Below is the meeting agenda and zoom info for the meeting on April 7, 2020.

Join Zoom Meeting
https://zoom.us/j/734533928?pwd=UURHQjhql2NWenJVZnpuc0g3WUpjQT09
Meeting ID: 734 533 928
Password: 253194

One tap mobile
+13126266799,,734533928# US (Chicago)
+16465588656,,734533928# US (New York)

Dial by your location
+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)
+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)
+1 253 215 8782 US
+1 301 715 8592 US
+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)
+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)
Meeting ID: 734 533 928

Find your local number: https://zoom.us/u/agT8esU52
TOWN OF WINCHESTER  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING FOR LOCKE STREET SUB DIVISION  
TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 2020 @ 7:30PM  
REMOTE PARTICIPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30PM</td>
<td>Open Meeting and Updates (recording Secretary and minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35PM</td>
<td>Public Hearing Locke Street Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30PM</td>
<td>Dennis Carlone 10 Converse Place, and 654 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45PM</td>
<td>Town Meeting articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15PM</td>
<td>Abby Road closeout with Town Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45PM</td>
<td>New Business not known at time of posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00PM</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CORRESPONDENCE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday April 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 7, 2020 Planning Board Meeting

DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION

Petitioner seeks a Definitive Subdivision to create 1 new lot (Lot B) on the border of Arlington and Winchester near the corner of 36 Dunster Lane (a public way) and Locke Street (a private way). Currently, there is a single family home under construction on the lot to be subdivided (Lot A). Petitioners have met with the Engineering and Planning Depts and after having conferred with Legal counsel, a Definitive Subdivision Application was seen as the most appropriate instrument to make the necessary improvements to Locket Street to accommodate a new house lot, rather than a less formal “Road Improvement Plan.”

The property is located in the RG-6.5 zoning district and the proposed building lot (Lot A) would have 9,647 SF and 88.65’ of frontage on Locke St, while the remainder of the subdivided lot (Lot B) will have 8,186 SF and 96’ of frontage on Dunster Lane. Access to each lot will be over their respective frontages. A 350’ section of Locke Street is planned for improvements in order to build a new house on Lot A.

WAIVERS REQUESTED

1. NAVD88 plan survey to be used
   a. Defer to Engineering Dept
2. Stormwater Management Report
   a. These calculations should be provided prior to any decision by the Board.
3. Street Design Standards Maximum 8% grade
   a. Engineering and Planning have walked the site with DPW and we all feel that the proposed grade matches the existing grade and would be impossible to meet the design standard of 8%. I would recommend granting this waiver.
4. Sidewalks
   a. No sidewalks are located on Dunster or Locke Street. Upgrading the road to include sidewalks for this section only for 1 house does not make sense. I would recommend granting this waiver.
PLANS

1. Refer to the Engineer’s memo from March 31, 2020 related to technical requirements for the upgrade to the road and services in the street.

2. Landscaping Plan: I am OK with the removal of the dead tree and I would recommend against the use of Arborvitaes. No other issues

Other Notes

It is paramount that coordination between Arlington and Winchester Engineering/DPW take place to ensure a successful project. I suggest a draft decision get sent to Arlington before final approval of the subdivision.

Is there an HOA that already exists on Locke Street? Is there another type of mechanism that is being used to handle any of the drainage on the street?

I recommend waiting for the Design Review Committee’s comments before making a final decision on this matter.

Brian Szekely
Town Planner
TO: Winchester Planning Board

FROM: Beth Rudolph, PE, Town Engineer

DATE: April 2, 2020

RE: Abby Road Subdivision – Update of Outstanding Work + Cost Estimate

The Abby Road subdivision was approved by the Planning Board on January 8, 2019. Over the past year, the applicant, Five Points Development, has moved forward with construction of the subdivision roadway. On January 14, 2020, Mr. Craig Miller of Five Points Development, submitted an email to myself and Town Planner Brian Szekely requesting release of the lots associated with the subdivision. The Engineering Department issued a memo on February 6, 2020 outlining the remaining work items. This memo is intended to provide an update to that list, based on work completed over the past year, as well as a recommended amount for the proposed tripartite security. Please note that this information reflects conditions on the site only to the best of our knowledge at this time, and it is possible that issues may be identified, or may arise during the course of construction of the five proposed homes.

