

## WATERTOWN PLANNING BOARD

DATE: January 9, 2013 PLACE: Town Council Chamber TIME: 7:00 PM COMMENCED: 7:00 PM

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Monthly Meeting

PRESENT: John Hawes, Chairman; Jeff Brown; Linda Tuttle-Barletta; Neal Corbett; Fergal Brennock  
Steve Magoon, Director; Ingrid Marchesano, Clerk to the Board; Danielle Evans, Senior Planner; Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner

### ADMINISTRATION BUSINESS

Jeff Brown motioned to approve Minutes of 12/12/2012.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta seconded the motion.

Voted 4-0 In favor

### CASES PENDING

- **24 Longfellow Road**; John & Clare Loughran – Special Permit Finding

John Loughran, this is a proposal to extend the existing front porch along the entire front of the house. It will keep up with the dutch colonial style of the house.

Gideon Schreiber, the house is located on a 6,300 s.f. lot. The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing stairs and rebuild a full length porch with a hip roof. The proposed change will not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood. Staff recommends an approval with conditions.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the Special Permit Finding under Section 4.06(a) based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

- **16 Sunset Road**; Mathew D. Engle – Special Permit Finding

Steve Winnick, Atty, this is a 5,000 s.f. lot located in a T zone. The 2-family structure is nonconforming in height. The proposed build-out will increase the square footage by converting the existing unfinished attic into a master suite. The proposed change will not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood, staff report is in favor of the proposal.

Fergal Brennock arrived at this time.

Gary Moyer, Architect, the attic space of the 2-family house will be converted into master suite. We are proposing to add gable dormers to provide height for bathroom and closets. The design will blend with the architecture of the house and neighborhood.

Steve Winnick, the design was enhanced with the help of planning staff.

Gideon Schreiber, the original design was redesigned to be more in keeping with the architectural style of the building. The interior space was slightly downsized. SPF is needed for alteration of non-conforming structure with a non-conforming side yard setback. The non-conforming height will be maintained. Staff recommends approval.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the Special Permit Finding under Section 4.06(a) based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Fergal Brennock seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

- **69 Howard Street**; Mat Frankel – Special Permit with Site Plan Review

Mat Frankel, our company is growing and we are proposing to move our fitness class from a space in Newton to this 8,528 s.f. tenant space. Special Permit is needed to allow enclosed recreational facility.

Gideon Schreiber, the Site Plan Review was waived because this is an existing structure that is being converted into commercial recreational use. A roofing company was using the space previously. The rear area is used for parking and storage. The 30,604 s.f. structure is nonconforming and set against the sidewalk with no setbacks. The structure is located in the Pleasant Street Corridor District (PSCD) that consists of residential and commercial mixture. The request is to allow shared parking. The project is consistent with the neighborhood plan. It is a conversion of industrial lot into recreational facility. Four criteria for special permit have been met. Staff found deficit of 4 parking spaces but it will even itself on the weekend. The staff report has standard conditions, drainage work will be done in the parking area as required by the Conservation Commission. Chain link fence will be removed and landscaping added.

Mat Frankel, the outside doors will be replaced, chain link fence removed and shrubs added. We are not proposing signage at this time. The classes are small, 10 to 20 clients. This location is larger than what is needed now.

Sean Graham, 34 Howard Street, we are in support of the proposed use, the only concern is parking. Parking on Howard and Pleasant Streets is not allowed.

Corinna Baksik, 34 Howard Street, we are hoping that trees will be planted and that neon signage will not be allowed. There is always concern with parking.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the Special Permit under Sections 5.01(3.b.2) and 6.01(f) based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

- **192 Pleasant Street**; John B. Wise, Burkhard Corporation – Special Permit with Site Plan Review

William York, Atty, this is a proposal to revitalize the site and replace the industrial building with a 14 condominium structure. Majority if the site is covered with a structure. The proposed building is small in scale, the required front yard setback of 12' will be increased. The building will be 3 stories on Pleasant Street and the sides and 4 stories in the sloping rear facing the River. Access to the River path will be provided on the east side of the building. The design is consistent with the intent of PSCD that is encouraging low impact design. The proposal has been reviewed by Dan Driscoll of DCR, DPW, Planning staff, Housing Partnership and Bike committee. The proposal is being reviewed by the Conservation Commission tonight because it is within the flood plain district.

