



TOWN OF WATERTOWN

Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Alternate

Telephone (617) 972-6427

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, February 26, 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Suneeth John, *Member*; Christopher H. Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Alternate Member*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development & Planning; Gideon Schreiber, Mike Mena, Louise Civetti.

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting, introduced the board and staff and swore in the audience. She noted 33 Mt. Auburn Street and 1 Dana Terrace will not be heard tonight.

Member Ferris read the legal notice for Item #1:

"417 School Street –

Edson Leal, 1 Frost Street, Cambridge, MA 02139, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit Finding in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §4.06(a), Alts to Non-Conforming Structure, Side Yard Setback and §5.04, Table of Dimensional Regulations, Building Coverage, so as to construct an attic dormer with a westerly (right) side setback of 5', where a 2' setback exists and 10' is required, and further to expand 2-story rear deck by 2', increasing building coverage from 33% to 34%, where 30% maximum is allowed. Located in the T (Two-Family) Zoning District."

Paul Lessard, Architect representing the owner, explained that a fire occurred at the residence approximately 1-year prior and when considering reconstruction of the roof considered constructing new dormers while maintaining the same roof pitch and style as original roof, prior to the fire. There is an exterior stair to be rebuilt to code; there will be a new stair from the second floor to the basement and the first floor apartment will be rebuilt as it was.

No one spoke from the audience.

Member Ferris asked whether the new roof and materials would match original roof and materials with exception of the dormers and asked why eave and trim of the dormers would not line up with the main roof. Member Ferris also asked if the three large trees on the property would be retained.

Mr. Lessard responded that the new roof and materials would match that of the original roof and that the dormers did not line up with the main roof because of the need of ceiling height in those areas – the low point is 7' for the cathedral ceilings. Everything else remains the same including the trees.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked that the proposed setbacks be clarified at 5' - the bathroom dormer increases the non-conformity and it is about 4' at the closest point and whether the lot coverage was changing from 33% to 34% it is really .4% (less than 1%)..

Chair Santucci closed the public hearing; read from the Staff and the Planning Board reports, which both recommended approval.

Member Ferris also asked that the dormers be modified/lowered to line up better with the main roof to create uniformity. The roofs would be a bit steep.

Mr. Lessard stated that the setback would be approximately 4-feet from the side lot line, which is an existing non-conformity. He also stated that there would be no change to lot coverage from the existing. Mr. Lessard conferred with his client regarding the modification to the dormer and responded that it would be acceptable to modify the dormers.

The Chair then asked that any approval require submittal of revised plans due to the change to the dormers and also proposed a condition to require that the rear deck remain uncovered and open.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the project with the relief from side yard setback and lot coverage and conditions as proposed. Member Gannon seconded the motion. The Board voted and the project was approved with a 5-0 vote.



TOWN OF WATERTOWN Zoning Board of Appeals

Administration Building
149 Main Street
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, February 26, 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Suneeth John, *Member*; Christopher H. Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Member*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development & Planning; Gideon Schreiber, Mike Mena, Louise Civetti.

Member Ferris read the legal notice:

“270-274 Palfrey Street - Brian C. Badrigian, Trustee, 11 Loring Street, Newton, MA 02549, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit/Site Plan Review in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.01.1 (f), Table of Use Regs, Multi-Family, so as to raze existing dwelling and construct a new four (4) unit dwelling with below grade parking. Located in the LB (Limited Business) Zoning District”

Ken Leitner, Attorney, explained the property is one house up from Waverley Avenue and is in an LB Zoning District which limits building a two-family – the zoning ordinance states a multi-family or a commercial use has to go there and the argument is that commercial cannot go there as there isn't enough traffic. They plan to build a 4-family there where initially they planned a 5 family; however, staff stated that was not in keeping with the neighborhood. There are 2 curb cuts with a 3 unit building, one is not permitted properly and they are proposing to close one of the curb cuts. They plan to keep the existing retaining walls. They plan to park 8 cars within the garage with a stairway

leading to a common hall that will have the front doors for two units and the rear doors for the other two units. There will be mirrors and light sensors to notify anyone on Palfrey when the garage door opens that someone is coming out. There will be a 15' setback in the front; both 15' setbacks on the sides, 25' on the rear. No one will back into Palfrey Street. There will be an unobstructed view of Palfrey Street. The house will be 'jogged' in. The garage is maintained at the 15' and the house will have a concrete conclave not visible to the neighbors; there will be a bike rack for each unit; they will have a tree in the front yard and 3 trees in the terraced patio area towards the back. In the Site Plan Review they had a swale or rain garden and they'd like to ask for that to be removed to maintain a strip of backyard for the unit owners to put their grill and play ball (Cond #11?). They want the front façade to look like a two-family with two front doors. The other units will have front doors on the sides. Each unit has a balcony. The proposed building is only 3' higher than the existing building. They are not changing the grade of the property or increasing it. The driveway side will have boxwoods lining it.

