



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** **May 9, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.**

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

Staff Present: Karen Martin

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

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

61 Baker Circle

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Homeowner Richard Murphy presented his proposal for a storage shed with a pull down garage door.

Mr. Carr asked if the side setback complies for the proposed shed. Mr. Murphy replied that it does.

Mr. Heikin asked about the poured foundation at 55 Baker Circle and noted that construction there seems to be stalled and looks like a mess.

Mr. Cook, who lives nearby, gave a recap of the project at 55 Baker Circle and related issues.

Ms. Hamlin asked what the width of the proposed garage door will be. Mr. Murphy replied that it would be 8 feet wide.

Mr. Heikin asked if the paved area to the right of the garages had been previously expanded. He also asked to clarify if this structure is to be used as a garage for a car or storage shed.

Ms. Hamlin stated that the scale seems to be off and that having only one foot surrounding the garage doors seems too minimal.

Mr. Carr asked if the Planning Board should support a proposal that goes against the intent of the By-law and flies in the face of zoning.

Mr. Hines agreed that the Board should not set a precedent of this sort.

Mr. Heikin pointed out that the Murphy's driveway appears to encroach onto the property of 55 Baker Circle.

Shal Shahani (55 Baker Circle) spoke about the construction delays on their site as well as the issue of the driveway encroachment.

Mr. Heikin stated that he supports the proposal with two pull out doors totaling 6 feet in width. He also suggested that the shed should be set back further than the existing garage by 2 feet.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Antoni Szerszunowicz dated 9/16/2015 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 showing the storage shed set back 2 feet from the front façade of the main house with a 6-foot wide door opening, subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. The storage shed shall remain as such and not be converted to a garage for vehicular use without the approval of the Board of Appeals.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall rectify the issue of their driveway apron encroachment onto the neighboring property at 55 Baker Circle.
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 and 2) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

33 Glenland Road – construct two attached single-family dwellings

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert explained the proposal.

Michael Schneider of McKay Architects presented the architectural plans.

The Board discussed options of a side-facing garage.

Abutter **Matt Warman** gave a presentation showing the potential loss of trees on the shared property line. He requested a 20 foot side setback and 30 foot rear setback as well as the elimination of the 3rd floor bedroom that would face his house.

Mr. Heikin asked if the new tree-clearing by-law would be triggered by the tree removal.

Tom Provost (36 Glenland Road) stated that he would support the project if it were moved 10 feet to make it easier to pull out of the garages.

Mr. Hines asked if moving the house would create a non-conformity on the Newton portion of the lot.

The Board discussed the zoning implications for the City of Newton. Ms. Gilbert stated that there had not been any zoning discussions with Newton because the project conforms entirely.

Mr. Heikin stated that he feels it would be appropriate to speak with Newton regarding the zoning.

Mr. Heikin stated that he likes the design overall but that a better job could be done with the siting of the structure on the lot to minimize tree loss.

Mr. Hines stated that more consideration needs to be given to the grading.

Mr. Heikin added that the applicant should identify major mature trees to see if the house can be shifted. He stated that he is okay with the front facing garages.

Ms. Hamlin stated that the plan can also be reduced in width by shrinking the size of the rooms.

The case was continued.

761 Washington Street – construct new two-family dwelling

Attorney Gilbert gave an overview of the project.

Architect Beth Whitaker presented the revised architectural plans.

Mr. Heikin asked if the courtyard spaces are counted towards the FAR. The architect replied that the full height ones were not counted but others were counted using a factor for the portion of the space over 12'.

Ms. Hamlin pointed out that the staircase to the garage should not be excluded from the FAR.

Ms. Hamlin also asked if the zoning by-law section on uneven alignment would apply to this property.

Mr. Heikin noted that the proposal seems to be for 3 units and not 2. The homeowner explained her family circumstances needing space for extended family. The Board discussed this issue and how it seems to be skirting the zoning requirement.

Mr. Hines stated that the issue is a lot of extra space appearing to be an extra unit.

Mr. Carr stated that he is not concerned about this aspect and that accessory units are common in Brookline and surrounding communities.

Mr. Hines stated that the design is improved.

An abutter across the street stated that the design is attempting to squeeze every inch into a box.

Mr. Heikin asked about the changes to the porches and decks.

Jennifer Kritzer (direct abutter) discussed her letter of opposition and stated that she doesn't support this modern design and that it doesn't fit in. She also cited major privacy concerns.

Sam Ditzion (direct abutter) added that he has concerns about the chosen wood product and that the house will not be maintained. He asked Ms. Whitaker about the wood product and she explained that it will be Aquia – a cedar-like wood product.

Mr. Hines stated that he is concerned about the uniformity of the wood exterior and suggested a mix of other materials.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that it is currently designed as a 3-family house and needs to be designed as a 2-family house. He stated that the contemporary urban design is fine with him.

Mr. Hines stated that he is fine with the design but not with the zoning issues.

Ms. Hamlin stated that the front façade is too close to the street, that the windows are like a prison and the façade is like a wall.

Mr. Heikin suggested a mix of materials.

The case was continued.

1443 Beacon Street – extend rear patio

Andy Martineau of Chestnut Hill Realty presented the case.

Mr. Hines asked about the grade change between the parking and patio.

Mr. Heikin asked about the proposed landscaping.

Mr. Carr asked if the abutters' yards will be visible from the deck. Mr. Martineau stated that they are not visible in the summer and showed photos.

Mr. Hines suggested a condition that the applicant remove vines from the trees at the rear of the property.

Mr. Heikin suggested shrubbery as landscaping.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Stantec dated 9/13/18, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan 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 indicating counterbalancing amenities, 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 and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

174 Gardner Road – move driveway

Attorney Bob Allen presented the case.

The Board had no issues with moving the driveway to protect a street tree.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Antoni Szerszunowicz dated 3/5/2019 subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit site plan 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: a) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

Dexter School – new lower school building

Attorney Allen presented the background on the case.

Phil Laird of ARC presented the architectural plans.

Mr. Heikin asked about ADA accessible entrances.

The civil engineer presented the site plans and grading plans.

Mr. Carr asked if the building will be LEED certified. The applicant replied that they are not pursuing LEED due to costs. Mr. Carr stated that schools should be sustainability leaders in town and he would like to see more sustainability elements.

A representative from the Brandagee Estate asked about the height and raised concerns with parking issues and the loss of spaces.

The Sinapis, abutters on the Boston side across St. Paul's Avenue, raised concerns about traffic, a construction management plan, drainage and fire truck access.

Ms. Hamlin stated that she supports the project but would like to see more playfulness in the building for children.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Hines seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Staff recommends approval of the architectural plans prepared by ARC and dated 3/21/19 and the site plans (C-1 to C-5) prepared by Beals + Thomas and dated 1/30/19, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, final elevations with material specifications shall be submitted to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.
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: 1) a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final 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.

OTHER BUSINESS

Minutes of 4/25 were approved.

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

The meeting was adjourned.