



TOWN OF WATERTOWN
Zoning Board of Appeals
Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Member
Kelly Donato, Member
Neeraj Chander, Alternate Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, June 25, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. in the Richard E. Mastrangelo Council Chamber on the second floor of the Administration Building, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing. In attendance: Melissa Santucci Rozzi, *Chair*; Christopher H. Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Member*; Kelly Donato, *Member*, Neeraj Chander, *Alternate Member*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development & Planning; Gideon Schreiber, Mike Mena, Louise Civetti. Absent: David Ferris, *Clerk*.

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced Neeraj Chander as the board's new alternate member and for a second month, Kelly Donato as a full member. She explained that in the absence of David Ferris, Full Member, Neeraj will be voting as a full member. She then introduced the rest of the board and Staff and swore in the audience. There is one case on the agenda, Member Heep will be Acting Clerk. Chair Santucci Rozzi admonished the audience to come to the podium when providing testimony, and to keep their testimony focused on the case before the Board.

Member Heep read the legal notice:

"202-204 Arsenal Street/58 Irving Street

David S. Hall, Hanover R.S. Limited Partnership, 2 Seaport Lane, Boston, MA 02210 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit/Site Plan Review in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §9.03, §9.05, §9.07, & §9.08 subject to §5.01(1)(k)(2), Mixed Use Development, to construct a 4-story structure with 6,777 s.f. of street front retail with up to a 80 seat restaurant/retail use and separate retail uses. The project also proposes 297 residential units (30 affordable) and a garage with 519 parking spaces. ZBA-2014-12(a)

Ed Nardi, Cresset/WS Venture LLC, 120 Water Street, Ste 200, Boston, MA 02210 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit/Site Plan Review in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §9.03, §9.05, §9.07, & §9.08 subject to §5.01(1)(k)(2), Mixed Use Development and §5.01(3)(f)(2) Retail, to construct a 33,157 gross s.f. retail structure with 108 parking spaces and signalized entrance from Arsenal St. The projects also propose to build a public multi-use path on-site along the subject property on Arsenal St and provide publically accessible open space (Franklin St rain garden) and pedestrian paths around the perimeters of the site with a pedestrian connection to Birch Rd. I-3 (Industrial) Zoning District. ZBA-2014-12(b) in conjunction with Mixed Use project ZBA-2014-12(a)."

Chair Santucci Rozzi swore in additional members of the audience who came in to the room after the Hearing Notice was administered.

Mr. William York provided the Board with a PowerPoint presentation describing the proposed project. He noted its long history as an industrial site and stock yard. He said the site's redevelopment is focused on

re-energizing the Arsenal Street Corridor via mixed use. Mr. York said the project is consistent with Watertown's draft Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Economic Development Plan. He noted a Traffic Study was done which was peer-reviewed, and results in over \$1.0 million in new roadway infrastructure. He said the site is designated for mixed use development. He said development provides Watertown with annual tax revenue in excess to new construction jobs. Mr. York said the project provides 30 affordable units and infrastructure improvements. He showed a slide of the various staff and prior Planning Board meetings. He noted the Community Meetings held and the peer review of the traffic study. He said there had been significant community outreach. He introduced the project team. Mr. York said the project team is well known and respected in the industry.

Ed Nardi, Cressett Development, discussed the recent history of the land assemblage. Owned the site since 2008. In 2012, realized that mixed use would work well at the site. Partnered with WS Development, and match that with a high quality residential developer. Chose to partner with Hanover for this component. Reached out to abutter, Piroli, at the strong suggestion of the Planning Staff. He said the land swap worked out better for both properties. This project has better frontage on Arsenal Street, with a unified access on the Street, and the Piroli property also get to remove an easement. He noted the efforts gained impetus in 2013.

David Hall, Hanover Properties, noted the company has developed many properties in New England. Likes that the property already had a vision for the developer to follow given Watertown's various planning efforts. 18 month planning process. In Watertown because there is an imbalance of housing in the Commonwealth. Housing stock is not addressing the types of housing trends that are in full force. People want transit, an urban environment. Housing is designed for workers such as patronize athenahealth and empty-nesters who want amenities. Described the Hanover Company. Only does apartment housing. Noted developments in Needham, Cambridge, and on Pier 4. Organize development around courtyards. Showed slides of various other Hanover developments. Summarized the two joint projects. Hope to attract a restaurant for the smaller retail space. Added 6 three-bedroom units based on staff and Housing Partnership input. Showed a site plan of the layout of both the sites. Also hope to attract a grocery store to the larger retail space. Described site circulation. Noted pedestrian walkway in circumferential roadway around the site. Noted the rain garden. Goal is to have connections between the abutting neighborhoods to access Arsenal Street. Added a notch along the East façade, along property line with the Dobel property. The East façade is not visible from Arsenal Street. The building sits 8-10 feet below the level of Arsenal Street. Building is 4 stories, but it reads like a 3 story building.

