



**TOWN OF WATERTOWN**  
**Planning Board**  
Administration Building  
149 Main Street  
WATERTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS 02472

Jeffrey W. Brown, Chairman  
Janet Buck  
Jason Cohen  
Gary Shaw  
Payson Whitney

Telephone (617) 972-6417  
Facsimile (617) 972-6484  
[www.watertown-ma.gov](http://www.watertown-ma.gov)

Planning Board  
Minutes  
July 10, 2019

The Planning Board of the City known as the Town of Watertown held a public hearing on **Wednesday, July 10, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.** in the Richard E. Mastrangelo Memorial Council Chamber, Second Floor, Administration Building, 149 Main Street, Watertown, MA. In attendance, Planning Board Members: Jeff Brown, Chair; Janet Buck, Jason Cohen, Gary Shaw, Payson Whitney. Also in attendance, Steve Magoon, Community Development and Planning Director/Assistant Town Manager; Gideon Schreiber and Andrea Adams, Senior Planners; Louise Civetti, Zoning Office.

Chair Brown opened the meeting at 7:03pm announcing the first order of business is the approval of minutes from June 12, 2019. Member Buck motioned to accept the meeting minutes of June 12, 2019. Member Whitney seconded. Members Buck, Whitney, Brown, Shaw & Cohen voted in the affirmative, 5-0, approved. Member Whitney signed the minutes as approved.

Chair Brown announced two agenda items are requested to be continued: 18-20 Clyde Road and 19 Loomis Avenue.

Chair Brown announced the first case, **48-50 Carroll Street** and asked the petitioner to state their request. Mehdi Aria stated that he bought this house for his family two months ago and wanted to add parking for his parents who are disabled. A family member spoke for Mr. Aria to assist with his language. He explained the purchase of the property and the need for accessible parking for his elderly, disabled parents. He stated that his architect created a drawing that the town (staff) revised. The revised plan will be workable and thanked the town for the revision.

Chair Brown asked for the Staff report: Andrea Adams, Senior Planner explained the plan shown on the monitors is the original request, which is to extend an existing non-conforming parking space/driveway along the side of the house to the rear of the property. She read through the report noting there were not any public comments received; no relevant building permits pulled and the required parking for a two-family home in Watertown is two on-site parking spaces per unit – this property has one space total and it is common in Watertown for properties to have less than required or no parking at all. Another revision of the plan created by Staff was shown on the monitor. This plan reduced the impervious surface from 1,332 s.f. to 680 s.f. to the southerly side and increased the curve nearest the house. She said it is still a lot of impervious surface but provides more of a buffer between the neighbors' property, perhaps allowing the mature trees to remain. She suggests they use porous pavers or permeable pavement to help with stormwater infiltration vs. asphalt. This might eliminate the need of a stormwater permit which is a separate permit from the Department of Public Works (DPW). DPW guidelines state any impervious surface over 500 s.f. requires a stormwater permit. She added that the conditions of the approval would include updated control plans – the plot plan drawn by Mr. Rober. Condition #2, states they require a DPW stormwater permit but the use of porous paves may eliminate the need for that permit. The rest of the conditions are standard.

Member Shaw confirmed the elderly parents are driving a car and suggested the original plan allows them to turn around and drive out of the long driveway instead of the revised plan which appears to have them backing out of the long driveway onto the street.

Mr. Aria's interpreter discussed this with the petitioner and stated that Mr. Aria will work with the architect to come up with a plan that remains within the town's requirements and provides some buffer to the neighbors. He added that what the town suggests (the revised plan) tonight is a workable situation.

Further discussion on stormwater permit requirements ensued, resulting in a better understanding of the amount of pavement being requested (revised is 680 s.f. without the driveway) and noting that all of the driveway would need to be porous pavers in order to avoid the stormwater requirement.

Mr. Magoon stated they suggested the revised plan not for the intention of backing out of the long driveway but more to allow the ease of parking four vehicles, 2 and 2 stacked vs. the previous parking suggestion with a turn-around which would not have worked.

