

TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting February 2, 2022

Document Prepared by Susan Peghiny



Video Recording: <https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?nav=programs%2FPlanning%20Board%20-%20Weston%20MA>

Meeting called to order at 7:001 PM. Chair Alicia Primer read Governor Baker’s Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law.

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Alicia Primer (AI) - Chair	Yes	Imaikalani Aiu (IA) – Town Planner	Yes
Leslie Glynn (LG)	Yes	Christine Zale (CZ) – Assistant Town Planner	Yes
Steve Oppenheimer (SO)	Yes	Dave Conway (DC) - Consulting Civil Engineer	Yes
Alex Selvig (AS)	Yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	Yes
Laurie Hess (LH)	Yes	Others	
		Rob Williamson, Wright-Pierce, consultant	Yes
		Amy Coppers, Wright-Pierce, consultant	Yes

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

OTHER BUSINESS

Town Planner Report

- Review of upcoming meetings & site visits
- 40B Updates:
 - 518 South Ave: Next meeting is on February 17th.
 - 751 Boston Post Road: On agenda tonight.
 - 104 Boston Post Road, Stony Brook: No update.
 - 255 Merriman: On agenda tonight.
- Long Range Plans:
 - Private Tree Protection: Working on a framework to present to the Board.
 - Historic Heritage: Will be continued from February 16th meeting.
 - Water Master Plan: On tonight’s agenda.
- Committee Updates (CZ reporting)
 - Water Towers: On agenda tonight.
 - Sustainability: AS reported that they are exploring a fossil fuel bylaw for new construction.
 - Tree Advisory: They presented to CPC funding request for Case Park. Next meeting is February 9.
 - CPC: Their January 24th meeting included presentations for Town Meeting.
 - Invasive Plants: CZ reviewed their current priorities.

Update from Weston Plant and Pollinator Alliance on Byron Road Landscape Project

Representation: Elizabeth Soares

Overview: Ms. Soares described the Byron Road traffic triangle and proposed pollinator garden for the site. She also asked for recommendations on how to repair the historic stone wall. They would like to begin site preparation in the spring/early summer. DPW has agreed to help with site preparation.

Discussion: There was a discussion of CPC fund availability and application timing.

AS suggested that DPW could repair the area of the wall that appears to have been hit by a car. This was discussed and it was decided to do a site visit. It was also suggested that Ms. Soares talk to town counsel about whether the wall would be a repair or historic preservation.

There was a discussion of the trees on the site and Ms. Soares said the ailing cherry/crabapple tree will be removed but the Yew at the wide end of the triangle will remain.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

221 Boston Post Road – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval – New 7,134sf RGFA House - Bhaskar Edara and Sudha Bolla, Applicants

Representation: Angela Kearney, Landscape Architect; Dan Carr, Civil Engineer; Brian Zagorites, Architect

Overview: Mr. Carr reviewed the engineering plan for the proposed house. Ms. Kearney presented the landscape and lighting plans for the proposed house. Mr. Zagorites presented the architectural plan for the proposed house.

Documents:

- [221 Boston Post Road Civil Engineering Plans](#)
- [221 Boston Post Road Landscape Plans](#)
- [221 Boston Post Road Lighting Plans and Specs](#)
- [Arborist Report for 221 Boston Post Road](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 221 Boston Post Road](#)
- [Existing Condition and Context Plans 221 Boston Post Road](#)
- [Hydrology Calculations for 221 Boston Post Road](#)
- [RGFA Calculations for 221 Boston Post Road](#)

Discussion: DC advised that he was satisfied with the engineering.

KT said the landscape plan looks robust, although some existing trees are deciduous, and the ledge does not block all of the house. She suggested some larger evergreen shrubs at the top or trees at the bottom added to that area to help with buffering. After some discussion it was agreed to add 3 field-located shrubs in that area.

AS asked for details on the side of the house that would face the historic house next door. There was a discussion of the visual impact of a modern white house in a National Register Historic District.

LG expressed concern about the location of the LED strip lights, which Mr. Zagorites spoke to.

LG asked if the native grasses are drought-resistant, which Ms. Kearney confirmed. LG also asked for details about the location of the front fence which Ms. Kearney provided. LG asked for some shrubs on the road side of the fence, and Ms. Kearney said they will try to do that, although there are places where the fence is very close to the wall drop off.