Brian O'Connor, CUBE-3 Studio, noted the grade drops about 8-10 feet from Arsenal Street. Showed a graphic in the Petitioner's Power Point presentation which indicated the various types of zoning around the site. Abuts residential and industrial uses. Noted potential for pedestrian access with more retail use along the street corridor. Noted the pedestrian paths that connect the neighborhoods to Arsenal Street. Rain garden could become an amenity, and a buffer for the residences. Arsenal Street is the public access point. Want to engage the street face, and possible future development. Discussed the site plan and the building layout. Along Arsenal Street edge, there will be a drive that drops down into the site. Retail parking is below grade. Trying to make sure the retail can front on the Street. Also have the residential building oriented towards Arsenal Street. Noted the notch on the right side of the building. Pulled the notch all the way back to the corridor. Creates clear view inside the building, and a small pedestrian amenity. Noted bicycle parking. Described the other floors going up the building. 6,000 square foot retail in front of the garage. Also noted layouts of the uppermost floors. Residential building wraps the garage. Camouflage the garage, and allows better access to the garage on all floors. Affordable units are evenly distributed through the project. These units have the same amenities at the market rate units. Discussed pedestrian and vehicle access. Described the proposed exterior materials to create as much glass on Arsenal Street as possible, to activate the street frontage. Noted public spaces provided as part of the streetscape. Want to activate the street. Retail buildings will relate to the residential building, but also have a varied height along the active edge. Noted ten foot grade change at Birch Street, and showed photo-simulations of views from Birch and Franklin Streets. Noted East façade from Dobel side with the notch. Identified as an access point into the building. Patterned asphalt will be

used to denote a pedestrian path. Added more landscaping. Created the notch by removing units. Created a shadow line in the building and changes the exterior façade treatment. Noted cross-section with roof-top HVAC equipment. Designed to sit in the middle of the roof, over the hallways, so they should be well-screened. Highlighted streetscape and location of bike lane and pedestrian area. Creating patio areas for seating and dining. Noted access to retail spaces.

Ron Mueller, Ron Mueller and Associates, discussed traffic assessment. Peer reviewed by the Town's consultants. Will address the comments in the final project design. Study evaluates the impacts of both projects. Road improvements will accommodate surrounding projects: Pirolli property and Webster Realty Trust property. Assumed 90,000 square feet of retail and 600+ residential units. Development assumed in the Traffic Study is almost double what is being considered. Done purposefully, to ensure that the infrastructure improvements can accommodate the proposed traffic. Noted a segment of Arsenal Street, from Irving Street to Louise Street. This segment will be reconstructed. Upgrade of all existing signals. New signal at the project entrance. New Community Path. He noted the new signal at the project entrance would be coordinated with the other signals along the corridor. Town's peer review consultant recommended a two general purpose lane on one approach to the site. He said this would be done, allowing better signal coordination. Noted the ten-foot wide Community Path on the North side of Arsenal Street. Noted Beacon Park area. He said neighborhood interested in closing off Beacon Park. Developer will fund the design of this and pay the cost for the closure so long as the Town agrees to this.

A member of the Board asked for clarification on this point.

Mr. Mueller clarified the proposed location of the road closure, and that the Developer was willing to pay the cost of the design, and to fund the road closure should the Town okay this.

Mr. Mueller continued to describe the project's traffic impacts. Noted the Beechwood intersection design. Included project traffic in this area and as part of the traffic signal upgrade at Beechwood. Noted comments from Town's Peer Review recommended adding width to the Community Path in this area, slightly narrowing the vehicle travel lanes in this area. Has the secondary benefit of being a moderate traffic calming measure by way of the narrower lanes reducing vehicle speeds.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked Mr. Mueller to comment further on the Traffic Report. Figures for the particular projects?

Mr. Mueller said the study assumed 420 to 790 trips depending on the peak hour being generated by the combined project. He said the actual trip numbers for just Hanover and Cressett ranges between 235 and 524 in the peak hour. These numbers do not include any deduction for transit. Noted the Petitioner will join a Transportation Management Agency to aid in the development of further public transportation along the Corridor and in Watertown. Contribute to traffic improvements in Watertown Square.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked the architect to discuss the exterior treatments on the various facades.

Brian O'Connor, using PowerPoint slides, said the main façade on Arsenal Street is all masonry. Red brick and a buff colored masonry with glass. Want a contemporary feel to the façade. Subtle horizontal lines in the brick. Corner tower elements are a mix of metal panel, cement board and glass. He said the masonry, metal panels and glass continue around the facades. He said the general materials pallet is consistent. He noted the use of a fair amount of glass, and common window shapes. He noted the Juliette balconies. He said the garage is "open" per Code. He said the Petitioner could provide additional sketches showing how it's constructed. "Open" for the perspective of ventilation needs. Noted the use of panels to block headlights. He said the parapet goes around the entire building is roughly 3 feet in height. He said the pre-cast panels will probably be fabricated with some type of reveal.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked those in the audience who wished to speak to raise their hands to be acknowledged. State name and address for the record.

Megan Preveval, 44 Beacon Park, aware of the project. Acknowledge possibility for negative impacts. Access is her main concern. Even so, excited about the project. Hope to walk to the proposed restaurant and grocery store. Looking forward to new development. Understand primary concern for the Developer is their bottom line. Believes Developer will do the right thing. Held several Community Meetings. She and her husband submitted petition to close Beacon Park.

John G. Gannon, Member, asked if Beacon Park was a public or private way?

Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development & Planning said Beacon Park was a public way. Petition taking to the Traffic Commission to close the public way. No opposition by Fire Chief, Police Chief and DPW Director to close the road. No commitment from the Town to close Beacon Park, but also no opposition to it at this point, either.

Chico Sajovick, 59 Farrell Street, Cambridge, direct abutter. Aesthetic concerns about the garage and the backside of another retail facing onto his property. Planning Board did not take this under consideration. Letter to the Board concerning the private way. Handed copies of the letter to the Board at the meeting.

Mr. Gannon, Member asked staff for clarification with respect to the proposed private way.

Mr. Magoon is the private way is the middle access. To the one side of the proposed grocery store. Potential access as well for Mr. Chico's property.

Mr. Sajovick went over his letter. The private way is potentially a public benefit. It's not just for the Petitioner's benefit. Creating a large, signalized intersection on a public road. This is an alteration to a public good. Designation of the entrance as a *private road* gives the project setback relief, versus if the road was a public road. The access road is wider than if it was a driveway. Noted definition in the Zoning Ordinance of a "street." Suggested that this is a street, not a private way. Webster property access is also via this new "way."

Mr. Gannon, Member asked Mr. Sajovick how much land his family owned.

Mr. Sajovick said his family owned roughly 3.25 acres, the present use of which is a gym, fencing academy, an area for batting cages, recreation facility for toddlers, space for landscapers and a small office. He said a better design should be forward looking to the redevelopment of this property as well. It would serve the Town better if future development on this site accessed and egressed out Arsenal Street rather than Phillips Street and Parker Street.

Casak Cruchcarian, 72 Evans Street, supports the project. Likes the detail on the project. Area has no "look" to it now. Grew up on Franklin Street. Very courteous to the public on that side. Revenue coming to the Town will be most welcome. Likes mixed use.

Joseph Levendusky, 33 Templeton Parkway, considerable sentiment in the Town that Watertown is being remade. Generational responsibility to "get this right." Propose that the project be continued to allow one more phase of design development. Need to make sure the project is integrated into the neighborhood. Need to also look at this in context with other developments on the board. Look at this area as a totality. North and Eastern edge needs more work. Commends Petitioner for steps taken along this side of the development. Need another design gesture on these sides. Important to what the residents look at. Need to do more on this façade. Be very careful to get the public space as one that is an enticing amenity. Need a more robust transportation package to encourage alternative modes and public transportation. Need a more robust assessment of traffic impacts to Watertown Square. Supports moratorium until the Comprehensive Plan is in place. Suggested a delay to improve the project.

Rena Baskin, 15 Franklin Street, improvement over the project originally brought to the Planning Board. Agrees with previous speaker. Not really inviting from the abutting neighborhood. Project is turned

inwards. Question on where the roof-top HVAC equipment would be? Is anything going to be done to address noise impacts from these?

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked Mr. O'Connor to address Ms. Baskin's question about the HVAC equipment.

Mr. O'Connor used a PowerPoint slide to illustrate the location of the HVAC equipment. He said the condensers will be along the center of the roofs. They are in lines. The building will be shielding the condensers. They will be about 28 feet in from the edge of the roof. Look at another project that has these units. Can't see or hear them. Suggested a site visit to Needham project.

Ms. Baskin said more time was needed to look at the project in context of the entire Arsenal Street corridor. Not sure there is room in the road layout for the proposed narrowing, the Community Path and the bus stop. Connectivity to the neighborhoods around the project, and to the rest of Watertown is key.

Steve Corbett, 14 Irving Park, supported the proposal. Acknowledged it was a large project, and it had the potential an impact on the neighborhood and the area. He said he believed the impact would be a positive one. He noted the prior industrial uses on the site had had a large impact on the site and the neighborhood. However, because the site has been dormant so long, those impacts have been forgotten. Mr. Corbett said the site had been vacant for too long, and needed to be redeveloped. It is a large site, on a major thoroughfare that can handle a large project. Likes the mixed use. Streetscape improved and the bike path further developed. The retail activity will be useful. Looking forward to having a market to walk to. Residential component will be a less intensive use of land. Traffic spread throughout the day. Addresses the demand for housing and welcoming new residents to Watertown. Substantial increase in affordable units. Watertown is diverse. Many residents live adjacent to non-residential property, such as schools, parks, municipal, commercial, industrial and apartment buildings. Irving Park backs up onto a commercial plumbing contractor and showroom. Noted busy North Beacon Street. Wide variety and mix of activity that makes Watertown what it is. Whitey Plaza building of over 400 units. Next to one and two-family units. Archstone Apartments built, and it did not devastate the area. Projects have fit into Watertown before. Board can only deal with the project before it. Developer has an excellent track record. Going to expend a significant investment in Watertown. Urged the Board to support the proposal.

Marsha Seer, 13 Bay Street, noted the project had some nice elements. There seems to be a trend to build these insular, inward looking designs. Large outsides with large parking lots that are ugly. Agree that the East and North facades are quite a long wall for the neighborhoods. Support a moratorium. Look at the Arsenal Street Corridor as a whole. Streetscape improvements – recommend yellow lines in the street to separate traffic. Suggest using a planted divider or other things that will make crossing the street easier. Concerned about exterior lighting.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked the Petitioner to address Ms. Seer's question about the exterior lighting.

Mr. O'Connor said the goal is zero light spill at the lot lines. Solid edges to the parking garage. Units will have blinds. Exterior lighting will include pedestrian scale lighting. No grand plans to illuminate the building from the ground. Some lighting to illuminate the retail areas.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted for the audience that the Board typically includes conditions dealing with exterior lighting. She noted that light levels can't spill on abutting residential properties. Lighting package has been submitted. Available from the DCDP staff.

Aaron Dushku, 10 Elmwood Avenue, knows the site intimately. Many things to like about the project. Project team is trying very hard. Shared the best features of the project. Recognize positive benefits to Watertown's tax revenue, and the improved services the Town can offer as a result. Have the right to be selective. Union Market site is a critical linkage in the Town. Residents are asking for us, as Councilors and Board members, to do better. Key points:

1. Unrealized potential of neighborhood connections, particularly the rain garden. It's a great feature, but will be underused if not truly accessible to the public. Need to open easements and walkways from Franklin Street.
2. Creating a switchback from Birch Road needs work. Driveway down that side is generally bleak. Notch and pocket park is a "token gesture" based on the Planning Board's review. Project team grudgingly admitted more could have been done with this.
3. Peter Z and Chico sites have issues and impacts that should be resolved before the Board acts. Acknowledged that no plans are yet on file for those sites, but noted that access to Arsenal Street should be reserved for them.
4. Concerned with size and massing of the building, especially on the back. Acknowledged the need for the Developer to make money on the project. Need smoother transitions to residential neighborhoods. Aesthetics and population densities drive the transition in housing styles from single family to those along Arsenal Street which appeal to Millennials. Think about ways to make these transitions happening better. Hard to build a community, easy to build housing. Need to consider the impact on the neighborhoods. Believes there is a transition between the apartment blocks on Main Street and the abutting neighborhoods, with the park and the Boys & Girls Club. Want to welcome new residents as well.

Mat Lambo, direct abutter to the South, no safe way to get North of Arsenal Street unless you go to School or Irving Street. Excited about the ability of being able to cross through this property to the Hosmer School and elsewhere. Also able to access the river. Agree there can be further improvements made. Development team has been making improvements. Now in support of the project. Compare to what is there now. Benefits to the whole community. Some concerns about the amount of green space and possible light pollution. Beacon Park closure – three entrances to that road currently. Closure will still allow full access.

Cecilia Link, District Councilor, Arsenal Street area has been a blight on the area and the Town for a long time. This development is a good way forward. Supports the project. Possibilities with the Chico and Peter Z properties to do the kinds of transition area that has been discussed. Peter Z owns the Dubois property; where the barns burned down. Worked for many years in the Fort Point Channel region. First started there, it was a dump. Now her office is above the Children's Museum. Now the area has vibrancy. This development could be the catalyst for redevelopment of the area. Can possibly revitalize the area because it brings people to the area. Hopes that Arsenal Street and other parts of Watertown can be transformed. Been involved with the project and the neighborhoods. Project is a great first step.

John Labordini, 91 Waverly Avenue, purchased a house on Main Street. Letter on behalf of the development team submitted for the record. In support of the project. When he was growing up, the area on Beechwood Avenue was a no man's land. Left Watertown in 1985. Seen bad development in other cities. Has a unique perspective. Great balance of retail, commercial and residential. Supports Watertown's tax base and need for revenue. Development team has listened to the needs of the community, and changed the project accordingly.

Vincent Piccirilli, District C Council Member, level of comments tonight have been insightful. Noted that the sites have been industrial for 30 years. Changed zoning in 1990's to encourage redevelopment and to provide Watertown with more tax revenue. More of Town's tax burden was shifted to the residential land. Strategic Framework for Economic Development adopted in 2012. Signals to developers what kinds of development Watertown wants, and provides guidance to the Board of Appeals and Planning Board. Planning Staff has worked with the Developer to ensure that the project meets the Vision and objectives of the draft Comprehensive Plan. Transforming Arsenal Street for the new economy. Noted the industrial uses that had been on Arsenal Street: Rubber plant, munitions works. Now have athenahealth, with employees who hopefully will want to live in Watertown. This is the arc of the economy and settlement. Look at the transformation of the Arsenal. Live in Watertown and walk to work. Smart Growth as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Key objective of the Comprehensive Plan and the Strategic Framework is more economic growth and growth of the tax base. Revenue from new growth keeps taxes low while providing services. Watertown does not need a tax override to bring in new

revenue. Needs in the school system that must be met. Increases in the budget via Town Council. Meet commitments in revenue requirements through new growth. Lucky in Watertown that there are vacant sites that can be appropriately redeveloped. Wal-Mart was not appropriate for the site. This project is. It's mixed use. It creates a Community Path. Land swap with Pirolli property. Provides non-vehicular access to Peter Z property. Please take these factors into account. Thanked the Board for its hard work.

