

Weston Planning Board Minutes: 14 February 2018– Approved ddMONTHyy

Board Members Present: Alfred Aydelott, Susan Zacharias, Steven Oppenheimer, Anthony Flynn (late)

Staff Present: Imaikalani Aiu (Town Planner), Kathleen Broomer (Assistant Town Planner)

Meeting called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Public Comments: None.

Topic:	Informational for Session	Transit Oriented Senior Development Overlay District (TOSDOD)	Type: Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment and Rezone	Address: 255 Merriam and 11 Hallet Hill
---------------	----------------------------------	--	---	--

Flynn recused himself from this item.

Main Presenters: Brendan Harley, 246 Merriam Street

- Stated goal of reducing impact of proposed 40B on site, scenic road and Historic District.
- Stated goal of converting 10 unit 40B to 8 unit age 55+ restricted housing.
- Stated that overlay district would come before Town Meeting as 2 By-law amendments.
- Stated that By-law requirements would mean that proposal would apply only to this parcel.

Susan Scott, 67 Silver Hill Road

- Stated history of development, 40B negotiations, appeal and current agreement.
- Stated parameters of TOSDOD, including minimum of 2.97 acres/8 units and proximity to train, compliance with setback requirements and Board Site Plan review.
- Stated that both Kendal Green and Hastings stops were within 500 feet of stream and ineligible for TOSDOD.
- Stated that each article requires 2/3 approval at Town Meeting.
- Stated that units would add Senior housing but not help Town meet affordable housing goal.

Documents:

Type	Author	Title	Date
Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment	Susan Scott – Silver Hill Group	Transit-Oriented Senior Development Overlay District	01/29/2018

Discussion:

Process	Issue: Aydelott stated that Board had not yet reviewed final language of Bylaw. Action: None.
----------------	--

<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that proposal is spot zoning because it is limited to a single location. Stated that Town has never done spot zoning. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Board would refer issue to Town Counsel for review. Board would discuss issue once Town Counsel has advised them. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Board had supported 8 unit density on site during 40B process. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Zacharias stated concerns that proposal might actually impact other areas in town. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Zacharias asked if all units would be rental and if any were market rate. None would be rental and all would be market rate, none affordable. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Zacharias asked if development would be a mini Highland Meadows. Aydelott stated that only 1 resident per unit here had to be 55+, unlike Highland Meadows where all must be 55+. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked if 55+ resident had to be a Weston resident and stated that Weston residency would be important. Asked if nanny could count as 55+ resident. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Zacharias stated many issues still outstanding, e.g., age and residency requirements, were rentals allowed, enforcement, etc. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked about future impact of train stations closing and about how sizes of units were determined. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked if Wellesley Farms station had been included in calculations. Applicants stated that it would not be impacted. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked about how many parcels in Town could be combined to fit size requirements. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Oppenheimer stated that plan is spot zoning and predicted others will result in Town if this is approved, setting a bad precedent. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Aydelott asked why plan specifies Site Plan Review instead of Special Permit. Neighbors preferred Special Permit but Site Plan Review came out of negotiations with developer. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that issue would be referred to Town Counsel and Board would hold another informational meeting prior to Public Hearing. Action: None.</p>

Public Comments:

Commenter	Issue and Resolution
<i>Unidentified resident</i>	Issue: Stated HPP cites need for senior housing and this proposal raises issues of age discrimination. States that plan does not meet Town and HPP goals of affordable housing. Action: None.
Via email: Karen Levin, 51 Hallet Hill	Issue: Stated support for proposal. Action: None.
Via email: Eli Mather, Hobbs Brook	Issue: Stated that proposal would overwhelmingly impact North side of Town and would be destructive to rural feel of Town. Asked why transit oriented development would require 2 parking spots per unit and why Seniors were targeted instead of commuters. Action: None.

Informational session to be continued to 7 March meeting.

**Topic: Continued for Construction Type: Special Permit for Address: Merriam
Public of new Wetlands and Floodplain Street
Hearing sidewalk Protection Overlay
District and Work in
Scenic Road ROW**

Documents:

Type	Author	Last Revised	Title	Sheet
None				

Discussion:

Process	Issue: Broomer stated that Traffic and Sidewalk Committee was not ready with new information. Action: None.
	Issue: Aydelott stated that Public Hearing would be opened and then continued to 7 March meeting. Action: None.