Member Whitney asked who would review the plan if they reduced the amount of impervious surface. Mr. Magoon stated that there is a DPW permit required for the paving along with a Zoning review.

No one spoke from the audience.

Member Buck motioned to suggest to the ZBA a conditional approval of the requested Special Permit Finding, under section 4.06(a) as it meets the criteria set out in the ordinance. Member Cohen seconded. Voted 5-0, approved.

---

Chair Brown announced the next case: **36-38 Hillcrest Circle**

Kaveh Abdi, co-owner with his brother of 36-38 Hillcrest Circle, stated he wanted to have a continuation of this petition but withdrew it to provide a more sufficient survey. He purchased the house in 1996 and they have been parking straight in front of the house from the street. All of the houses on this dead-end street did the same. In 2016, the town put curbing and sidewalks on the street and prevented all of the houses to be able to park. He met with Mr. Mena, Zoning Enforcement Officer, at that time to explain that the side of his house is very steep and is not a usable driveway. He said Mr. Mena suggested applying to park in front of the house at a later time. They applied for parking and were approved to have parking on the right side of the house without opening the curb and using the neighbor's driveway to gain access. They found it not to be usable without the neighbor's approval. They then filed for relief to park in front of the house. He stated that the plot plan is to show how much area is around the house but the proposed parking is not necessarily the way they want to use it. He said there would be one parking space on the right; two in the middle and one on the left side, which is similar to what his neighbor has to his left – they have front yard parking. They cannot park in their driveway, which is next to his as their driveway is also too steep. Since 2016, they have not been able to park. He has spent a lot of money for an engineer to show if they can use this for a driveway and the report from the engineer shows it is not possible to do that. They do not have a place to park.

Chair Brown asked for the Staff report: Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner explained that this project did come before the Planning Board and the Zoning Board before and it was withdrawn then. He has reapplied with survey plans vs. sketches. This is a Variance request, not a Special Permit Finding. He said the parking requirement is 8x17' and this request is for both the size of the parking spaces; being in the front yard; and three spaces there. Staff suggested a denial based on the four criteria (for a Variance). He added that the statement from the petitioner did not say why the driveway on the left side of the house could not be fixed (the report showed structural issues with the foundation and the side of the yard). Staff found that criteria #1 was not met as the Variance was not sought due to topography; #2 was not met as staff did not agree that the cost (to repair) was a financial hardship; #3 would not be met as it requires a curb cut along the entire frontage of the property, eliminating the sidewalk separation. The front yard parking of cars would also have the cars hang out over the sidewalk. #4, staff felt the intent of the ordinance is to not have front yard parking and this request is not supporting the goal of the ordinance. Staff did suggest a single space on the right side and then further use the side of the house for

stacked parking of two cars. However, the petitioner did not submit alternative parking and only discussed limiting the 3 cars in the front to 2 cars. Staff recommends denial of the variance request.

Member Cohen asked the petitioner what is it about the driveway that is not usable to him when the staff report states the driveway is usable. Mr. Abdi said it is not his opinion - it is the opinion of the engineer. If he could park there, he would. His neighbor put a heated driveway in and he still cannot park there. This request is for the winter time as they park on the street otherwise. He further explained that during the winter, the slightest snow makes the driveway like a ski-shoot. It is extremely steep and this is steeper than the allowed slope for a residential driveway (in Arlington). He said again that even his neighbor with a heated driveway cannot make it up the driveway. The driveways are obsolete. The driveway is also narrow as there is a fence there now. The engineer said it will cause issues with the foundation and costs over \$30,000. There is not much space to open doors and it is steep (narrow and steep). Member Cohen reiterated that he is asking for 3 parking spaces that are 7' x 14' which is 4' short of the ordinance. Mr. Kaveh said this is where the parking was. Member Cohen said there is a moratorium on the curb cut; however, Mr. Schreiber stated that if the board granted the Variance, the curb opening would then be a discussion with DPW. DPW would not allow you to drive over the curb even if the board approved this request.