Attorney Leitner reviewed the interior floor plans, including garage. He noted the terraced patio. He then addressed the special permit criteria stating that a multi-family is the only thing that could go in this space as you cannot put a one or two family there and it is not appropriate for a commercial use. This dwelling will be state-of-the-art, they are containing all of the water on the site – no runoff; the building will be sprinkled; in compliance with the 'Stretch' code for building and heat; no one will be backing onto Palfrey Street; eliminating a curb cut and putting a tree there. There is no adverse impact to pedestrian or traffic. No one will be viewing cars on the lot; two visitors can park in the rear, as well. He discussed the conditions from the Planning Staff; #9, 10, 11 - #10 concerning landscaping, they want to keep the grass in the rear as opposed to the rain garden. They want to eliminate #10 and 11. In lieu of the rain garden, they have a water retention system with 10 sub-terrain containers in the rear of the property. They have an oil and particle separator in the garage which runs to the rear and all will be pumped into the detention system and let out over time into the ground. The catch basin in the middle of the driveway also is pumped into the retention system. They have not done test pits yet.

Joe Grillo, 110 Forest Street side, an abutter, said he has lived here for 25 years and he sees the neighborhood changes and mostly for the better. He took a lot of time thinking about this proposal and he is not in favor of it. He provided a list of items that he feels the board looks at to determine their decision: Encouraging the most appropriate use of land – this property will be a monstrosity on a hill where he is set behind it and his brother-in-law at 112 Forest Street will be directly impacted. Overcrowding of the land – this will be overcrowding of the land, it is too big for the lot. Design – he found 10 criteria on the town's website and is referencing #10: The proposed development should not be offensive – he feels this is not visually offensive but it is offensive in size. He told Mr. Corbett that a 3 unit would be acceptable but not 4 units. He tried to determine the height restrictions in Watertown and he was given 30-35' and then 43'. He said because this property is on a hill and the proposed building will be 3' above the existing, the houses around it will be overshadowed. He added that Attorney Leitner indicated that the unit owners will be able to play ball in the back yard and there isn't any room to play ball as the structure takes up the majority of the land. The in and out of the 8 cars at all hours of the day and night will have a type of noise pollution or a potential problem to the abutters – especially him. He said the attorney mentioned the LB zone and how a business could go in there and we'd really be in trouble so why can't the zone be changed to accommodate a two-family home. What would make a proper or better use for that land as opposed to a large monstrosity?

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that there is a two-family there as a pre-existing non-conforming use and they could choose to alter that non-conforming use. They could also petition the Town Council to change the zoning to coordinate with the surrounding properties; however, that is not what is being proposed. She added that although a two-family is not allowed, it doesn't mean what is there cannot be altered.

Mr. Grillo asked the board to look at the size of this project and picture themselves living in his house and consider that when they go to vote. He wants to know if this will affect the sale price or the ability to sell his house in the future due to the monstrosity above him.

Gabriel Nir, 108 Forest Street, agrees with Mr. Grillo - nothing else but a two-family would be appropriate at this location.

Chair Santucci Rozzi explained that there is a small Limited Business (zoning) area and the surrounding area is mostly a 'T' zone and further up the hill on Palfrey and other hilly areas, it is an S-6, Single family zoning district.

There were no further comments from the audience.

Member Gannon asked Staff when the area became zoned for LB. He recalls an autobody at 141 Waverley, which is now 3 condos; however, when was it an LB zoning district.

Gideon Schreiber, Planner, stated the 1998 Growth Management Plan recommended that this become an R.75 Zoning District and he does not know why it was not adopted. The 1989 plan changed all of the zoning throughout the town; however, there is no explanation for this LB zone vs. an NB zone or any business history in this spot.

Member Gannon stated that there was an automotive use at 141 and 117-119 previously. He is concerned about the bulk of the units.

Member John is concerned with the bulk and how it will change the neighborhood. He wants to know how the trash works – they have to drag the barrels up the stairs or is it private pick-up.

Attorney Leitner stated that it will be public pick-up. They are under the lot area coverage, the height requirement, impervious, - any developer is going to want to maximize the lot. The two-family that exists cannot be saved. He then pointed to an area where the trash will be stored and stated the individual owner will bring their barrel up the stairs or down the driveway.

Member John asked about the bike parking. Atty. Leitner said the bike racks will be the "U" shaped ones and within the garage.

Member John wanted to know if the last parking had enough room to maneuver. Atty. Leitner stated that the plans met the requirements of the Site Plan Review and although they may have to make a couple of turns, there is sufficient alley room for it. A visitor would back into the driveway area and then pull forward. They had that spot engineered.

Fergal Brennock, Registered Engineer, stated that there is a transportation letter submitted with the original submittal. He said there is 24' at the front wall in the garage so the spot in question has enough room to make a 4-point turn as opposed to a 3-point turn. It is based on a 19' long auto – a Toyota Camry could make it in 3-point; however, a larger car would be 4. The visitor would back onto the 20' of pavement with the wheels against the landscape and would make 4-point turn to drive out.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked for the dimension of the corner to the stair – it is 17'.