Public Comments: n/a

Zacharias moved to continue hearing to 7 March meeting, **Oppenheimer** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Flynn joined the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Topic: Continued for New Public Hearing **Type: RGFA Site Plan Approval** **Address: 210 Summer Street**

Main Presenters: James Rissling, architect

- Stated existing 2244 RGFA would be replaced by 7700’ house.
- Stated neighborhood conditions, houses and highway proximity.
- Stated that exterior lights were dark sky complaint and LED.
- Stated plan for traditional center entrance Colonial style.

Vito Colonna

- Stated existing septic passed Title 5 and would remain.
- Stated that impervious surface would increase from 3800’ to 6000’.
- Stated that front portion of retaining wall would stay, with stones reused for new portion.

Steve Cosmos, landscape architect

- Stated plan to add screening along Summer Street and along property line.

Documents:

Documents	Author	Last Revised	Title	Sheets
General	Civil Engineer: Sullivan, Connors and Associates	02/05/2018	Property Data (Zoning) Table <i>see Stormwater Plan</i>	1
		04/11/2017	Plan of Land (existing dwelling)	1
Plans	Land Surveyor: Massachusetts Survey Consultants	08/21/2017	Proposed Dwelling Plan	1
		Architect: LR Designs, Inc.	02/28/2018	Neighboring Properties along Summer St (context map)
	Site Sections			1 of 19
	Story Above Grade Calculations			1 of 19
	RGFA Calculations			4 of 19
	Measured Drawings Floor Plans Elevations Building Sections			5 of 19 4 of 19 2 of 19
	* Exterior Lighting Plan			1 of 19
	Landscape Architect: Cosmos Associates	02/07/2018	* Landscape Plan	1

Stormwater	Civil Engineer: Sullivan, Connors and Associates	02/05/2018	* Stormwater Site Plan (includes erosion control)	1
		05/17/2017	Storm Drainage Report	1
Specifications – Lighting			Manufacturer’s cut sheets for lighting fixtures	12
Correspondence	Public Health Director, Town of Weston	02/07/2018	Email to Land Use staff on plan for septic system	1

Discussion:

Engineering	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked planned width of new driveway and if it would flare at street. It would be 12’ at narrow point and flare at street. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked to compare existing conditions site plan. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias asked about structure shown on driveway plan. It is a foundation drain from house. Action: None</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked for clarification on RGFA. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that RGFA calculation included more than Town includes, which Broomer confirmed. Total excluding basement would be 6500’. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked if basement were above grade. It would not be. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias asked about locations of a/c unit and generator. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked what changes had been made since previous meeting. This meeting was to answer outstanding questions. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that there had been engineering issues and questions at original meeting. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Broomer stated that intake meeting had revealed issues for follow-up. Action: None.</p>
<p>Issue: Aydelott asked if generator would be enclosed, given its proximity property line. Noise standard would be met. Action: None.</p>	
<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that ambient noise level from Route 128 is 70 dba. Action: None.</p>	

	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked if Conway had signed off on engineering plan. Broomer stated that he had.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
Landscaping	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that Turner had determined neighbors were not impacted because of grading on site.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Turner’s comment was read, stating that she had reviewed and found no issues.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked if any trees were being removed.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Turner should consult on final location of planting for more natural appearance. Zacharias agreed.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
Architecture	<p>Issue: Broomer stated previous Board issue with garage lighting plan and that plan had not changed.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias asked for total lumen count.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn asked Aiu if Board would verify lumen count. Count would be confirmed.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked for clarification on lighting locations.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked about width of dentil moldings.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn asked about walkway location.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked about shutters planned only for front façade.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias asked about number of bedrooms, original versus planned. New house would have 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>

Public Comments: none.

Draft decision will be reviewed and approved at 7 March meeting.

Topic: Public Hearing for Remove Requirement for Registered Mail **Type:** Revisions to Rules and Regulations of Site Plan Approval **Address:** n/a

Main Presenter: Town Planner

- Stated background for rules revision.
- Stated applicants had previously been required to send notifications by certified mail.
- Stated that revision would codify recent practices.
- Stated that office logs outgoing notifications in each file.

Documents:

Type	Author	Date
Proposed Revision to Rules and Regulations	Town Planner	02/14/2018

Discussion:

Process	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that use of certified mail provided a record of notification. Stated need to record notifications, suggested a log could be used. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that Post Office offered other options. Aiu stated that all would require proof of receipt. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that email could be used. Action: None</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer stated that Priority Mail provides tracking and is not expensive. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that Priority Mail would meet Board duty to notify. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn stated that cost per envelope would be \$7. Action: Aiu or staff will ask Post Office about options.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer and Zacharias stated corrections to text. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn stated that State defined 300' area as abutting. Aiu stated that is instead the defined area of interest. Action: None.</p>

Public Comments:

Commenter	Issue and Resolution
Adrienne Giske, Boston Post Road	<p>Issue: Stated case in which notification was done by hand with only verbal records, and resultant objections and claims that it had not occurred. Action: None.</p>

Oppenheimer moved to approve as corrected, **Zacharias** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Topic: Decision for Add patio, pool and parking **Type:** RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment **Address:** 96 Rockport Road

Applicant: Jean-Claude and Esther Tetreault

Documents:

Type	Author	Date
Certificate of Action	Town Planner	02/14/2018

Discussion:

Process	<p>Issue: Aiu stated that landscape plans had been updated and pool equipment moved out of the setback. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn asked about format of special conditions. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated possible revision. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that document refers to conditions that must be met before building can be occupied, but the house is already occupied. Stated need for revision to wording of standard conditions. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that special and standard condition notes should be modified to relate more directly to changes made, for accuracy. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Zacharias stated that approval should not be delayed while revisions are made to the process. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked if there would be a pool house and about changes to scope of work area. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked lighting changes. Aiu stated that previously installed non-compliant light fixtures were to be removed. Action: None.</p>

Public Comments:

Commenter	Issue and Resolution
Diana Chaplin, Love Lane	<p>Issue: Stated that changes to approved plans would be more common as years pass and that they could be referenced in new approvals. Action: None.</p>

Oppenheimer moved to approve as corrected, **Zacharias** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Topic: 2017 Annual Report for **Type:** Address: n/a

Main Presenters: Town Planner

Documents:

Type	Author	Date
Annual Report	Town Planner	02/14/2018

Discussion:

	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Board had only 1 review related purely to RGFA issues. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer stated that many cases were for combined Scenic Road and RGFA review. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott and Zacharias stated minor corrections. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aydelott stated that guardrail issue, Case House, Old Library, JST, and High School athletic fields should be included in recap. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Flynn asked to include Merriam Street sidewalk issue. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked to include Rail Trail. Action: None.</p>

Public Comments:

Commenter	Issue and Resolution
Diana Chaplin, Love Lane	<p>Issue: Asked about non Scenic Road RGFA case. It was on Willard Road. Action: None.</p>

Oppenheimer moved to approve as amended, **Zacharias** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Minutes:

20 December 2017: **Oppenheimer** moved to approve as corrected, **Flynn** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Town Planner Report

Regis College	<p>Issue: Aydelott asked about Regis College site visit. Action: None.</p>
----------------------	--

	<p>Issue: Aiu stated that Regis had submitted plans for new field house, concession building and grandstands for track and baseball fields. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked about architect for project. Action: None.</p>
Process	<p>Issue: Aiu stated upcoming meetings. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked about Boston Property meeting and if and when the Board would be voting on recommendation. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Board would issue draft report on Boston Properties to Selectmen. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aiu stated that he had completed revisions to Board website and linked documents online. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aiu stated that new plans moved parking away from against the house. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aydelott asked about existing gate. Aiu stated that Fire Department wanted access. Aydelott stated that Fire had approved plan previously and that they have key to gate. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Oppenheimer stated removal of gate would cause many traffic issues. Board agreed that traffic would be an issue. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aydelott stated that Traffic Engineer had previously determined gate was important to include. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Oppenheimer asked about inclusion of porte cochere, which is not shown on plans. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Zacharias asked if kindergarten addition were being removed. Aydelott stated that the School Committee wanted it retained. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aiu reviewed Fields Pond tree removal request and stated that Turner had approved it. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aiu reviewed 46 River Road changes to exterior details. Zacharias stated that no changes were made to RGFA or exterior lighting. Action: None.</p>
	<p>Issue: Aiu reviewed Fields Pond tree removal request and stated that Turner had approved it. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aiu reviewed 46 River Road changes to exterior details. Zacharias stated that no changes were made to RGFA or exterior lighting. Action: None.</p>
Administrative Approvals	<p>Issue: Aiu reviewed Fields Pond tree removal request and stated that Turner had approved it. Action: None.</p> <p>Issue: Aiu reviewed 46 River Road changes to exterior details. Zacharias stated that no changes were made to RGFA or exterior lighting. Action: None.</p>

Zacharias moved to approve changes to 46 River Road plans, **Flynn** seconded approval. All in favor, none opposed.

Public Comments:

Commenter	Issue and Resolution
Adrienne Giske, Boston Post Road	Issue: Stated that porte cochere was planned at Case House and would replicate original. Action: None.

Oppenheimer moved to adjourn, **Flynn** seconded. All in favor, none opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Alicia Primer