Mark Sideris, Town Council President, thanked the Board for its service to Watertown. Noted the prior discussion about Wal-Mart. Old, under-used industrial site. Wal-Mart did not work. He spoke to the property owner about Watertown needing a better quality development as what is proposed. Change is hard. Easy to live next to a vacant site for 8-10 years. Need an overall vision for Arsenal Street. Property owners have been in communication. Want to make sure everyone is doing something appropriate for Watertown. Appropriate place, appropriate development of good quality.

Tony Palomba, 40 Oakley Road, Town Council Member at Large, asked the Board to think carefully about questions relative to the integration with the North side abutting neighborhood. Developers have a responsibility to the Town to listen carefully. Not something special. It's something Developers must do to be good neighbors. Still working on the Comprehensive Plan. Still don't have a vision for Arsenal Street, just one development. Developer made some changes, which, according to the Planning Board, are relatively minimal. Spent a lot of money and personnel time and public comment on the Comprehensive Plan. Expected to be finalized in December. Need to stop, and think about what is going to happen before December comes. Carefully consider impacts to the neighborhood. This is also not a vision for Arsenal Street. Need a Comprehensive Plan in place before we defacto decide what Arsenal Street is to look like. Don't want to repeat what occurred on Pleasant Street, even with the Overlay District in place. Want it to be a unified vision for the corridor.

Robert Childs, 2 Cross Street, said he's lived in Watertown since 1970. He has a tremendous interest in the history of the Town. Member of the Historical Society. Watched the property decline. Glad to see that something is being done to use the land property, and that is very attractive. Likes the mixed use. Looks forward to more development on the corridor. Suggests project is a model for development along Arsenal Street.

Dennis J. Duff, 33 Spruce Street, caution about the use of the word "urbanization." Understands the reluctance to embrace change. Part of the Watertown Redevelopment Authority that oversaw the redevelopment of 50 acres of land. That created great change, but the community survived. Question about the sidewalk width, and that there are no street trees in the design. Also questioned whether this is the same developer that proposed the project on the corner of Coolidge Hill Road? Questioned whether the interior courtyards count towards the project's "open space"? Suggested these spaces should not, because they can't be publicly accessed. Zoning is for the health, safety and aesthetics of the general public. This project turns inward. East façade and the "notch." This is the minimum possible. Better with three notches. Planning is forward thinking. Think about what might happen if the Dobel Engineering Building was not there. Watertown needs green open space. Need more of it in Town. Massachusetts is the third most densely populated states in the US. Urged inclusion of street trees. What about snow removal and plowing? Pleased at the changes in the façade, brick and glass.

Barbara Ruskin, Spring Street, look forward to revitalization of Watertown, but also protection of what makes Watertown great. Zoning issues to encourage further discussion. Need for transition spaces. Strategic Framework spoke to the need for this. This development does not achieve the transition to the neighborhood, in the same way as Brighton Mills across the Charles River does. Too much parking on the site. Watertown is a transit hub. Don't need 500+ parking spaces for Millenials who want to walk to work and shop. Need collaborative planning to address these issues. Public/private green space is lacking. Circulation in the zoning ordinance is not met. Allowing island fortresses to be created in Watertown. Collaborative planning is needed because streets area listed in the zoning as a valuable resource. Possibility to create new streets to connect this development to the existing neighborhood. Create a street on the East side. Use the proposed fire lane to make a connection to the Dobel property on the East side. Apartment building on Beacon Street in Brookline has separate entrances along the

street. Great solution to create more notches and stairways to the street. Watertown should not be building special enclaves. Want new developments to be inviting to the community. Create ways for existing residents to join the new area. Need to think about having the best now.

Sarah Ryan, Paul Street, one of the parallel streets up to Arsenal Street. Familiar with the area. Seen an earlier plan. Seen changes to what's before the Board now. Plan could still use work before it's built. Close. Understand that the site now is hideous. Blending to the neighborhood, but need more green to soften the exterior. Density, size and closed-ness to the neighborhood is troublesome. Small houses behind and across from this project. Large and quite dense. Need to work on this. Residents in the project will spread around the neighborhood. Those who live below the project have two routes out of the area. Need to consider this. Even if a number of residents in this project don't use cars, there will still be significant traffic. Comprehensive Plan is close to being finished. Wait a bit longer to make sure development is done right.

Curtis Whitney, 43 Grandview Avenue, his family lived in Watertown for multiple generations. Letter/petition signed and submitted to the Planning Board and also submitted to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Complete support for the project. Reasonable and responsible redevelopment of the site. Developers are first class. Community can be proud of the project. Meets mixed use criterion as stated in the draft Comprehensive Plan. Arsenal Street is the right place for new development. New fees and tax growth for Watertown. Provide numerous jobs and help small businesses. 30 affordable housing units. Spoken to the direct abutters on the North side of the property. Five have signed this letter as well.

Jim Laughlin, Arsenal Apartments, very impressed by the presentation. Would like to see more green space on the site. Postponing of decisions or a moratorium – have to say enough has been done. Hate to see the decision postponed.

