



Town of Brookline Massachusetts

Town Hall, Third Floor
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445
(617) 730-2130
www.brooklinema.gov

PLANNING BOARD

Steve Heikin, Chair
James Carr
Linda K. Hamlin
Blair Hines
Matthew Oudens
Mark J. Zarrillo

BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES By Zoom Event September 3, 2020 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Linda Hamlin, Matthew Oudens, Mark Zarrillo,
Staff Present: Polly Selkoe and Victor Panak

Steve Heikin opened the meeting and asked if anyone wished to make public comments on matters not on agenda. No one wished to speak.

SIGN AND FAÇADE CASES

1376 Beacon Street – Signage for new business, UDA, consisting of a façade sign

Victor Panak described the proposal for a sign for UDA. The Planning Department recommended a change to the background colors (white) and lightening the yellow letters.

The applicant has another store without the website on the sign but with Covid thought the website was a good idea. However, she agreed to put the website on the window at the bottom on both sides.

The Planning Board suggested that the signage subtext could be enlarged.

Mark Zarrillo suggested outlining the yellow letters in black.

Linda Hamlin suggested reducing the panel that the sign is on to align with the width of the entry.

The applicant said she could eliminate the panel altogether.

The sign with these modifications is approved.

Therefore, the Planning Board voted (4-0) to approve this application subject to the following condition.

1. The applicant shall submit a set of revised plans as described above before a building permit is issued, subject to the approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning or designee.

303 Harvard Street – Signage for new business, T-Mobile, consisting of a façade sign

Victor Panak described the sign proposal. The Planning Department recommends approval.

Steven Heikin noted that the awning has been eliminated from the proposal.

The applicant explained that only the T-Mobile letters are individually lit. He also stated that the sign would be centered.

Therefore, the Planning Board (4-0) voted to approve this proposal, which now eliminates the awning, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the final plans subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning or designee.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

35 Wallis Road – Expand the width of the existing driveway towards the left-side property line requiring zoning relief for parking setbacks and other design requirements.

Victor Panak described the proposal and the zoning relief required. The Planning Department is opposed to the expansion of the driveway.

Attorney Bob Allen stated that the driveway is really narrow and tight and is dangerous. Abutters are supportive of the proposal. The curb cut would also need to be expanded.

The applicants, David and Lauren Handelman, showed the plans. The car doors don't open all the way and it is difficult to get in and out. Visibility for backing out will be better, and landscaping will be added.

Attorney Bob Allen said permeable pavers will be used.

Matthew Oudens is supportive if permeable pavers are used.

Steven Heikin suggested only widening it a little and flaring the left side wall.

Linda Hamlin doesn't support a 1' side setback.

Mark Zarrillo is supportive but doesn't believe porous pavers solve basic drainage problems. They do not solve drainage problems but just provide a method to immediately remove water from the paving surface.

Steven Heikin feels porous pavers are more attractive and would support the proposal with that as a condition.

Therefore, the Planning Board voted (4-0) to recommend approval of the site plan by Boston Survey Inc., dated 11/25/19, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a final site plan showing the conversion of the driveway to pervious pavers, 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 that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.**
- 3. 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.**

105 Stedman Street – Demolish existing single-family home and construct new single-family home requiring zoning relief for setbacks and parking regulations.

Victor Panak described the proposal and the required zoning relief and stated that the Planning Department staff is supportive.

The owner, Sharona Taieb, was introduced.

Attorney Jeff Allen stated that relief for the side yard setbacks can be granted under Deadrick or under Section 5.43. Everything else complies and the open space is greater than required.

Steven Heikin stated that the demo delay has expired and asked about the façade materials.

The architect, Irena Mandelbraut, said there are two colors of stucco.

Steven Heikin asked if this building will be electric (FFF).

The applicant said she hadn't looked into the costs yet.

Citizen, Joan Rachlin, 100 Beale Street, had environmental concerns and urges use of electricity, or other sustainable measures. She does not like the design of the proposed house.

Mark Zarrillo also didn't like the design and will not support it.

Attorney Jeff Allen, himself, went to supreme judicial court to overturn “Gale” but court upheld it in appeal of the Gloucester Board of Appeals.

Linda Hamlin also doesn't like design and feels it doesn't fit into the neighborhood.

Steven Heikin called it an unarticulated box. He would like three dimensional views and more information about the materials. He is not ready to approve this.

Matthew Oudens also doesn't like the design and pointed out that the drawings are stamped by an engineer, not an architect. He likes contemporary architecture but doesn't support this without more information.

Attorney Jeff Allen is troubled that the Board is ignoring the law. It falls under Gale vs Gloucester and design review is not applicable for this case.

Steven Heikin would like some modifications to the design and more information on materials.

The applicant said the lot is just too narrow to meet setbacks. The façade is stone and the rest is stucco. She looked at other materials used in contemporary homes in Brookline.

Steven Heikin suggested a compromise that after the ZBA hearing the Planning Board have design review, prior to a building permit.

Jeffrey Allen stated he doesn't want to give Planning Board veto power but would be willing to come back for design feedback.

Attorney Jeffrey Allen suggested a condition to read:
Prior to a building permit the applicant shall come back to the Planning Board for input on the design.

Mark Zarrillo is generally opposed to engineers doing architecture.

Linda Hamlin is not ready to support this as it is not an asset to the neighborhood.

Planning Board approved this with a condition of design review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit.

Attorney Allen will ask ZBA to make it Planning Board input, not approval.

Therefore, the Planning Board voted (4-0) to recommend approval of the site plan by A. Matthew Belski dated April 27, 2020, and architectural plans by RAV & Associates., Inc. dated June 29, 2020, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall return to the Planning Board for final design review and approval.**

2. **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 or engineer 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.**
3. **Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning.**
4. **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 of 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.**

223-229 Boylston Street was continued until next week due to computer connection problems.

The meeting was adjourned.