

## WATERTOWN PLANNING BOARD

DATE: March 8, 2006 PLACE: Town Council Chamber TIME: 7:00 PM COMMENCED: 7:0 PM

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Regular Monthly Meeting

PRESENT: John Hawes, Chairman; Jack Zollo; Jeff Brown; Linda Tuttle-Barletta

Chairman John Hawes opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

Jack Zollo motioned to approve Minutes of February 8, 2006 meeting.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In Favor

### CASE PENDING

**46-60 Arsenal Street;** Elie Rivollier, Jr., Trustee/MSI Realty Trust – Special Permit Finding, Amendment to Special Permit Finding, Amendment to Special Permit & Amendment to Variance

Steve Winnick, Attorney, this is a petition to construct a Cambridge Savings Bank branch at 46-60 Arsenal Street. The property consists of group of parcels, this parcel being next to the recently constructed Wild Willy's restaurant. We are asking the Boards to amend the original Special Permit Finding granted in 1986. The relief requested is for lots that would operate as single parcels. The property will share access, parking and other amenities. We are proposing 62 parking spaces which would exceed the zoning requirements. Traffic is not a significant issue for this project. After meeting with planning staff, new plans have been provided. The staff report is favorable. This will be a single story brick and manufactured stone with a structure with a full basement. Landscaping will be provided.

Brian Pendleton, TEC Engineering, the parcel will be cleaned and the driveway will continue service both businesses. The drive-up is placed against the building. Occasional deliveries will be made to the existing dock.

Jeff Brown, vehicles that are exiting the ATM area might not be able to make the 90° turn

Steve Winnick, this is a high quality design. All issues, such as landscaping, drainage, etc. Have been addressed. The amendment to the existing SPF is warranted.

Peter Stahl, Wild Willy, we are in favor of the project, but as an immediate abutter, we have some concerns. Existing entrance to the property is obstructed by telephone pole. The proposed configuration does not work very well for exiting and entering.

Steve Winnick, the revised plans that are now in front of the Board provide for relocation of the telephone pole. The curb cut has been angled to provide more turning radius. The landlord will provide snow removal of the lots and sidewalks. A development construction plan will be developed to minimize the impact. Mr. Stahl was also concerned with the visibility, we are proposing to replace it with a sign more visible. The Bank will contribute towards the cost.

Linda Tuttle-Bartlett motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals approval of the Amendment to Special Permit Finding granted on April 28, 2004 based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

Linda Tuttle-Bartlett motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals approval of the Amendment to Special Permit and Variance granted on April 28, 2006 based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

Watertown Planning Board

March 8, 2006

Page Two

Linda Tuttle-Bartlett motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals approval of the Special Permit under Sections 5.05(d), 6.01(g) and 9.12 based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

CASE PENDING

**41-43 Commonwealth Road; Richard & Carol Dorr – Special Permit Finding & Variance**

Richard Dorr, we have appeared in front of the Board in February. Plans have been revised and square footage of the third floor reduced.

John Hawes, the staff report is in favor of this proposal. The changes before the Board are the result of last month discussion. The Planning Board feels that the petitioner addressed all the issues.

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

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals approval of the Variance under Sections 5.04 & 2.71 based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

CASE PENDING

**52-54 Putnam Street; Jean Soghomonian – Variance**

..... Soghomonian, son of petitioner, my parents purchased the property in 1999. We are asking the Board to allow parking for 1 vehicle on the right side of the house. My father is a maintenance officer on call 24 hours a day and needs a separate driveway.

John Hawes, the staff report states that there is an existing parking on the left and the remainder of the property is filled with gravel. The desired relief could not be granted without a detriment to the public good.

Jeff Brown, the gravel covers the entire right side and rear, without any buffer.

Jean Soghomonian, it has been like that when we purchased the property.

George Nelson, 56 Putnam Street, as an immediate abutter, we are opposed to this proposal.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals approval of the Variance under Section 6.02(j) based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set out in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 0-4    Opposed

John Hawes, it is a strong desire of the Board to accommodate off street parking, but we do not want to see the entire site covered with gravel.

CASE PENDING

**615 Arsenal Street;** Home Depot USA – Appeal the Determination of the Zoning Enforcement Officer

Watertown Planning Board

March 8, 2006

Page Three

Susan Schneider, Home Depot, we are seeking to overturn the Zoning Officer's decision to change the operating hours from 7AM to 6AM, to follow up on a customer request. The property is located in an industrial area and the location of the building serves as a buffer from any residential property.

Dennis Duff, 33 Spruce Street, I hope that the Board will uphold the 7AM. Other similar businesses in Town open at 7AM, this large store should not have such an advantage.

Angie Kounelis, Town Council, I am in favor of the proposal, other businesses can come forward also. The Home Depot needs to pay more attention to their parking lot. Many vehicles get damaged with the large shopping carts.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta, the petition indicated that the request regarding opening hours was made by many Watertown residents.

Susan Schneider, the contractors making the request are Watertown residents. They arrive early and wait for us to open.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta motioned to recommend to the Board of Appeals to overturn the determination of the Zoning Enforcement Officer to change the opening hours from 7AM to 6AM..

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 3-1 In favor

LindaTuttle-Barletta opposed

CASE PENDING

**94 Acton Street; Greg & Karyn Ramshaw – Special Permit Finding**

Karyn Ramshaw, we are proposing the construction of a full shed dormer in the rear of the house. The existing height will be maintained and side yard setbacks will remain.

John Hawes, the staff report recommends approval.

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

Jeff Brown seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

CASE PENDING

**28-30 Parker Street;** David Harrison/Lisa Feltner & Neighbors – Appeal the Determination of the Zoning Enforcement Officer

Linda Tuttle-Bartlett motioned to continue the petition to the April 10 meeting of the Planning Board

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 3-1 Linda Tuttle-Bartlett against

CASE PENDING

**480 Arsenal Street;** New Cingular Wireless – Special Permit

Mary Brenninkmeyer, Anderson & Kreiger LLP, this is a request for a special permit to operate roof and façade mounted wireless facility. The structure is located in I-2 zone and the distance from the closest residence is over 100 feet. 12 antennas will be divided into 3 sectors and will not be more than 10 feet above the roof line. Sector B will be mounted onto the existing penthouse, sector C on existing screen wall and sector A to a proposed ballast mount. Cables will run along the roof line. There will not be any offensive lighting, odor or smoke. One vehicle trip per month will provide maintenance to the facility. Photos submitted in the package show existing conditions and the location of the proposed antennas.

Watertown Planning Board

March 8, 2006

Page Four

Jeff Brown, the 10 foot height above the roof line is substantial.

Sal Aj, RF Engineer, the 10 feet is needed because the tree line is higher than the roof top.

John Hawes, if the building owners wanted to put other equipment of the roof they could do it without coming in front of the Board. Cingular is here because they are a telecommunication company.

Nancy Scott, this building is a new home for NESN. They will be adding dishes, will that affect Cingular antennas?

Jeff Brown, is this the final location in Watertown? Does it now cover all areas?

Richard Detch, Cingular, this should be the final site.

John Hawes, the staff report is favorable, the equipment is 170 feet from the nearest house. We cannot consider any health issues.

Lisa Williams, 20 Oak Street, this development has a major impact on our home, I have 2 small children. There are piles of salt on the property, there must be a way to screen this better from the residential neighborhood.

Elizabeth Winston, 108 Laurel Street, I have lived here for 11 years. The neighborhood is changing, new equipment has been added to the property. The photographs are shown only from the front but in the rear the look is not softening – that is what we are looking at. Could the antennas be moved further away from the residences?

John Hawes, the buildings are clean looking, the antennas are not very visible. The stacks could be moved to the south area, further away from the residences.

Sal Aj, the signal would hit the roof if antennas moved to different location. In order to operate properly, this is the best location. If we go back further, we would have to go higher.

Linda Tuttle-Barletta, could you provide better screening?

Richard Detch, we have proposed fiber glass sleeves at 313 Pleasant Street but that had more visual impact. We can paint the antennas at this property any color to make it blend in.

John Colangelo, 14 Oak Street, many families have moved from this neighborhood. The Telecommunication act gives the petitioner right to put up the antennas. We now have too many in Watertown. There are other huge units on the roof already. It was stated tonight that NESN wants to add equipment. When the building was built, we did not know about all this equipment. Policy needs to be set now before others come with more requests.

John Hawes, the plans are showing "future equipment". The roof is empty, could the equipment be moved further from the edge?

Sal Aj, we need to have the antennas closer to the edge to provide the best coverage.

John Hawes, the site is abutted by industry on 3 sides, only the north side is abutted by residential neighborhood. I want to see what actual equipment is on the roof now before we vote. The large equipment might be blocking the new antennas. It might not be noticeable but we need to see updated photograph. It might be preferable to continue the petition.

Watertown Planning Board

March 8, 2006

Page Five

Angie Kounelis, could the companies share their equipment? Would it be possible to know what future equipment will be placed on the site?

John Hawes, we want to see updated photograph and we want the petitioner to demonstrate why the equipment needs to be at this location and if this location is the highest point.

Jeff Brown motioned to continue the petition to the April 10 meeting of the Planning Board to allow the petitioner to provide updated plans and photographs.

Jack Zollo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4-0 In favor

Linda Tuttle-Barletta, we need to see the justification of the placement of the antenna. I want to know what equipment is on the site now and how many will be added.

Chairman John Hawes adjourned the meeting at 8:45 PM.

MEETING                      ADJOURNED:                      8:45                      PM                      MINUTES  
APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

For more detailed Minutes see tapes dated 3/8/06 available in the DCD&P office.