Lisa Feltner, Parker Street, President of Concerned Citizens Group, in Councilor Lenk's District. Development turns its back on the neighborhood. Minor pedestrian connections. Rain garden is accessible once you are inside the development. Direct abutters have not been contacted about making additional connections to the neighborhood. Abutting property owners have no interest in making a connection either. Not really great open or green space. Don't see people walking to the proposed grocery store. Baffled by Beacon Park's response. Road closure and walking to the store or restaurant does not make sense. Advocating for a consultant to bring the Developer, Town and neighbors together to come up with a plan. Offered matching funds. Tried to present concerns at a late Community Meeting. On the same night as a meeting for the Arsenal project. Concerned about change, because it does not connect to the neighborhood. No discussion about Peter Z or Chico property. Want transition zones. It's a known term in planning circles. Sent materials to the Planning Department and the Board. Urged the Board to take the group's comments under consideration. Not anti-development. Want the best possible for Watertown.

Mr. Sajovick spoke again. As a neighbor, witnessed several people interested in the property. Automobile dealers, The Ride, Harvard Facilities Management. Urged the Board to be careful not to make the project unprofitable, such that a lower-end use is the highest bidder for the site.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if there were any residents from Birch Street or Franklin Street present in the audience? She noted one person who lives on Birch and Franklin was present.

Liz Usume, citizen of Watertown, registered architect, noted the Comprehensive Plan was still in draft form. Misconception that the Comprehensive Plan will establish a final blueprint for Watertown. Noted that there is no Master Plan in place yet for the Arsenal Complex. Hopes the Comprehensive Plan will be used as a tool to inform zoning for residential, commercial and mixed use. This has to do with urban planning. This design in context is only a portion of Watertown. Should have an aerial perspective. Indicates no relationship to the neighborhood. Not permeable. Not truly walkable. Not really sustainable. Project has a big emphasis on driving and parking. Town has not done the appropriate traffic planning for the nearby 5-leg intersection. Without a Master Plan for the Arsenal, there is no real connection to that

area. Starting to build a city of islands. Does this have all the answers? Not sure, but does not seem to address the questions raised in the Comprehensive Plan process. Once things are built, that's it.

Board Comments and Questions

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if there was additional public comments? Hearing none, she noted the Board had received comments for the record. She noted comments from Nancy Hammett, the Riverside Neighborhood Group, Barbara Ruskin, Beacon Park Neighborhood Group, Edgecliff Area Neighborhood Group. She noted the Board also had an unsigned copy of Mr. Whitney's letter. She noted a letter from the Concerned Citizens' Group, as well as a letter from "Barb." She noted a letter from Barbara Ruskin, Angela Carasella, Janet Buck, and from the residents 40 and 42 Washburn Street. Chair Santucci Rozzi said a letter had been received from John Donahue, 11 Standish Road which requests that the Chair read it into the record. She read the letter which noted the increase in the school department budget. The letter notes the new development such as is being considered tonight will generate the necessary tax revenues to support Watertown's schools. She said the letter states that such development is a sensible way to get Town revenues up without burdening the community with a tax override. She said the letter urges the Town's Planning and Zoning Board of Appeals and Planning Department to show a commitment to further development to support the community and schools.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said the hearing would now be opened up to Board Member questions or items to be looked into for further presentations.

Member Donato asked about the easements for the Community Path connections. Any issues with these easements?

Mr. York said some is on the Developer's lot line. If access can be gained at the location of the rain garden, need help from the Town. Issue at Franklin Street. Need about 20 feet. Looking forward to working with the Town. Location in question is on the sharp turn at Franklin Street.

Member Heep asked about the pedestrian access out to Birch and where it would go?

Mr. York said this was not an easement. It was direct access through a gate. Bicycles could also pass through the opening.

Member Heep asked for clarification at Arsenal Street relative to the retail and the elevations.

Mr. York said at Arsenal Street, there would be the retail at grade. Three stories. Retail, then two levels of residential above that.

Mr. O'Connor said that from Arsenal, you could walk directly into the retail. He said as you go deeper into the site, there is a level of residential that exists a floor below the retail. At grade with Arsenal Street. This works to support retail at grade. True of both retail spaces. Nothing below the 6,000 square foot retail, where there is parking field below the larger retail.

Member Heep asked questions about the traffic study. He said the 5-way Watertown Square intersection was not included in the study. Perhaps because of the volume of traffic it experiences. Not enough of the cars heading West warrant study? He asked about why the other future development was included in the study? Town's peer review noted no pedestrian phases or bus stops were included. Don't these impact the roadway's resultant Level of Service? Comment in mitigation section of report: Table 9, East side drive operates at LOS F. Operations expected to be worse than modeled.

Mr. Mueller said Mr. Heep was correct. Included 5 other intersections. Watertown Square had minimal impacts with the project. Would not justify making improvements as a result of the proposed project. However, the Developer has nonetheless agreed to make a monetary contribution towards transportation systems improvements as the Town chooses. Mr. Mueller said the increase in traffic to Watertown Square is 50-80 vehicles, or 1 additional car every minute. He said, however, the study included the

Zoning Board of Appeals

Minutes – June 25, 2014

Approved xxxx

Page 9 of 14

other projects. So that the access drive signal could support future build out of the Pirolli site and the Webster/Chico property. So as not to have to rip up the road again. He noted the development is proposing new pedestrian connections that will cross roadways, and things such as bus stops are design details that will included, such as pedestrian actuation. These will be worked out with the Town and DPW. Things such as pedestrian phases in the light do impact Level of Service, but these were accounted for in the study. Relatively few pedestrians today, and relatively low impact on Level of Service. Bus stop locations would be ultimately worked out with the Town. Mr. Mueller said the comment relative to Table 9 indicates that if the Developer left the East drive unsignalized, and looked at the volume, operations would be at Level of Service F. With the signal, the Level of Service is likely to be worse, because queued cars may block that driveway. This is why developer is proposing the signal. Member Heep's comments also relate to Table 11.