LG asked about the demolition plan and suggested that there were items in the house that might be salvageable and asked that they consider this.

LH asked if the house would have solar panels since they are removing trees for solar gain. Ms. Kearney said there may be panels in the future but right now the goal is to increase the passive solar in the house. LH asked if there were other sustainability components in the house, and Mr. Zagorites said they had not discussed this.

AS pointed out that the south-facing side of the house does not have many windows and will not benefit from solar gain by removing trees and asked why they wanted to remove the trees for so little benefit. Ms. Kearney said the goal is to bring more light into the house, plus make space for the driveway. Mr. Zagorites explained how the light gain from this side of the house would penetrate into the house.

SO said it appears that the trees are being removed for the driveway. He asked for clarification on the location of the new driveway, which Mr. Zagorites and Ms. Kearney provided.

SO also asked several questions about the existing and new fencing, including matching the color of the new fence to the existing one or painting all of it dark green. SO also asked if the fence could be turned north earlier to move it away from the road.

AS said the house does not fit the fabric of the historic district and is concerned that solar gain was cited as the reason to remove trees when that appears to be untrue.

AP asked several questions regarding the trees along the road.

SO asked if the house could be moved north to keep more existing trees, which would make the house color and design less noticeable from the street by increasing the screening.

Public Comments: Steve Jackalis, 215 Boston Post Road, said he is concerned about the color of the house because of glare on the east side. He is also concerned about trees and their sizing. The lighting is also of some concern, and finally he proposed using a natural berm instead of fencing along the front.

***Motion:** AS moved to continue the public hearing to March 2, 2022. LG seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Development Standards for Municipal Utilities – Town of Weston Applicant

Overview: IA explained that the water tanks in town need to be replaced, and because of where they are located there is a need for a zoning change. He then outlined the draft bylaw.

IA said that another approach would be to get a variance at each site, although each of these would be subject to appeal.

Documents:

- [Hydraulic Profile-Graphic](#)
- [Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment for Municipal Utilities.](#)
- [Transmittal of Zoning By Law Amendment](#)
- [Water Tank Graphics Board](#)

Discussion: LH asked if the proposed unlimited height for water tanks was standard in other towns. Mr. Williamson said he was not aware of any community that has a height limitation on any water tanks. There was a robust discussion of the height limitation issues as well as what other towns do.

AP asked if a cell tower could be added to the top of a water tower. IA said that in the draft bylaw as written this is not allowed, but the Select Board asked that it be considered.

LH asked if the proposed size of the new tanks is unusual in any way. Mr. Williamson said there is nothing unusual and explained the criteria used to size the tanks. Ms. Coppers said it is also based on the topography of the community.

LG pointed out that nothing in the draft bylaw mentions water conservation and wondered if the water problem be solved through conservation. This was discussed.

AP asked Mr. Williamson about Wright-Piece's report from 2019 and its difference from the current recommendation. This was discussed.

AP asked about the replacement of the pumps for the water coming from the reservoir near Wellesley, which was discussed.

LG asked if larger pipes would be required to serve the larger tanks. Mr. Williamson explained that currently this would not be needed but would be in the future, which he explained.

LG asked if other places in town with elevation had been considered for the additional tanks instead of replacing the existing tanks. Mr. Williamson said they had looked at other town-owned property, and none are appropriate. Plus, that would not reduce the additional height needed on the existing tanks.

LG asked if graphics could be provided to have a visual idea of the height of the tanks and also what shadows would be cast. Mr. Williamson shared a drawing of the existing and proposed tank heights for comparison, which was discussed.

There was a discussion of siting the tanks and conservation land access.

SO asked for clarification of whether or not the Board would be voting on the height of the tanks, since that is decided by the water elevation needs. There was a discussion of options regarding the height. He also suggested that the water conservation issue be considered separately from the tanks issue since they were not related.

Public Comments: Tom Seaman, 100 Highland Street, asked for clarification on what structures would be outside of the height restriction, and IA explained that it would only be the water tanks. AP pointed out the Select Board's request to allow cell towers. Mr. Seaman asked why the Town was attempting a bylaw rather than a variance for each tower and expressed concern that input from residents would be limited by this approach. Mr. Williamson said the tank height is dictated by the needs of the community. If the tanks are not allowed, a large part of the community would have inadequate water service, especially for fire protection. There was a discussion of this issue.

