



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 July 7, 2022 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Mark Zarrillo, Andrea Brue, Blair Hines, Abigail Hiller
Staff Present: Polly Selkoe, Victor Panak

Steve Heikin opened the meeting.

1) PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments on matters not on the agenda.

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

25-27 Brington Road – Divide existing lot and construct new single-family home on newly created lot requiring zoning relief for setbacks, open space, lot width, height, and parking design. (8/4) Pct. 6

Polly Selkoe introduced the case, reviewed the required zoning relief, and indicated that the Planning Department is supportive of the proposal.

Cameron Merrill (attorney) introduced the owners/petitioners and discussed the details of the proposal.

Ralph Kilfoyle (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin asked for clarification from the applicant on why pervious pavers aren't being used for the parking area at #25. Mr. Kilfoyle indicated that the applicant is concerned about the stability of the parking surface. Mr. Hines stated that pervious pavers have no negative impact on surface stability. Board members and the applicant discussed how the applicant would manage stormwater runoff. David Harelick (owner) said that he is amenable to pervious pavers if his civil engineer confirms that they are a good option for the property.

Mr. Zarrillo suggested that the location of the parking in the middle of the site could be moved to the driveway side of the site. Mr. Kilfoyle said that the option had not been examined at length. Mr. Harelick said that locating even one space along the wall of the

existing building would impair the driveway access to the rear lot. He noted a number of other concerns with the alternative solution.

Mr. Hines felt that the division of land itself is unreasonable and does not comply with requirements. Mr. Merrill explained that the division of land would be an ANR endorsable by the Planning Board. He also explained why he believed that the proposed division of land is a reasonable proposal.

Ms. Brue questioned the use of the proposed house as a “buffer” and whether anyone would want to live there given that it is immediately adjacent to the MBTA line. She also expressed some concern with the landscaping and hardscaping located over the sewer easement. Mr. Harellick indicated that he has met with the Department of Public Works and that the DPW said the landscaping and stone wall would not impede the work they would need to do on the sewer line, which would only occur once every 50-100 years. Ms. Brue also raised some concern with the amount of light in the basement. Mr. Kilfoyle reviewed the basement floor plan and the window wells that would provide lighting. Ms. Brue said that the lack of natural light and air to the basement was another sign that she felt that the project would not work.

Mr. Heikin said that he could potentially support the concept for this property but he felt that the proposed new building is lacking in finesse or character. He said he could approve the project but that more work needs to be done to design the house and more clarity and coherence needs to be provided for the site materials.

Public Comments

There were no public comments

Mr. Hines indicated he could not support the project on the grounds that there isn't sufficient area for the subdivision of the property. He also felt that the narrow window wells are very problematic.

Mr. Zarrillo agreed with Mr. Hines.

Ms. Brue also agreed with Mr. Hines and Mr. Zarrillo.

Ms. Hiller said she could support the subdivision but does not feel that the design of the site and building are acceptable. Mr. Zarrillo agreed that a subdivision of the land could work if it were redesigned.

[The applicant was given the rest of the meeting to confer with their attorney. At the end of the meeting, the Board made the following motion at the applicant's request.]

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend denial of the project. Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

996 Commonwealth Avenue – Construct addition and alter layout of site circulation and landscaping for Enterprise Rent-A-Car requiring zoning relief for design review. (7/21) Pct. 2

Polly Selkoe described the proposal, summarized the required zoning relief, and indicated that the Planning Department is supportive.

Nicholas Zozula (attorney) introduced members of the design team and provided the Board with a brief presentation of the proposal.

Scott Rogers went into detail about the proposed site plan.

Mr. Heikin asked about the runoff from the bucket wash and whether it had the potential to impact water supplies.

Mr. Zarrillo said that the Board usually requests counterbalancing amenities for Special Permits and asked if the applicant would be willing to donate some new street trees. He also noted that the site is well taken-care of. Ms. Brue and Mr. Heikin agreed with Mr. Zarrillo's request. Mr. Hines and Ms. Hiller felt that the proposal is reasonable regardless.

Public Comments

Adam Scotto, 26 Crowninshield Road, raised concerns with the noise and chemical runoff that would come off the site.

Nancy Heller, 40 Abbottsford Road, strongly supported the suggestion from Mr. Zarrillo that additional trees be required. Ms. Heller also raised concerns about potential environmental impacts and concerns with the use of gas-powered washing tools.

Mr. Maxwell explained how the oil/water separator would capture all toxic runoff and further explained that all Washington products used on the site are biodegradable. He added that oil changes would never occur on this site and indicated that all washing tools are electric – not gas-powered.

Mr. Zozula said that Enterprise would happily agree to the tree planting condition and a condition limiting the hours of lighting on the site.

Mr. Zarrillo noted that the existing lights are floodlights pointed towards the parking areas. Mr. Heikin suggested that a condition be added requiring to return to the Board prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy with a new lighting plan.

The Board and applicant continued to discuss details of the operations on the site.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site and landscaping plan by JK Holmgren Engineers, dated 3/22/22, and architectural plans by Cornerstone Architects, dated 3/01/22, 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. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning. The landscape plan shall include the addition of three street trees along Crowninshield Road subject to approval by the Town's Tree Warden.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval a lighting plan and photometric plan that demonstrates that no light shall spill off the site and that allows dimming of lighting by rheostat during non-business hours.**
- 4. The addition's doors will be closed to the maximum extent feasible during the washing of cars to minimize noise to the surrounding neighborhood.**
- 5. 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.

Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

1154 Boylston Street – Construct additions and make exterior modifications to existing building requiring zoning relief for design review. (8/4) Pct. 15

Polly Selkoe described the proposal, summarized the required zoning relief, and indicated that the Planning Department is supportive.

Bob Allen (attorney) introduced the design team and briefly summarized the proposal.

Steve Sousa provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin said he thinks the project is a very classy transformation.

Mr. Zarrillo agreed and asked whether the means of egress along Boylston Street needs to be handicap accessible. Mr. Sousa indicated that since its an existing building, it does not need to be handicap accessible.

Ms. Brue asked if the signage is part of the project. Ms. Selkoe confirmed that the signage would come back for approval by the Planning Board at a later date.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site plan by Greater Boston Surveying and Engineering dated 3/1/22, and architectural plans by Sousa Design Architects, dated 4/28/22, 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. 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. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

63-65 Green Street - (Continued from 3-17-22) - Demolish two-family dwelling and construct new three-family dwelling requiring zoning relief for design review. (8/18) Pct. 2

Polly Selkoe described the proposal, summarized the required zoning relief, and reviewed some of the Board's concerns from the previous meeting.

Mr. Allen (attorney) briefly reviewed the proposal and summarized the zoning relief. Mr. Allen also discussed the changes that were made to the design in response to comments from the Board and neighborhood.

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

Mr. Zarrillo said he thinks the new design is good and that he likes it. He said that having the driveway on the left side of the lot is the better option.

Ms. Brue also felt that the revised design is an improvement. She asked how high the headhouse is. The Board discussed that the head house does not count towards the height requirement. Ms. Brue asked that a portion of the left side of the building near the front façade be made to look like a dormer to improve the transition from stucco to the modern portion of the building.

Mr. Heikin said he really dislikes the ramp leading to the front stoop and made a few alternative suggestions. Mr. Hines agreed with the suggestions and further suggested that a stucco wall be used instead of the railing along the fence. The Board continued to discuss solutions to the accessibility issue. Mr. Heikin added that he felt the changes to the exterior facades addressed the key issues of concern with the previous designs. However, he noted some excessive spaces on the interior of the building and suggested that the building could be made smaller.

Ms. Brue said she would prefer to see some more articulation on the back and sides of the building.

Public Comments

Susie Roberts, 69 Green Street, expressed opposition to the project. She claimed that the shadow studies presented to the Board were the same. She also pointed out that other adjacent buildings have center entrances. She commended the applicant, Alejandro Chavez, for the improvements to the design but still maintained that the building is too large and that too much of the building's design remains incongruous with the neighborhood. She also felt that the Board's decision has special importance because it would impact precedence for other similar upcoming projects.

Beatka Zakrzewski, 59 Green Street, echoed comments by Susie Roberts. She also raised specific concerns with demolition, potentially causing negative health impacts on abutters.

Nancy Heller, 40 Abbottsford Road, also echoed the points made by Ms. Roberts and Ms. Zakrzewski. Ms. Heller added that she is concerned with tree loss and suggested that planting significantly more trees could mitigate the scale of the building.

Marci Joy, 59 Green Street, expressed opposition to the demolition because of health concerns and also opposed the design, feeling that the design remains terrible.

Mr. Hines said he thinks that the Board should require a reduction in the size of the building.

The Board and applicant discussed the viability of reducing the scale and the viability of preserving the front façade of the existing building.

Mr. Zarrillo said he felt that the Board should recommend approval because the project meets all dimensional requirements and has made significant improvements in design. Ms. Hiller agreed.

Mr. Heikin agreed with the sentiments of Mr. Zarrillo.

Mr. Heikin noted that the motion is based on the alternative plan that centers the building on the site, known as “Plan B”.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site plan by Boston Survey Inc., dated 6/16/22 and architectural plans by Mayer and Associates Architects, dated 6/17/22, 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. 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. Hiller seconded the motion. The Board voted 3-2 to approve the motion.

Mr. Hines said that his opposition was based on his desire for the building’s size to be reduced.

3) Consider Endorsement of Approval Not Required Plan for 50+52 Davis Avenue

Ms. Selkoe briefly reviewed the ANR plan.

Mr. Heikin moved to endorse the ANR plan for 50-52 Davis Avenue. Ms. Brue seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

4) Discuss and Vote on Authorization for Chair to Approve Planning Board Minutes

Ms. Selkoe introduced the idea to the Board.

Mr. Heikin moved that the Board authorize the Chair to approve Planning Board minutes after review and approval by other Board members. Ms. Brue seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

5) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 6/15/22. Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 6/23/22. Ms. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.