

WATERTOWN PLANNING BOARD

DATE: January 10, 2018 PLACE: Town Council Chamber TIME: 7:00 PM COMMENCED: 7:00 PM

PURPOSE OF MEETING: Public Hearing
Regular Monthly Meeting

PRESENT: John Hawes, Chairman; Janet Buck; Payson Whitney; Jeff Brown; Gary Shaw
Ingrid Marchesano, Clerk to the Board; Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner; Andrea
Adams, Senior Planner

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

Jeff Brown motioned to approve Minutes of 11/8/2017 & 12/5/2017 meetings.

Janet Buck seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

Gideon Schreiber, we have tentatively scheduled a meeting on 1/31/2018 to discuss short term rental. The date has to be confirmed, it is not mandatory for all members to be present.

Janet Buck, I will be away starting January 19 through February 12.

John Hawes, I will be out end of January and back for the February 14 meeting.

ZONING AMENDMENT

AMEND Article V, by inserting new Section 5.19, TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS and further amend the Table of Contents by inserting Section 5.19, TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS.

Gideon Schreiber, this moratorium will allow more discussion regarding recreational marijuana establishments. The moratorium through 12/31/18 was suggested by the Town Council and Zoning office. Staff is in support of the proposal.

Gary Shaw, is there a reason why we have not acted on it ?

Gideon Schreiber, we are waiting for the State to act on it. Moratorium seems to be the right direction.

Jeff Brown motioned to endorse the above amendment to recommend to the Town Council to approve the above amendment for temporary moratorium through 12/31/2018.

Payson Whitney seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

John Hawes closed the Public Hearing.

CASES PENDING

- **15 Arden Road;** Richard Williams & Jeanne Segal – **Special Permit Finding**

Keith Brown, Architect, this petition was before the Board previously and we were asked to downsize. This is a Dutch colonial single family home built in 1928 with a single car attached garage under a sunroom. The front, side yard setbacks, and building coverage are nonconforming, We are proposing to add 2 feet on the front of the garage and add pergola on top of the second floor sunroom. The rest will stay the same The front façade will be reconstructed with a single dormer to provide head height for the stairs.

Andrea Adams, a new look is presented tonight. This is a 5, 346 s.f. lot with an attic Dutch-Colonial home with a 2-car garage and porch element on the side. Pergola is proposed on top of second floor sunroom. We did not receive any comments from abutters. The proposal is not substantially more

detrimental. There are large dormers on homes in the neighborhood. Staff recommends approval of the special permit finding.

Gary Shaw, there are two different designs on sketches, which is the right one ? Is there a plan by the applicant to enclose the structure on top of the sunroom ?

Keith Brown, the petitioner chose the design that is more budget friendly. This is a light structure to providing shading.

Gideon Schreiber, the petitioner would have to come back to the Board. Conditions will be added to prevent the enclosure.

Janet Buck, is there an access to the pergola ?

Keith Brown, there is a door and window in the back, because of the angle on the plans, it is hard to see.

Jeff Brown, this design is more open, very visible from my home.

Payson Whitney, condition #5 states As Built, should we add the correct height ?

Jeff Brown motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the petition for Special Permit Finding under Section 4.06(a) for the extension of the basement garage, second floor pergola, and half story/third floor addition based upon the finding that it meets the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance subject to conditions set forth in the staff report.

Payson Whitney seconded the motion.

Vote: 5-0 In Favor.

- **385-393 Pleasant Street;** Stephen J. Collins, Manager, Amstel Heritage Watertown, LLC – Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Bill York, Attorney, following the November 8, 2017 meeting, we have put together a set of revised plans based on the Boards and abutters comments.

D'Artagnan Brown, Architect, the unit count remains the same, we have deleted Building D, moved 2 units from F to E to allow for better truck circulation. We have created three substantial planting beds, deleted commercial building to allow access to the site. Deliveries will continue behind the buildings, there are two pick up locations. A connection across the site to the River walk will be provided, some units moved to the top, to allow for more green space. Comments were made about the front façade, balconies on second and third floor will be introduced. All buildings comply with the height limitations. There will not be major impact on surrounding buildings, some existing buildings are higher. Shadow study was completed, there is no impact in the summer, and winter has the harshest conditions, shade over the first house on the East. One of the affordable units was moved from second to the third floor.

Blair Hines, Landscape Architect, we are trying to create attractive streetscape for this very long and narrow site. The site is former railroad. New building F allows for street trees and shrubbery plantings. Building E is more challenging, windows are facing the street. Mitigate the impact of this development on neighbors. Three large planters are proposed, Building C is 7' below the other planting areas. Large trees will be planted by the developer on adjacent properties.

Bill York, the site is consistent with requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, there are other major developments in the area. We are not requesting to increase FAR, the building height is 33' where 35' is allowed. The site is difficult to develop, mitigation buffer is provided, surrounding homes are equal in size.

David Gamble, Gamble Associates, Pleasant Street is not a great street, previous developments created tensions. Design Guidelines were created, this project relates to existing buildings, massing works in this instant. This is a clever solution, landscape will be provided. The design is not perfect, it is full three stories, different materials are needed.

