



Planning Board Meeting Minutes Tuesday, June 14, 2022, at 7:00 pm – Zoom Meeting

Members Present:	Diab Jerius, Chair Kurt Spring I-Ching Scott	Sally Dale, Vice Chair/Clerk Nicholas Rossettos
Also Present:	Brian Szekely, Town Planner Bryan Manter, Assistant Town Engineer	WinCam Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary
Others Attending:	Davey Jackson Zeina Marchant Ani Nikova Allan Ayden Richard Leaf Mike Pierce	Richard Rohan Tara Doubman John Suhrbier Hank Lin Kellee Fiske Brian Mulvehill Michael Wang, Form + Place John Rufo, Form + Place Jamie Pachell Charlie Dale

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, Jerius in attendance. Spring and Rossettos arrived a few minutes later.

1. Updates

- a. Chair Jerius: The Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Working Group (composed of PB, Housing Partnership Board, Council on Aging, Disability Access Commission, Winchester Housing Authority), had a forum where ADU's were introduced and included presentations from Arlington and MAPC. Next phase is public outreach. The Trees Working Group (composed of the PB, Conservation Commission, Climate Action Advisory Committee) had a booth at Town Day to promote discussions and awareness to preserve and enhance the tree canopy. Ms. Dale noted that there will also be a table at the upcoming Farmers' Market to continue outreach.
- b. Mr. Szekely: Had discussed the community planning transit grant with Phillip Beltz, Council on Aging (COA) Director, and Ken Pruitt, Sustainability Director. The consensus is to wait on applying for this transit grant. The town wide transportation Master Plan is in process. Once completed, the Town will be in a better position to apply. In addition, the COA has one van, and will be getting a mini-van to accommodate two wheelchairs. The other update is the Holton Street Visioning Phase I Public Meeting is scheduled for June 28th at 7:00 pm.

Rossettos and Spring arrived.

2. North Main Street Corridor - Community Meeting:

Chair Jerius: Consultants with Form + Place to present on the North Main Street Corridor (NMSC) vision, looking at zoning changes and design guidelines. Recently MAPC studied the existing conditions that identified buildings, properties, probability of development, etc. The 2030 Master Plan also identified this area for economic development. It is an area for improving pedestrian safety and as well as being a good location for affordable housing.

Mr. Wang: Started the presentation, briefly summarized as follows:

- Goal to refine and implement the vision and recommendations identified in the MAPC study.
- Reviewed the stakeholder/public feedback statistics obtained during the MPAC study.

- Identified 3 critical components to enhance the corridor: identify incentives to achieve desired development and design outcome; enhance the public realm (streetscape improvements); implement a “complete streets” approach.
- Identified future development issues and tools to implement changes (zoning amendments and design guidelines). The goal is to create a framework that incentivizes the desired approach to future development, including the mix of uses as well as appropriate character and scale.
- Reviewed several sections of the NMSC, discussing the common and unique characteristics of each.
- Presented example projects that reflected different characteristics and design challenges, as well as sample design guidelines.

Discussion:

Mr. Suhrbier (Chair, Housing Partnership Board): How are Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) draft zoning guidelines for multi-family housing near transit being included in the NMSC study?

Mr. Szekely: Have to wait for the draft guidelines to be finalized before incorporating. Would like to be able to include the entire corridor in the multi-family housing total, instead of just the area within ½ mile of the transit station. Most of the corridor is beyond ½ mile. (Mr. Wang confirmed Burger King marks the half-mile distance from the commuter rail station in downtown Winchester). Expect the guidelines to be finalized by the end of the summer.

Mr. Wang: Continued the presentation.

- Identified issues related to the pedestrian environment and tools to implement changes (public realm design standards, public-private partnerships). The goal is to enhance the public realm through streetscape improvements that create safe, accessible and walkable pedestrian environments.
- Reviewed the components of a Complete Streets Neighborhood Connector.
- Provided visual examples from Falmouth, Newtonville, and Woburn.
- Reviewed several sections of the NMSC focusing on the existing streetscape issues.

Discussion:

Mr. Rohan: Raised the concern from businesses regarding the challenge of delivery trucks finding parking space to make their deliveries.

Mr. Wang and Mr. Rufo: Noted that in one previous project, space was available behind the shops, accessible from a side street. Also noted, delivery times can be used when need to deliver from the main street or to share in the use of specific zones.

Ms. Dale: Indicated that one of the residents noted that the exit onto Main Street from Russell Road, a one way street, is dangerous. It is hard to see and pull out onto Main Street. The same condition exists next to Meineke on Glenwood Avenue and several other locations as well.

Ms. Scott: Noted that Main Street is currently “car-centric”. Bus lines and bicycles need to be included in the public realm. The current bus route is being rerouted to go to Porter Square and the Red Line, which will encourage more ridership.

Mr. Rohan: Asked about the rezoning of the large parking lot south of the church; there was a development agreement with the Town. How does it impact this study?

Chair Jerius: Yes, there was an agreement signed by the Select Board and the Children’s Corner. It allows housing to be developed in the current parking lot.

Mr. Szekely: Noted that this agreement does not impact this study.

Ms. Fiske: Lives on Russell Road and confirmed Ms. Dale's statement. She noted the parking to the left makes it very hard to see on-coming traffic. She noted she often walks Main Street, enjoys the park, but the rest is not so pleasant. Looking forward to changes to make it more serene for pedestrians.

Ms. Nikova: Lives at the corner of Hill and Main Street. Noted this is a safety challenge with traffic when driving. There is no visibility.

Mr. Wang: Continued the presentation.

- Identified issues related to the Right-of-Way design, and tools to implement changes (complete streets implementation guidelines, Right-of-Way design guidelines). The goal is to implement a complete streets approach to the Right-of-Way that meets the needs of all users – vehicles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.
- Discussed the definition of a “complete street” (a neighborhood connector that incorporates zones for road, sidewalks, transit, bicycles, storefronts, amenities, trees, lights, etc.)
- Provided visual examples and discussed the challenge to get visual continuity (Springfield, Brookline Village, Cambridge, Boston) as well as accommodating the variety of needs.
- Discussed need for added crosswalks in the NMSC

Mr. Rufo: This part of the presentation focused on the Right-of-Way design. The goal is to meet the needs of all users. Using one section as an example, he provided visual concepts and discussed changes in this section to create a potential “complete street” that included trees, underground wires, crosswalk bump-out, streetlights, banners, etc.

Discussion:

Mr. Lin: Lives on Canal Street. Has anyone looked at the gradient of Main Street?

Mr. Szekely: Noted that a traffic engineer would review the gradient.

Mr. Suhrbier: How do the trees impact the sidewalks for wheelchair users?

Mr. Rufo: There are zones for accessibility/pedestrians, and separate amenity zones. Accessibility is one of the essential elements of complete streets.

Mr. Szekely: Our current sidewalks are brick, making it very difficult to navigate for many people.

Ms. Fiske: The tree grates need to allow the trees to grow, not just for 10 years. The trees psychologically slow people down. Appreciates the ramps at the bump-outs. Concern with the bikeway and the grading.

Chair Jerius: As a cyclist, the bike lane will significantly help with safety. Also, the PB is focusing on the streetscape since it will make a big difference in providing continuity and improving the visual character for the NMSC.

Ms. Dale: Noted she hoped that the tree design for Main Street would continue on the side streets.

Mr. Dale: Referenced a good example of an existing bump-out at Hemingway and Main Street. Noted he is a landscape architect. Suggested partnering with property owners to plant trees with more area so that they can survive. When planted close to the street, there is not enough soil area for the roots to expand, shortening the life of the tree. If they can place in the adjacent yard, the trees have a better opportunity for longevity.

Mr. Wang: Appreciated the feedback from discussion today. Presented a slide outlining the next steps in the study: 1) Community Input/Brainstorming/Data Collection; 2) Conceptual Right-of-Way Design Studies; 3) Feasibility Case Studies/Potential Development Sites; 4) Proposed Zoning Amendments/Design Guidelines; 5) Implementation of Preferred Corridor Framework.

3. ZBA Petition No. 3964 – 94 Church Street:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking Site Plan Review under Section 9.5.1(5) so as to be permitted to construct an addition where the total floor area of the single-family dwelling will be greater than 5,000 square feet. The property is located in the RDB (Single Residence) zoning district and contains 22,631+/- square feet. The house was built in 1895 with renovations in 2008. MACRIS record attached. The Historical Commission voted 5-0 (2 absent) that the proposal has no adverse effect on a historical and cultural resource. DRC voted favorable action (5-0), stating the addition is tasteful. The proposal entails a second floor addition over the 2008 addition to add a bedroom, bathroom, and laundry. No changes to the footprint, landscaping or trees. This is a tasteful addition that adds living space to a beautiful home. Due to the scale and location of the proposed addition, this does not negatively affect the neighbors or the neighborhood streetscape. Favorable action is recommended.

Ms. Scott moved to endorse the Site Plan for ZBA Petition #3964 for 94 Church Street. Mr. Spring second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossetto, Scott, Spring, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

4. ZBA Petition No. 3965 – 16 Lorena Road:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking a waiver from Site Plan Review as a proposed addition is less than 500 square feet where the total floor area of the single family dwelling is greater than 5,000 square feet. The property is located in the RDB zoning district and contains 12,112 SF+/- . This is a new construction built in 2016. The Historical Commission voted 5-0 (2 absent) that the proposal has no adverse effect on a historical and cultural resource. DRC voted in favor (5-0). The proposal entails the construction of a 280 SF expansion in the rear of the home and will use materials that will match the existing. No setbacks are further encroached upon as a result of the proposal. The height and scale of the addition is in proportion to the existing home and other homes in the neighborhood. Favorable action is recommended due to the limited scale and scope, as well as the rear location of the project.