Member Buck said she remembers this case and does not find any more convincing evidence that this is required. She said the engineer reports say it is costly not impossible (to park along the side). Having three cars (in the front yard) with doors opening into each other jutting out over the sidewalk is a costly thing to the neighbors. It is unattractive. Putting money into improving the property should be something the petitioner would want to do to provide parking for future generations. There isn't any new information. She reiterated that the parking along the side is not impossible. She spoke about two unrelated people trying to get out of their car in the front of the house and it becomes a problem. Mr. Kaveh said all of his neighbors park in the front and he is the only one violating. Member Buck said she is not convinced that he cannot do better.

Member Whitney said he agrees with Member Buck. The criteria for a Variance have not been met. He added that as an engineer, he reads the report as stating the foundation work has to be done anyway for the structural integrity of the house. He said he walked down the driveway and found that it was not as steep as the driveway where he grew up.

Member Buck motioned to recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny this request for a Variance, section 6.02(j), as it does not meet any criteria for a Variance. Member Shaw seconded. Voted 5-0, Denied.

---

Chair Brown announced the next case: **101 North Beacon Street**

William York, Attorney on behalf of 101 North Beacon Street LLC introduced the owners, Martin Cafasso and Vincent MacNutt; Embarc (Architects) Dartagnian Brown and Cindy Lee; Vanesse Associates, Traffic Engineer, Giles Hamm; Verdant Landscape, Blair Hines and McKenzie Engineering, Brad McKenzie. Attorney York reiterated the process they have been through – a number of meetings with Staff and DPW regarding traffic, storm water; outreached to several departments, Zoning, Fire, Solar (new), design review with David Gamble; community meeting on April 30<sup>th</sup> (he thanked Councilor Feltner); Developers Conference, the site plan review committee and a follow up neighborhood meeting on June 26<sup>th</sup>. The relief requested is Special Permit, Site Plan Review. He thanked Staff for the detailed reports, David Gamble for the design review and DPW for the storm water.

Dartagnian Brown reviewed the site, describing the block and its' location, providing existing views from all directions; explained the current vs. proposed building for the 28 units and going from a 3% pervious to a 77% pervious site. He further described the proposed site in detail with dimensions, noting the building mass is moved 56' away from the residential area, closer to the commercial side of North Beacon Street. The five units on the ground floor have direct access from individual patios to their unit. The building is dark-sky compliant with new lighting contained within the site without spillage onto neighboring properties. 8 units are one bedroom, 685-700 s.f. range and 22-two bedrooms units around 1,000-1050 s.f. range. 24 units have direct access to private patios, balconies or decks. The roof plan will have an outdoor

community space; the center of the building houses the a/c condenser units and a solar array farm. They worked closely with staff and David Gamble on the design. He provided renditions of the building from all directions, showing the 26' setback from the corner of Irving and North Beacon Streets with a patio and lobby and the different levels of height, facade, color and material – each of the units at the ground level have separate entry patios. The Ladd Street side has one private entrance patio and they worked with the abutter in the rear to avoid the headlights onto that property with a 6' wooded slat fence that matches the wood trellis at the top of the Ladd Street side of the building. From Irving Street to North Beacon, you can see the outdoor patio space and the outdoor living space on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor. The exterior is natural flash recycling material with 3 tones and the natural break in the building that comes from a lighter material to darker. The doorways are natural wood but enclosed in vinyl and a natural product. He then showed the elevations from each direction; the shadow studies from several different times of the day and seasons. They included the affordable housing and they are meeting on that next week.

Giles Hamm, Vanesse, discussed the traffic counts on Irving and Ladd Streets showing Ladd being much less than Irving and North Beacon having the most at peak hours. The prior rental use generated slightly more peak hour generated traffic than the proposed use. Site access is in from Irving and out from Ladd – small impact to neighborhood streets. They closed the north Beacon Street curb cut. There will be 34 bicycle racks on site; they are upgrading the sidewalks along perimeter; a pocket park along Irving Street and a Bike Fix-it station. There is cueing now and there will be upgraded signal improvements.