Member Ferris asked about the landscaping – there are only planter boxes that are not planted in the ground. Mr. Brennock said there is an updated landscaping plan that specifies the trees that will be planted on the 'upper' side of the property; the communal mailbox area with a lighting bollard, a bench, a downcast light, in a rock area to give the entry area some definition.

Mr. Schreiber noted that there are (11x8.5) sheets in their packets that explain the trees; the planters, as well as other information.

Member Ferris asked about the grading and a new modular block wall. He wants to know if the sidewalk is lower or higher than the adjacent property. There is also a 6' high stockade fence on top of the wall. He feels this is very tall and wants to determine which side that is. Mr. Brennock said the walkway is graded; the patios are level except for drainage, the versalock will go from 0 to 12 or 18" at the top (front of the property). The wall is about 12" higher than the walkway.

Mr. Mena noted that a stockade fence on top of a wall will be counted together to determine maximum height of the 'fence' height. He further explained from the bottom of the wall to the top of the fence, the maximum is 6' in height.

Member Ferris asked if the clapboard-style siding is vinyl – it is "Hardy Plank".

Mr. Ferris asked if the newer construction in the area is the same development company. Attorney Leitner stated it is the same developer that did the First Baptist church.

Member Ferris asked if the optional patio in the front is allowed. Mr. Mena said paving is not allowed in a front yard which would provide for parking; however, brick pavers that did not meet up with the driveway or if there were an obstruction, potentially it could be allowed but staff may have an issue. Attorney Leitner stated that they would be more than happy to remove the patio from the front. He added that the fencing was a request from Mr. Grillo with the potential of it extending to the rear of the property.

Member Ferris asked about rooftop equipment – there is none; about downspouts – they feed into the water detention system; the foundation material will be poured concrete.

Member Heep stated that the open space will be taken down from 83% to 35% - where is the water going to go. Mr. Brennock said drawing C1 – based on all impervious surfaces; the asphalt driveway, the asphalt walkway and the roof area they propose to use 12 stormtec (basins) with a conservative percolation rate – they replaced the rain garden with 10 tanks with everything graded away from the building with a berm, a gully to the two basins with cleanout and the second being diverted with a main stormdrain manhole – there is no pumping or mechanicals here. The garage will also drain to the main stormdrain with a gas separator. His modeling does not anticipate any overflow for the 5 inch, 100-year storm. There is different modeling – a 7", 100 year is extreme. He used state requirements. He may need to revise quantity when another perc test is in the Spring; however, he is not anticipating a high water table area. There are a lot of hills, though with clay but it is not a water table issue.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated she is concerned with the west elevation and is 4' above grade at the rear of the structure. She is not in favor of patios in the front and greenspace is preferred. She asked that they address the snow removal. Mr. Brennock showed an area in the rear that would be used for snow storage (a patio area) and then some to the side rear corner (on the grass).

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted that along the driveway there is not a 4' landscape buffer at the catch basin – did they request a variance for that. Mr. Brennock did not address that as an additional request. He will move the catch basin into the driveway as opposed to requesting a variance.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted that the Zoning Table does not add up – the impervious coverage and open space. Attorney Leitner stated that the table is not accurate as the impervious is 65% in the narrative.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked about a parking spot that is not the best for maneuverability and asked if these will be deeded. Attorney Leitner said they would be deeded and although Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that it would be a 4-point turn, they'll be able to do it.

Chair Santucci Rozzi appreciates the explanation on the drainage; however, she still has concerns given the area and the grades of the adjacent properties. She asked Staff to explain the topography.

Mr. Brennock said the grade is about 2' on average behind the retaining wall at the adjacent property and continues to slope but not as dramatic.

Chair Santucci Rozzi expressed concern with that especially with the snow storage there and potentially draining onto that property if it is not absorbed. She asked if the entire driveway will be bermed. Mr. Brennock did not anticipate that. She then stated that the storage area is at 90 and the slope is then towards the drain. Mr. Brennock said the rear is 90 and the (front of the grass) is 89.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked why they do not want to rebuild or alter. Attorney Leitner said it is not in shape to rebuild and the owners of the property want to get the highest price for it. His client does not own the property that is why they do not have a perk test.

Member John asked if they are required to have a railing at the steps. Mr. Mena stated that anything more than 4 steps would need a railing and that would be addressed at the building stage.

Member John asked if the west side will have the water pushed towards the west. Mr. Brennock reviewed the numbers Mr. John showed him and agreed that it should be the opposite. Mr. Brennock confirmed that Mr. John is correct.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if the mean average grade is 95 and the back of the property on the ground is 89, what is the height of the property. Mr. Brennock stated 44' at the rear and 33' at the front – 9' (difference).

Member Ferris asked Staff about the R.75 zoning district. Mr. Schreiber stated that there are only 3 structures left in that zoning district. This area was included in that change and during the council meeting, there were two properties that were not changed at that time.