Andrea Adams, comments and questions were received at the November meeting. Cars will not block the Pleasant/Rosedale/Waltham Street intersection. Site circulation is provided and different levels of plantings created. Parking has been reduced and the number is still more than required. Adequate impervious coverage, screening of utilities, commercial interiors lights, project will face Pleasant Street. Affordable housing mix will stay the same, same number of units. Transportation mitigation is not needed. The staff recommends approval with conditions.

Payson Whitney, this is a big improvement over the last presentation. There is still some concern over the east side. We have received a good reassurance from David Gamble. Concern about UPS drivers backing or parking on Pleasant Street.

Jeff Brown, why are we doing so much on this sliver of land, who would want to live there, I cannot support this proposal. There is so much asphalt, the developer is trying to do too much on limited site. This is in front of the Board for a reason.

Gideon Schreiber, half of this site can be built by right, the second half to the west requires SP/SPR.

Bill York, the development meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the buildings can be 35' high, we are proposing 33'. We need guidance from the Board how to proceed.

John Hawes, the Zoning Ordinance shows how far can the petitioner go. Planning Board needs to express their opinion. Each case is different, the decision depends on the site, abutters, etc.

Janet Buck, I was not happy about this proposal originally. After talking with staff about what they can do – remove the berm, trees may be compromised. Last month questions were answered and plans revised. This site is being developed in appropriate way, our concerns have been answered.

Gary Shaw, if building D is removed, the area will not be used. There was an opportunity to make the area less massive, is this the right thing for this site? There will be major impact on neighbors and environment, will it make living better in Watertown – it fail in all three. I cannot support this project.

John Hawes, getting rid of Building D was a good move, the issue is the east end of the property. I always worry about the abutters relation to new development. There are houses on Bacon, Howard, many are single family. 16 Waltham Street is a little 1-1/2 story house. I accept that the berm will be removed. This project will improve Pleasant Street, plans are showing accurate relations between the existing and proposed buildings. Fine tuning of the development is needed.

Dartagnan Brown, 5 large tree will be planted on our property, ten more on the abutters land. We can take Buildings A,B,C and combine them into 2 buildings.

John Hawes, the Design Guidelines show that we do not like long buildings, could some of the structures be moved further west.

Gideon Schreiber, staff spoke with the petitioner, there are issues with moving the buildings, and it would not be feasible.

Cindy Lee, shifting the buildings would make us lose units, there are few 1-story sheds and garages and 2-story houses in the back.

John Hawes, developers always say that they cannot do it, but changes are always possible.

Bill York, the biggest issues is the narrowness of the lot. Tonight's session was very helpful. 16 Waltham Street is under purchase and sale agreement, located in S-6 zone, it will be renovated. We are asking the Board to continue the petition to allow for more answers.

Janet Buck, I would be interested in seeing the buildings moved and what is the impact on the Waltham Street homes.

Payson Whitney, could 16 Waltham Street be incorporated into this development ?

Gideon Schreiber, that property was originally located in industrial zone and then change to S-6 zone. There will be 4 members present at the February 14 meeting, the petitioner might prefer full Board.

Jeff Brown, this project can be much smaller with less asphalt, if not I will continue my position.

Gary Shaw, I have worked with developers for 40 years, numbers can be changed. I believe it could be smaller and still feasible. The problem is proximity to everything. These are not townhouses, these are apartment buildings sharing entrances and hallways.

Bill York, this is a very expensive proposition, it cannot be any smaller.

Louise, I am worried about the Rosedale/Pleasant Street intersection. Snow pockets will make cars difficult to navigate.

Brian, Rosedale Road, the plans are not showing any powerlines.

Joanne Gumbleton, 47 Waltham Street, I represented 16 Waltham Street at the last meeting, the sale of that property is beneficial for everyone. Somebody will be living there after the renovations, I am concern with snow, there is not much space behind the buildings. Snow should not block the intersection.

Libby Shaw, Trees for Watertown, everyone is saying that the berm has to go. The site was not abandoned by nature, a significant number of mature trees will be lost. Huge amount of sound and noise filtering. The site is tremendously beneficial environmentally to the area. Berm could be kept if the site is purchased by the Town, it should be preserved for the sake of neighborhood and Town.

Jill, 38-40 Waltham Street, the developer is now showing deliveries by trucks. I have not seen what the view will be from my house, renters will be overlooking our backyards. This will change the neighborhood.

Maryann Mulligan, 23 Falmouth Street, cars are always parked on our street. The new development of 58 units will make it worse. It will have a major impact, Pleasant Street does not have shuttle.

Ken Woodland, Town Councilor, the zoning for this parcel was created from all the comments. We changed the zoning to allow for better projects to come in. We have been discussing this project for over a year. We had 2 community meetings, the developer met with the residents, changes were made to the plans based on community input. Lot of effort went into these plans. The enforcement of traffic and parking is increasing, increase of public shade trees.

John Hawes, this was a very important summary. The Planning Board saw this project for the first time 2 months ago.

Bill York, we should continue to address all the comments, the petitioner would prefer to continue the petition to March when a full Board is present.

Jeff Brown motioned to continue the petition to the next meeting.

Payson Whitney seconded the motioned.

VOTE: 5-0 In favor

John Hawes adjourned the meeting at 9:15 PM.