Blair Heines, Verdant Landscape Architect, said they design the landscaping to create a positive image along North Beacon, Irving and Ladd Streets; to support the residential living; to utilize sustainable best practices; and to buffer the impact of development on the neighbors. He said there would be street trees planted along North Beacon Street, 8 street trees on Irving St., and an expanded area on Ladd Street for street trees to root. At the main entrance, they have a garden space with seating; the types of planting will be drought tolerant and habitat value – pollinating and birds; the storm water structure at the rear will be a garden setting with plants, shrubs and trees. The development will be buffered along street edges with street trees and landscaping between the sidewalk and building; the rear will have a large area of plantings, saving the two existing trees; evergreen trees to be planted so there isn't a direct view into the neighbors. North Beacon Street will have a sidewalk with a planting strip and the patios and garden area for all the first floor units will provide a pedestrian walk that appears to be residential.

Brad McKenzie, Civil Engineer, said his firm prepared all of the civil plans for the project – existing and proposed. The site is currently 97% impervious; 50% of the frontage is curb cut and most of those will be closed. The topography is flat (22-24). The site pitches towards two catch basins in the parking lot to the town drainage system. The ground is sand and gravel and is favorable for storm water runoff. The Zoning table is met; the parking calcs are summarized – providing 39 parking spaces plus a shadow space; the site circulation is one way in/out; aisle is 24' wide; the curb cut on North Beacon is closed; the complete reconstruction of sidewalks and curbing will be consistent with what is in use now; the radii has been changed at both intersections (but now on hold with DPW); easement for the town for future mast-arm signaling; accessible ramps at both intersections; the proposed grading and drainage; the reduction of impervious to 77%; they've created a subsurface storm water system to accept the roof runoff and a portion of the parking lot, complying with DEP requirements; reducing peak flow on all 3 streets; the utility plans, as discussed with DPW are consistent with their requirements – they are responding to DPW utility and storm water questions.

Andrea Adams, Senior Planner reviewed the Staff Report; noting the description: site characteristics, surrounding land use, nature of the request and relevant permitting history. The zoning is limited business and residential to the back and sides; the relief is required as it is multi-family plus 4. There was once a house on the lot in 1911. The AA Rental was in use since 1996. The prior special permit can be expunged. She has distributed comments received from the public and another today from an abutter, Desmaris and a letter from Mr. Holt. Concerns are trees, snow storage, pedestrian access, shadow impact, curb cut and other details. The plan is consistent with the Strategic Framework for underutilized sites; consistent with the Comprehensive Plan by providing a transitional housing type; the Future Land Use Map indicates the area would be mixed use commercial. The Design Review had two reports by Gamble Design, the site does not appear to be good for retail; the project presents a stronger public interface and reflects ambitions in the guidelines. The material selection should be local, natural materials. The four Special Permit criteria are met and she provided the details of each criteria. She also reviewed the 10 criteria for the Site Plan Review. The Solar Energy system requirements are new and

met. Conditions are added for most criteria points. Housing Partnership meets next week. Staff recommends conditional approval as it meets the criteria of approval with a long list of conditions.

Member Whitney noted how good the process is as far as making improvements before it gets to this point with community meetings, developer conference, etc. He said the massing and fit ties into the residential neighborhood and asked about the zoning amendment for the site across the street. Mr. Schreiber said that site is in the Industrial zone and can be up to 5 stories with a build-to line of 10'. Member Whitney said he is pleased that the units will be owned and not rented. He asked what prevents the site from being a cut-thru site and suggested speed bumps or something similar. He asked if there will be designated visitor spaces, how many, and if the 2' wide planting strip will be wide enough. Mr. Schreiber said there is the potential to change this, if necessary. Member Whitney asked if the bio-retention is deep enough at 6" as DPW expressed concerns. He suggested 8' is better than 6' for the fence at the rear of the property and for the petitioner to have a discussion with the rear abutting neighbors. The letter received today is concerned with noise with the HVAC units being in the center and the solar panels are around it; if they were to be moved closer to North Beacon Street, it would open up a larger southern exposure for the solar. Mr. Brown noted they are seeking an acoustic enclosure around each of the condensers. From a site line perspective, they typically put it in the center for the hallways, etc. Member Shaw added that they are speaking of an acoustical screen and favored towards North Beacon side, creating a parapet that screened the units and deadened the sound.

Member Buck is impressed with the scale, landscaping, etc. The only clarification she seeks is there are handicapped parking indicated but not handicapped units. Mr. Brown said they do not have the 5% and the units can be converted, if necessary. Member Buck said that adaptability could change a two bedroom into a one bedroom and a one bedroom into a studio. Mr. Brown explained that if this were a rental project, they would be required to have the 5% but they are going to be condominiums and they can be adapted.

Chair Brown asked if the corner in the back, lower floor has windows. Mr. Brown said it is actually below the building, where the trash is but they could design some high windows to let light in. Member Shaw asked if that entire area could be a storefront. Mr. Brown said they might be able to pick up 40-50% of the façade for windows.

Member Shaw asked what the vision of the project is and what is the project giving back. Are they paving streets or upsizing services, etc? Attorney York said normally they would work in the milling and overlay of the streets and they will continue to work with DPW on that. This is a smaller project and not one of the larger projects this board is the SPGA on – they are willing to continue to talk to DPW to explore those options but they do bring upgrades of storm water and landscaping; a presence in the neighborhood; the curb cuts and removing the North Beacon Street access as per design guidelines. Member Shaw asked what the benefits are outside of the project. Attorney York said they are upgrading the neighborhood and the milling and overlay in the area is to be discussed. Member Shaw asked what is in it for the town. Attorney York stated there would be speed bumps to lessen the traffic. He said they have received a favorable approval from the town and they are bringing homeownership – people that are vested in the neighborhood and upgrades to the site. Member Buck said the two manholes that the storm water are draining into go directly into the river and the storm water controls that they are putting in will vastly improve this. Attorney York said the subsurface is extreme; the solar on the roof is massive for a small project.

Member Cohen said it is an attractive project and the scale is appropriate; the shadow studies show little impact to the neighbors; he asked if there is total storefront at the kink in the front elevation and if that will be a privacy issue for that unit. Mr. Brown explained that is public area.

Jonathan Bockian, Irving Street, said he looks forward to welcoming people to this neighborhood. The intersection at Irving is a disaster. It takes more than one light cycle to get through unless you block the box. He is pleased with the ingress to this project from Irving and not egress. He believes this project is over-parked. He added that the Transportation Planner for the town did a survey where the Marriott and Lynx are shown to have surplus parking. He suggests that since the ordinance requires 38 spaces – that the board requires 4 shadow spaces and unbundling the parking spaces. He suggests pavement spikes for the one-way entrance from Irving Street to help the signage and no exiting onto Irving Street.

Jim Muse, 8 Ladd Street said the developers did a great job but the kink in the building at the parking section, said the Irving Street side has more green space. He said the cars face right into his house and back yard. The people on Ladd Street put their snow there (AA let them put the snow against the fence).

Jon Labordini, Main Street, said the developers have been responsive to the requests of the neighborhood and the project is more aesthetically pleasing than what is there. He and his wife are happy to see condominiums rather than rentals – people putting stakes into Watertown. He wishes everyone good luck.

Chair Brown asked about the timing. Mr. Brown said approximately 18 months.

Nancy Kay Demick, 9 Irving Park, said she sees the back of the AAA building. She said the neighbors were very concerned at the Community Meetings. She said the project feels invasive with noise and traffic. There is no benefit to those in the neighborhood. The mass is not appropriate – it is too large. The roof deck is a wonderful idea but not at 10pm when they are in bed. The developers have made changes based on their concerns but it does not feel great. Take into consideration how the residents feel about it.