Member Ferris stated that this is a dense proposal and there is a precedence in this area for something different. This is in compliance with the zone that it is in. Chair Santucci Rozzi said this meets the dimensional criteria and this board is required to state if this meets the site plan review criteria and the special permit criteria – she then read the 4 criteria of the special permit.

Chair Santucci Rozzi expressed concerns with the size of this project for the lot, especially with the grades and proximity and grades of the abutting properties, this may look good on paper, in the field, it will appear much larger. She doesn't know if there is a way to improve on the 4 story and asked the petitioner to address their concerns.

Steve Corbett, Partner in this development, stated that they have reduced the size of this proposal. The building lot coverage and the height are less than two properties in the area. The scale of this building does fit in, as he said the Planning Board said. They will pull out if this does not go through. It may be a project for someone else on a smaller scale at a different purchase price. He added that the original proposal for 5 stories was closer to the dimensional limitations. There were 4 quadrants with one unit in the middle. The parking and everything was tighter and they cut it back.

Chair Santucci Rozzi reviewed the setbacks – Mr. Corbett said the Limited Business Zoning District allows for closer setbacks; more units; and they are cleaning up non-conformities of front yard parking and a two-family. He then added that this is a great improvement to the neighborhood as the parking will be safer to enter, exit and a fully sprinklered building. He disagrees with one neighbor who states it is a monstrosity. Each unit ranges from 2200 – 2400 square feet. The total square footage of the building is 9300 s.f.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said at over 9000 s.f. not including the garage is quite large. On paper these look good and then when they are built... this is pushing it a bit.

Member Ferris said they are concerned with the 4-story effect at the south side of the property. He suggested a step back at the master bedroom to allow for a full balcony to buffer the impact a bit. If

the 4th floor were stepped back about 6' from the 3rd floor, it may give a better presence on the site and still allow for the development.

Chair Santucci Rozzi noted the office spaces in the units at the front of the building and asked if they were eliminated, would that decrease the square footage and size of the structure – they'd still be three bedroom units.

Attorney Leitner stated they would have no objection to putting terraces in the rear as Member Ferris suggested. He said removing the offices would leave the same building envelope.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if they would eliminate the entire 3rd floor. Atty. Leitner said they would not be inclined to do that.

Member Ferris said the fact that this is a mansard roof will help to make the building feel a little bit shorter as you wouldn't have clapboard siding all the way up. If the rear elevation had a railing across the back, left to right, and some terrace doors pushed back 6' and where there is not terrace doors to keep the mansard vs. a wall, so that it looks like it is a roof and pushes that roof back from the main elevation. They will need to re-plan to move the stairs further north.

Member Ferris reiterated that if the 6' deck were retained and wrapped around to the east; with terrace doors; and punctuated with dormer windows; the wall surfaces treated with roof except where the glazed openings are and the railing in the foreground, that would soften the impact on that side of the building.

Mr. Grillo said there is no privacy although his property does have trees. The balconies will have neighbors close to them. The two-family will look out at the balconies.

Mr. Grillo noted that there is a huge conflict of interest with a member of the Town Council presenting to the Zoning Board of Appeals when he votes on whether or not a member can be in position. It is a conflict of interest.

Member Gannon is still concerned with the bulk, height and dimensions of the project – it is shoehorned – it would be appropriate on a larger lot. The quality of other form this developer projects are great.

Member John is concerned about the bulk and like the suggestion by Member Ferris.

Member Ferris appreciates the comments by the abutter which would make him want to have more planning in the southeast corner – like an Oak, something substantial. Density – having buildings closer together is how the town used to develop. This is new and should be pulled back and landscaping should be added to compensate.

Member Heep is also struck by the size of the proposal. His concerns are bounded by the zoning district and the dimensional regulations allowed in this zone. Since this is also a special permit/site plan review, there are other factors to consider. He supports Member Ferris' suggestion to pull back the top floor and add more landscaping to buffer the increased mass.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked the petitioner if they would like to continue. Atty. Leitner stated that they would like a month to review. She added that slight changes to the footprint; stepping back maybe the second or the third floor, try to take away from the massing – 3 vertical stories on the same footprint; the addition of open spaces on various floors, 3rd floor and come back to the next meeting in an accurate format with a revised landscape plan. They cannot do the test pits until March but any further information about the drainage would be helpful.

Member Ferris asked for clarity on the grades to the abutting properties. He wants to understand the grades of the neighbor to the east.

Chair Santucci asked for larger plans with all of the changes requested.

Member John asked for an explanation as to why condition 12 was removed regarding landscaping.

Atty. Leitner said the Planning Board wanted a grass strip as opposed to landscaping and they wanted the row of trees in the rear. They asked for the grass instead of the rain garden. Member John said the landscaping plan will be brought back (the trees).

Ralph Todino, 135-137 Waverley Avenue said the roots of the trees are going to push the walls (4' and 15') down on his and his neighbors property. He doesn't think trees are the right way to go due to the walls. Member Ferris explained the edge along his property will have a boxwood shrub, not a tree. The trees are in the rear. They will consider the walls to the rear in the landscape plan.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked that the petitioner show the top of the wall and the bottom of the wall on their drawings.

