



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
Jason D. Cohen, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov
Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, June 24, 2015 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Christopher Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Member*; Neeraj Chander, *Alternate Member and new Alternate Member Jason D. Cohen*. *Absent*: Kelly Donato, *Member, Mike Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Gideon Schreiber and Andrea Adams, Sr. Planners, Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA.

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced Jason D. Cohen, an architect, as an alternate member to the board. She then introduced the rest of the board and staff. She announced that due to a family issue, Member Gannon will be leaving early; therefore, the agenda will be taken out of order. She then swore in the audience.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that the minutes would be tabled to July.

Member Ferris read the legal notice for the first case:

"11 Fuller Road - James P. Caulfield II, 11 Fuller Road, Watertown, MA 02472 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit Finding in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance, §4.06(a), Alterations to Non-Conforming Structures and a Special Permit in accordance with §5.04(r), Table of Dimensional Regulations, FAR, so as to replace and extend an existing 6' x 16' two-story rear porch to 8'5.5" x 20'3.5", creating a 9.1' northerly side yard setback, where the non-conforming house is at 6.5' and where 10' is required; extend the non-conforming distance required between structures from 6'3" from porch and 3' from handrail to 4'4", where 10' is required; increase non-conforming building coverage from 35.8% to 37.2%, where 30% maximum is allowed; and increase FAR from .58 to .61, where .5 -.625 maximum is allowed.

T (Two-Family) Zoning District. ZBA-2015-16

Jim Caulfield, owner, stated that he is replacing the rear porch in failing condition and for better use by his family, he is increasing the size. He explained that the finding is for the FAR as he is increasing it slightly and the distance between the porch and the garage. He is moving the stairs away from the garage and the access between the garage and stair will increase; however, the second floor will be about 1' away.

No one spoke from the audience.

Member Ferris stated that his driveway is slightly on his neighbor's property. Mr. Caulfield said that his surveyor was surprised to find this and ended up doing a survey of the block - when the town expanded

Orchard Street, it took 3' of the southerly neighbor's yard so all of the monuments were in the wrong place. They re-surveyed Chandler, Mason and Fuller to confirm the plot.

Member Ferris asked about the same neighbor and their building permit and asked if the two properties were owned by him. Mr. Caulfield said they are only doing interior work and he is not involved.

Member Ferris noted that the posts are going to grade and on drawing A2.01, the wood should be at least 8" from grade. Mr. Caulfield said these drawings were conceptual and a new full set of drawings will be submitted to the building department. Member Ferris also noted the posts on the porch.

Member Ferris asked about the material. Mr. Caulfield said the porch will be wood; they may do a composit vs. mahogany. They have an interior stairwell and moving the stairs outdoors to provide room for a table.

Member Gannon asked about the distance between the new porch and the garage. Mr. Caulfield said the first level will be wider and the second floor will be closer at 11' in height.

Member Cohen clarified that with the garage roof being sloped, would that still mean the 2nd floor porch is still 1' away. Mr. Caulfield said that the second floor is at 11' and yes, it is still 1' away from the garage.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if you walked between the garage and the porch, you'd be underneath the cantilevered portion. Mr. Caulfield agreed and noted drawing A2.03 shows that you'd be beneath the overhang. She then asked if he is still seeking lot coverage relief and he is.

Member Ferris asked Staff if the porch area that is not covered is not included in the FAR. Staff said that is correct.

Chair Santucci Rozzi read from the Planning Board report, pointing out a non-standard condition stating that the porch may become screen in and may not be enclosed or fully functioning living space. She said if that were enclosed, she'd have a different opinion of the relief.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the request to modify and extend the porches. Member Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0, Alternate Member Chander voting as a full member. Member Donato absent. Alternate Member Cohen not voting.



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
Jason D. Cohen, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov
Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, June 24, 2015 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Christopher Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Member*; Neeraj Chander, *Alternate Member and new Alternate Member Jason D. Cohen*. *Absent*: Kelly Donato, *Member*, Mike Mena, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Gideon Schreiber and Andrea Adams, Sr. Planners, Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA.