Member Heep has a concern about approving the beginning of a private road which partially accesses another property as a Special Permit. He asked what happens if the Town does not accept the private way? There is no subdivision regulation in Watertown. Concerned about approving a partial road that leads to a piece of property with an unknown use.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said staff had clarified that the road is a private way under easement.

Mr. Magoon said as a private way, there is a combined easement between this site and the Pirolli property that covers that private way. It is proposed as a private way. He noted there is another process for the private way to be approved and accepted by the Town. He said more details on this process could be provided to the Board. Public hearing involved.

Mr. Nardi said the private road would serve the proposed development and the Pirolli property to the East, and possibly to accommodate a potential connection to the back. No plans for that yet. No objection or intent to make a connection to the back.

Member Gannon asked Mr. Nardi about the private way. Will it lead to semi-tractor trailer trucks exiting from the brickyard? Is the circulation agreement part of the project record? Concerned about trucks circulating around this site.

Mr. Nardi said that per an agreement with Pirolli property, if it operates as a brick yard, the trucks will use their traditional entry off Irving Street. The agreement requiring this is between the two land owners.

Member Heep noted the finding with respect to open space: designed to maximize visibility for persons passing the site. Rain garden in the rear of the site. Not much on the front of the site. That's a concern. Noted discussion of traffic mitigation. What about a clean list of all the mitigation proposed by the Developer? He would like to see a global list of mitigation items from the Applicant.

Mr. Mueller said all of the traffic mitigation is listed in the traffic study. Supplement with the peer review, and that creates a complete list of the mitigation package.

Mr. Magoon noted that there is the beginning of a list in the Planning Board report, starting on page 11.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if this was a full list of the proposed mitigation? She suggested it did not include everything from the Town's peer review. Wanted to make sure the Developer had submitted a schematic of all the structural improvements to Arsenal Street.

Mr. Magoon said this could be clarified with the Applicant.

Member Gannon noted the Town's Traffic Commission would have to weigh in on the reduction in width proposed along Arsenal Street. Town Council involvement in reduction in a public way?

Mr. Magoon said this could be discussed with the Traffic Commission. Typically deals with intersection signalization or parking concerns. Not generally roadway widths. He also noted the lanes along Arsenal Street are being reconfigured, and the public way was being widened if anything.

Member Gannon noted the retail mix. What is the way that potential tenants will be selected? He also asked about the affordable housing units to be included in the development.

Mr. Nardi said the goal is to attract something more than an Ocean State Job Lot. Discussing tenancy with grocery stores comfortable in an urban area. Discussions are ongoing.

Mr. Hall said they had had discussions with three restaurants. Also a coffee shop in the remaining space programed for the smaller retail space. Wants a great set of retailers for the benefit of the residents. He said the 30 affordable units were discussed with the Housing Partnership. The Developer knows that the units have to be scattered throughout the project. Has a contract with a company handle the marketing of the units, lottery and ongoing monitoring.

Mr. Schreiber noted there is a distribution plan in the Control Plans showing the proposed location of the affordable units.

Member Gannon asked if the Fire Department had yet signed off on the project, including the access/egress scheme? He said the number of different parcels and ownerships. Does the staff know the ownership mix? Any existing zoning conditions on those pieces of land?

Mr. Magoon said the Fire Department was part of the Site Plan Review process, and the Developer did incorporate some design changes related their concerns, such as to turning radii for trucks and standpipe connections.

Mr. Schreiber said there is a sheet in the Control Plans which shows the parcel fabric for that area. Three parcels and perhaps another small property. Not done a division that has completed the land swap. He said that nothing from prior approvals would be relevant to this proposal.

Member Gannon expressed concern that the Board needed to know what existing requirements from prior approvals might run with the land. Give the sense to the Board that what is being waive is okay. Concern about the location and inclusion of the bike path. Conditions run with the land, and the use of some of the property potentially involved in this project is as yet not known. May need to vote to retain, amend or remove old conditions.

Mr. Magoon said staff would look into this, and give this information to the Board. Present this as an amendment or replacement of the old conditions.

Chair Santucci Rozzi suggested the Board could potentially impose new conditions that would render the existing conditions null and void.

Member Gannon asked what could be done to mitigate the starkness of the parking garage façade. Gave the example of the Lexus property.

Mr. Hall said the Developer would be happy to have a condition in the decision to work with Planning staff to maximize the screening, meaning trees. He noted, however, that there is very little room to do this because the road had to curve. He noted that the project will provide as much green as possible, including considering a trellis.

Member Gannon asked the Developer to address snow removal and rubbish collection.

