



Town of Brookline Massachusetts

Town Hall, Third Floor
333 Washington Street
Brookline, MA 02445
(617) 730-2130
www.brooklinema.gov

PLANNING BOARD
Steve Heikin, Chair
James Carr
Linda K. Hamlin
Blair Hines
Matthew Oudens
Mark J. Zarrillo

BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES By Zoom Event January 21, 2021 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Linda Hamlin, James Carr, Matthew Oudens, and Mark Zarrillo

Staff Present: Victor Panak

Steve Heikin opened the meeting.

1) PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments on matters not on the agenda.

2) BOARD OF APPEALS CASE (Tentative Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing Date) and relevant Precinct:

148 Kent Street – Construct dormer addition and new porches, make interior renovations, and modify parking area requiring zoning relief for setbacks, height, and parking design. (2/4) Pct. 3

Victor Panak described the proposal and the requested relief and noted that the Planning Department is supportive.

Bob Allen, attorney for the applicant, introduced the design team and reviewed the zoning relief.

Ralph Kilfoyle (architect for the applicant) provided a presentation of the proposed plans.

Linda Hamlin noted that the presented plans were slightly different than the plans submitted to the Board. She felt that the revised plans were better.

Mr. Heikin noted that some of the work had already started. Mr. Allen indicated that the applicant received permits for the work that could be done by-right and was seeking a Special Permit for the additional work.

John Degnan (applicant) confirmed that neighbors were in support.

Planning Board members expressed their support for the project.

James Carr asked about whether it is allowed to extend several pre-existing nonconformities a once. Mr. Allen said yes.

Fred Muehter, 220 Aspinwall Road, wanted to note his original concerns about the project (privacy and emergency access) had both been resolved.

Randy Gioia, an abutter, raised some concerns with access to the rear porch in case of fire but was otherwise supportive of the improvements to the property.

Mr. Heikin assured the abutters that there is sufficient emergency access.

Mr. Heiken moved that:

The Planning Board recommend approval of the site plan by Keenen Survey, dated 1/20/21, and architectural plans by RDK Architects, dated 1/21/21, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning. The counterbalancing amenities must be executed in accordance with the approved plan.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan, floor plans, and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Linda Hamlin seconded the motion. The PB voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

257 South Street – (Continued from 1-4-21) Renovation, garage addition, and driveway expansion requiring zoning relief for floor area ratio. (1/28) Pct. 16

Victor Panak described the proposal and the requested relief and noted that the Planning Department is supportive.

Cameron Merrill (attorney for the applicant) presented the proposal, focusing on the reasons why changes to the building are proposed.

Sara Segal (architect for the applicant) provided the Board with a presentation of the plans.

Mr. Heikin asked about access to the garage and why the garage couldn't face towards the right side of the property and be accessed from the side. Ms. Segal responded that that configuration had been considered but that it didn't work due to the sloping grade.

Mr. Carr asked about a U-shaped driveway to preserve some open space. Ms. Segal responded that that was also looked at and did not work.

The applicants committed to reducing paved areas in the rear yard to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Oudens expressed his support for the project. He suggested altering the exterior stair at the rear of the building to allow for more natural light for the grass.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved that:

The Planning Board recommend approval of the site plan by J Webby Consulting, LLC and architectural plans by SLS Architecture, dated 9-29-2020 subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan, floor plans, and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

331 South Street - Second-story addition requiring zoning relief for floor area ratio and setbacks. (1/28) Pct. 16

Victor Panak described the proposal and the requested relief and noted that the Planning Department is supportive.

Bob Allen (attorney for the applicant) presented the applicant and design team and reviewed the reasons for the requested changes to the building.

Jason Cummings (applicant) briefly spoke about the reason for the need for additional space.