Chair Santucci Rozzi announced that the next case is a continued case and the notice will not be read. It is added below for reference:

"56-60 & 57 Irving Street and 122, 150, 160, 162 & 204 rear Arsenal Street-B. Henry, Greystar GP II, LLC, 8405 Greensboro Drive, Suite 950, McLean, VA 22102 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit with 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; §5.04, Table of Dimensional Regulations; §5.05(i) FAR; and 5.07 Affordable Housing so as to construct approximately 282 residential units (36 affordable) and 11,000 s.f. retail/commercial space with 465 parking at the former M. J. Pirolli & Sons site. The project will also involve the removal of 8 existing structures. I-3 (Industrial), LB (Limited Business) and R.75 (Residential) Zoning Districts. ZBA-2015-07"

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked the petitioner to start with an update of the new materials submitted to the board after the last meeting. Member Gannon asked if they have hard copies of the plans submitted by email. They do.

Mr. Magoon explained that there is new equipment in the Council Chamber (cameras, microphones, monitors) and there are some glitches that are trying to be worked out. They will not be able to view the presentation on the TV Monitors.

Chris Reigner (Attorney) for Elan. They are here to update the board. Tom Shultz will update the specifics. They have been working on the project since 2014 and they have been a willing participant in the Design Guidelines. The comments received at the last meeting were regarding the bridge – it was looked at to add architectural features for a 'Jewel Box' look and eliminating the supports under the bridge. They were asked to look at the colors – the print showed a vibrant orange and green and they have submitted alternatives. The percentage of smooth materials, landscaping updates, text oriented on post, completion of traffic monitoring, and park maintenance.

33:08

Tom Shultz spoke on the bridge design stating that they submitted a plan for a bridge at 32' deep with 4 columns – they researched and came up with a design that meets the requirements. They slid the columns over next to the building and they are now like piers. They are no longer free-standing columns and there is a much greater width under the bridge. They narrowed the amenity space by 18'. A 57% reduction of the massing of the bridge. It is much more light and airy. They had a wall within the bridge and now there is glass on both sides where light can go through and shadow impacts will be much less. The color alternatives are a grey scheme and a brown scheme. They want to stay with the earth tones. They used a darker grey – less than 5% will be orange and green. They are not trying to introduce another color. They toned down the orange and the green to a burnt orange and sage green. A ZBA member mentioned there are a lot of flat surface buildings in Watertown. They have introduced 20% masonry with horizontal banding, red brick and Aris-craft (stone); 10% precast with vines for the garage, 20% clapboards; 50% smooth fiber siding in various colors. The upper portions of the buildings, the 4th floor is designed to make it disappear against the sky. The majority of the panel is in the courtyard and not seen by the public way. The landscaping at the northeast corner parking garage. They softened the area by adding a third layer of shrubs to the north and along the east they added shrubs, vines and perennials. The visibility at that area does not support a tree surviving there but a lower scale shrubbery

will. There was a request to add a tree at the corner of Irving and Arsenal Streets but that corner is special and an urban corner to celebrate the importance of that intersection. He said they have done a great job of creating the two-story residential entrance there and to put a specimen tree there would dilute that concept. They do not show a tree there.

Chris Reignier spoke about the park with a community process of having two meetings. The visions they have heard are a dog park, a more passive use, food trucks. They have scheduled their first meeting on July 8th at the library, which is intended to get people in the room to hear what they want.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked for public comment. No one spoke from the audience. She then welcomed Alternate Member Cohen to participate in the discussion although he will not be voting.

Member Cohen asked what the impetus was to make the bridge smaller. He said he doesn't believe the size was an issue as it was glassy and airy and an amenity space there would create more light, presence and activity. With just a passageway it may be dark more often, the opposite of a jewelbox. Mr. Shultz said he was happy they were asked to make it thinner as the same experience is felt on the north and south side and they would have needed lights below it. The number columns would have had to be increased, as well. There is passive amenities with chairs.

