the preservation/addition). New Atlantic has also developed a third option, for new construction, with a modified massing that steps down to the east, still with 18 units.

- Public Comment: Alan Fisch, Fisher Hill resident, asked how affordability is defined. Bill Madsen Hardy provided a response in terms of the income ranges that fall within the typical percentages of AMI for different affordability levels, depending on family size: \$63-71,000 at 80% AMI; \$80-90,000 at 100% AMI, and \$100-112,000 at 120% AMI. Units would be allocated by lottery, with preferences for town employees.

- Paul Saner asked about the timeline for 125 Holland: when will New Atlantic get further along, including when will a decision regarding preservation vs. new construction be made. It was suggested that Town Meeting would want to understand the choices before it (including the Holland Road vs. Housing Authority options), and the possible outcomes of each choice. Paul also asked: If the project needs to wait out an 18-month preservation delay to demolish the existing building, how much would the project be delayed? Bill thought the delay would only be two months. New Atlantic would like to be on the same DAT schedule as the Welltower project.