Compliance with Development Agreement Requirements:

(1) Loop Water Main – Section I.B.3 requires the applicant to convey Parcel 6 to the Town, subject to an easement across Parcel 6 to North Border Road, and together with an easement across Parcel 5, for a looped water system for the Project. The Engineering Department can confirm that the looped water main has been installed, and has passed the required pressure test.

April 2, 2020 Update – This item is complete.

(2) Utilities to Parcel 6 – Section I.B.4 of the Development Agreement requires Five Points to “extend the installation of sewer, gas, and electric utilities on Lot 5 to the boundary of Parcel 6, at its expense, in a manner reasonably satisfactory to the Town”. The Engineering Department can confirm that the sewer line has been extended to this boundary. The applicant has chosen not to install gas in the street, so that utility is not available, and the decision was made that it would be easier to run electric service from North Border Road into Parcel 6 than to come through Lot 5.

April 2, 2020 Update – This item is complete.

(3) Demolition of 22 Highland Avenue – Section II.E requires Five Points to reimburse the Town for the demolition and disposal of the house at what was formally 22 Highland Avenue. The Engineering Department can confirm that the Town has been reimbursed for this work.
April 2, 2020 Update – This item is complete.

(4) Reimbursement for Saw Mill Brook Drainage Work – Section III.C requires the applicant to reimburse the Town for 50% of the cost of the drainage work on Saw Mill Brook near the site. The Engineering Department can confirm that the drainage work has been completed by the Town, but the Town has not been reimbursed yet due to the timing of reimbursement payments outlined in the Agreement.

April 2, 2020 Update – The Town submitted the invoices to Mr. Miller for reimbursement on March 30, 2020. The timing of the reimbursement payments are still being determined. The Engineering Department defers to legal counsel on this matter.

Subdivision Construction:

(5) Interim As-built Plans – Prior to the release of the lots, the applicant should be required to provide an updated interim as-built plan for the project in accordance with the requirements of Section 7.21 of the Subdivision Regulations. The plans must be stamped by a Professional Land Surveyor and Professional Engineer, and include the certifications outlined in Section 7.21.2 of the Subdivision Regulations. Previous interim as-built plans were received on September 30 and November 11, 2019 (Attachment 1), but were not stamped nor did they include this certification.

April 2, 2020 Update – Mr. Miller provided an acceptable interim as-built plan on March 6, 2020. The interim as-built plan showed that the drain line connecting CB#1 to Underground Storage System (USS) #2 has a bend in it. The Engineering Department notified Mr. Miller that this was not acceptable. Mr. Miller subsequently, without notification to the Engineering Department, installed a manhole structure at the bend. However, the new manhole is located in close proximity to the sewer service for the Town-owned Parcel 6 (off of North Border Road). At our site visit on April 1, 2020, the Engineering Department notified Mr. Miller that the sewer line would need to be TV camera’d to determine if there was any damage to the pipe, and any damage would need to be repaired. The Engineering Department recommends carrying funds in the tripartite agreement to cover the TV inspection and any potential repairs.

(6) Utility Easements – Over the past year, the applicant has made several changes to the design of the underground infiltration systems associated with the project. These changes were previously approved by the Engineering Department. Comparing the as-built plans provided on September 30, 2019 to Sheet S-1 of the approved subdivision plans, it appears that the infiltration systems have not all been installed fully within the easement areas laid out in the approved plans. The applicant should provide the Engineering Department with a plan overlaying the as-built location of the infiltration systems and other utilities on Lots 1 – 5 with the utility easements shown on Sheet S-1 (Attachment 2) of the approved subdivision plans. If the infiltration systems as constructed do not fit within the boundaries of the utility easements shown on the approved subdivision plans, the applicant will need to file new plans at the registry updating the easement boundaries. The Engineering Department recommends that this be completed before any impacted lots are released so that the deeds for sale of the lots reflect the correct utility easement locations.
April 2, 2020 Update – Mr. Miller recorded a new easement plan at the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds on March 6, 2020. No further action is required.