Member Ferris asked what else could be placed into the LB zone. Mr. Magoon stated that this could be a commercial property at 4 stories, 40' high.

Member Gannon wants the footprint to be reduced.

Member Ferris is more supportive of a residential use as opposed to another use and another use would require a special permit, as well.

Member Ferris motioned to continue the petition to the next hearing. Member Ferris seconded. Voted 5-0, continued.



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

Melissa M. Santucci Rozzi, Chairperson
David Ferris, Clerk
Suneeth P. John, Member
Christopher H. Heep, Member
John G. Gannon, Member

Telephone (617) 972-6427

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

MINUTES

On Wednesday evening, February 26, 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*; David Ferris, *Clerk*; Suneeth John, *Member*; Christopher H. Heep, *Member*; John G. Gannon, *Member*. Also Present: Steve Magoon, Director, Community Development & Planning; Gideon Schreiber, Mike Mena, Louise Civetti.

Member Ferris read the legal notice:

“314, 330 Arsenal Street/121-125 Walnut Street - Murray S. Patkin, Manager, Arsenal View LLC, 149 Arsenal Street, Watertown, MA 02472, herein requests the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a Special Permit/Site Plan Review in accordance with Watertown Zoning Ordinance §5.01.3(d), Table of Use Regs, Vehicles for Sale, so as to raze existing building at 314 Arsenal St; convert a portion of 125 Walnut to Auto Dealership Use with parking and landscape improvements; change vehicle entry of 330 Arsenal and construct off-street public bike/pedestrian path. Located in the I-3 (Industrial) Zoning District.”

William York, Attorney on behalf of Arsenal View LLC Lexus of Watertown, introduced the project participants, explained the project and how the use of the exiting building on Walnut Street will open up the street on the Arsenal Street side and reduce some of the parking. He reviewed what was formerly called the Springwell Building. He showed the site plans with the property (on Arsenal Street) acquired in 1990 as the pre-owned section; a railroad; SB Green ironyard; improvements made in 2001 by acquiring the School Street, Walnut Street, Arsenal Street property and creating the Lexus site. Barker Steel, a pizza shop, a hairdresser at the corner of School was a blighted area. There is a prep center on Arsenal Street with 8 bays and constrained due to the ownership of the property at the rear of the building. They will remove the pre-owned building, use the Walnut Street property as the Arsenal Street front door, add landscaping, reduce the number of cars, without adding to the existing building. The balance of Walnut Street will be used for the storage of preowned inventory using a ramp that exists in the building. It was originally designed for front-end loaders. Beaver Brook, Seven Cycles will remain with 30,000 s.f. of space as well as some vacant space. The historic nature of the front of the building on Walnut Street will remain with added landscaping. There will not be access to Arsenal Street through the Walnut Street side. There will be a gate placed on the site to prevent cut-through. The scope of work on the exterior will be on Arsenal street. The façade of the front of the building (125 Walnut Street) will keep the brick exterior with a metal band across the top, the windows. There will be an entry added. The parking will be reduce from 154 to 118 cars on display. Most significant work will be done on the interior; a ramp from the side to the second floor for showroom. The AA-4 plan shows the prep building with added landscaping and the windows and the bike path will be 10' wide along the entire front. The creation of a bio-remediation rain garden(s) to the property within the landscaping along Arsenal Street. Loading and unloading will take place at the rear of this building. The 'courtyard' at Walnut Street will be maintained. The other portions of the Walnut Street building are vacant. Previous parking was non-compliant and it will now be one site and brought into compliance (400) parking spaces and 100+ interior parking. This is such a large site. The architect can answer questions.

Chair Santucci Rozzi opened the meeting to public comment.

Maria Siease from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee stated that this is the first time she has seen this and she considers the entire Arsenal Street an integral part of the town for bicycle and pedestrians as it connects the east end with the rest of Watertown and connects Cambridge through the bike path and the community path. She also mentioned a 'spur' that goes by Target into Athena Health which will connect that to the river. She is looking at this from a transportation point of view. They are looking at the connection along Arsenal Street as an integrated piece and she does not know how they are going to manage this. There is major housing being built along this street and the pedestrian and bicycle impact will increase. She is happy that there are fewer driveway openings to this property, however, she wants to see the bicycle path kept further away from the road in front of this property. She wants to see if the pedestrians and the bicyclists can be separated a bit more, as well. In the winter she states the snow is piled high at the ends of the property where pedestrians and bicyclists cannot get by. They want to make sure the snow is removed along this path. This stretch of land along Arsenal Street is important to the type of community we want to be.

Chair Santucci Rozzi asked if their committee had an idea of where they wanted things to be laid out and how. Ms. Siease said they are not engineers and have worked with the planning department and they are not aware that the staff made recommendations for this.