Philip Kramer (architect for the applicant) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Ms. Hamlin noted that dimensions were missing from the plans. Ms. Hamlin asked if there is sufficient space in the master bedroom for a queen-size bed and whether the office is usable. Mr. Kramer confirmed that the size of all of the rooms were satisfactory to the owners.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved that:

The Planning Board recommend approval of the site plan by GW Site Solutions dated July 10, 2020, and architectural plans by Philip Kramer Architect, LLC dated October 21, 2020, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect, and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning. The counterbalancing amenities must be executed in accordance with the approved plan.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Mr. Oudens seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

228 Pleasant St – Construct dormer addition, make interior renovations, and install AC condensers requiring zoning relief for setbacks and floor area ratio. (2/4) Pct. 8

Victor Panak described the proposal and the requested relief and noted that the Planning Department is supportive.

Bob Allen (attorney for the applicant) presented the proposal and introduced the design team.

The applicant provided a brief overview of the permitting process to date for this project, focusing especially on the Preservation Commission’s approval of the proposed dormer.

Matthew Francke (architect for the applicant) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin asked if the applicants are considering making the building fossil fuel free. The applicant said no.

Mr. Zarrillo asked some questions about the railings around the porch relating to code compliance and whether the Preservation Commission requested any specific changes. Mr. Zarrillo suggested that the applicant reconsider the glass railing at the second floor. He also suggested that the applicant look into the risk of ice dams.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved that:

The Planning Board recommend approval of the site plan by Peter Nolan and Associates, dated September 23, 2020, and architectural plans by MGFA Architect, dated 10/16/2020, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect, and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning. The counterbalancing amenities must be executed in accordance to the approved plan.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk’s office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

11 White Place – Construct second-story addition requiring zoning relief for setbacks. (2/4)
Pct. 6

Victor Panak described the proposal and the requested relief and noted that the Planning Department is supportive.

Cheryl Anne Snyder (applicant) presented the proposal. Ms. Snyder reviewed the reasons for the requested expansion of the building.

Lee Silverstone (architect for the applicant) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin commented on the requirement for a Variance. Mr. Heikin felt that the requirement seemed unfair.

Mr. Heikin moved that:

The Planning Board recommend approval of the site plan by Everett M. Brooks Co., dated 11/30/20, and architectural plans by SB Architects, dated 10/06/20, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit final floor plans and elevations, stamped and signed by a registered architect, and a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, to the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning for review and approval.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit a landscape plan that shows proposed counterbalancing amenities subject to approval by the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning. The counterbalancing amenities must be executed in accordance to the approved plan.**
- 3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall electronically submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval a) the site plan, floor plans, and elevations displaying the approval stamp of the Assistant Director for Regulatory Planning; and b) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been obtained from the Town Clerk's office by the applicant or their representative and recorded at the Registry of Deeds.**

Mr. Oudens seconded the motion. The Planning Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

3) OTHER BUSINESS

8:45 PM 83 Longwood Avenue – Discuss 40B application/plans and issue comments to the Select Board for inclusion in Town's response letter to the subsidizing agency.

Victor Panak stated that the Board should discuss the plans and produce comments for inclusion in the Town's response letter to the subsidizing agency. In addition, Mr. Panak suggested that the applicant might provide a presentation.

Mr. Heikin noted that the Town had fallen out of “safe harbor” and no longer has the ability to deny 40B applications.

Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert provided an overview of the process and brief summary of the proposal.

Mr. Heikin reviewed his concerns with the project. He noted that he supports the addition of affordable housing units but also felt the height of the building is excessive. Mr. Heikin was especially opposed with the provision of 1.5 parking spaces per unit, feeling that it amounts to too much parking. Mr. Heikin also raised a variety of concerns with the floor plans.

Mr. Zarrillo stated that he is generally in favor of the project, feeling that housing in that area is a good idea. He also suggested that additional parking in the area could be useful, not only for this building but for those around it. He felt that the site and building’s interaction with the street could be improved. He suggested that the first floor could be pulled back from the street edge about 20 feet.

Ms. Hamlin emphasized the need for more open space, if only provided through balconies. She also felt the building is too tall.

Mr. Carr felt that the building is very poorly designed and that it does not provide enough affordable units.

Mr. Oudens also felt that the proposed building is too big and that the proposal attempts to fill-out the site without regard for its surroundings.

The meeting was adjourned.