



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 September 9, 2021 – 7:30 p.m.

Board Present: Steve Heikin, Linda Hamlin, Mark Zarrillo, Blair Hines, Matthew Oudens
Staff Present: Polly Selkoe, Victor Panak

Steve Heikin opened the meeting.

1) PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Abby Hiller, a candidate for the Planning Board, introduced herself to the Board and had a brief discussion with Board members.

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

50 Thorndike Street (*Continued from 7/29/21*) - Demolish detached garage and construct attached garage requiring zoning relief for setbacks. (9/23) Pct. 9

Victor Panak briefly summarized the project and indicated that the Planning Department is supportive.

Scott Gladstone (attorney) provided a summary of the proposal, introduced other members of the applicant team, and reviewed the required zoning relief.

Leonardo Coelho (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin asked if the planting strip along the left side property could be extended further toward the garage in the rear. Mr. Gladstone explained that the property owner would like to keep a large paved area for kids to play basketball.

Mr. Hines said he is surprised that the project was not cited for setback for driveways.

Mr. Oudens expressed concerns with the height of the attached garage and distance from the neighbor. Ms. Dagatti (architect) indicated that the height of the garage was needed to accommodate a hip roof and match the style of the main house.

Ms. Hamlin suggested lowering the dormer on the proposed garage.

The Board discussed options for reducing the height of the attached garage.

The Board discussed whether permeable pavers should be required and the stormwater management for the site. Ms. Dagatti explained that the applicant is working with a civil engineer.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site plan by Peter Nolan & Associates LLC, dated 8/24/21, and architectural plans by MGD Habitat Design, dated 8/10/21, 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. The architectural plans shall be revised to show lowered dormers on the garage that match the height of dormers on the main structure.**
- 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. The Planning Board strongly supports the proposed use of pavers and further requests that the pavers be permeable provided that the soil be appropriate for such permeable pavers.**
- 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. Hines seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

136 Willard Road – Construct one-story rear addition and second-story addition requiring zoning relief for floor area ratio and design review. (10/7) Pct. 13

Victor Panak briefly summarized the project and indicated that the Planning Department is supportive.

Timothy Burke (architect) provided the Board with a presentation of the proposed plans.

Mr. Heikin suggested a hip roof instead of a flat one.

Jeremiah Foster (contractor) indicated that the project has support from all surrounding neighbors.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Mr. Heikin moved to recommend approval of the site plan by Charette Land Surveying, dated 5/28/21, and architectural plans by Timothy Burke, dated 5/19/21, 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 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.**

Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 5-0 to approve the motion.

107 University Road – Create curb cut and two parking spaces in front yard requiring zoning relief for curb cut width and parking stall setbacks. (10/7) Pct. 12

The case was continued.

101 Monmouth Street (*Continued from 5/13/21*) – Modification of Variance #893 (9/5/1958) requiring 190 parking spaces to only requiring 75 spaces. (TBD) Pct. 1

Polly Selkoe introduced the case, reviewed comments made by the Board at the previous meeting on this case, and briefly discussed new materials submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Hines raised a previously discussed concern with the functionality of the proposed parking layout. Mr. Heikin agreed.

Jeffrey Allen (attorney) stated that with a reduced number of parking spaces, functionality of the parking area is unquestionable. Mr. Allen also discussed the findings of a parking demand study submitted by Howard Stein Hudson. He discussed the availability of

alternative transit options. Mr. Allen argued that reduction of the required parking spaces will allow for more housing on the Boston side of the Town line, a goal shared by most municipalities of Massachusetts.

Mr. Heikin noted that the Planning Board has submitted a zoning warrant article to allow reductions in parking requirements by special permit. Mr. Heikin also summarized some of the concerns raised by neighbors about the need for parking in the neighborhood.

Mr. Zarrillo said that, although the project was not approvable 5 months ago, he now feels that the request should be approved. He stated that he feels there should be 2 conditions: a limit on the height of the proposed residential building and a parking ratio of 0.5, both for the existing building and the new building in Boston. He also said that EV ready spaces should be required.

Mr. Hines supported the comments by Mr. Zarrillo. He added that the height of the building should be limited to what is shown in the Rode schematic (69 feet).

Mr. Allen committed to holding a meeting with the Brookline residents of the neighborhood as well as the Planning Board on the proposed building in Boston.

Public Comments

Louise King (69 Monmouth Street) noted she is one of the residents of the neighborhood who rents a space. She expressed opposition to the approval of the modification until the impacts of the modification on the neighborhood can be thoroughly studied.

Cathleen Cavell (Pct. 1 TMM) expressed opposition. She noted that the owner of 101 Monmouth Street made a deal with the Town. She also stated that the height of the building and parking ratios promised by Mr. Allen are unenforceable.

Sean Lynn-Jones (Pct. 1 TMM) expressed opposition and stated that the modification should not be granted until the implications of the any proposed redevelopment is fully explored.

Marc Zimman (77 Monmouth Street) expressed opposition. Mr. Zimman suggested that the applicant is misrepresenting that the building is being underutilized in an effort to extract further financial gain.

Dolores Boogdania (452 Park Drive) expressed opposition on the grounds that granting the modification is premature.

Paul Warren (71 Carlton Street) asked the Board to not approve the request at this time. He noted that the area is undergoing extensive change and that the granting of this request is premature.

Bob Schram (47 Monmouth Street) asked if the Planning Board had quantified what the requested modification would provide to the property owner. Mr. Schram suggested that

the Planning Board request a legal opinion from Town Counsel about how to enforce any commitments made by Mr. Allen.

Mr. Heikin stated that he believes progress is being made and that a rough concept of what is being proposed is becoming clear. Mr. Heikin echoed concerns from some of the members of the public about the enforceability of any conditions and the form of any conditions of approval. Mr. Heikin also stated he would like to hear directly from Howard Stein Hudson about details of the methodology.

Ms. Hamlin expressed a disappointment in the quality and quantity of plans that have been submitted. Ms. Hamlin also agreed with concerns about losing leverage.

Mr. Oudens said that he is also not ready to approve the project. He said that not enough information has been submitted.

Mr. Hines generally agreed with fellow Board members but said that he thinks the Board should make it clear that, with a complete set of plans and supporting information, the Board would approve this modification for reduced parking.

Mr. Allen argued that the height requirement of 69 feet could easily be enforced by including a condition that the Variance will only be modified if the plans approve by Boston comply with the height limit.

The Board and applicant continued to discuss how enforceable conditions could be drafted and what kind of additional documents should be required.

The Board agreed that Town Counsel's opinion should be solicited, and that staff should draft a set of workable conditions.

The case was continued.

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 7-28-21. Ms. Hamlin seconded the motion. The Board voted 2-0-3 to approve the motion.

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 8-18-21. Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 3-0-2 to approve the motion.

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 8-19-21. Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 4-0-1 to approve the motion.

Mr. Heikin moved to approve the minutes from 9-2-21. Mr. Zarrillo seconded the motion. The Board voted 4-0-1 to approve the motion.

The meeting was adjourned.