Mr. Magoon stated that they have shared plans with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner, has attended most of their meetings. There was an analysis done by a group of Tufts students and their recommendation was for the path to remain along Arsenal Street. This

applicant is the first to construct a portion of the community path on their property. They are taking this and continuing it further down Arsenal Street; widening it to 10' and providing a 5' stretch for pedestrians and a bio-retention area. The trade-offs were between 10' and 8' and the committee felt strongly about 10'. Ms. Siease said this did not appear before their committee. Mr. Schriber said this was reported back to the committee as their representative was not in attendance at the December site plan review meeting. Ms. Siease said she doesn't want to see Arsenal Street (community path) done willy-nilly. Chair Santucci Rozzi remembered being on the ZBA when Lexus came before the board many years ago and Lexus was the first to concede to provide land from a property owner. She further stated that this does not look willy-nilly, it is 10' wide, it is done in connection with the existing path, and she encourages Ms. Siease to stay in touch with staff and to participate in meetings when invited to. Ms. Siease said they bring a different perspective to the meetings.

Janet Jameson, Bicycle Committee, said they have been working on getting the path through Watertown. She said Steve was correct about the Tufts students recommendations getting the path through School Street, behind town hall, and down to the river. A problem on Arsenal Street with (could not hear name) was he stated the bicycle path would never cross his property and that is why the Tufts students had the path along Arsenal Street. She said things are changing and there may now be a way to institute the path along the railroad property. Their concern along Arsenal Street was having a path closer to the street instead of it being further in the property. She said it is better to follow the railroad path as once it goes down Arsenal Street, they don't know how it will 'hook-up'.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that there are areas where the connectivity is in the road-way. She further said the connection is more important than the location. She said this property is allowing it along the front of their property and other properties may be in different locations. She said the bicycle committee cannot discuss other properties at this board meeting. Ms. Jameson said she wants this board to know of their concerns. Member Gannon said this board had their own initiative to provide a condition to another property to provide for a bicycle path and this board does take bicycles and pedestrians into consideration when making decisions and conditions.

Richard Markerson, Walnut Street, stated that on February 5th, they were invited to hear about the plans for this property at 125 Walnut Street and they showed them the plans and improvements. He moved there 30 years ago and the street looked very different then. Mr. Patkin has beautified the neighborhood.

Member Gannon asked Mr. Markerson if he recalls a former neighbor speaking up about the initial Lexus project "creating a wall" in the neighborhood (with the backside of the building) and could he comment on that. Mr. Markerson said the consensus at the meeting on February 5th was that this would be an improvement. A concern was the lack of parking some of the neighbors have during the winter months and they rely on Doble and others to provide winter parking for them.

Dennis Duff, 33 Spruce Street, said his father was a welder at Lewis and Shepherd for 42 years so he is familiar with the property. He wants to clarify open space – it should be green open space. He said this open space proposed is only about 3%. The planting has been butchered. He said the neighbors do have parking in their garages and they choose not to use them for storage and not for parking. He said a missed opportunity for parking across the street and not just in the winter. He has been an advocate for sidewalks since the redevelopment committee many years ago. He said a prior chairman stated that every 5 years projects come before the board and now there is a growing 'automile' on Arsenal Street. When is it enough.

Mr. Magoon stated that this is not an additional dealership – essentially they are taking a dealership and putting it inside an existing building and from the town's perspective, this is a win-win. He would have shared the concern with a new dealership.

Mr. Duff stated that the initial request from Toyota was to get the Lexus dealership off of that property. Now the Toyota dealership had added Scion and cramped it up again.

Member Gannon asked how much of the inside of the building will be dedicated to automotive use and what type of automotive use. Attorney York showed the interior plan of the building including the entranceway. He noted the showroom, offices, etc. and a storage area that is not for display. The second floor plan with a ramp that supports heavy equipment will be for storage, as well – inventory. They have another storage area and they do not know if it will be for offices or additional storage. The other areas from Walnut Street are the one-story area for Beaverbrook and Seven Cycles – a high end bicycle manufacturing and they may expand. There is also office space that is vacant. The storage area for Lexus is about 300 vehicles. These vehicles are now stored in an area across the street and at the existing dealership. There is no outside storage on the Lexus site now. There is a lot behind VFW that has autos stored; however, that is not ideal. This is not an expansion of the business. This provides a use for a building that does not have a use now. It creates very little traffic. The area in the front of the 125 Walnut Street building will be used for display of pre-owned vehicles with customer parking. Traffic will come from Arsenal Street or School Street. This does not expand the business, it accommodates the existing business. They will keep the vehicle delivery off the street and the test vehicles off of Walnut Street. Access from Arsenal Street.

Member Gannon asked Attorney York to address the issue at the Toyota dealership since it is in the same ownership. Attorney York said there is no parking of Toyota vehicles on Arsenal Street – it may be customer parking.

Member Gannon asked about the potential of a photovoltaic system on the roof. Attorney York said they are more than willing to look at it as a condition.

Member Gannon said the owner was very gracious to accommodate the path.