Member Cohen asked if the balcony configuration was different. Mr. Shultz said they activated that corner it made more sense for the living area to be on that corner. So they added a unit there and it makes more sense to have a true balcony vs. the Juliette balconies to activate that corner.

Member Cohen said the limited use of colors are very effective. A little bit more on the Arsenal Street side to give it more pop.

Member Gannon asked which of the green areas are open to the public. Mr. Shultz said the pool area is the only area not open to the public and that is because it is above the parking garage. It is there due to roadway changes.

Member Gannon asked if pedestrians (public) could walk from Arsenal Street through to the "Chico" property to Mt. Auburn Street. Mr. Shultz explained that Phillips Street deadends at the back of this property and the central drive has sidewalks on both sides so pedestrians and bicyclist can use those to connect on through the bollards although autos cannot.

Member Gannon asked if the Zoning Board would be voting on two issues with the park as a separate vote. Attorney Reignier said the filing covers both as there is no zoning relief required for the park – a condition regarding the two public meetings. Member Gannon asked if after the two public meetings are held regarding the park, will they come back to this board for approval. Mr. Schreiber said after the two public meetings, the DCDP Director, Staff and DPW would review that park space as a community space within the town and a normal process for designing park space within the town – this is what the conditions currently state. Member Gannon commented that this board should weigh in on the park process. Chair Santucci Rozzi welcomed him to attend the community meeting.

Member Gannon asked Staff to describe the community meeting. Mr. Magoon said general outreach to the community, organized in a way to gain insight into what would be the most appropriate way to program that space as. He does not believe there would be a reason to come back to the board unless there were a divergence of opinion between the residents and the property owner.

Member Gannon stated that a plan for a park doesn't have any legal "teeth". He feels that a hypothetical park without the zoning ordinance would allow a future developer to be able to move the park around. He'd like to have the results of the community process legally bound by the developer. Attorney Reignier said they will work with staff on that – they have the park maintenance language and they see this as a great amenity for the project. Member Gannon agrees that it is a wonderful idea to have a community park. He just wants to make certain it is built as the community requests and there is a legal document – by the towns' attorneys that states the park is to be built and maintained in this fashion. Chair Santucci

Rozzi suggested that a condition be defined and then once the plan is done for the park, they are going to have the maintenance condition and the condition about the meetings and the record plan could be recorded with the maintenance covenant against the deed so that would allow the input, the plans then sanctioned by the town staff and then that could be recorded. Attorney Reigner said they have worked well with staff and they will continue to work with staff on an agreed plan. If a short agreement is needed memorializing what it would look like, the maintenance standard, how additions may be approved by the planning staff, and then they will work with staff on the agreement.

Member Gannon said he worked at the town 25 years ago there were agreements that were hard to monitor. He'd like to make sure the park stays as it is then planned. He'd like to see an element come back to the board for a control document.

Attorney Reigner said they have been at this since 2014, they are under pressure to have this voted on and have a strong preference for that tonight. The agreements could be recorded with the design of the park and before a certificate of occupancy, a control document that runs with the land, etc. Member Gannon said the community input takes place then staff incorporates the final document into this control plan.

Member Heep appreciates the community meetings regarding the park but he assumed that since the park is in the control plans that they are looking at, there would not be much change. He feels there should be something more definitive to hold the developer to. He is comfortable with holding staff responsible to provide a much more detailed and definitive standard, including trash removal, cleanliness, maintenance – they need to go further in writing that out to enforce it in the future.

Member Heep mentioned the façade on Arsenal Street and wondered if the side by the cyber café was addressed. Mr. Shultz said they have made revisions to that but it is not in the package submitted tonight. The size of the openings are the same it is detailed with store front. The change has been made.

Member Ferris requested a less than 50% flush material and especially in the rear where it is used mostly as all sides of the building should be attractive. He likes the toned down colors of sage green and burnt orange. The color change of flat material is not as effective as a material change. He suggests horizontal elements at the bridge towers and elsewhere. He suggested landscaping at the garage entry; however since there is not enough room, suggests 1 -2 trees closer to Arsenal Street. Mr. Schultz explained that there is a covered walkway there and they wish to provide as much visibility to the retail portion as possible. Member Ferris thinks the shallow bridge is better and the fact that you can see through it; however, it is just a lawn on both sides and suggests Pachysandra or low shrub to embellish the area - more than just grass. Southeast corner tree would not block the entry and a smaller tree like a dogwood would soften that area. Mr. Schreiber said that there may need to be traffic signals there and that would also require a clear view.

Member Chander said he agrees with Member Ferris about changing the percentage of the flush material to less than 50%. Mr. Schultz explained that the burnt orange and sage green are used on the different buildings and related to the recessed balconies.

Chair Santucci Rozzi commented on the revised traffic monitoring where they state moderately and sustained needs to be defined. The traffic engineer explained that the general occupancy of an apartment building stays around 80%. The control docs are based on 100% occupancy so they built in the monitoring 80% occupancy collect traffic volume and compare it to 80% of the projected occupancy volume to see if they are within 10%. They will do the same at 6 months after then. They will do it again at 90% and then at 100% of retail. If at any time they exceed 10%, they need to do more mitigation.

Chair Santucci Rozzi had raised concerns last month about pulling in off of Irving Street and learning they cannot get into the garage. She asked about wayfinding or signage to assist. They have not increased their signage but will address that to make it clear that it is not for visitors.

She asked about the spaces open and accessible on the 'green' spaces that are open to the public. Could this become problematic in a private residential community. Attorney Regnier said that they have been requested to provide a way through the property for pedestrians and bicycles and they have provided a way from Arsenal through to Phillips and back as well as Irving Street to the back of the property. The surface green spaces will be available to the public as there is a retail aspect to this project. Practically, if there is a space that is being used in an abusive way, they will be asked to leave. The Management team will have to police the area. They clarified that there are two courtyards for residents only.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said she likes that the public can participate in the park planning and a maintenance document should be developed and recorded and available to residents. She does not have a problem with the size of the project. She appreciates the toned down colors and suggests more of a burnt orange and sage green (not orange crush and lime green) and the other colors looked too dark but appear fine. She appreciates the detailed synopsis. She wants details on the panels and asked how they can upgrade them – on the two sides of the bridge.

Member Ferris mentioned changing the percentages of the flush panels to a third rather than a half. It was explained that the top floor is off-white and 25% and the recessed balconies are at 5% and wrapping cornices down to grade will add to the flush percentage so they asked for a compromise at 40%. Member Ferris said he does not feel comfortable negotiating. He would prefer a product like the lap siding. They will change the flush panel to a reveal system and noted that there isn't one color that is 50%. He prefers not to do the battent system. They agreed that the bridge (especially facing Arsenal Street) should have a change in material.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that a letter received today by Ms. Feltner from the Concerned Citizen's group is not clear. Lisa Feltner, President of Concerned Citizens Group, her neighborhood association, said the Hanover project has not cut traffic down from their neighborhood and she is happy that the town purchased the end of Philips Street to provide a pedestrian pass. They are happy the columns have changed on the bridge. The Keystone building is actually 3 parcels and turned into park area. They are hoping to have the building repurposed instead of demolition. Ms. Santucci Rozzi said the process regarding the park is open to community meetings and will be discussed then. Ms. Feltner wants 3 meetings vs. 2 for their park discussions.

Elodia Thomas loves the colors, Greystar has been great and honorable, the park will be beautiful, they are tuned into the community and the park is for their residents as well as the public.

Dennis Duff is disappointed about the tree and he is pleased with the open space park and no other developer has done this. He said Member Gannon should be commended for bringing up a legal doc for the park.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that the meeting for the community park will be at the library at 7:00 pm on July 8th.

Libby Shaw, Trees for Watertown, said they should make sure there is enough space for the root system of the trees they are planting. They should plan the infrastructure (the underground) for mature trees. Trees do not interfere with signage if you wait long enough. The ZBA should write into the document that the trees need to be maintained (over time).

Chair Santucci Rozzi closed the public hearing.

Member Gannon commented on the park maintenance statement written into their presentation that they will maintain the park in accordance with the law; however, there is no law regarding the building of a park and no law regarding the maintenance of a park. Attorney Regnier said that it is in regards to applicable park law like snow removal and removal of tripping hazards...Gannon requests better protective language for the town and suggests the town attorney look at this as a condition. He wants a public drinking water fountain.

Member Ferris complimented and thanked the petitioner for working with the town and the public and thanked them for the park gift. He reviewed the siding percentages and suggested 37% max of the flush hardy plank. He suggested the horizontal siding on the bridge. A smaller ornamental tree at the intersection. Burnt orange and sage green preferred. Painted the dryer vents and pipes.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said that Member Ferris's synopsis is accurate and asked the board if there were anything to add.

Member Heep added that not only they maintain the park but they maintain it for the use open to the general public.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that there were extensive documents submitted to the board for review; a Staff report with an addendum dated May 15, 2015 and the final Planning Board meeting was held on May 21, 2015 with conditional approval, great input from the community, from David Gambel and from the staff and this will be a win/win for the community; a definite transformation for Arsenal Street; a benefit to the town and she thanked them for their investment. She added that the town is fortunate to have such a high caliber developer bring this project to the town.

Member Gannon thanked them for putting together a quality project and for working with the community. He remembers the brick yard with the railroad cars and he is in support.

Member Ferris motioned to grant the petition with the conditions discussed. Member Heep seconded. Members Santucci Rozzi, Ferris, Gannon, Heep, Chander voting in the affirmative. 5-0, Granted.



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
Jason D. Cohen, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427
Facsimile (617) 926-7778
www.watertown-ma.gov
Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, June 24, 2015 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Christopher Heep, *Member*; Neeraj Chander, *Alternate Member and new Alternate Member Jason D. Cohen*. *Absent*: Kelly Donato, *Member*, Mike Mena, *Zoning Enforcement Officer*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Gideon Schreiber and Andrea Adams, Sr. Planners, Louise Civetti, Clerk to the ZBA.

*The board notes Member John G. Gannon has left the meeting due to personal matters.

Member Ferris read the legal notice:

*“80 Elm Street - Cherag Patel, Elm Hospitality LLC, c/o Winnick & Sullivan, 134 Main St., Watertown, MA 02472 herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a **Special Permit with Site Plan Review** in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §9.03, §9.05, §9.06 and subject to §5.01.1(i) Hotel Use; §5.04, Table of Dimensional Regulations; §5.05(i) FAR; §5.05(d) Side Yard Setbacks so as to construct a 5-story, approximately 64,300 s.f. hotel with parking for 79 vehicles at the site of the former Atlantic Battery company. 1-1 (Industrial) Zoning District. ZBA-2015-06”*

Steve Winnick, Attorney for the petitioners, introduced the team Cherag Patel, the principal LLC, Tom, Architect; Steve Bbler; Ron Traffic; David Gamble, design. He said they want to have their full presentation.

Chair Santucci Rozzi announced that the board will hear the full presentation and take some comments from the public; however, will continue the hearing. Attorney Winnick agreed.

Attorney Winnick continued his presentation stating that the town was looking for hotels and now has the potential of having two close to each other. He said the Greystar case before this was the first to pass through the town's new design guidelines. He spoke of the industrial history of the town and the process of the design guidelines over the past three years written to ensure the best design within the zoning ordinances. He included the history of zoning coming in the 1920's and how a single family home could be built next to a factory. Now the town is changing those underused industrial sites with small pockets of residents living next door. He stated that the residences are non-conforming in the industrial zoning district. He said the residences must adhere to the changes in this zone. The zoning district does not allow single family homes. This project is as sensitive to the neighbors as it can be. The theme is important.