Member Shaw said one thing that has not been discussed is the construction phase, which will be the most disruptive with noise and parking of the workers. He suggests that they show a thoughtful approach to getting this built and work with the Planning Department to make the pain and suffering of the neighbors minimal.

Member Cohen asked about the unbundled parking. Mr. Schreiber said the ordinance states that rentals be unbundled; the condo models, which there are not a lot of in Watertown, have discussed assigning one parking space to each condo and unbundling the rest – he doesn't suggest putting it in as a mandate in the event that it does not work. There is less parking now than before.

Patricia Geller, 19 Irving Park said it is offensive to her here them talk about how this is great for the neighborhood when they do not live in the neighborhood. This is not giving back; it will increase noise and traffic. There is no guest parking. The neighborhood will be filled with autos. The signal changes will not change the traffic. Every project in Watertown is a done deal. She is glad they will be condos and they are cramming them in and there are too many and too many parking. They do not need additional cars parked up and down the street – there are children and Perkins walks their students around the neighborhood. This is going to be a disaster. Sound travels in the neighborhood due to the topography and the roof top noise will be heard. They are getting back traffic.

Chen Woo – 5 Ladd Street said it is a great project but there are two issues – more traffic, which is underestimated. Safety is the other issue. He has a four-year-old child that plays outside. What about the traffic that makes a 'U' turn. He thinks it may be too late but he suggests moving the parking to the North Beacon Street side. He gave an example of another project in Watertown with front parking. He then suggested the middle of the building for the traffic/parking. He wants to keep the neighborhood quiet, too.

Member Buck acknowledged there were no further comments and moved that the Planning Board recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals the approval of this request for Special Permit under section 5.01f, 5.05f, etc. a 3 story, 28 unit residential structure. Member Whitney seconded. Members Buck, Whitney, Brown, Shaw and Cohen voted in the affirmative, 5-0.

---

The board took a 10-minute break.

---

Mark Deshane, Boylston Properties, announced they are going to discuss Building G, the last building in the Arsenal Yards project. He provided a quick history – Building E has been completed and is ready for tenants to move in; Building A is expected to turn over by the end of the year. The garage and Building B2 has been completed; the hotel is started; Building F is having the foundation dug; Buildings C & D will

start in August – all going according to schedule. Building G is on the southeast corner of the site. He stated that the use as a lab was introduced in 2011 as part of the strategic framework and then again in 2015 as the comprehensive plan. He states that Building G is being converted to life sciences due to Watertown being a unique town – a hub for life sciences within the Boston area and attracting many life science companies. The success of this is having the facilities available and the access to Boston. The Building was planned to be a residential building with a 130' height limit; they considered another larger in height building that was not received well; and are not presenting the 130' tall tower building which grew wider for a lab use. The original approval was for 184,000 s.f. and this will be 156,000 s.f. with 9 stories and one level underground parking. This use is a great focus for this project and the traffic and parking are reduced with this use. They had challenges attempting to convert Building A to life science and this building will be built for life science. It has better access to loading and better bio-safety levels. He again mentioned the less required parking and traffic with life science uses and showed a table, which compared numbers to office use. He also showed a table with residential use numbers for parking and traffic with a higher demand during the 9-5 hours and then less at all other times.

Adam Gross mentioned two interesting community meetings that have occurred and stated that if the members read the report, this project is being looked at as urban design with a walkable 24/7 community. The building design was responding to the four different views (long and short). The 130' height limit and lab use has been the reason for the stacked floor height to accommodate a 17'6" ground floor. The tenants have about 14' for each floor. The garage in Building F will provide a layer of parking for Building G. An aerial view shows the lower roof of the residential courtyard and the roof plan of building G has a sculptural form on two sides.

Chris Jones, landscape architect, said the final design aspects are coming together for Arsenal Yards, Building G and the Arsenal Park and it has been a pleasure working with the consultants for the town. He showed the access point from Greenough Boulevard to the dog park and the parking area at Home Depot. The original design had a 12% slope and it is now lessened to provide bike riders and walking. He detailed the exits and circulation routes to the river green and arsenal yards. There is a 6' wall within the parking lot at Home Depot due to the grade change.