Diana Chaplin, Love Lane, said that the lack of redundancy for the water coming into the town was very concerning and thought this should be resolved before replacing the tanks.

Mario Alagna, 137 Sherborn Circle, asked if the existing pumps are strong enough to service the tanks and if rebuilding one tank has value until all three are done. Mr. Williamson said replacing the pumps is part of the proposed plan, and that

building the tanks one at a time will not benefit the town for many years. They are recommending doing two tanks at the same time to expedite the benefits.

Barbara Fullerton expressed concern about the water demand of the proposed 40B development on Rt. 30. Mr. Williamson explained that the issue is serving housing on higher elevations and providing fire protection, and which types of usage, primarily commercial and industrial, add significantly to water demand. The final size of the tanks will include any new developments under consideration.

Roy MacDowell, 156 Highland, said he would like the zoning bylaw to limit the height of the tanks to what is needed for adequate service rather than leaving it unlimited. He also said he does not have an issue with emergency communications towers on the tank but is concerned about cell towers being allowed.

***Motion:** LH moved to continue the public hearing to March 16, 2022. LG seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

OLD BUSINESS

70 Loring Road – Site Plan Approval Amendment – Relocate Driveway at existing 8,517sf RGFA house – Nathan and Lindsay Ott, Applicants

Representation: Joe Skorupa, Lombardi Design; Kevin O’Leary, Jillson Engineering; Jamie Madeja, Permitting Counsel.

Overview: Mr. Skorupa outlined the existing site conditions and the proposed driveway and landscaping changes.

Documents: AS asked who had deemed Loring Road “unsafe”. Mr. Skorupa said a report was done by Transportation Data Corporation. Ms. Madeja pointed out that not all of Loring Road is unsafe, but that it is less safe for how the owners want to use the property. There was a discussion of the conditions on Loring Road.

Mr. Skorupa outlined the tree removal plan.

Discussion: AP referenced the minutes of a 2015 Planning Board meeting where the chair said:

“The Planning Board’s initial findings on the proposed driveway would not be reconsidered from the decision two years ago without compelling reasons to change the decision. He wondered what had changed to have the Planning Board reverse their decision.” AP explained that in a 2013 decision, the Board found that “a driveway fronting on Meadowbrook would be counter to the stated goals of site plan approval listed in the Town of Weston Zoning Bylaw, Section 11 *Site Plan Approval Standards and Criteria*...relocation of the driveway from the existing cut on Loring to a new curb cut on Meadowbrook would result in a failure to preserve natural or historic features and would fail to minimize tree, vegetation, and soil removal and grade changes”.

AP explained that in 2013 and 2015, the Board denied requests to relocate the driveway. She asked the Board if there had been anything presented that would cause the Board to reverse two previous decisions.

SO, who was on the Board at the time of the previous decisions, said he does not remember why the house was sited backwards (rear yard facing the driveway entrance on Loring Road, front yard in the rear). AP explained that the developer said they would have had to remove ledge and more trees to reverse the house orientation relative to Loring Road and that the current orientation would make sense if the driveway could be relocated to Meadowbrook Rd.

There was a discussion of the issue.

AS said that although there are two previous decisions, he does not see anything wrong with the request and sees no harm being done. SO agreed, especially since the neighbors are now in support of the request, which they weren’t in 2013 and 2015.

LH expressed concern about reversing two previous Board decisions. She does not feel there has been compelling new evidence that circumstances have changed. This was discussed.

LG expressed discomfort with overturning two previous Planning Board decisions but could also see why the decisions might be overturned. She could see both points of view.

Ms. Madeja said the circumstances are different from the previous requests because the previous Board was heavily influenced by residents and the Roads Trust, who felt the developer had not worked with them. Now, the owners have worked with the neighbors and the Roads Trust to gain support for the change.

There was a discussion of who the letters of support were from.

LG asked what changed the position of the Roads Trust from previous requests. Ms. Madeja said it was the support of the area neighbors, and how it was presented. There was a discussion of the Roads Trust's new position.

Mr. Skorupapointed out that the new trees and shrubs proposed along the new driveway will provide additional buffer to the scenic road.

Mr. Skorupa reviewed the environmental benefits of the proposed driveway change.