Cherag Patel, Principal, Elm Hospitality LLC. His background is in owning and developing hotels for the past 16 years and his parents owned and operated hotels. He thanked the staff, the board and Gamble Associates for taking the time with this project.

Tom Trikowski, Silverman Trikowski Associates, Architect. He spoke about the businesses abutting the project and showed a slide on the monitor of the first rendition of the project - then after their studies of the façade modulation (and design guidelines) they came up with a new 'skin'. They had a design review session with the staff and David Gambel to show how the building can better fit the location, they started to look at it in its context and they developed a façade that comes across the Elm Street property line with a setback on upper levels. They screened the cars and provided a terrace at the front of the building. They looked at it from four different vantage points. Elm Street has a rise and they are at the top. They added a view from the back parking lot.

Steve Matarano, Bohler Engineering, gave an overview of the former Atlantic Batterly site, stating that further remediation is forthcoming. The project is a 104 room hotel with 80 parking spaces with the majority of parking under the building, 11 surface, with 69 in the garage, accessible on the surface and a few for short term. The main entrance, the parking is screened, there is a cul-de-sac for loading and drop-off with the trash and recycling into the back of the site. The parking is under the cul-de-sac. The parking garage building will have green planting on top of the garage. The left side of the site is landscaped and narrow. The patio at the front to get activity at the front. The front of the street does not support street trees as there are power lines and a very narrow street. They will add street trees on their property and will maintain them. The drainage system is designed to Watertown standards, the underground infiltration system is designed to capture 8.9 inches of water or a 24 hour rainstorm. The pervious pavers in the back corner of the site will infiltrate. The other utilities are available from Elm Street and will be pulled from there.

Ron Mueller, Mueller and Associates, Traffic Engineer, said the traffic report was done within all local and state standards; the town hired a peer review, World Tech, they issued comments in January. World Tech

made suggestions of background development to be added to the counts, traffic mitigation at Arsenal and Elm and traffic calming at Arlington and Elm. This project responded and World Tech issued a final review letter in February where they agree with the comments and the mitigation plan. They also suggest they include traffic monitoring at 6 and 12 months after completion of the project. They have evaluated a morning, afternoon and Saturday peak hour. The accident rates are well below state averages; the speed data was collected for the minimum site requirements. Measurements exceed requirements; pedestrian facilities and public transportation...future conditions projected 7 year with 1% per year growth rate and the projects in the general area – including 7 projects. The hotel is a minimum traffic use compared to other projects; 55 trips in the am peak to 75 trips on a Saturday. They showed the possible traffic counts if another use came in – a restaurant could generate 104 trips. 55% from the east; 35 % from the west and 10% from the north. He stated the minimal increases in volume. He said that World Tech recommended adding a traffic light at the intersection near the mall – they did not suggest that this project be sole responsible party. A fair share contribution at a 2% traffic generation or the Elm Street approach which is 10% would net about \$21,000 towards a \$200,000 traffic signal. \$100,000 in improvements to that intersection would be provided whether or not a signal was installed. The intersection at Arlington Street and Elm Street they have committed to constructing a bump out at the area of the crosswalk to shorten the length of the crosswalk and to make the pedestrian more visible.

Attorney Winnick suggested that David Gambel speak to the board regarding his recommendations.

David Gambel, Architect and Urban Planner. They have worked with the town on the last 3 months on the guidelines based on the adoption of the comprehensive plan. This project dealt with the project to the street edge, scale and parking/traffic. They looked at the project not the use. The first attempt of re-design was not taken seriously. The whole area is in transition. People's concerns are valid. This is the first project that will transform this area on Elm Street. The public meeting a couple of months ago was extremely charged regarding use, traffic, massing. The project has done many changes based on the recommendations. Chair Santucci Rozzi asked about the letter addressed to Mr. Magoon. The parking and building height were discussed.