(7) Catchbasins – The approved subdivision plans called for the installation of four double-grate catchbasins in the right-of-way. The catchbasin details were shown on Sheet D-1 of the approved subdivision plans (see Attachment 3). These details show that the catchbasin grate was to have square openings and be installed directly against the curbing to prevent runoff from flowing around the basin. The detail also notes that the catchbasins graters shall be three-flanged. There are several issues with the catchbasins, as installed:

a. Three of the catchbasins have been installed 3 to 7-inches from the curb line (see photos in Attachment 3). The fourth is in a driveway opening, so there is no curbing here. As a result, stormwater runoff can flow behind the basins and down the curbline, completely circumventing the drainage system. The catchbasins need to be reset to the curbline in accordance with the details in the approved subdivision plans. Additionally, instead of using straight curbing behind the basins, the applicant installed curb-inlet type, even though the basins are not designed to act as curb inlets. Leaves and other debris will collect in the indent in the curbing.

b. At least two of the catchbasins are four-flanged, not three-flanged as called out in the approved subdivision plans. These basins shall be replaced in accordance with the approved plans.

April 2, 2020 Update – Mr. Miller and the Engineering Department have met several times to discuss options for addressing the catchbasin issues, and the Engineering Department has consulted with VHB regarding the issues at CB#5. Below is a summary of the current status:

- CB#2 and CB#3 – At a site visit on April 1, 2020, the Engineering Department observed that the grates from these two catchbasins had been moved back towards the curbline, and the location is now acceptable. For CB#3, however, the rim elevation is higher than the surrounding binder pavement elevation, and it appears to be higher than what the finished grade would be if paved with the standard 1.5” top coat. The applicant will need to work with his paving contractor to insure that there is a positive slope towards to the basin, and that rim is not higher than the surrounding roadway elevations.

- CB#4 – No changes were needed at this location.

- CB#5 – The Engineering Department reviewed this basin issue with VHB, who completed the peer review for the project during permitting. VHB recommended that Mr. Miller install a shim coat of pavement in the roadway now to reduce the possibility of runoff bypassing the basin. At our site inspection on April 1, 2020, Mr. Miller indicated that the paving had not been completed, but was expected this week.

- The curb inlets have been replaced with sections of straight curbing behind the basins.
**April 2, 2020 Update** – This issue has been resolved based on the changes outlined above. No additional action is required.

c. Two of the catchbasin grates are a non-standard grate opening. The applicant shall provide calculations to show that they have the same inlet capacity as the standard, square grate, and if they do not, they should be replaced.

**April 2, 2020 Update** – Mr. Miller provided shop drawings on February 14, 2020 documenting the inlet capacity for both types of catchbasin grates. No additional action is required.

(8) **Sewer Manholes** – There were six sewer manholes installed as part of the Abby Road construction, including one where the sewer line from Abby Road ties into the sewer line in Highland Avenue. The Engineering Department identified several deficiencies in these manholes during our site inspection, as noted below:

a. Overall, the workmanship of the brick in the bottom of all the sewer manholes is poor quality, and very rough. The Engineering Department is concerned that solids and paper will get caught as sewerage flows through the manholes, causing clogging and back-ups. The inverts need to be repaired to address this concern.

**April 2, 2020 Update** – Mr. Miller has completed some repairs in the sewer manholes; however, the Engineering Department recommends that the Planning Board hold some money in the proposed tripartite agreement to cover any issues that may arise once the system becomes operational.

b. All of the sewer manholes currently have water pooling in them, even though there is no flow connected to the system. The Engineering Department and DPW are concerned that the bottom of the sewer manholes are not positively draining. Prior to the release of lots, the applicant should be required to survey the inlet and outlet inverts elevations at each sewer manhole to confirm that the inlet is higher than the outlet and provide a plan showing that information to the Engineering Department, and to confirm that the brick at the bottom of the manholes is positively draining towards the outlet.

**April 2, 2020 Update** – Mr. Miller has completed some repairs in the sewer manholes; however, the Engineering Department recommends that the Planning Board hold some money in the proposed tripartite agreement to cover any issues that may arise once the system becomes operational.

c. All of the sewer manholes have dirt and debris at the bottom of the manhole (see photos in Attachment 3), with SMH-3 being the worst. The applicant should be required to clean each sewer manhole prior to the release of any lots.

**April 2, 2020 Update** – The sewer manholes have been cleaned. No additional action is required at this time.

d. SMH-4 is completely filled with water. The applicant needs to investigate what the issue is here and remedy the situation. Additionally, the rim and cover on this SMH has been knocked off and needs to be adjusted (see Attachment 4).

**April 2, 2020 Update** – The water in SMH-4 has been drained. Mr. Miller has indicated that the rim and cover will be adjusted before final paving.
e. The drop inlet connection in SMH-5 connecting the Abby Road sewer line to the pipe in Highland Avenue is not connected. Prior to the release of any lots, the applicant needs to reinstall this connection and secure it with stainless hardware to the satisfaction of the DPW.

April 2, 2020 Update – This issue has been addressed. Any final adjustments will be made by DPW.

(9) PS#3 Manhole – PS#3 shown on Sheet C-3 of the approved subdivision plans needs filled with concrete between the manhole cover and the edge of curb (see photo in Attachment 5).

April 2, 2020 Update – This issue has been addressed.

(10) Curbing at Hammerhead – The curbing at the rear of the hammerhead needs to be cut to remove the overhang at the intersection of the two pieces of curbing (see photo in Attachment 6).

April 2, 2020 Update – Mr. Miller has indicated that this work will be completed.

(11) Pavement Quality – Following installation of the binder coat of pavement, the applicant had to dig out and repair a large section of pavement in the hammerhead because water infiltrated under that area and shifted the pavement (see photo in Attachment 7). The Engineering Department is concerned that similar issues may arise in other areas of the roadway; this will need to be monitored over the next several months as the pavement settles and additional traffic is introduced on the site during construction of the homes. Also, the Engineering Department would like to highlight Section 8.4.4(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, which states that “no subdivision shall be accepted and no final release of a performance guarantee shall be given by the Board until the integrity of road pavement and drainage has been verified following a full winter in place.”

April 2, 2020 Update – The Engineering Department recommends including funds in the tripartite agreement to address any pavement quality issues that may arise.

(12) Stone Bounds – The stone bound on the south side of Abby Road near station 1+50 (see photon in Attachment 8) needs to be replaced and the drill hole redone. The current drillhole is at the edge of the bound. Other bounds should be inspected for similar issues and replaced as needed.

April 2, 2020 Update – The Engineering Department recommends including funds in the tripartite agreement to address any potential issues that may arise with the stone bounds.

(13) Construction Items still Remaining – In addition to the required repairs summarized above, there are several items that have not yet been completed as part of the subdivision, as outlined below. Some of these items overlap with the list provided by Mr. Miller in his email from January 14th, and some are new.

a. Guardrail – The guardrail has not been installed for the project. The Engineering Department is still waiting to review the detail for the Merritt Parkway Aesthetic Guardrail that was approved by the Planning Board at their meeting on January 7th.
April 2, 2020 Update – As of our site inspection on April 1, 2020, the guardrail has been fully installed.

b. Work on Highland Avenue – The curbing has not been installed on Highland Avenue in accordance with Sheet C-2, including the curb radii at the intersection of Highland Avenue and Abby Road. Additionally, the applicant has not installed the swale (east side) and berm (west side) in the grass strip in Highland Avenue as shown on Sheet C-4 of the approved plans. Concrete handicapped ramps need to be installed on Highland Avenue at the intersection with Abby Road, with ADA compliant tactile panels.

April 2, 2020 Update – As of our April 1, 2020 inspection, Mr. Miller is in the process of completing the work on Highland Avenue. The curbing has been installed, however, handicapped ramps and installation of the swale and berm is still underway. The tripartite agreement should include funds to cover these outstanding items.

c. Landscaping – Final landscaping in the right-of-way in accordance with Sheet C-5, as well as loam and seed of the swale and berm in Highland Avenue and on Town-owned property in the temporary easement area.

April 2, 2020 Update – Landscaping for the project has not been completed.

d. Street Lights – The street lights have been installed, but are not powered up. Eversource has filed a Grant of Location with the Select Board for installation of the two new utility poles and conduit on Highland Avenue to supply the subdivision with power. Review of that GOL is on the Select Board’s agenda for February 24th. It is unclear to the Engineering Department if the wires have been pulled to the lights, or what additional work will be required to power up the lights beyond approval of the GOL.

April 2, 2020 Update – No update.

e. Signage – In accordance with the signage shown on Sheet C-2 of the approved plans, five “no parking” signs, one stop sign, and one, double sided street sign denoting “Abby Road” (per Town standards) needs to be installed.

April 2, 2020 Update – As of our April 1, 2020 inspection, it appears that a few of the “no parking signs” have been installed, and the stop sign is in. DPW has indicated that they will install the street sign.

f. Final Paving – Completion of final paving on Abby Road, including raising and adjusting frames, grates, and covers from binder course to final pavement elevation.

April 2, 2020 Update – Final paving will be completed at a future date.

g. Drainage System Final Cleaning – In accordance with Section 7.15.9(e) of the Subdivision Regulations, the applicant shall clean each drain pipe, catchbasin, drain manhole, and appurtenant structure using either a high velocity jet or mechanically powered equipment at the completion of all construction on the subdivision and prior to the final release of security.
April 2, 2020 Update – Mr. Miller has indicated that he believes the drainage cleaning should be performed by the lot buyers. The Engineering Department does not agree. Prior to the final release of security, Mr. Miller should be required to fully clean the drainage system, including the infiltration systems, so that a clean, fully-working drainage system is turned over to the property owners who will be responsible for maintaining the system in the future in accordance with the HOA. The Engineering Department recommends carrying funds in the tripartite agreement for the cost of this cleaning.

h. Certification of Stone Bounds – Section 7.10.3 of the Subdivision Regulations states:

“No permanent monuments shall be installed until all construction which would destroy or disturb the monuments is completed. Placement and location of bounds shall be certified in writing by a registered professional land surveyor after installation of the street and shall be shown on the ‘as-built’ or record plans.”

However, the applicant has already installed stone bounds at the site. At the completion of all construction (roadway and house construction) on the subdivision, but prior to the final release of the security for this project, the applicant should be required to resurvey the bound locations and have a land surveyor certify that they are in fact installed in accordance with the approved subdivision plan.

April 2, 2020 Update – The Engineering Department recommends carrying funds in the tripartite agreement to cover the potential cost of needing to reset bounds.

i. Final As-built Plan – Completion of a final as-built plan in accordance with Section 7.21 of the Subdivision Regulations.

April 2, 2020 Update – The Engineering Department recommends carrying funds in the tripartite agreement for the completion of the final as-built plan.

Recommendation

Based on the remaining work associated with the Abby Road subdivision (as of April 1, 2020), the Engineering Department recommends that the Planning Board require the applicant to provide a security in the amount of $118,000. This includes a 25% engineering and construction contingency, and a 3% escalation factor compounded over five years. A copy of the detailed estimate is attached.
## Abby Road Construction Estimate

**Date:** April 2, 2020  
**Prepared by:** Winchester Engineering Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete fine grading at CB#5 per VHB memo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmanship in brick bottom of sewer manholes and concerns about pooling between inverts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair curbing at hammerhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Bounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV camera inspection of sewer service to Town-owned Parcel 6 + any repairs to sewer line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work on Highland Avenue (Not including landscaping)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Handicapped ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Detectable warning panel (ADA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Labor for construction of swale and berm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Loam and Seed</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>$57</td>
<td>$10,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trees in ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Arborvitae on Lots 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Holly bushes on Lots 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage installation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Paving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjustment of structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Binder pavement quality repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bituminous pavement top course (1.5&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage system cleaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final as-built + Certification of Stone Bounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Construction Contengencies (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Engineer’s Estimate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base Year of Estimate:** 2020  
**Proposed Completion Date:** 2025  
**Inflation at 3% per year compounded to completion:**
- 2021: $104,686  
- 2022: $107,827  
- 2023: $111,061  
- 2024: $114,393  
- 2025: $117,825

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL GUARANTEE:** $117,825 Say $118,000
Dear Planning Board,

I am writing in favor of the proposed improvements to Locke St. I currently own and reside at 14 Locke St., Winchester. My property abuts the proposed work by Mr. DeMartino to fix the road. The work desperately needs to be done, as rain flows down Locke St. into my yard, causing flooding, corroding and damage to my property. I have been dealing with this problem for years, and my land is slowly sinking. In addition, I have received notes from mail carriers over the years that they may stop delivery due to the road conditions. It is also not easily accessible and passable for emergency vehicles.

It is my understanding that the work Mr. DeMartino proposes will help alleviate this situation & provide flood mitigation.

I urge you to approve any improvements proposed.

Sincerely,
Ms. Heidi Rutstein DiLeo
14 Locke St.
Winchester, MA 01890
781-910-4756
hrdileo@gmail.com
March 10, 2020

Town of Winchester
Planning Board
71 Mt. Vernon St.
Winchester, MA 01890

RE: Definitive Plan for Locke Street Road Work

To Planning Board:

I live 29 Dunster Lane directly across from the planned road work to Locke Street and I am writing in support of the proposed work. Michael DeMartino has shown me the new road plan and I am very much in favor of his proposal. Mike has been building a house on the corner of Dunster and Locke, and I want to let you know that his construction site has been neatly maintained the entire time, and that he has been a good communicator with our neighborhood. I am sure he will complete the road work responsibly and with the least amount of disruption as possible.

Locke Street is truly an eyesore, doesn’t drain properly, is a hazard to our vehicles and desperately needs to be fixed. Given that Mr. DeMartino will be footing the bill for all road work, this is a great opportunity for us. I am therefore hopeful that the Planning Board will approve his request to fix the road.

Sincerely,

Steven DeStefano
29 Dunster Lane
Winchester, MA 01890
March 24, 2020 Draft Minutes

Meeting open at 7:32PM via full remote participation

Planning Board members present: H Von Mering, M Meister, H Hannon, D Jerius. (E Cregger not present). Town Planner, Brian Szekely also present.

Members of the public participating:

- Jennifer Goldson, Barry Frankin, Anna Callahan of Master Plan consulting firm JM Goldson
- Dennis Carlone of Carlone and Associates
- Craig Miller of Five Points Development
- Ted Touloukian, Larry Beals, Ian Gillespie, David Hacin, David Tabenken, as the development teams for 654 Main Street and 10 Converse Place.
- Residents John Stevens, John Clemson, Jamie Devol (still need to listen to recording, not working currently)

Master Plan Agenda Item:

Jennifer Goldson and Anna Callahan outlined the entire process of the Master Plan and highlighted the changes from the previous version and the process necessary to get to completion. A placemat will be made after the final edits of April 7th that will be an executive summary of sorts that we can easily distribute to residents.

MOTION: Meister, to adopt the Master Plan as amended at the March 24, 2020 Planning Board meeting, with any minor edits needing to be approved by the Chair, and subsequently sent to the Dept of Housing and Community Development. Jerius 2nd, 4-0-1, Cregger not present.
Dennis Carlone Agenda Item:

The Board discussed how Dennis would be integrated into both the 10 Converse Place and 654 Main St project and for the Town Planner to manage the relationship and report back as needed.

654 Main St Agenda Item:

Architect Touloukian presented new drawings that incorporated the house at 63 Vine Street into the project. John Clemson of the Historical Commission saw this as a very positive element and will draft a memo regarding what parts of the original structure should be kept and reused, and what aspects of the building will be recreated. Residents John Stevens and Jamie Devol thought the building was far too massive for the site and had concerns about shaded open space due to proposed cantilevers.

Abby Road Agenda Item:

Mr. Miller requested all 5 lots from the Abby Road subdivision be released contingent upon the full execution of a Tripartite agreement in the amount of $200,000.

MOTION: Meister, to grant Five Points’ request to release all 5 lots, contingent on the full execution of a Tripartite Agreement in the amount of $200,000 and to delegate Diab Jerius and Heather Von Mering the authority to approve and sign the Tripartite Agreement on behalf of the board. Hannon 2nd, 4-0-1, Cregger not present.

