



Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 01, 2022, at 7:00 pm – Zoom Meeting

Members Present:	Diab Jerius, Chair I-Ching Scott Kurt Spring	Sally Dale, Vice Chair/Clerk Cheryl Wolfe
Also Present:	Brian Szekely, Town Planner WinCam	Bryan Manter, Asst. Town Engineer Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary
Others Attending:	Ian Gillespie Paul Soughley Diom O’Connell Tara Doubman Dylan Forester Philip Chen Ellen Spencer William Foucher Beth Stecchi David Tuell Juli Riemenschneider	Jan Steenbrugge John Suhrbier David Hacin Maura Sullivan Fred Spencer William Band Carol Savage Sarah Girotti David Miller Micaela Tuell J. Copley
		Jamie Devol David Tabenken Sean Sanger Ruth Trimarchi Lee Wooten Allan Rogers Reed Pugh Scott Leboeuf Larry Murray Winchester Conservation Commission Karin Galil

A quorum being in attendance, Chair Jerius calls the Winchester Planning Board (PB) meeting to order at 7:00 pm, noting that the meeting is being video recorded via WinCam and Zoom. Roll call of PB members: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in attendance.

1. Reappointment of Ellen Spencer, Design Review Committee (DRC):

Chair Jerius: Introduces Ms. Spencer, noting that she is a long-standing member of the DRC and requests she provide her background and interest in being reappointed.

Ms. Spencer: Indicates she has served on the DRC between 10 and 15 years, has a background in art history and interior design, is currently retired. She noted that the DRC role has expanded with the new Zoning Bylaws and Design Guidelines. She would like to continue participating and serving the Town in this capacity.

PB Question: What is the biggest challenge in the past and for the future?

Ms. Spencer Answer: Right now, it is 10 Converse Place. With the new Center Business District (CBD) Rules and Regulations, it is complicated and a big learning process. This new project is serving as a “test case”.

Ms. Scott moved to reappoint Ellen Spencer to the Design Review Committee. Ms. Wolfe second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

2. Updates – Chair Jerius:

An appeal has been filed on the PB’s decision for the development at 654 Main Street (Fells Hardware). The case, currently in Land Court, is still in Discovery.

3. Minutes for Planning Board Meeting held Tuesday, January 4, 2022:

PB discussed and agreed on several edits and clarifications. A question was raised on the statement about the Washington/Swanton project being 40B. PB decided to hold on approving the meeting minutes to check on details to clarify this statement.

4. Updates continued – Mr. Szekely:

Strategic Land Ventures (SLV) is the developer for the two 40B rental developments that are mixed income (affordable and market rate) in Winchester, one at 416 Cambridge Street and the other at 19-35 River Street. Massachusetts Housing has suspended him from applying for any further housing development projects. This situation is related to Wellesley, and does not impact Winchester's projects, specifically Cambridge and River streets.

5. Public Hearing for 10 Converse Place Special Permit CBD Petition #14 Continued:

Chair Jerius: Opened the Public Hearing for 10 Converse Place Special Permit at 7:24 pm, noting the focus is to review and discuss the updated design changes.

Mr. Tabenken: Presented the design changes, noting the developer had two meetings with Mr. Chen and Mr. Szekely since the last Public Hearing. He summarized key feedback, showed updated landscape plan, and plans for the different levels (basement, ground floor, levels, 2, 3, 4, 5). Total unit count is 43. He presented two options for the Town House façade. The building height is 62 feet without the two foot parapet and the eight foot mechanical area.

Mr. Forester: Presented and explained the digital massing model. They have two links and instructions on how to manipulate the model program that will be made available. He noted that the model does not include any landscaping trees and the slopes along the water edge are being refined.

Mr. Chen: The team has done well to create a consistency of a three-story appearance by stepping back the fourth and fifth levels. The entrance on the corner of Mt. Vernon Street for retail has been added. The two proposed options for the Town House façade are to reduce the boxiness of the dormers and roof profile. The developer added more three-bedroom units. Much has been done. Probably some more work exists to simplify a little more.