Anne Lazaro, 106-108 Elm Street spoke in opposition to this project and presented a letter from Phil Holmes, 110-116 Elm and Chadbourne also in opposition. She has lived there her entire life; she worked at BF Goodrich; she has always had good rapport with the lumber yard across the street. The lumber company did a nice job on their showroom and two houses they own. The tractor trailers have to back into the building and they do not fit so they block Elm Street. Arlington Street to Elm Street has over 60 cars passing in one hour. There is a lot of traffic already. The hotel will increase the traffic and tower over the houses in that area. Where will the people going to the café park? Don't destroy Elm Street by putting a 5-story building, maybe a 3-story would fit. The people here with buttons to support the project only want jobs – they don't live there.

Rich Antonellis, IBEW said 140 electrical workers live in Watertown. They are here to support the project and feel the developer has been very attentive to the concerns of the neighbors and the town. For their group, they believe it is a good location and close to the other 5-story hotel already approved. The parking underground addresses the concerns expressed by the town and neighbors. Elm Street is industrialized and although the rest of the town is moving along, Elm Street is stuck in time. The taxes generated would be beneficial. The area is 'dumpy' and could use an upgrade.

Elodia Thomas doesn't live on Elm Street but has been involved. She said the original design and the new design have come a long way and in the other meetings there were harsh words about the lumber yard. This town can use two hotels. This is a keystone project for this area. She commends the developer for listening to the people.

Mary Horrigan, Yukon Ave, has lived there for 40 years. There are a lot of residents in this area. They are only looking at the commercial space not the residential street. This isn't fair – it will ruin the street.

Tony Palomba, 40 Oakley Road, said the developer has taken significant steps to improve the original design and put the parking underground with additional cost. He has to clean the site further to dig

deeper. The site will add beauty to the neighborhood. It is surrounded by commercial properties and is not in the middle of a residential area. This will be a viable project – the two hotels will benefit each other. They passed a hotel/motel tax a few years ago and Watertown will benefit from this.

Jim Gavin, 87 White Avenue, grew up in Watertown and as a child played in this area with black soot on his hands. He is happy to see the site being cleaned up and would not want to raise a family in a contaminated area. He is in support.

Angie Kounelis, 55 Keenan Street, East End Councilor. She thanked Mr. Gambrel for the improvements and commented that this is a lovely development. She said this 5 story hotel is being opposed by the neighbors but they did not oppose the other hotel, the expansion of the lumber yard, a marble fabrication, an auto repair. In the east end they have harmoniously lived with commercial and industrial businesses. This is a five-story hotel on Elm Street does not fit. Lovely rendering. There is a one means of egress via a 24' opening – no second means of egress and no easement. This site does not have to be improved by a 5-story hotel. Any development will have to clean up this site. They opposed the snow dump and they opposed the vehicles for sale parking at this site. She opposed the comprehensive plan because of this development. They are losing site of a neighborhood. This does not fit the parcel or location. They have been threatened by other projects that may go there. It is in the hands of every commission and board that sits at this table (to consider what they are doing to the community).

Pat Stenson, Watertown Mall, referred to a letter written to the board and stated their major concern is this property encumbers on their property. The Watertown Mall parking lot will not be available to them for parking.

Steve Corbett, 14 Irving Park and a member of the Town Council. He supports this project. He appreciates the concerns regarding traffic. This is a low intensity use and there are other intense projects that could go there with more traffic. This project will have traffic spread out more than other projects. This is a side street off of a main street next to the mall is a good location. It will improve street scape, consistent with design guidelines, create positive economic development.

Libby Shaw, Trees for Watertown, thanks the Planning and Community Development department for incorporating a healthy tree environment on the street. She is concerned that the front of the building does not have enough soil – there needs to be structural soil under the sidewalk. The flare at the bottom of a mature tree will need more space. She wants to be certain that these trees will support a long healthy life.

