



Town of Brookline

Massachusetts

PLANNING BOARD

Steve Heikin, Chair
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 July 11, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Robert Cook, Linda Hamlin, Blair Hines, Matthew Oudens, Mark Zarrillo
Staff Present: Victor Panak

Mr. Heikin called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. He asked if there were any members of the public in attendance who wished to make comments on matters not on the agenda. There were none.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

114 Rawson Road – Construct an additional story and a half and a garage with living space above, requiring relief for setbacks, FAR, and design review.

Victor Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief.

Shayna Gallinat, attorney for the applicant, presented the project. She noted that the applicant's had sought a waiver of the demolition delay imposed by the Preservation Commission, but had ultimately decided to wait out the 12-month delay period.

Verne Porter, surveyor for the applicant, reviewed the existing and proposed conditions, explained the proposed addition, and discussed the trees to be removed and preserved.

The Board and the applicant discussed the preservation of the existing 40" tree at the front-left corner of the property.

Steve Heikin asked if the large curb cut was really necessary. Mr. Porter stated that it wasn't entirely necessary but would make circulation for the residents safer.

Linda Hamlin asked the applicant why they felt that additional square footage was necessary. Ms. Gallinat responded by stating that the additional square footage was still within the 120% of maximum FAR allowed by the Bylaw under a Special Permit. Linda Hamlin stated that the garage should be pushed back.

Uri Natanel, architect for the applicant, reviewed the proposed architectural changes.

Blair Hines stated that the proposed work left very little of the original house remaining and that, in his view, the addition may as well be a new house. Given that fact, he would prefer to see an entirely new house that was better designed and better situated on the lot.

Ms. Gallinat stated that the reason for keeping a portion of the existing house was that partial demolition is easier with the Preservation Commission. Ben Saada, the owner, added that building on the existing footprint represented significant reductions in cost of construction, length of construction, and nuisance to the neighborhood.

Mr. Porter reviewed the proposed landscaping work.

Mark Zarrillo asked why the additional square footage was necessary and noted that if a mere 768 SF were omitted, the entire addition could be built in a compliant manner. Mr. Saada stated that the existing basement added a lot of square footage.

Mr. Heikin invited members of the public to comment.

Tim Kasida, 104 Rawson Road, said he had concerns with the outsized massing of the proposed house.

Scot Plotnick, 99 Rawson Road, asked if the house is still proposed with stucco exterior walls. Mr. Saada confirmed that it was still proposed with stucco and brick walls. Mr. Plotnick said that the house “belongs in Newton” with its size and architectural style.

Edward Blumstein, 119 Rawson Road, said that this section of Rawson Road is almost entirely single family and that this house would be much bigger than anything else.

Craig Halvorson, 124 Rawson Road, said that he was certain that the 40” tree would die as a result of the site work. He added that an effort should be made by the applicant to emulate the consistent pattern of street tree plantings that currently exists along Rawson Road.

David Harnett, 98 Rawson Road, opined that the footprint was too wide for the lot and that the applicant should instead expand the structure towards the back of the lot.

Karen Halvorson, 124 Rawson Road, asked what the square footage of the basement was.

Mr. Heikin believed that the applicant’s proposal and the neighborhood’s requests were not very far apart. He encouraged the applicant to move the garage wing back and to work on improving the design a little bit more.

Matthew Oudens agreed with Mr. Heikin, adding that the applicant should explore removing some square footage from various locations as well.

Ms. Hamlin also agreed.

Mr. Hines agreed as well, and added that the applicant should make serious efforts to become completely compliant and that the driveway should be no more than 14 ft. wide.

Mr. Zarrillo added that tree protection measures should be implemented, including air spading to protect significant trees.

The Board continued review of the project to a future meeting date.

53 Risley Road – First-floor addition to rear and side to expand family room and kitchen requiring relief for lot width, side yard setback, and floor area ratio.

Mr. Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief.

Tom Timko, architect for the applicant, presented the proposed addition.

Mr. Heiken noted that it is a small house on a small lot and that he understood the need to expand.

Mr. Heiken asked if there were any public comments. There were none.

Mr. Heiken made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by G & C Survey Company, dated 11/7/18 and architectural plans by Copper Beach Design, dated 4/15/19, 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 subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.**
- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities 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 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.**

Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the motion.

83 Payson Road – Extension of garage and second-story toward front property line and other associated alterations requiring relief for setbacks, lot size, and design review.

Mr. Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief.

Ivan Efremov, the applicant, explained the reason behind the addition.

Yefim Massarsky, architect for the applicant, presented the proposed addition.

The Board and the architect had a brief discussion to clarify the existing and proposed roof pitch.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by Delaney Group, dated 12/20/19 and the architectural plans by YM Design. Inc. dated 12/19/2018 subject to the following conditions:

- 2. 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.**

3. **Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities 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: 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.**

Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The Board voted 6-0 to approve the motion.

30 Webster Street – Conversion to hotel and 8th floor addition.

Mr. Panak provided a brief description of the status of the case, noting that the project had previously been reviewed by the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals but the applicant had been asked to return to the Planning Board with additional information on specific aspects of the project, including landscaping and parking.

Bob Allen, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the proposal and briefly described some of the changes that had been made to address the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals' concerns.

Harry Wheeler, architect for the applicant, presented the latest changes to the project.

Mr. Heikin said that he did not believe the tandem parking spaces would be functional. Mr. Wheeler responded that their functionality had been verified with a valet service.

Mr. Heikin asked why the parking spaces along the driveway were not moved to the right side as had previously been requested by the Planning Board. Mr. Wheeler responded that moving the spaces to the right side severely limited the maneuvering space of the driveway and limited the number of parking spaces that could be provided.

The Board and applicant continued to discuss issues related to parking needs and usage, and circulation.

Mr. Heikin read comments submitted by James Carr, a member of the Planning Board absent from the meeting. The comments outlined a series of measures that could be taken by the applicant to improve the sustainability of the building, including providing a more detailed Impact Statement, calculating carbon emissions reductions, providing a detailed description of how to meet the Stretch Code, and offering on-site renewables or opting in to 100% green power.

Mr. Oudens also expressed skepticism about the functionality of the parking.

Mr. Allen asked the Board if they were comfortable with the design and intent for the 8th floor. The Board confirmed their support for that aspect of the project.

The Board expressed their support for the proposal, provided that the applicant accurately show an expansion of the driveway on the plans and provide supporting evidence from a transportation consultant or valet service that confirms that the parking layout will be functional.

60 and 74 Sargent Beechwood – Change style of windows and other miscellaneous changes.

Mr. Zarrillo recused himself from discussions and votes on this case.

Paul Apkarian, architect for the applicant, presented the most recent revisions to both projects.

The Board had no issues with the changes.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to approve the final designs. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

8 Singletree Road – Add cast stone to entire front elevation, reduce left top floor window from a triple to a double casement, and add a double casement on second floor left elevation.

Mr. Zarrillo recused himself from discussions and votes on this case.

Ken Goldstein, attorney for the applicant, presented the latest revisions to the plans.

The Board had no issues with the changes.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to approve the final designs. Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

134 and 138 Babcock Street – ANR Plan was endorsed by the Planning Board.

Minutes of June 6 and June 27 were approved by the Planning Board.

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

The meeting was adjourned.