Member John asked Mike Mena, ZEO, what the rules are for signage. Mr. Mena said it is calculated by the frontage of the building – the length by the height and they are allowed a percentage of that in the Industrial Zone. He believes it is 5% as opposed to commercial zoning districts which are up to 10%. A separate permit process is applied. A pylon sign exists and they want to be grandfathered. They removed the billboards on this property as part of working with the community.

Member John asked why the middle curb cut is needed. Mr. McKenzie said that is the main entrance and there are 5 curb cuts there now. They are reducing it to three. Member John said they are improving the site; however, this doesn't really help the entrance and two exits at this location. Mr. McKenzie said the two openings near the old pre-owned site will be used for the pre-owned site and the other entrance is a main entrance for everything else. Member John reiterated that having three openings is a concern for him.

Member John asked if there could be added street trees planted between the bike path and the street on town property? He commented that they are removing existing trees. Mr. McKenzie said some of these are within the bike path and some are dead. Attorney York said they will address the tree warden and staff on the reviving the street trees that are there along with the large number of trees being added to the property. They would like to have more street trees. Member John said there are trees in front of the Lexus but not in front of the pre-owned area of car display.

Member Ferris asked what the glazing will be on the glass facing Arsenal Street. Alan Hopkins said they are keeping some of the windows even though there may be car washing equipment behind it – they will use film or sandblasting of the glass to keep the look of the glass; however, not to view through it. There will be clear glass at the break room.

Member Ferris suggested planting away from the utility poles to avoid severe pruning. He added that some of the trees are small enough not to be interrupted by the utility lines. There is a tree buffer (8 Ginkos) between the bike path and he suggests adding a tree with more density. He thinks the proposal is very strong.

Member Heep asked about the gate to keep cut-throughs from happening between Walnut Street and Arsenal Street. Attorney York said the gate will most likely be in an area midway on the building side facing the courtyard for 125 Walnut Street. He wants the neighbors to be able to use some of the parking lot for winter parking overnight and remain respectful to the Lexus site.

Member Heep appreciates the reduction of curb openings; however, three is still too many.

Chair Santucci Rozzi said she counted 120 autos outside on H2 plan. She assumes the tandem section of 17 cars is also display. She corrected the amount to 86 in front of the pre-owned area and the tandem parking is additional for employees to be able to create a wider path from truck delivery. Mr. Mena stated that tandem parking is allowed in the central business zone; however, this site is showing the tandem parking as not part of their required parking. Attorney York said customers park in the courtyard for the pre-owned and for the Lexus in the area in front of Lexus and service go into the building. Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that a condition for no more than 86 display cars outside (will be written) and interior to the building is not a concern. Attorney York correct the number to 87.

Chair Santucci Rozzi she said the Lexus dealership stated that there would not be any cars on display; however, she sees more and more on display. Attorney York said those conditions would remain in effect.

(tape stopped working)

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that three curb cuts are too many; the snow should be removed from the site; the lighting plan should be added to the islands.

Member Gannon asked about fire safety inside the building. Attorney York stated that there are no issues with fire equipment.

Member John still has a concern with curb cuts.

Member Ferris does not have a concern with curb cuts and wants the interior islands to be maintained.

Leo Patterson – 60 Channing Road stated that this is a 5 spot lot with tenants and is concerned with Walnut Street traffic. Attorney York stated that there will not be any additional traffic to Walnut Street.

Member Ferris motioned to approve the request with conditions. Member Heep seconded. Voted 5-0, approved.

Tape 2 of 2

OTHER BUSINESS:

A Presentation on the conceptual master plan for the redevelopment of the Arsenal Office Park.

Athena Health requested time to provide a presentation to the Zoning Board of Appeals. This is only a presentation. Nothing has been filed to formally come before the board.

Carolyn Reckman, VP, Athena Environment, Athena Health presented Larry Beals, Project Manager and Land Planner for Athena. She spoke on their plans:

They are looking for comments on the existing condition at Arsenal on the Charles – the 29 acre campus. Athena Health has been occupying space on this campus for 9 years, beginning in 2004 as a tenant with 300 people and they now have over 1,000. They occupy over 300,000 square feet of space out of approximately 700,000 square feet. They worked out a purchase of the property from Harvard in May

2013. They have been putting together a master plan for the next 10 years for this property by attending Planning Board meetings, forums on the Town's Master Plan, etc. as they want to meld into what the town's future look like.

Their business is to change the way health plans run in this country. They are trying to reduce the amount of asphalt on the campus to provide more green space. They want to add a parking garage at the far end (or beginning of the campus on Arsenal Street) to add green space to where there are currently parking spaces. There will not be any retail in the new parking garage. They want to create a 'main' street retail area from the main entrance off of Arsenal Street, maintaining the ability to park along that street area to use the retail spaces. The existing parking garage will remain; however, they will eventually remove the top two parking floors to add office space, only after the new garage is built. They want to widen the existing road in back of (the long building along Arsenal Street where Boston Sports Club currently resides and where their offices are) to allow for fire trucks to come down. However, for the safety of their employees, this will become a tree-lined ally for walking.