Jack Wise, Burkhard Corporation, the area consists of commercial and mixed residential. The site is very small and we felt that high density development would not work. The building has 2 wings with central section that has brick façade. Extensive remediation work will enhance the wetlands. Landscaping will be substantially increased over existing conditions.

Ben Nickerson, Project Architect, the site is located in a transitional zone of Pleasant Street. We are looking for balance between 2-family structures and commercial development by using materials that are used for 2 family homes. The sides of the building have similar façade, the center façade is made of brick. The building is 3 stories high on Pleasant Street, the visual mass is reduced by sloping of the

roof. The shadow study provided different times of the day and different seasons. December shadow will continue across the street. The view from the bike path along the River will show the 4<sup>th</sup> story gable roof and shed dormers. The top units will be 2 stories. Each unit will have balcony space. Openings in the rear are showing parking under the building.

Bill York, landscape plans have been reviewed by the DPW. The existing 2 curb cuts have been reduced to one. There will be public access to the River and the bike path. The architectural design and landscape will provide enhanced street presence. Parking under the building is consistent with low impact design.

Al ....., McKenzie Engineering Group, this is a very steep site, some water runs between the existing garages. All runoff from this site will be directed to the rear of parking area, into the storm water diagram, then to be treated and exit to SW corner of the property. The system was reviewed by Dan Driscoll, DCR, and was found acceptable. We have worked with JP Shadley & Associates to enhance the landscaping. The steep access to the bike path does not exceed the 10% allowed. We will provide 4 bike rack spaces. Green area will be substantially increased.

Bill York, we will work with DCR regarding the access to the bike path. Many areas on the bike path are much steeper. This design is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements. The project will have minimal traffic impact.

Danielle Evans, staff reviewed the proposal, zoning relief Special Permit with Site Plan Review subject to Affordable Housing requirement. This is a request to raze existing industrial building and garages and replace it with four story 14-unit condominium structure. 20 conforming parking spaces along with 8 tandem spaces will be provided beneath the building. The site is appropriate for such a use providing transition between a 2-family zone and denser area to the left. It will benefit the neighborhood by replacing the existing structure, two driveways will be reduced to one. All building safety requirements have been met. The property is located in Flood Plain District and the Conservation Commission is reviewing the proposal tonight. Significant landscaping will be provided along the front, rear and western side of the property. The greatest shadow impact will be in the winter months. The open space will be increased from 7% to 32%. Traffic study is showing minimal impact. The surface drainage will be improved, runoff treated before discharge, the utilities will be located below grade and trash will be collected by private company. The construction will comply with Energy Stretch Code. The mechanical equipment will not be exposed, lighting will be minimal. 10% of the 14 units, 1 unit, will be designated affordable. The affordable 2 bedroom unit will be the same as the market rate units, 1,188 s.f., appliances will be comparable. The drive will be 24 feet wide to meet requirements to accommodate fire and emergency vehicles. Staff recommends conditional approval subject to Conservation Commission approval. Condition #11 regarding parking during the construction will be approved by the Police department, condition #12 & #13 if a variance for the path is not granted, it will be replaced with landscaping. Condition #15 that additional bike rack will be placed near the front entrance.

Jeff Brown, does the front of the building have stairs? What type of balconies will be on the river side? Windows seem to be of very small size, is that intentional? The walkway area is very slippery.

Ben Nickerson, the front ramp is placed diagonally to the front doors. The intent is to have straight shaped balconies. We are trying to build an energy efficient structure. Large windows are not energy efficient. Attic area toward Pleasant Street will not be used, the area toward the River will be used as bedrooms for third floor units.

Fergal Brennock, the front façade looks well, the rear elevation looks very dramatic. The windows and the columns at the parking entrances should be improved. I will encourage the developer to mask the rear area with landscaping.

Neal Corbett, this is noble development but it needs to be tweaked. The brick on the front façade feels heavy. The view from the path to the building does not reflect the neighborhood.

John Hawes, 140 Pleasant Street has 44 units, this will only be 14. This is a very busy street, cars are not allowed to park on Pleasant Street, how will a drop-off work? It will be difficult to turn around.

Bill York, couple of parking spaces have been designated for drop-off and pick-up.

Alan Sampson, 197 Pleasant Street, I am 77 years old and live right across the street. 14 are too many units for this site. Traffic on Pleasant Street is horrendous, the proposed structure is too high.

Corinna Baksik, 34 Howard Street, this proposal is a great improvement of the site. Low brick wall around the site would be preferable.

Sean Graham, 34 Howard Street, the proposal is huge improvement but the rear design is too busy.

Luke Delorme, 195 Pleasant Street, the structure is too tall to fit with the scale of the neighborhood. A letter expressing the neighbors concerns was submitted at this time.

Cynthia Nelson, 193 Pleasant Street, I bought this condo 10 years ago, one of the reasons was a beautiful view to the River. It is already difficult to back out of my driveway. New gym is being built nearby.

David Odette, 100 Pleasant Street, where are UPS and other deliveries going to park? The street was just redone, are they going to open it? We were not notified of this hearing.

Steve Magoon, the developer will redo the road. Notice was mailed to abutters within 300 feet. The agenda was posted on Town website and notice send out via Notify Me. The existing access to the path is not at the crosswalk. The new access will be at close proximity to the crosswalk making crossing the street safer.

Sarah Mack, 195 Pleasant Street, I support the development but I am opposed to the height. We now have a nice view of the River. Parking on Pleasant Street is prohibited, where are the guests going to park? The design needs to be more consistent with the neighborhood.

Brian Wyncoop, 46 Rosedale, why is the structure so high, the attic should not be used. Where will the construction vehicles park?

Bill York, a condition in the staff report states that the petitioner has to find parking for the construction vehicles. The building setback is 12 feet and it will be landscaped.

Chuck Langenhagen, 111 Pleasant Street, all structures are too close to Pleasant Street. The major concern is parking, people park on Myrtle and Green Streets. Building is too high, there will be shadows on the houses across the street. The light loss will be significant. Not many people use bicycles or walk in winter.

Siobhan Murphy, 79 Myrtle Street, this is an eccentric neighborhood, we have been notified of tonight's meeting, why is the Conservation Commission reviewing the petition tonight also? We need more time to review the project.

Arthur Venezia, real estate agent, many different developers were interested in the property. The site is very difficult to develop. Some proposed 22 units, others 30 units, but could not do it. This design is attractive, the site will be developed.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta, we are concerned with the size and massing. If you visualize the structure, it seems out of scale. It could be refined in massing and scale.

John Wise, Burkhard Corp., the site has many problems, economics make fewer units difficult. We have tried to match the hip roof of other houses in the area. We are sensitive to the area and we did have neighborhood meeting.

Bill York, this is far below of what is allowed. All improvements are significant, this is a very expensive project. Other developers proposed 20-30 units for the site. We are proposing 14 condominium units.

John Hawes, this proposal is lower density then what is allowed. The ideal design would be townhouses. The view of the River will be lost for the houses across the street anyway. I don't know if this design can be considered improvement of the site. The roof line could be gables on the end and flat roof in between. Major issue is scale of the structure relating to existing houses. The Ordinance allows for the buildings on Pleasant Street to be on the sidewalk. The petitioner can address some of the issues by working with the planning staff.

Fergal Brennock, this is a critical stage of the proposal, Planning Board should be the one with more input.

Steve Magoon, staff is willing to work with the applicant and will welcome the resident input. We have started the Comprehensive Plan process creating vision for this Town. We encourage residents to come and express their opinion. Adjustments will be made, members of the public should be part of the process.

Neal Corbett, I am troubled with the massing. It is important to refine the design. The Board needs to interact.

John Hawes, it is a very large residential development. Next step should be for the staff to meet with the developer and modify the design. Planning Board is the permit granting authority for this project. The option is to continue the petition until the next meeting of Planning Board to allow more time for review.

Fergal Brennock, it is important to listen to the residents as well as the developer, and to allow everyone to participate in the process.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to continue the petition to the next meeting of the Planning Board.  
Jeff Brown seconded the motion. VOTE: 5-0 In favor

Chairman John Hawes adjourned the meeting at 9:30 PM.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 9:30 PM MINUTES APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_  
For more detailed Minutes see tapes dated 1/9/13 available in the DCD&P office.