Mr. Hall said there is little room for snow storage. Could create a snow storage plan, but expect that it will be loaded up and trucked off the site. Rubbish collection will be one time a day. He said it would be

during business hours. There are trash rooms for the retail and residential that is picked up daily, during business hours. No problem with a condition limiting hours of trash pickup.

Member Chander asked about the height of the retaining walls at the rear of the property? He noted the pedestrian access was five feet and flush with the fire lane?

Mr. Neal, Engineer, TetraTech, said the retaining walls go between five to 14 feet. He said it will be seen from the fire lane, with a fence on the neighborhood side made of wood.

Mr. Hall said keeping it flush, allows two cars to pass. Pedestrians and cars share this space. Infrequently used by vehicles.

Mr. Schreiber noted the Planning Board felt that corridor needed to be more green. Allowed the project to gain 5 extra feet of landscaping on that side. Allowed for more of a vegetated buffer.

Member Chander asked about asked about the materials on the rooftop? Tie back into the rain garden.

Mr. Hall said it would be a layered white roof.

Mr. Magoon noted the staff had retrieved a prior decision for one of the properties in 2003. 18 conditions. Appears a majority of the conditions have to do with unloading of vehicles for sale. One apparently relevant condition: Future public access if there is a change of use. Believe that condition has been met.

Member Gannon indicated Board would still need to vote to rescind and replace these conditions.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked for a so-called Approval Not Required Plan to show what has been switched.

A member of the audience said ANR Plan has been signed by Mr. Magoon as Director of the Department of Community Development and Planning.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said the Existing Conditions plan has a lot of notations, recording references, etc. What are these? This needs to be listed, summarized and clarified. Who has the benefit to these easements? There is a Restrictive Use on the property. This needs to be clarified. Questions about the rain garden being open to the public. It's really a drainage feature, not really a public feature.

Mr. Hall said the upper ring is high. It's meant to walk your dog around the ring. It will have vegetation inside of it. Don't really want people inside of it. Gravel, durable surface path.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted the long, East façade with the notch. Not visible now but may be so in the future. Need different surface treatments on that façade, such as the brick. Do sparingly. Views could be opened up. See more of the architectural elements on the other facades added to this side.

Mr. Hall noted the Developer had been looking into ideas such as color changes, or material changes. Would like to see this before a condition? Do have a potential idea using brick.

Mr. Schreiber noted a condition recommended by the Planning Board was on page 22, and spoke to this concern.

Mr. Hall showed revised architectural facades showing the notch in the façade. Create a pair of tower elements that would come off the façade about one foot. Break the roof line. Creates a distinct break in the building. Highlights the notch as well. Breaks the horizontal plane.

Chair Santucci Rozzi indicated the revised façade design using brick was an improvement. She asked about the distribution tables in the traffic report. She noted that Figures 8 to 12 are broken down from the

retail and residential and an earlier statement was 80 vehicles making it to Watertown Square. Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if this is just residential, the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours?

Mr. Mueller stated that the figures are the retail and residential combined. He said the Chair is correct that it is the AM peak, the PM peak and Saturday peak hour figures.

Next Steps

Chair Santucci Rozzi said this is a large project with lots of different components. She asked the Board if they'd like to move forward.

Member Gannon requested that the present conditions on the land have to be modified or eliminated. He also requested a copy of the slides presented this evening. He noted that a lot of new information presented this evening. As such, Member Gannon said he does not feel comfortable voting tonight.

Member Donato agreed with Member Gannon.

Chair Santucci Rozzi suggested the following additional information/conditions be presented in writing prior to the next meeting:

1. Traffic monitoring post occupancy for both driveways and effected intersections to ensure the trip generation and level of service is functioning as deigned.
2. Standard conditions on roof-top equipment screening
3. Conditions on Light Spillage
4. Green Wall
5. Snow Storage
6. Trash removal
7. Operations/maintenance – litter control, drainage (it was stated that there is a plan)

Mr. Magoon added the following:

8. Eastern façade brick (the slide presentation including alternate design to be submitted)
9. Disposition of property easements with Pirolli

Member Heep requested:

10. Alternatives to break up the east facade (other than what was submitted tonight).
11. Provide the complete list of traffic mitigation conditions
12. Accompany the above with a time table for completion of mitigation improvements.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted all effected roadways are Town-owned, therefore no MA DOT approval would be necessary.

Ms. Civetti noted that Member Heep would not be available in July leaving a four-member board. She said there are four cases on the agenda for July 23, 2014.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked the Board if they are comfortable providing another date in July prior to the next scheduled ZBA meeting date (of July 23, 2014).

Mr. Magoon stated that the Planning Board meets on July 9, 2014 and it would be a tight turn-around for reporting.

Ms. Civetti noted the Planning Board report has already been received for this case; therefore, the July 9th meeting hasn't any effect on this case.

Attorney York requested that the board provide a date where a five-member board is available.

Member Heep suggested July 16th or the first week in August. All members indicated they would be available for July 16th at 7:00 PM.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked for a motion to continue this case to July 16, 2014 at 7:00 PM.

Mr. Heep motioned to continue to July 16th at 7:00 PM. Mr. Gannon seconded. Voted 5–0 to continue to July 16, 2014 at 7 PM.

Adjourn

Mr. Heep motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0, meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.