KT said Mr. Skorupa's comments were accurate, and she has no concerns about the proposed landscape buffering.

Public Comments: There was no public comment.

LG asked if Loring Road feels like the back of the property. KT said the plantings are doing what was intended so she has no issue with that part of the property.

Mr. Skorupa said they are open to letting go of the maintenance access to the site from Loring Road.

***Motion:** AS moved to continue the public hearing to March 16, 2022. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

9, 15 and 20 Riverside Road - Site Plan Approval – Redevelop Existing Office Park to Biotech Offices – Greatland Realty Partners, Applicant

Representation: Kevin Sheehan, Greatland; Justin Mosca, Civil Engineer; Michael Munn, Sustainability Consultant; Todd Dundon, Architect; James Ward, Attorney.

Overview: Mr. Mosca provided the details of the anticipated 33,000 GPD water use of the property, as requested.

IA asked if there was anything on the Project Summary document that the Board objected to.

LG said the water issue needs to be considered. She also asked IA about nighttime brightness reduction and motion sensors for the exterior light fixtures. Mr. Sheehan said he believes there will be dimmable fixtures and motion sensors on the west parking lot. LG asked that the entire site be included. There was a discussion of this. Mr. Dundon said that all fixtures are dark-sky compliant.

Documents:

- [Applicant Responses to Transportation Peer Review](#)
- [Arborist Report for Riverside Road](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Boundary Survey Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Civil Engineering Peer Review for Riverside Road](#)
- [Civil Engineering Site Details](#)
- [Civil Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Civil Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Cover Letter for Riverside Road Redevelopment](#)
- [Initial Presentations to Planning Board](#)
- [Landscape Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Landscape Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Landscape Revisions Presentation for Riverside Road](#)
- [Offsite Roadway Improvement Plans for Riverside Rd](#)
- [Park Rd Improvements Turning Movements](#)
- [Peer Review Response to VHB](#)
- [Presentation to PB Transportation with Park Rd](#)
- [Project Narrative for Riverside Road](#)
- [Riverside Campus Traffic Impact Analysis Peer Review](#)
- [Riverside Labs Community Noise Evaluation](#)
- [Riverside Noise Baseline Survey](#)
- [Riverside Sustainability Presentation](#)
- [Site Lighting Report for Riverside Road](#)
- [Site Visit Handbook](#)

Discussion: LG asked several questions for clarification of how the water use was calculated, which Mr. Mosca and Mr. Munn answered.

LG asked if the Board had ever set water usage limits for large projects. IA said there were not any others to consider for precedent.

Public Comments: There was no public comment.

SO asked if the decision would be a standard COA. IA said it would have that form, but there would be different criteria because it works under a different zoning bylaw.

***Motion:** LG moved to continue the public hearing to February 16, 2022. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

OTHER BUSINESS

751 Boston Post Road – Comprehensive Permit – Decision Comparison

Discussion: AP expressed hope that the Board can comment during the MEPA process. IA said the Board can comment on the documents, but it depends on what will be reviewed during the MEPA process.

IA advised that there is not much that can be done to change the **comprehensive permit**. The hope would be to get Board comments to other boards and to try to find a way for the Boards to have a role in renegotiations. There was a discussion of the issue.

DECISIONS

45 Hill Top Road – Scenic Road Right of Way Work – Remove Five Trees – Edwin Smith and Teresa DeMarco, Applicants

***Motion:** LG moved to approve 45 Hill Top Road – Scenic Road Right of Way Work – Remove Five Trees, as edited. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

255 Merriam/11 Hallet Hill, Village at Silver Hill – AARC Site Plan Approval Amendment – Remove five additional trees

***Motion:** SO moved to approve 255 Merriam/11 Hallet Hill, Village at Silver Hill – AARC Site Plan Approval Amendment – Remove five additional trees, as edited. LH seconded, and the motion passed 4-0 by rollcall vote. LG recused herself from this vote.*

MINUTES

Approval of Minutes

*LG moved to approve the minutes of the **December 15, 2021, January 5, 2022, January 11, 2022, and January 19, 2022** Planning Board meetings as edited. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall.*

FUTURE MEETINGS

February 16, 2022
March 2, 2022
March 16, 2022
March 23, 2022

ADJOURNMENT

***Motion:** LH moved to adjourn, LG seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

Meeting adjourned at 10:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Peghiny
Recording Secretary