Mr. Deshane said some of the space on the first floor has been requested for community use. The design functions as common space for tenants and the community with the tenants being encourage to provide an educational opportunity for S.T.E.M. to the Watertown Public Schools. The space can accommodate about 150 people and can be used by the community for fundraising, etc.

Mr. Gross explained the parking level that ties into building F, under construction that provides 55 parking spaces. The service zone has a loading dock under the service area; bike parking; showers; lockers, etc. The ground floor could have flexible furniture and storage of the 150 seats. It can be a conference area during the day and a stage at night. Sliding doors would make it semi-private. The second and third floors about the garage and floors 4-8 have open, flexible lab layouts. The balconies alternate from west to east, depending on the side you're on. The material of the exterior is reflective and clear glass. They are introducing solar shading and corrugated metal at the penthouse with mesh material on the roof. The eastern facing façade is simplified and is seen from the Mass Pike and the Home Depot. The area that shows the bending of the glass has two-story balconies that alternate. Every floor except the second floor has a balcony. They showed the different elevations with the different glass types (clear, reflective and punched). The penthouse is a refined metal panel that steps back.

Gideon Schreiber, Senior Planner provided the Staff Report with a supplemental report for conditions. This is Phase V (5) of the master plan for approval and this is to change the building from residential to lab and office use. Comments at the Community Meetings were about landscaping, primarily due to the ramps and access from little Greenough; traffic patterns; site development; public access; building design and use; lab use; and the site in general. There were no written comments submitted. The Master Plan for Building G was for 142 residential units; amended for 119 residential units; and now office, R&D and Lab, etc. The 10 criteria were reviewed for the Site Plan Review and the Developer's Conference had all departments weigh in. The changes to this area have been substantial in a positive way. The dog park and the ramping system; crossing of little Greenough boulevard for a multi-use park across the way. They have substantially improved the landscaping and space perspective. They have committed to work with the town for Phase one of the park and \$500,000. There is a slight modification to that condition. Mr. Schreiber went through the 10 criteria for the Site Plan Review, stating the criteria have been

conditionally met by Staff. There was a condition regarding the bird-strike. The areas that have changed did go to the Conservation Commission and they suggested the Ring Road to Arlington Street be looked at for modification later. The loading zones are also pedestrian zones. Storm water and surface water draining have been reviewed and approved – the final stages still need final approval. The utilities are satisfactory. The loading area door in the alley meets the ordinance at 14' height and screened. More transformers were added to the alley area but create a clear path for the fire department. Environmental sustainability – they are on their way to LEED Silver Certifiable. Screening has been submitted. The change in use has been reviewed by the Fire department and no concerns. Building permits for tenants would be reviewed in detail for fit-out. Staff recommended this be conditionally approved with the suggested changes and updated plans submitted. Condition #7 had additional language added.

Member Buck said she reviewed these plans without building F and now her questions are being answered. She asked about the pedestrian experience – she asked if people using the park would park there. Mr. Deshane said there are several access points – one being from the use from the Home Depot parking lot; the service corridor – it leads to better circulation. The 6' grade change limits the use. Ms. Buck added that if pedestrians will use this to access the park, what are we doing to make it safe – if it is only a loading dock then there is no further issue. A Boylston Properties person stated that the grade change happened and the people accessing the park will most likely use the Home Depot parking lot as it is at grade. They will not do anything to discourage use as the Fire Department needs to be there and it will be lit for safety purposes. It will be safe and attractive. They will not be encouraging people to go that way. Mr. Jones said the loading next to the cinema is the same as the loading here so you do not feel like you're in an unsafe area. The exhaust fumes will not be dumping there. Member Shaw said the loading dock is insufficient to contain a vehicle with doors shut so he assumes they will have a protocol to require the engines be shut off. Mr. Gross stated the door will be open; the trucks will drive in; shut off their engines, ideally; unload and drive off and the door will close.

