



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 September 12, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Linda Hamlin, Mark Zarrillo, Blair Hines, James Carr
Staff Present: Victor Panak

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. There were none.

BOARD OF APPEALS CASES

143 Laurel Road – Construct two-story addition requiring relief from setbacks.

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

Tom Saltsman, architect for the applicant/owner, described the scope of work and the attempts to keep the addition consistent with the architectural style of the existing building.

The Board briefly discussed how applications are reviewed when they are subject to both the Planning Board and either the Preservation Commission or the Conservation Commission.

Steve Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan and architectural plans by Saltsman Brenzel Design Construction, dated August 8, 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 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.**

Linda Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

305 Clark Road – Construct two-story addition requiring relief from floor area ratio.

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

Jason Cornell, applicant and owner, described the motivation for the addition and reviewed details of the proposed work.

Ms. Hamlin confirmed with Mr. Panak that the application was seeking relief under *Deadrick*.

Mr. Heikin stated that he did not find the addition to be unreasonable or detrimental, but was skeptical about the orientation of the master suite. The applicant provided the Board with revised plans showing an alternative orientation for the master suite.

Blair Hines stated that he would like to see the required setbacks noted on plans.

Mr. Heikin asked if Board members had any thoughts on the expansion of the porch. Ms. Hamlin opined that she found it acceptable and that the existing house likely needs the extension.

Mr. Heikin stated that he would like to see materials noted on plans and acknowledged receipt of abutters' comments, all of which were supportive.

Ms. Hamlin noted that the applicants were proceeding without an attorney and suggested that, given the nature of the relief needed, they may need one.

The Board discussed whether they found the addition not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure in the light of a previous standard the Board set where an addition that increases the FAR over 120% of that allowed under the Bylaw would be deemed substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood. The Board agreed that the prior standard would need to be flexible depending on the specific circumstances of each case. In this case, the Board agreed that the altered structure is not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure, thereby satisfying the criteria for a Section 6 finding.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by Michael P. Clancy, dated 3/25/19 and revised 7/26/19, and the floor plans and elevations by Pauli & Uribe Architects LLC, dated 9/12/19, 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.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan showing all 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 5-0 to approve the motion.

95 Clark Road – Construct second-story addition requiring relief from floor area ratio.

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

Mr. Heikin confirmed that the addition is proposed over the existing footprint. James Carr then asked why the zoning relief was subject to Deadrick. Mr. Heikin stated that it was because the addition entails additional building mass within the required setback area, thereby intensifying an existing nonconformity.

Miriam Spear, architect for the owner/applicant, briefly reviewed the materials being used for the proposed expansion.

Mr. Carr stated that he was happy to see a statement addressing the criteria under design review (Section 5.09) but that the comments should contain more detail.

The Board discussed counterbalancing amenities. Mr. Heikin and Mr. Hines suggested eliminating one of the 3 curb cuts, but Mr. Heikin did not feel comfortable requiring it of the applicant whereas Mr. Hines did. The applicant indicated they would be very reluctant to eliminate a curb cut, noting that they all saw some use. Ms. Hamlin agreed with Mr. Heikin. Mr. Hines indicated that, despite his support for the proposed addition, he would vote in opposition because he wanted to require the elimination of the curb cut as a counterbalancing amenity.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan by Frank Iebba, dated 6/8/19, and the floor plans and elevations by Miriam Spear, dated 6/11/19, 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.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan showing all 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: 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.**

Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 4-1 (Mr. Hines opposed) to approve the motion.

111 Winthrop Road – Convert a three unit dwelling into a five unit dwelling requiring relief from setbacks.

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

Robert Allen, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the history of the property, the required zoning relief, and the discussions with the Preservation Commission.

Phil Kramer, architect for the applicant, provided the Board with a presentation on the proposed work. Board members inquired about the materials for the curved bays (Hardy plank), whether the stair on the back elevation is necessary (Building Code requires it), and other minor design elements.

Mark Zarrillo suggested that the applicant add a pattern to the front walkway and consider adding plantings at the head of the parking area.