MOTION: Hannon to adjourn at 10:28PM, 2nd Jerius. 4-0-1 Cregger not present.
Update Report to Winchester Planning Board
Design Review Progress for Converse Place and 654 Main Street Projects
Dennis Carlone

The two projects are at different points in their design development and their ability to successfully present to the Planning Board. Both have the potential to be positive additions to downtown Winchester. Each is described below in detail.

Converse Place Remote Meeting of March 31, 2020

The development team is proceeding with two scenarios as recommended at the March 24th Planning Board meeting. The different approaches are: 1. modification of the presented 6-story approach, and 2. a new five-story scheme that has a larger floor plate. Each will eventually be guided by Board member comments and recommendations.

Six-Story Proposal: There were productive design discussions and a willingness to modify the upper massing and silhouette, and add further articulation (base, middle, top) to the building. The upper floor “lanterns” are now proposed to be a little glassier and, at least along Mt. Vernon, slightly angular in plan. The north elevation (facing Town Hall) has a more varied design. Units are 1-3 bedrooms in size.

I proposed curving back the top floor profile (not well received), using pergolas at the fifth floor to soften and give human scale to the setback terraces (will be reviewed), rhythmically alternating the “lantern” profiles along Mt. Vernon (non-committal response, will look at other options), consider lighter colored natural slate at upper floors (possible) and the possibility of having chimneys for their fireplaces (fireplaces would be gas fed).

Five-Story Proposal: A lower building with the same Floor Area Ratio as the 6-story scheme requires a revised floor plate that is 20% greater. Preliminary five-story massing drawings showed longer side elevations, significantly smaller open space overlooking the pond, and a one-story articulated top. These drawings are now being further developed with greater detail and articulation to match the level of the original design.

Project Evaluation: Thoughtful town design evaluates and promotes strategically located placemaking (within an open space network), activated by ground floor uses, and defined by handsome building massing and facades. The project architect has clearly shown the capacity to design such structures in historic districts – in particular Beacon Hill and the Back Bay.

My work is directed by the Planning Board’s objectives, existing zoning regulations, and quality town design goals. With that in mind, I believe the 6-story massing and its greater public space potential is superior. But there is one caveat: The design of the two upper floors require extensive, detailed study related to setbacks, massing, materials selection, and appropriate architectural character. If this project is going to be the tallest downtown building at a 3.0 FAR, it has to merit that responsibility.
654 Main Street Remote Meeting of April 1, 2020

This eight-sided parcel is significantly more complex site than Converse Place. It is in the flood plain, has over a ten-foot change in contours over its length, is restricted dimensionally, and borders a smaller-scaled residential neighborhood.

This project is in the preliminary phase of design. Nevertheless, we had a productive design discussion focused on the proposed porch - it's ramp orientation, and it's overall character. The architect proposed shifting the residential entry to Elmwood Avenue, which should strengthen the retail frontage integration of the ramp access.

The architect rightfully proposed that the project should be broken down into pieces: The principal component defining Main Street, the second piece along Elmwood Avenue, and the third part is the Greek Revival home. Each piece should have its own character and civic responsibility, and yet, still be a well-integrated whole.

The preliminary sketch of the building’s upper floor generated significant discussion. It must be made calmer and more a part of the lower portion of the elevation.

When I brought up the need to better transition between the three parts: scaling down the Main Street portion along Vine Street next to the Greek Revival building and more clearly express the proposed notch on Elmwood Avenue, I was told that this would be difficult given the development need to maintain the 2.5 FAR. In response, I recommended replacing any removed square footage with a small, setback penthouse on top of the fourth-floor roof. We realize this might be a concern with the Planning Board and I mentioned that I will bring it up at the next Planning Board meeting.

**Project Evaluation:** This project has good potential but clearly, we are in the very early stages of design. It is not yet ready for submission to the Planning Board. I am looking forward to seeing preliminary elevations and improved solutions for the areas discussed above.

Dennis Carlone
dennis.carlone@gmail.com