Member Whitney asked about anchor tenant signage on the building. A Boylston Properties member stated that the tenants may request signage and they will have to review it at that time. They commented that one side vs. another might cheapen the look of the building. Member Whitney asked about the mechanical penthouse, which adds 30' to the roofline of the building. He said it reminds him of a power plant and asked if it does need to be that large. Mr. Deshane said the first level is 18' for the hvac systems and then the exhaust system is on top of that. Mr. Gross said they will get that as compact as possible. Mr. Whitney said the rooftop features need not be more than 15' and do they want to add that as a request for Special Permit Finding, in accordance with section 4.10. Mr. Brown said the 130' is the limit and then the 30' penthouse is on top of that. Mr. Gross said the other renditions had a penthouse. The Boylston Properties person said it could be 30', it could be 24'. Mr. Deshane said it could be 24'.

Member Shaw asked about specialty exhaust. Mr. Deshane said there will be shaft space. Member Shaw asked if there will be unintended consequences along the river road with the semi-reflective glass (motorist eyes, etc.). Mr. Gross said it will darken at certain times and they are conscious of that.

Member Cohen is interested in the passageway between F & G and people will most likely not use it given the choice. He is expecting the community use will have more heated discussion. The TMA wording has made it difficult to enforce or start and he wonders if they will commit to 'kick-starting' a shuttle or at least be part of the solution. It appears that everyone is waiting for everyone else to do it first. The Boylston Properties member said that they have had a shuttle at Lynx for a year and it has been working well with one stop in Harvard Square (with 300 employees). Athena has four or five different locations for their shuttle and they have been spending \$1.5M on their shuttle. The new owners of Athena said they are no longer going to do that and others will have to share that cost. He said they are committed in other projects to do things – the town found out that it is more expensive to do what they thought they could do when they crafted this 4-5 years ago and the money is a lot of money. A shuttle system for 7 developments within this area and the public starts using it and it becomes the junior MBTA and that is not very successful and no one will give you money. It needs to be faster and more efficient for their users. He further spoke of Athena and said they will not be spending that money to continue that shuttle. The town should spend money only if the public can use it. If there are a lot of stops then it is good for the public and not good for their clients. Mr. Magoon said they are getting into the details and he would take exception to some of the things mentioned, as there is not a complete understanding of what has been going on. They are ahead of where they were and the Athena shuttle started to serve other

projects. The public access doesn't mean there are more stops – it could mean the public has access to where the shuttle stops and they help to foot the bill. He respectfully disagrees that it isn't going to happen and hasn't happened due to the wording of the conditions. The shared shuttle service is happening now and will grow gradually. If the users are paying for it, most employees have a badge or a pass could be sold to the public. Boylston Properties member said they are spending a lot of money and although they no longer own Lynx, they are planning to spend the same to run the same program here. Their hope is the same people coming off of the Red Line to work here and the bus going back would have residents. There are options. The market says they need to do it. Member Cohen said everyone is taking care of their employees but Athena and they could work together. More to be worked out.

Michelle Cochoner, 37 Paul Street asked for example of numbers they are using. Mr. Deshane said the actual data from Lynx is from the actual usage and less than they projected as an office building. The lab and office will be a dual use. They did analysis of other buildings at the time they were determining for Lynx of Alewife, etc.

Member Buck moved that the Planning Board recommends the request for Arsenal Yards, Master Plan, Phase V, to modify the master plan and allow the conversion of Building G from master plan residential to R&D, Lab, Life Science, and Office be granted with the conditions based on the findings that this Phase is in accordance with the Watertown Zoning Ordinance 5.1-8 and propose they add to the conditions, section 4-10, there is an exception to height regulations (such features exceeding the height limitations in the district by 15') shall be allowed only by Special Permit. Mr. Schreiber clarified they are motioning to approve and with the additional height for that under section 4.10. Member Shaw seconded. Voted 5-0.

Chair Brown closed the meeting at 10:37 p.m.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 10:37 PM

MINUTES APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

For more detailed Minutes see the DVD dated 7/10/2019 which is available in the DCDP office.