Bill Dillon, who manages this project for the owners, said the traffic issue is the cause of the lumber delivery truck which blocks half of the street. He thinks the lumber company will be forced to use smaller trucks for their delivery. He said the hotel will not be receiving large deliveries and will not be the cause of a traffic issue. There were no shadows on any property according to the shadow study. The hotel makes sense on this site.

Dan Haslem, a member of Local 103, the electricians union and a coach of the Watertown Little League said this is a tough area. He likes the traffic study. He said the concern at the other end of Elm Street near Filipello Park was addressed. Watertown has had nuclear sites that have been cleaned up and reused. He is here to support the project.

Dennis Duff, 33 Spruce Street, he commented that Attorney Winnick's comments in regards to residents in the 'I' district were disconcerting. None of the buildings in the area were 2-3 stories high and now there is 5-stories and is out of scale. Arsenal Street is fine. This little street needs to be protected – even if the residents own property and don't live there, their tenants live there. His family is union and he supports the union but this is not the right place for this project. He requests denial in honor of the people that live on this street.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked Mr. Patel to address the history of his business, what flag he plans to fly at this site, etc.

Mr. Patel said they own Holiday Inn products, Hilton products, Marriott products – this franchise is part of Hilton. All of his hotels are in the mid-west, nothing in New England. He sold a couple of products that were limited service and 15 years old as he wants something different. He is doing an airport product that encompasses 5 hotels in the mid-west. This will be a limited service extended stay. He said there will be kitchenettes, where you can live for an extended period of time. The owners reviewed the parking and require 70% parking and this has 75% parking.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked that he submit information about his company and his holdings, etc.

Member Ferris asked if he is the owner. Mr. Patel said he is under contract but Mr. Dillion manages the property for the owners.

Ms. Adams brought up a question that the Chair had regarding the Design Guidelines and stated that it can be found on page 5-6 of the planning board report. She said that Mr. Patel and his team already addressed the parking and design concepts regarding charging spaces.

Ms. Kounelis said that this is the first that she has heard of kitchenettes. She said the board, in its infinite wisdom, should condition this, if approved, so there is no possibility to rent to any state or federal agencies.

Chair Santucci Rozzi agreed with Ms. Kounelis. She requested that Mr. Patel put together more information for the board – the type of hotel it will be, how it will function, how it will be staffed, what type of amenities, will it have a breakfast bar, limited food service, vending machines. She doesn't see beds on the floor plans. Member Chander asked for more renderings, 3-D views, from the outside looking towards the entrance, from the sidewalk, etc. Member Heep asked for color rendering from the north and the west elevations. Ms. Santucci Rozzi asked for more detail on the room set up and the layout of the hotel. Member Ferris wants more clarity on what the guest room is. He was surprised to hear the potential of cooking inside of the rooms. He does not see that on the floor plans. He can see a sink in the bathroom but not in the cooking area. He'd like to understand what the average stay will be.

Attorney Winnick said this dialog is useful and he wishes each boardmember state their needs.

Member Chander asked for a diagram and site line for rooftop units. Mr. Trikowski said they will provide a static elevation view a sectional elevation.

Someone spoke from the audience but was not at a microphone. Chair Santucci Rozzi responded that the board is trying to find out all of the information to be brought back next month to find out the details of the usage.

Member Ferris asked that the mechanicals be shown in a rendering. Mr. Trikowski said they are rendered into the model.

Mr. Magoon stated that Member Heep will not be available at the July meeting and asked if they would like to continue this to the August meeting.

Member Ferris motioned to continue the case to August; Member Heep seconded. Voted 5-0 to continue with Members Santucci Rozzi, Ferris, Heep and Alternates Chander and Cohen voting.

Member Heep motioned to adjourn. Member Cohen seconded. Voted 5-0 to adjourn at 10:45 p.m.