They showed renditions of what the spaces will look like; gathering spaces; walking paths; trees; seating areas. They want to add a performance area – an outdoor performance area. There is currently a nice lawn; however, it does not invite you in. The neighborhood wants to be able to come in to use the area as their grandparents used to work here and no one could go on the property without special permission. Their culture is to have the community come in to the campus. They want to add a retail area near the arts center for art studios on a seasonal basis. They want to add a beer garden for people to enjoy the river. This will be a mix of employees and neighborhood. The smoke stack has been renovated they just want it to be an icon of the space. It is not in working condition. There is a small code generating solar panels on building 311 so this smoke stack will not be used. There used to be a nuclear reactor on this campus and they have had environmental studies of the site and they did it again when they bought the property. Their campus population is young and an employee has commuted to work in a canoe, arriving at the yacht club. They cannot take down the fence as it is a historic fence. They'd like to bring in some artifacts from their early stages of this campus and celebrate the history of this site. They want to create a glass garden space for community activities and connect the buildings near the art center with the office buildings, remove the asphalt and create a winter garden. They will also use pedestrian bridges for their employees only as they are HIPAA regulated and are required to have anyone entering their space to be credentialed. Their office space will be connected by the blue lines on their renditions. They will no longer have bridges above the space. They plan to have 'pop-up' retail components near Panera Bread and use rain garden areas along the walking paths. The retail will have yogurt, coffee shops, artist spaces, etc. There will be seasonal spots like a farmer's market when the weather is good and then that space will turn into something else. They want to experiment a bit. They want to have interesting things on each side of the 'roadway. They want to focus on the main roadway area first with more green-space. They want to address the 'issue' of Arsenal Street. They want to move the fence closer to the building as the cars and busses pass by you on the side walk very quickly. They want to plant street trees by moving the fence and the sidewalk (creating a berm to plant). They will consider a type of tree that is not a Ginko; however, that northern portion of the building area gets very little sun. They are committed to the greening of this campus; the way stormwater travels through the campus, etc.

They plan to have the parking garage for employees of Athena only with connections from the garage to the building.

There is a loading dock at the Harvard Publishing building now and they want to keep the loading area and pretty it up.

Squibneck Park is an area that they would like to have their employees utilize. They are considering a way to cross the street to use the area. There may be a kayak rack or a launching dock along that area by partnering with DCR.

They have been asked to bring on-campus bikes to get around; zip-car parking and electric car charging areas.

Their plans are very conceptual; however, the most important area is the garage near the residential space on North Beacon Street – they will add trees along that side and perhaps a green wall.

They cannot replicate the campus buildings in the design of the parking garage – it has to be different.

Their culture is very important; their employees work day experience is important.

Larry Beals said the stormwater (on this campus) is very important. They found old manholes and pipes. It is all old concrete. There is an old line that runs from School Street through the campus down to the yacht club and dumps there. They want to figure out something there to recharge the stormwater by using a landscape element – like a rain garden. The green roof will be above the Harvard Publishing and above what is now a warehouse building with steps from the proposed amphitheater to use the roof. They also plan to ‘do something’ with the roof of the existing garage once the proposed garage is built. He added that there are tremendous views from the roof there. They plan to replace a lot of windows as there is energy being wasted.

Ms. Reckman added that they do over all of the catch basins. There was one sewer line that was dicey and they replaced it.

Mr. Beals said there was a 4” water line that was connected to a storm drain that was running full force. He joked that the water pressure in Watertown would go up and the Charles River would dry up when they corrected this.

Ms. Reckman said their employee base will grow to 3600 in 10 years. Right now they have 1300 employees. They will be working on shuttles from Harvard Square and Brighton to the campus; they have bicycle sheds and parking on the campus; they have a small segment that works shifts and their employees work from 7 am to 9 pm. They have a valet service during the day and the parking is not that full in the evening.

Mr. Duff asked if they give priority to hiring Watertown residents. Ms. Reckman said they hire the highest and brightest no matter where they are. There will not be any housing on the site. He asked what their plan is to continuously water the trees they plan to plant. He stated that the Arsenal Mall was built to bring people in to the area.

Chair Santucci Rozzi stated that there is a partnership with the person that owns this and the person that bought the Arsenal Mall.

Ms. Reckman clarified that the property they are speaking about is owned by Athena Health. Jonathan Bush is a private investor to the Arsenal Mall property. They are two different owners and properties. They do plan to work with them to provide walkways, etc. They plan to work with all of the surrounding elements, like the bike path.

Mr. Magoon said the two metal doors in the earth at the bottom of the Commander’s Mansion property are bunkers. Mr. Schreiber added that they are connected to the tunnel system. Boats would pull up and unload there. The granite wall was a dock for the little boats. There is a roadway leading up from the granite wall to the back of the nuclear reactor.

Chair Santucci Rozzi thanked Athena Health for their presentation and said she assumes they will be back in front of the board for some form of relief in the near future.

Mr. Heep motioned to adjourn. Mr. Gannon seconded. Voted 5-0. The meeting ended at 11:50 p.m.