Mr. Carr was concerned about the location of the AC units, which, being located in a corridor between the subject building and the abutting building, would produce a lot of noise for both the residents and the abutters. Mr. Kramer stated that the location was very carefully considered and that the units would be very high efficiency and very quiet.

Ms. Hamlin was supportive of the renovation idea but felt that more work was needed to improve the front façade and she was not particularly supportive of the head house. Mr. Heikin agreed, especially with Ms. Hamlin's comments on the front façade, to which he added that the architect should try to resurrect some of the original design elements apparent on old pictures from the early 1900s.

Mr. Allen asked if the Board would consider recommending approval of the application with a condition that it returns to the Planning Board for final design review. Mr. Heikin stated he was comfortable with this.

Mr. Heikin asked if some of the parking could be eliminated. Mr. Kramer stated that it would be possible but the intent was to avoid any tandem parking. Elimination of the space furthest from the left property line (the space the Board wanted to see eliminated) would require some tandem parking. Mr. Zarrillo said he also supports eliminating the parking space and replacing it with more landscaping.

Mr. Heikin made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan and architectural plans by Philip Kramer Architect, LLC, dated 7/9/19, and revised 7/30/19, 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 Planning Board. Revised plans shall also show the elimination of the parking space furthest from the left-side property line, the reduction in the width of the curb cut, and the relocation of the AC units.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscaping plan showing all counterbalancing amenities subject to the review and approval of the Planning Board.**
- 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.**

Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

1618 Beacon Street – Construct an addition to an existing 4-unit dwelling requiring relief from floor area ratio and setbacks.

Mr. Panak described the scope of work and the requested zoning relief, noting that the Planning Department was not supportive of the proposal.

Robert Allen, attorney for the applicant, introduced the owner and discussed the impetus behind the proposal. Mr. Allen then reviewed the opinion of preservation staff and regulatory planning staff. Mr. Allen stated that the applicant had heard the concerns and addressed them with revised plans that would propose two additional dwelling units. Mr. Allen also provided an argument to support the granting of a variance – notably that the removal of the front appendage would be costly and produces a hardship.

Gary Hendren, architect for the applicant, provided the Board with a presentation on the revised proposal, including a brief description of the site and the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Carr asked about how the step-back of the proposed fourth floor compares to the step-back of fourth floors on the adjacent buildings. Mr. Hendren stated it was roughly the same. The resident of the 4th floor at 1616 Beacon Street spoke to say he did not believe that was the case and that he is concerned about how the proposal would affect his view.

Mr. Hines stated that he supported the increase to six units but that he did not find the basement unit to be livable. Mr. Hendren suggested that a sunken courtyard could be added to the front elevation to give the basement unit more natural light. Mr. Heikin expressed doubts that the Preservation Commission would allow that.

Mr. Heikin expressed a variety of concerns with the project including the significant reduction in the rear yard setback. Mr. Hendren offered a few ways in which the project could be further improved.

Mr. Zarrillo asked about how much square footage was being added by the 4th floor. Mr. Hendren stated it was 2,127 square feet.

Mr. Heikin summarized the discussion by pointing out that there was not much support for granting relief from the rear yard setback requirement and the basement unit, while there was support for the addition of more units.

Mr. Carr and Mr. Hines made a few more suggestions including using the existing architectural design of this and adjacent buildings to inform the new design and to step back the fourth floor to match adjacent buildings.

The case was continued to a future Planning Board meeting.

Minutes of August 22 were approved by the Planning Board.

Discuss Planning Board Rules and Regulations and other Procedural Topics

The Planning Board briefly discussed this item. Due to some miscommunications between staff and Board members, some of the Board members had not seen the latest draft of the Rules and Regulations and were not in a position to discuss them. Some Board members nonetheless provided some feedback on the draft and the Board agreed to schedule a dedicated meeting to discuss the Rules and Regulations in depth, at which time staff would prepare a comprehensive package for review by the Board.

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

The meeting was adjourned.