



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 16, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.**

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Bob Cook, Linda Hamlin, James Carr, Blair Hines, Matt Oudens
Staff Present: Karen Martin

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

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES **420 Warren Street – install stairs to garage loft space**

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Attorney Jake Walters explained that the homeowners had previously received zoning relief and built storage space above their garage. After an inspection for a C of O by the Building Department, the owners were informed they needed to create a staircase to this space that meets building code and then they decided to finish this space which would count towards the FAR.

Mr. Heikin asked if the walls, ceiling and floor are being finished. The applicant stated that they are.

The Board had no concerns with this proposal.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.
Mr. Oudens seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Michael Paul Antonino dated 2/15/19 and the floor plans and elevations by Nicholaeff Architecture + Design dated 5/17/19, subject to the following conditions:

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

15 Lanark Road – convert two-family dwelling to 4 units (continued)

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Architect Michael Kim presented the revised plans.

Mr. Heikin asked to clarify the differences in the parking conditions between the previous plan and this current one. He also asked about the existing winder staircase.

Ms. Hamlin asked about the slider door on the first floor and whether it meets fire code.

Mr. Hines asked if the proposed dormer has a flat roof. The Board discussed the design of the dormer. Mr. Heikin stated that he has a problem with the flat roof dormer and asked about pulling in the bedrooms and putting a slope on the roof. Mr. Kim noted that the dormer is not visible from the street.

Mr. Carr stated that he doesn't share the same concern about the flat roof but that he would support making the dormer different or more interesting than the rest of the house.

Mr. Hines stated that he is concerned with the basement unit and its livability. He asked if the new light well could be connected to the basement level to create some connection of the outdoor landscaping to the lower unit.

Mr. Heikin asked about the basement unit's ceiling height. The applicant stated that it is 7' 4" but that they would need to confirm this. Mr. Heikin stated that the plans need to show that dimension. He added that he is also concerned about the livability of the basement unit.

The Board thoroughly discussed the ceiling height of the lower unit and whether the proposed height meets building code for habitability. Mr. Book, Mr. Oudens and Mr. Carr felt that this was not the purview of the Board and that a building inspector will check for conformance with building code.

Mr. Oudens stated that he doesn't like the flat roof but he would accept it. He recommended removing the two small, sister dormers.

Mr. Heikin stated that he would agree to a condition regarding the ceiling height of the basement unit.

Mr. Hines also asked to note that no counterbalancing amenities have been provided or noted at this time.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Carr seconded the motion.

Voted (3-2-1): Therefore, Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by A. Matthew Belski, Jr., dated 9/21/2018 and floor plans and elevations by Michael Kim Associates, dated 3/19/2019, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall submit a final site plan, dimensioned floor plans, and elevations, subject to review and approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a verified ceiling height for the basement and attic for verification by the Building Commissioner to ensure compliance with applicable building code regulations.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan including all counterbalancing amenities, subject to review and Approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.
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.

385 Clinton Road – construct rear addition

Karen Martin described the proposal and the zoning relief required.

Homeowner Celine Sellam was also present.

Mr. Hines questioned the detrimental impact to the neighborhood and the finding required under Deadrick to extend the pre-existing non-conforming FAR.

Mr. Oudens stated that the addition seems low and modest and has minimal impact.

Mr. Hines suggested that there should be a requirement for applicants making a Deadrick argument that information relating to neighboring properties is provided.

Ms. Hamlin said she is not thrilled with the look of the addition.

Mr. Cook stated that the right side of the addition seems to be lacking a window and looks blank. The owner stated that there will be cabinets along that entire side.

John Dogget (TMM) lives in this neighborhood and came to speak in support of the addition.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Hines seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the site plan by Michael Paul Antonino dated 2/15/19 and the floor plans and elevations by Richard Volkin dated 1/10/19, subject to the following conditions:

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

119 Payson Road – construct rear addition

Architect Steve Sousa presented the architectural plans.

Mr. Hines raised the issue of the FAR being barely over the pre-existing non-conforming threshold.

Mr. Heikin stated that he would like to see dimensioned plans so that the Building Commissioner can confirm the FAR numbers as well as floor by floor area calculations.

Mr. Carr asked what the new addition will be used for. The owner replied that it will be a playroom.

The Board also suggested the applicant ask for letters of support from neighbors. Mr. Cook noted that he lives two doors down from this project and is in support.

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 Thomas P. Bernardi dated 9/19/2013 the floor plans and elevations by SOUSA design Architects dated 1/28/2019 subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan, dimensioned floor plans and elevations subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning and to be verified by the Building Commissioner.
2. 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.

33 Pond Ave #NR-04 – convert office space to medical office

Attorney Shayna Duff presented the case.

The Board had no issues with the proposal.

Mr. Heikin motioned to recommend approval.

Mr. Cook seconded the motion.

Voted (6-0): Therefore, the Planning Board recommends approval of the plans, by Henry Stein and dated 3/20/19, subject to the following conditions:

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

27 Wolcott Road – construct rear addition

Architect Steve Sousa presented the plans.

Ms. Hamlin commented that the FAR limits for this neighborhood seem too low overall.

Mr. Carr stated that although the FAR is increasing over 130% of the allowable FAR, the massing is not changing and so he supports this.

The Board had no overall concerns with the proposal.

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 Stephen Desroche dated 9/5/2018 and the floor plans and elevations by SOUSA design Architects dated 5/30/2017 subject to the following conditions:

3. 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.
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: 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.

Hancock Village 40A Proposal update

Andy Martineau of Chestnut Hill Realty gave a presentation on the progress of the Design Advisory Team working on the proposal for a new community center building and new multi-family building at Hancock Village.

Mr. Carr asked about the five foot distance between the community center and the existing nearby building. Mr. Martineau stated that a gate will be added and this condition exists across the site.

Mr. Hines asked about the parking demand at Hancock Village. Mr. Martineau stated that most spaces are always filled.

Mr. Heikin stated that the DAT was concerned about the window proportions regarding the transom over the windows.

Mr. Oudens stated that the entrance seems kind of foreign to the building and has a more institutional feel. Ms. Hamlin agreed.

The Board suggested minor changes to the Gerry Building related to the entrance.

Ms. Hamlin stated that she likes the building much better than how it started. She stated that there are so many “innies and outties” to the façade and that it is crenulated. She questioned if it could be simplified to a more continuous surface?

Mr. Heikin stated that he likes the Independence Drive façade of the Community Center with the white surface and that it has improved a lot but could still see some work. He stated that he is okay with the banding.

Mr. Carr asked if the penthouse glass is consistent on both sides of the Community Center. He stated that he sees the building as functional and very fun/enjoyable. He asked about strategies to mitigate heat gain/loss. He also asked about potential for a recycling program.

The Planning Board advised that the proposal is ready to apply to the Building Department and return to the Board for formal review.

OTHER BUSINESS

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

The meeting was adjourned.