Mr. Manter: There is nothing needed from Engineering.

Mr. Pachell (petitioner): Noted there is no process for him to get a waiver except this.

Mr. Szekely: This addition is less than 500 square feet on a home that is greater than 5,000 square feet. They cannot apply for a building permit until they receive a waiver for this small addition.

Discussion: The PB agreed with the petitioner that Section 9.5.1A of the Zoning Bylaw, [Site Plan Review] Waiver, does not describe a Procedure for Requesting a Waiver. This results in a petitioner having to submit all the required materials described in Zoning Bylaw Section 7.3.16 to request a waiver. The PB discussed the impact of one suggestion: lowering the 500 square foot threshold for being eligible to request a waiver. The PB agreed that Chair Jerius will reach out to Town Counsel to discuss alternative text for Section 9.5.1A that will also specify the Procedure for Requesting a Waiver.

Ms. Dale moved to recommend favorable action to grant a waiver from Site Plan Review for ZBA Petition #3965 for 16 Lorena Road. Mr. Spring second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossetto, Scott, Spring, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

5. ZBA Petition No. 3966 – 82 Arlington Street:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking Site Plan Review so as to be permitted to change the grade of more than 500 SF by more than 6%. The property is located in the RDA zoning district and contains 23,231 SF+/- . This house was built in 2012. The Historical Commission voted 5-0 (2 absent) that the proposal has no adverse effect on a historical and cultural resource. The DRC voted in favor 5-0. The proposal entails the renovation of the current outdoor living space/patio areas and the grading of the rear yard to make it more usable and reduce storm water runoff. New retaining walls, a sport court, and

sections of new patio are planned, for a total increase of impervious surface of 1,598 SF. To offset this increase, the Applicant proposes to infiltrate runoff from 2,371 SF of impervious surface, which is comprised of the potential sport court and sections of the new patio/walls. Green Space + Hardscape = Open Area, however the Open Area listed is 76.8%, while the proposed Hardscape + Green Space = 83.7%. This should be corrected for both the sport court permit set and the non-sport-court permit set. Neither of the open areas equal the total of the Green Space and Hardscape. Overall, the proposal is not a detriment to the neighborhood, or the abutters based on the low retaining walls and increased amount of infiltration. Favorable action is recommended.

Mr. Manter: Their design is adequate and should meet the requirements for runoff.

PB Discussion:

- Gorgeous design. Good screening.
- There are several trees being removed; some in the footprint and several others.
- Concern about the very long length of the retaining wall (even though it is 3 feet tall).

Mr. Mulvehill (petitioner): If the sport court does not work out, there is an alternate plan. The retaining wall will help with the water drainage. For the trees, they had hired an arborist who noted several are not in the best shape. They are also adding several plantings.

Ms. Scott moved to endorse the Site Plan for ZBA Petition #3966 for 82 Arlington Street. Mr. Spring second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossetto, Scott, Spring in favor. Jerius opposed. Motion passes 4-0-1.

6. Planning Board Meeting Minutes

a. Meeting Minutes for April 26, 2022:

PB Discussion: Several comments and edits noted.

Ms. Dale moved to approve the PB Meeting Minutes of April 26, 2022, as amended. Ms. Scott second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Scott, Spring, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

b. Meeting Minutes for May 17, 2022:

PB Discussion: Several comments and edits noted.

Mr. Spring moved to approve the PB Meeting Minutes of May 17, 2022, as amended. Mr. Rossettos second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Scott, Spring, Rossettos, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0.

7. Education/Outreach:

Chair Jerius: Met with Mr. Szekely met to discuss how to improve the quality of PB presentations. One possible solution is to use a consultant, paid from the PB consultant funds. Another idea is to meet with precincts. Suggested inviting to a PB meeting to explore what is happening in that precinct and share the activities of the PB. Another suggestion is to discuss how the website could help. All with the goal of helping people understand the PB's relevancy to our community.

Mr. Szekely: Another possible way to expand awareness is a quarterly event and/or newsletter.

Ms. Dale: Suggested an easy immediate idea is to expand the PB agenda list to include more detail.

Mr. Spring: Suggested posting the agenda on the Town Facebook page, encouraging public attendance to PB meetings.

8. Adjourn:

Mr. Spring moved to adjourn the PB meeting of June 14, 2022. Ms. Scott second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Scott, Spring, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 5-0-0. Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Sally Dale, Clerk

Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary