

---

Karin Galil to Everyone

KG

My perspective is that a pathway along the water is insufficient. However, creating a wide swath of land all along the water that would allow for outdoor dining and café tables with views of the water/Sandy's Island, the library and town hall, with enough land against the water for paths and for children to play, people to picnic. but a wide swath of land that would allow for town life with outdoor dining, café tables set back all along the water with land in front of it for strolling past, sitting on the grass etc

Maura Sullivan to Everyone

MS

Is the Kellaway Plan available for the public to read? Thank you.

Ellen's iPad to Everyone

EI

Yes. See the monograph on Kellaway published by the Winchester Historical Society several years ago.

Maura Sullivan to Everyone

MS

Thank you. I'll try to find it.

Ellen's iPad to Everyone



Should be on the WHS website.

Maura Sullivan to Everyone



I don't see it but I will email them.

Ellen's iPad to Everyone



One option would be for the developer to change the design from a single, monolithic structure to two smaller but connected structures with open space between them.

Charlene Band to Everyone



how will concom justify a decision to fail to protect the Mill Pond view sheds and access which is specifically within your charge under the by laws?

Karin to Everyone



quantification: time x view

Maura Sullivan to Everyone 09:

MS

The bylaw: "2.4 "Aesthetics" shall mean the natural scenery and quiet of an area which is visually accessible from a public area or public way." No mention of feet.

Dawn Piccolo to Everyone 09:



To Conservation Commission and Select and Planning Members - I own/reside at 10 Winchester Place. The development as proposed creates a Wall blocking all views - water way, town hall, library, etc. I support development in the lot, but NOT as currently designed. Please apply the ByLaw to help ensure that the town makes the right decision for the future. Thank You

Agreed, the view is worse

Karin to Everyone



The bylaws are the minimum criteria not the aspirational goal. The current plan plonks a huge monolithic structure that will dominate the area and is not in keeping with the town center. I am in support of development but not the current design which is too big, does not speak the design language of the historic buildings nearby and does not provide outdoor space that is likely to become a beloved gathering space for town residents. (Also--can we insist that they incorporate bricks that match the town hall instead of the pepto-dismal shade on their plans?)

Charlene Band to Everyone



make the building smaller

Maura Sullivan to Everyone

MS

Adding the whole bylaw purpose section in here so people can see it: "The purpose of this by-law is to protect the wetlands, related water resources, and adjoining land areas in the town by prior review and control of activities deemed to have an adverse effect upon wetland values, including, but not limited to the following: public or private water supply, groundwater, flood control, erosion and sedimentation control, storm damage prevention, water pollution prevention, fisheries, recreation, wildlife habitat and aesthetics, collectively known as the interests protected by this by-law."

## Vreeland, Elaine

---

**From:** Tara Doubman <tdoubman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 26, 2022 1:12 PM  
**To:** Vreeland, Elaine  
**Subject:** 10 Converse Place - Meeting Comments

Hello,

I attended the Conservation Committee meeting last night during which 10 Converse Place plans were discussed. Rather than put comments in the chat, as a number of others did, I am following up with this email for my comments/questions. Would you please forward to the commissioners?

Many thanks,  
Tara

Winchester Conservation Committee Members,

Firstly, thank you for the important work that you do for this beautiful little town! We are so fortunate to have a number of natural areas that need our help to keep them as is for all to enjoy. Below are a few comments/questions based on the meeting I attended last night, specifically, the discussion around 10 Converse Place.

- I respect and appreciate the time Steve put into preparing the comments about the plans at 10 Converse Place. I see the memo on the town website, but not the slides. There were some images in the slides that I thought were very useful. Will those be posted as well (or are they up and I missed them)? The slides seemed to clearly indicate that there is a large protected area that the developer plans to use for the new building. Is there some reason the developer should not be required to make the size of this building significantly smaller to comply with these requirements?
- There was a lot of discussion last night about compromise and trade-offs, but I am not sure why that is the starting point. I am no lawyer, but the text below from the bylaws seems to indicate that the default is that no building should be permitted within 100 feet of the water source in town (paraphrasing). And that allowing a new building to be put within that 100 feet would be by **exception only**. What would the town or commission gain by permitting the building at 10 Converse Place as designed? Why does the builder/developer seem to have the upper hand in this situation? It seems that they really have no right to put such a large building in this location, without express permission from this group. And I certainly hope this commission, should you decide to allow any new building, would negotiate something **much** smaller (or perhaps multiple smaller buildings, as shown in the historical pictures) that would have significantly less impact on this site.
  - o From the by-laws: Except as permitted by the commission or as provided in this bylaw no person shall remove, fill, dredge, alter, or build upon or within one hundred (100) feet of any freshwater wetland, wet meadow, bog, or swamp; within one hundred (100) feet of any bank; upon or within one hundred (100) feet of any lake, river, pond, stream; upon any land under said waters; upon any land subject to flooding or inundation by groundwater or surface water; or within the foregoing areas in such a way as to detract from visual access to the Aberjona River, Horn Pond Brook, Winter Pond, Wedge Pond, Judkins Pond, Mill Pond, Smith Pond or Mystic Lake.
- I understand many people find the laundry building to be an eyesore, and I'm no exception (my girls call it the "Winchester skyscraper"). However, this building is far enough away from Mount Vernon and a small enough footprint, to not have a large negative impact on the overall downtown aesthetics, or views of Mill Pond and the trees/land behind the library. If the proposed building were not both as tall **AND** 5x the footprint of the current building, it would detract from the views/aesthetics much less. While this is only an opinion, based on other meetings and informal discussions, many people are not against any development at 10 Converse Place, but they are against a single, very large "block" being built.

It seems that you are all in a unique position to help shape this development since, based on my understanding from last night's meeting, the building should not actually be built to the scale it is currently designed. The designated "public spaces" in the developer's latest designs will likely feel like land private to the occupants of the new condo building or ground floor retail rather than publicly accessible because you won't necessarily know it's available to you just walking through. I walk all over Winchester, and this part of the bike path is not well traveled and I fear putting up a large building all along the waterway, as it is currently designed, will detract even more from the appeal of this waterway and the views in the center of town. Rather than nature, our eyes could be drawn to a very large building that is completely out of scale with its surroundings.

Many thanks for your careful consideration,  
Tara Doubman

Tara G. Doubman  
[tdoubman@gmail.com](mailto:tdoubman@gmail.com)  
M: 781.799.4635

## Vreeland, Elaine

---

**From:** Beth Caplow <beth.caplow@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 27, 2022 8:41 PM  
**To:** Vreeland, Elaine  
**Cc:** rich.caplow@verizon.net  
**Subject:** 10 Converse Place

Dear Elaine,

We're writing to express our extreme displeasure at the proposed building at 10 Converse Place. The building is so big both in height and square footage that it will ruin one of the most lovely, natural spots of beauty we have in Winchester.

When we were looking at towns to live in, we drove through Winchester and walked along Mt. Vernon Street, noticing the beautiful flow of the river with wetlands/greenlands on either side with a view of the library grounds and weeping willows. We chose Winchester to live for its small town charm and natural beauty. The proposed building at 10 Converse Place would destroy that. While we recognize that the current building on the corner is an eyesore, it takes up a small fraction of the space compared to the plans for the new building. That behemoth would ruin the small town feel and overall human size of buildings that the town center is composed of now. One long building, higher than all the others in the center would turn downtown Winchester into a commercial feeling town, instead of the human, walkable, beautiful place it is now. This huge building would not allow much enjoyment in walking or riding along the river with a towering structure right next to you on the other side.

From the plans, it appears the wetlands need to be protected as the building plans go very close to the river. We fervently hope that the conservation commission makes a stand to protect the river and the wetlands. The curving Aberjona river flowing through downtown is such an amazing and natural beauty to have in our town, destroying the view, the enjoyment of everyone as well as endangering the wetlands close to the river would be a monumental mistake.

We hope the planning boards will reconsider this behemoth of a building.

Regards,  
Beth and Rich Caplow



January 30, 2022

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public comment regarding the proposed 10 Converse Place project.

I very much appreciate the conversation surrounding improving the green space adjacent to the Mill Pond. I support the Aberjona Initiative and am happy that the project team is working with the town to develop a plan that includes improvements to the water's edge.

But I do not think the proposed building should be approved in its current form. Whether one looks at it from Mount Vernon or from Mystic Valley Parkway, in my opinion the building does not integrate with the rest of the town center.

I have written to the Planning Board regarding the FAR issue (12/14/21). I am writing to the Commission now to say that I am in complete agreement with Steve Cohn's analysis in his January 20, 2022 memo. The Winchester Wetlands Bylaw clearly states that the burden of proof is on the applicant to show that the proposed work will not "harm the interests protected by [the Winchester Wetlands Bylaw]." One of the interests is protecting the "aesthetics" of Mill Pond, where "aesthetics" is defined as "the natural scenery and quiet of an area which is visually accessible from a public area or public way." Under the bylaw, the applicant must, therefore, prove that the project will not have an adverse effect upon the "wetland values" associated with the area. I am still learning and have not read all submissions, but I have not seen that this proof has been made.

The fact that "visual access" to Mill Pond is specifically mentioned in Section 3 is significant. The Commission's jurisdiction is not limited to 100 feet of Mill Pond. The Commission has jurisdiction over and must protect the views of Mill Pond from any location. The last sentence in Section 3 does not include any distance requirement when mentioning "visual access" nor does the definition of "aesthetics" when describing "[visual access] from a public area or public way." It is not enough to say that the view from one public way (i.e., the bike path) is unimpeded so the bylaw has been satisfied.

Perhaps I misunderstood but I thought I heard (at your last meeting) that the Commission might entertain the notion of a "compromise." I do not see any room for compromise in the bylaw, however. If the project will have an adverse effect upon the

area surrounding Mill Pond, the Commission must not approve it. The Wetlands Bylaw has been in place for 35 years, thoughtfully drafted by your predecessors on the Conservation Commission, and approved by Town Meeting. I hope that you will continue to be good stewards of the land that has been given to you to protect under this bylaw.

Finally, please consider whether there is anything the Commission could do to raise public awareness. We are a busy town and there are a lot of meetings, but this is an important project that will dramatically change the town center given its location and I do not think that most people even know about it.

Thank you for your consideration,

Maura Sullivan  
Town Meeting Member, Precinct 1  
28 Stone Avenue

## Vreeland, Elaine

---

**From:** Szekely, Brian <bszekely@winchester.us>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 1, 2022 2:12 PM  
**To:** jnsuhr@verizon.net; dwm204@gmail.com  
**Cc:** arodgers08@comcast.net; Jerius, Diab  
**Subject:** RE: Steve Cohn's Assessment of Visual Impacts of 10 Converse Place Redevelopment

This was not submitted to me or the Planning Board so it didn't make the packet in time. This is not a transmission from Conservation Commission. Any Planning Board decision would have to comply with any Order of Conditions (OC) of the Conservation Commission regarding this particular issue with viewsheds. If there are any substantial changes to the footprint for example due to the OC, then the applicant may be back in front of the Planning Board post-decision.

Best,  
Brian Szekely  
Town Planner  
71 Mt. Vernon Street  
Winchester, MA 01890  
bszekely@winchester.us

Comments

**From:** jnsuhr@verizon.net [mailto:jnsuhr@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 1, 2022 11:51 AM  
**To:** dwm204@gmail.com  
**Cc:** arodgers08@comcast.net; Jerius, Diab; Szekely, Brian  
**Subject:** Re: Steve Cohn's Assessment of Visual Impacts of 10 Converse Place Redevelopment

I just read Steve's Cohn's 10-page memorandum assessing the visual impacts of the proposed redevelopment of the land located at 10 Converse Place. It will be interesting to see how this issue is addressed during this evening's Planning Board meeting.

The following are just a few of my questions and comments;

- Is the BSC Peer Review going to include Aesthetics and Steve Cohn's memo? I think of BSC as an engineering firm? Do they also have architectural, urban planning, urban design, and landscape design capabilities?
- Mr. Cohn has chosen three closely located positions along Mt. Vernon Street. As a resident of Winchester who values the Aberjona River and the Mill Pond, I consider the entire 360 degree view shed when evaluating aesthetic impacts. I also consider improved aesthetic views or benefits, rather than only locations where a view may be degraded. I also consider everything I am looking at, rather than just the water. In this context, one of my favorite locations for viewing the Mill Pond and the adjacent buildings is from the corner of Main Street and Mystic Valley Parkway. Steve Cohn acknowledges the importance of this broader perspective in the top paragraph on page 6 of his memo.
- Over recent months, I have enjoyed debating people whether the Laundry Building or the Parkview is the ugliest building in Winchester. While people differ which of these two buildings is the ugliest, there is broad agreement that these are the top two ugliest.

- Speaking as a retired transportation professional that worked on a number of safety-related initiatives, drivers on Mt. Vernon and other streets should not be looking at the Mill Pond; their eyes instead should be focussed on the roadway and potential interactions with pedestrians, bicyclists, and other vehicles.
- In reviewing the 10 Converse Place application, the Planning Board should consider Aesthetics from a broader perspective rather than just the very narrow perspective taken in Steve Cohn's memo.

John H. Suhrbier, Chair  
 Winchester Housing Partnership Board  
 9 Chestnut Street  
 Winchester, MA 01890  
 781-729-4824

On Jan 30, 2022, 5:21 PM -0500, David Miller <[dwm204@gmail.com](mailto:dwm204@gmail.com)>, wrote:

Hi all:

I have mentioned that the Conservation Commission is now deep into its review process of the Converse Place Notice of Intent. This was discussed at our meeting of January 25. Much focus was on the attached document, assembled by one of our members, Steve Cohn. I encourage you to take a look at it

We have also contracted w the BSC Group to undertake a peer review of the NOI application in light of the Wetlands Protection Act and, separately, the Winchester Wetlands Bylaw. Their work is just beginning

David Miller  
 Winchester MA

**From:** "jnsuhr@verizon.net" <[jnsuhr@verizon.net](mailto:jnsuhr@verizon.net)>

**Date:** Sunday, January 30, 2022 at 3:34 PM

**To:** Liu Jifeng <[jfliu\\_99@yahoo.com](mailto:jfliu_99@yahoo.com)>, DeLairre Naomi <[ndelairre@barrettsir.com](mailto:ndelairre@barrettsir.com)>, Jones Marty <[mleejones11@comcast.net](mailto:mleejones11@comcast.net)>, Matrundola Lisa <[L\\_Matrun@comcast.net](mailto:L_Matrun@comcast.net)>, Rodgers Allan <[arodgers08@comcast.net](mailto:arodgers08@comcast.net)>, David Miller <[dwm204@gmail.com](mailto:dwm204@gmail.com)>, Martin Edward <[edward.martin49@verizon.net](mailto:edward.martin49@verizon.net)>, Boyle Catherine <[ccampboyle@gmail.com](mailto:ccampboyle@gmail.com)>, Tuttle Felicity <[felicity.tuttle@shanahanre.com](mailto:felicity.tuttle@shanahanre.com)>, Bettencourt Michael <[MBettencourt@winchester.us](mailto:MBettencourt@winchester.us)>, Bergstrom Michelle <[mbergstrom@winchesterps.org](mailto:mbergstrom@winchesterps.org)>

**Cc:** Jerius Diab <[djerius@winchester.us](mailto:djerius@winchester.us)>

**Subject:** Housing Partnership Board Discussion of 10 Converse Place

In response to the Planning Board request for comments from the Housing partnership Board and other town committees on the near final proposed plans for 10 Converse Place, a review of the latest iteration of the most recent refinement of these plans is an important item for discussion as part of the HPB's meeting scheduled Feb. 9 .

Following is a link to the plans distributed to the Planning Board last Friday and that they will discuss between 7:15 and 8:30 PM next Tuesday evening, Feb. 1. The two updated landscaping plans still need to be inserted, but updated floor layout plans are included. The total number of units being proposed is now 43.

[https://www.dropbox.com/s/sz3dae2rudcewyr/220128\\_10%20Converse\\_Planning%20Board%20Presentation%20DRAFT.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/sz3dae2rudcewyr/220128_10%20Converse_Planning%20Board%20Presentation%20DRAFT.pdf?dl=0)