



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 August 22, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Robert Cook, Linda Hamlin, Mark Zarrillo
Staff Present: Victor Panak

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Steve 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.

Robert Cook made comments regarding the appropriateness of discussing the potential warrant article on accessory dwelling units later in the evening if it had not been properly vetted and supported by Town departments. Mr. Cook discussed an email that the Planning Board received from the Planning Director, which laid out the opinion of the Planning Department that the potential article was not ready for Town Meeting. Mr. Cook was concerned that the Planning Board was not following the proper process, and expressed his wish to abstain from discussion on the topic. He further encouraged the petitioner behind the warrant article to limit his discussion of the article to individual conversations with Board members outside of a public meeting.

Mr. Heikin said that he and the petitioner, Roger Blood, had been discussing this potential article for some time and that he fully expected the article to be submitted to the warrant for fall Town Meeting. He didn't believe there was any harm in the Planning Board discussing the draft prior to submission to the warrant. Mr. Heikin also expressed his dismay with the Planning Director's lack of support for the current draft of a bylaw allowing accessory dwelling units.

Mr. Zarrillo and Ms. Hamlin agreed with Mr. Heikin and believed that this meeting is an appropriate venue to discuss the potential warrant article.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

15 Toxteth Street – Construct two minor dormers (right and left side) to existing house.

Victor Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief, noting that the Planning Department was supportive of the proposal.

Shayna Gallinat, attorney for the applicant, introduced other members of the design team and explained the method by which the applicants were seeking relief.

Paul Worthington, architect for the applicant, reviewed the plans for the Board and explained how the proposed dormers were necessary to accommodate interior changes.

Mr. Cook asked if the pitch of both dormers could be made the same. Mr. Worthington said that would not be possible due to the constraints posed by internal arrangements. He also added that the difference in roof pitch between the two dormers would be negligible when viewed from the street.

Mr. Heikin asked about whether there was any rearrangement of the interior that could be made to accommodate a change in the dormer's roof pitch. Mr. Worthington explained the difficulties posed by the existing construction.

The Board briefly discussed whether the addition could be deemed "small-scale". The Board agreed that it could.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by Boston Survey, Inc., dated March 21, 2019 and architectural plans by Paul Worthington, Design and Restoration, Inc., dated March 28, 2019, 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.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan showing proposed 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: 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 4-0 to approve the motion.

18 Spooner Road – Construct rear-side addition and replace existing detached garage.

Mr. Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief, noting that the Planning Department was supportive of the proposal.

Shayna Gallinat, attorney for the applicant, introduced the project and reviewed the scope of work and required zoning relief.

Elizabeth Cahill, architect for the applicant, provided the Board with a presentation on the project, reviewing existing conditions and proposed changes.

Mr. Heikin and Mr. Cook both questioned whether the extension of the driveway towards the southern property line was necessary and whether the resident couldn't simply back out of the garage and turn around by backing up towards the house. Ms. Cahill contended that the additional paving is necessary.

Mr. Heikin also asked how one would access the green roof on top of the proposed detached garage. Ms. Cahill stated that a ladder would be necessary.

Mr. Cook asked if stormwater drainage had been looked at. Ms. Cahill indicated that it had not yet been reviewed, but that the applicant fully intended to produce a stormwater management plan.

Board members and Ms. Cahill discussed the benefits and downsides of a green roof and whether the maintenance cost is worth it. Mr. Zarrillo gave the applicant a few recommendations on how to improve the green roof.

Linda Hamlin expressed some concerns with the stability of the new chimney, decried the lack of dimensions on the elevation drawings, and suggested that the extent of the driveway could be reduced. Aside from those concerns, she expressed support for the project. Mr. Heikin agreed with Ms. Hamlin's concerns about the chimney.

Mr. Heikin and other Board members discussed the need for counterbalancing amenities and agreed to recommend that the applicant reduced the proximity of the driveway and retaining wall from the southern property line to 6 ft. Mr. Heikin added that the applicant should seek letters of support from neighbors and submit new dimensioned elevations prior to the ZBA hearing.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by EMB, dated June 5, 2019 and architectural plans by ART Architects, dated May 28, 2019, 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.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan showing proposed 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: 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.**

Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 4-0 to approve the motion.

210 Bonad Road – Construct two minor additions (front and left side) to existing house.

Mr. Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief, noting that the Planning Department was supportive of the proposal.

Ms. Gallinat, attorney for the applicant, introduced the team and noted the outreach to neighbors and the determination of non-significance from the Preservation Commission.

Richard Levey, architect for the applicant, reviewed the existing conditions and the proposed scope of work.

Ms. Hamlin and Mr. Heikin both expressed their satisfaction with the project.

Mr. Toppelberg, 25 Grassmere Road, raised concerns about the size and proximity of the large bathroom window on the proposed addition that would face his bathroom window.

The Board, Mr. Levey, and Mr. Toppelberg discussed some possible alternatives to the current design of the bathroom window. Ultimately, the Board decided that the matter was best left for resolution between the two parties (applicant and neighbor).

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of this application per the site plan by Land Mapping dated July 8, 2019 and architectural plans by Richard B. Levey Architects dated July 5, 2019, 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.**
- 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: 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.**

Mr. Cook seconded the motion. The Board voted 4-0 to approve the motion.

Minutes of August 8 were approved by the Planning Board.

Discuss and Consider Draft of Potential Warrant Article on Accessory Dwelling Units

Mr. Cook reiterated his comments from the beginning of the meeting for the benefit of Roger Blood, who joined the meeting. Mr. Blood is the main petitioner supporting the draft Accessory Dwelling Unit warrant article.

Mr. Blood noted that the warrant article had been reviewed by Town Counsel, the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning, and a number of other departments and boards/commissions.

The Board discussed the warrant article. All Board members stated that they were generally supportive of allowing accessory dwelling units because of how it would help aging residents stay in Brookline and allow others to find affordable housing options in Brookline.

Mr. Zarrillo raised a number of issues related to how the provisions for ADUs would interact with the Bylaw's provisions on FAR and how conversions of existing detached garages to ADUs could have significant impacts on established neighborhoods.

Maureen Coffey, 21 Hawthorn Road, asked about how the proposed provisions would interact with the requirements for Local Historic Districts. She was also concerned that an influx of ADUs in a historic neighborhood could affect the character of that neighborhood.

Generally, both the Board and the public were supportive, although a number of issues were raised with the current draft.

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

The meeting was adjourned.