PB Discussion:

- Prefer the mansard design option with more articulated balconies.
- Fine with the current building height but would prefer a smaller footprint.
- Parking is required for commercial tenants; not sure how to address this.
- Need to address the construction staging process.
- Concern with the distribution of the deeded affordable units within the building; PB will condition approval on the response of the Housing Partnership Board.
- Would like to see more space along the water side of the building.
- Prefer Juliette balconies on the Mt. Vernon façade.
- Facades still feel massive and monumental; maybe set back starting at the fourth floor.
- Prefer Option A of the Town House façade but stills feels chaotic.
- Like that the number of 3-bedrooms increased from 3 to 6; would like to have one be affordable.
- Would like the walkway made more friendly.
- What is the bicycle storage capacity?

Ms. Scott moved to continue the Public Hearing for 10 Converse Place Special Permit CBD Petition #14 to Tuesday, February 15, 2022, at 7:45 pm. Mr. Spring second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

6. ZBA Petition #3954, 14-16 Oak Street:

Mr. Szekely: Summarized noting the petitioner is seeking a Special Permit to tear down an existing non-conforming duplex and construct a new duplex outside the existing footprint. He clarified that this is a historic resource whose owners had taken advantage of a one-time opportunity to “opt out” of the demolition delay Bylaw. The Historic Commission voted in favor of this petition noting that the new home is in the same scale, rhythm and character of the existing neighborhood, but also recommended a 53G review. He recommends favorable action with the addition of a more detailed landscaping plan.

PB Discussion:

- This new structure reads as a single family. The existing home reads as a two-family.
- The roofline appears stepped up in the back of the home.
- How much taller and wider is this new home?

Mr. Murray: Noted the existing home is 3,122 square feet and the new would be 3,484 square feet.

Mr. Manter: Noted that there is an increase of 1,440 square feet of impervious material that is being captured in a storm water system.

Ms. Scott moved to recommend favorable action. There was no second.

Additional PB Comments:

- Putting the entrance to the second unit in the back, increases the traffic in the driveway and also takes away from the green side yard.
- The role of the PB for this petition is advisory.
- Reviewed the Special Permit requirements and referenced that the Zoning By-Laws, Section 9.4.2, Items 4 (neighborhood character), 5 (screening and buffering), 6 (natural environment) are all negatively impacted.

Ms. Wolfe moved to recommend unfavorable action based on these negative impacts (Items 4,5,6). Ms. Dale second the Motion.

Ms. Dale moved to amend the Motion noting that Item 8 (Historic Resource) is also negatively impacted.

Ms. Wolfe second the amendment to the Motion.

Vote for the amendment: Dale, Spring, Wolfe in favor; Scott, Jerius opposed. Amendment to the Motion passes 3-2-0.

Vote for the amended Motion: Dale, Wolfe in favor; Scott, Spring, Jerius opposed. Motion fails 2-3-0.

7. ZBA Petition #3953, 21 Laurel Hill Lane:

Mr. Szekely: Summarized noting the petitioners are seeking Site Plan Review to change the grade of more than 500 square feet by more than 6%. This will flatten the slope of their backyard to make it more useable but will require retaining walls that will reach in some portions 8 feet in height. He recommends favorable action if the retaining walls can be reduced to less than 8 feet.

PB Comments:

- 8 feet is too high for a retaining wall.
- 6 feet is maximum height for the retaining wall and a fence at the top.
- There is a lack of consistency in the shape of the walls.
- What is the requirement for handrails?

- The trees have roots on the property line that will be impacted with a new retaining wall. This will eventually kill the trees on the abutting property.
- Terracing is a better option to try and flatten the area.

Mr. Tuell: Clarified that the design has two 4-foot retaining walls.

Mr. Manter: Noted that one area has an 8-foot wall from grade (10 feet if the height under grade is included).

Additional PB Comments:

- Reviewed Site Plan Review requirements and referenced in the Zoning By-Laws, Section 9.5.7. that Item 3 (minimize the volume of cut and fill) is not met.

Ms. Scott moved to withhold endorsement because it does not minimize the volume of cut and fill. Ms. Wolfe second the Motion.

Chair Jerius moved to amend the Motion by adding that a safety fence would increase the overall height of the wall. Ms. Dale second the amendment to the Motion.

Vote for the amendment: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in favor. Amendment to Motion passes 5-0-0.

Vote for the amended Motion: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

8. Adjourn:

Chair Jerius noted that Executive Session will need to move to a future time; PB concurred with scheduling Tuesday, February 8, 2022, at 7:00 pm.

Ms. Wolfe moved to adjourn the PB meeting. Mr. Spring second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Scott, Spring, Wolfe, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.

Sally Dale, Clerk

Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary