



TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting October 20, 2021

Document Prepared by Susan Peghiny

Video Recording: <https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=d01f51d0-6d3f-458a-b70a-a03f6246a11d>

Meeting called to order at 7:01 PM. Chair Alicia Primer read Governor Baker’s Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law.

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Alicia Primer (AP) - Chair	Yes	Imaikalani Aiu (IA) – Town Planner	Yes
Leslie Glynn (LG)	Yes	Christine Zale (CZ) – Assistant Town Planner	Yes
Steve Oppenheimer (SO)	Yes	Dave Conway (DC) - Consulting Civil Engineer	Yes
Alex Selvig (AS) via telephone	Yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	Yes
Laurie Hess (LH)	Yes	Others	

1.0 Public Comments

There was no public comment.

2.0 Other Business

2.1 Town Planner Report

- Review of upcoming meetings & site visits.
- Meeting Procedures: IA shared the summary of suggestions to make meetings more efficient. It will be mailed to all members to identify their top 3 choices. Discussion will be on a future agenda.
- 40B Updates;
 - No changes to 751 Boston Post Road or 104 Stony Brook
 - 518 South no new drawings received, next hearing is late November.
 - 269 North Avenue: still no building permit filed.
 - 0 Wellesley was discussed at the last meeting. Comment letter to be finalized tonight.
 - 255 Merriam site visit is on November 16.
- Long Rang Initiatives
 - Private Tree Protection Bylaw survey has been closed, and the results are being reviewed. Urban Forestry Challenge grant was submitted for that and a tree canopy maintenance plan.
 - Rules & Regulations: it’s possible Town Counsel can help. Details to be determined.
 - Pollinator Group will be planting in the spring on Oak & Byron.
 - Site Plan Approval Amendment/RGFA Special Permit to be discussed on November 17, 2021.
- Committee Updates
 - LED Streetlights are Dark Sky compliant.
 - AP reported that there has been a lot of activity with Sustainability. She proposed a joint Select Board and Planning Board meeting to discuss this issue to coordinate efforts. IA will try to arrange this.

3.0 New Business

3.1 358 Boston Post Road, Josiah Smith Tavern – Site Plan Approval Amendment – Add Condenser and Relocate Plantings – Town of Weston and Friends of the JST, Applicant

Prior to discussion, LG noted she had filed Disclosure of Appearance of Conflict of Interest with the Town Clerk explaining why she was not recusing herself from discussion.

Representation: Adrienne Giske, Friends of the JST

Overview: IA explained that condensers have been added. There will be small wooden pergola structure and plantings to shield the condensers. He reviewed the proposed changes to the plantings and explained that some planned trees are missing because of lack of supply. He also reviewed issues brought up on the site walk regarding screening of an Eversource switch and planting a Norway Spruce.

Documents: [REVISED PLANTING PLAN for Josiah Smith Tavern](#)

Discussion: Ms. Giske said she had spoken with the Permanent Building Committee and Facilities who encouraged interaction with Comcast and Eversource to determine range of openings around the switch and what can be planted in the area.

KT confirmed that the 10 trees that are missing are smaller ornamentals/shrubs. She does not feel they are necessary for screening for the rain garden. Once the pergola is up, she suggests some of the dogwoods that are being moved be used to soften that structure. She has no issue with the change in the plan.

LG asked who would make the plans on how to screen the switch. Eversource & DPW will be approached for ideas, as well as input from the landscape architect. LG said there was also a suggestion to use the large rocks that are present to help in the screening. There was a discussion of using the stones.

It was decided that this would be incorporated into the approval memo as an open item.

Motion: *LG moved to approve the changed plan as presented with the one open item. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

3.2 441 Glen Road – Site Plan Approval Amendment – Car Barn Addition to existing 8,283sf House – George LeMaitre Applicant

Representation: Marcus Gleysteen, Architect; Brian Nelson, Civil Engineer; Jeff Plant, Landscape Architect; George LeMaitre, Owner; Marc Kaplan, Sanford Builders

Overview: Mr. Gleysteen explained that the proposed barn is to hold a car collection. He shared a rendering of the proposed structure and some of its features, which match the existing house.

Mr. Nelson shared a plan of the site and explained some of the details of the site. The proposed structure does come close to the conservation restriction line, and they will be filing with the Conservation Commission later in the week. The footprint is about 1,400 square feet.

Mr. Plant outlined the landscape plan for the area around the new building. The building will not be visible from the street, and only a filtered view by an abutter. AP pointed out that the property is visible from the public trail system. Mr. Plant explained the planned plantings to screen the building. He also reviewed the light fixtures.

Documents:

- [Architectural Plans for 441 Glen Road](#)
- [Civil Engineering Plans for 441 Glen Car Barn Addition](#)
- [Conservation Restriction on 441 Glen](#)
- [Landscape Plans for 441 Glen Car Barn](#)
- [Testimony on 441 Glen from Hutcheson](#)
- [Testimony on 441 Glen from Weston Forest and Trail Association](#)
- [Trail Easement Relocation Agreement for 441 Glen](#)

Discussion:

DC said they have been creative about adding infiltration. There will be some small items to add to the final approval.

AP asked if the changes the Board members had identified at the site visit had been addressed. Mr. Plant said there are changes that KT and IA suggested, but not anything since the site walk. KT said the buffer will screen the building, but the view from the trails will be different.

Ms. Barbieri summarized the email she sent to the Planning Board. She explained that the conservation restriction was carefully worded, and WFTA does not see how the building can be built without “people, vehicles, and materials” physically being on the conservation area which is prohibited by the restriction.

AP pointed out that a letter in opposition to the proposed building was received from the family that originally donated the land that is under the conservation restriction.

LH asked how the building could be built without materials and vehicles on the conservation land. Mr. Kaplan said they “surgically” excavate the sight, and put up a fence to delineate the line for the workers. Mr. Gleysteen added that they

would move the building away from the line by reducing the footprint of the building. AP said the Planning Board would like to see the new plans. Mr. Nelson said the distance could go to 5-6 feet away from the line.

AP expressed concern about the height of the building and asked for a rendering of the building from the public way at the next meeting, along with the revised plan.

LG asked KT how long it would take the planned hemlocks to grow enough to hide the building. She responded that it would be about 8-10 years. AP suggested larger trees.

AS asked how much space is needed to excavate. Mr. Kaplan said normally about 3 feet, but that they could do it with much less. However, they agreed that the building will shift away from the restriction so that it will not encroach on the conservation land. There was a discussion of how to ensure that the conservation land is not encroached upon.

SO asked if it was possible to lower the height of the building, and if the roof slope is higher or lower than the slope of the main building. Mr. Gleysteen said the current slope matches the main roof of the house (the slope of the porch roof is lower), but they will look at the pitch and light monitor to reduce the height of the building.

Public Comments:

Phil & Lucy Saunders, 445 Glenn Road. Mr. Saunders said that as part of the November 2014 Site Plan approval, the driveway lights are supposed to have motion detectors, which they do not. They would like this to be corrected. He asked that the new lights also have motion detectors. He asked that if ledge needs to be removed, they blast rather than use jackhammers. Finally, he said the windows on top of the proposed building probably won't bother them, but he feels the building will increase ambient light. He asked that those windows have shades or be removed. Mrs. Saunders said they want the approval to require all construction vehicles be parked on site, not on the street.

Michelle & Steve Garfinkel, 465 Glenn Road. Mr. Garfinkel provided some historical perspective. He said the trail is very close to the property and the driveway is visible. He feels that whether it's building or driveway, you're looking at an unnatural structure. They are familiar with the builder and attested to the quality of their work. He does not find anything distasteful about the mass or height of the structure.

Adrienne Giske said that "close contact" to the trail can easily be handled with a bond which has been done before.

Marcie Goldsmith, 425 Glenn Road, asked that a condition about the plants surviving be added to the approval, and also a condition about starting the work later on Saturday morning or no work on Saturday. IA explained that the town rules for Saturday exterior work is 8am-3pm and 7am-5pm interior work.

Lucy Saunders said there had previously been a restriction of no exterior work except for painting or other quiet work on Saturdays. She asked that this be required again.

Mr. LeMaitre thanked everyone for their work and the time that was given to this effort.

Motion: *LG moved to continue the public hearing to November 17, 2021. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

4.0 Continued Public Hearings

4.1 9,15 and 20 Riverside Road - Site Plan Approval – Redevelop Existing Office Park to Biotech Offices – Greatland Realty Partners, Applicant

Representation: Andrew Cridlin, Drew Stangel, and Andrew Taylor, Landscape Architects

Overview: IA reviewed the history of the proposal and explained that the focus of tonight's meeting will be landscaping.

Mr. Cridlin outlined the Landscape Strategy, saying that Bartlett Tree has been on site to assess every tree (there are 532 trees on site), and recommended the removal of 78 trees for tree health or safety reasons, 70 for construction for new building/facades, 21 for removal for site planning and environmental stewardship, and 39 for utility installation. A total of 208 are proposed to be removed. He then discussed the trees that will be used as replacements and their locations throughout the site.

Documents:

- [Architectural Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Architectural Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Boundary Survey Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Civil Engineering Peer Review for Riverside Road](#)
- [Civil Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Civil Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Cover Letter for Riverside Road Redevelopment](#)
- [Initial Presentations to Planning Board](#)
- [Landscape Plans for 20 Riverside](#)
- [Landscape Plans for 9-15 Riverside](#)
- [Offsite Roadway Improvement Plans for Riverside Rd](#)
- [Park Rd Improvements Turning Movements](#)

- [Presentation to PB Transportation with Park Rd](#)
- [Project Narrative for Riverside Road](#)
- [Riverside Campus Traffic Impact Analysis Peer Review](#)
- [Site Lighting Report for Riverside Road](#)
- [Site Visit Handbook](#)
- [Stormwater Report for Riverside Road](#)
- [Traffic Study for Riverside Road](#)

Discussion:

KT said she thinks this is a thoughtful plan that takes into account all of her comments.

LH asked about noise abatement because of the loss of taller trees. Mr. Cridlin said acoustics will be on the agenda for a later meeting. She also asked for clarification about the evergreen/deciduous mix both current and planned.

LH asked if each tree was tagged for size, species, condition, etc. and asked if that could be made available to the Board. Mr. Cridlin said that could be done.

LG asked what sizes were surveyed, and Mr. Cridlin said 6” and above, and they discussed the impact the removal of the white pines could have on the remaining white pines.

LG suggested that not all trees be planted at their maximum size. She asked that there be more four-season screening along Park Road. She asked why there are not trees in the parking lot islands. Mr. Cridlin said the wastewater system is shallow and doesn’t allow for trees. There was a discussion of putting something else in these areas.

There was a discussion of what happens to the trees that are being removed, including transplanting some items to other areas in town.

AS expressed concern about the adequacy of the Park Road screening.

AP said they need to add more plantings, since the Board usually requires a 2:1 replacement for trees removed. There was a discussion of this, and SO asked for KT’s opinion. KT said many of the trees being proposed are much larger than what would be used in a residential situation, and she thinks the overall plan is suitable for the site. She would like to look at the Park Street entrance again with the proponents.

Public Comments:

Terry Eastman said she is concerned about the large number of trees to be removed and wants to be sure that the reason for removal is based on the health and maintenance of the old trees. There was a discussion of reviewing the proposed trees to be removed. AP suggested another site visit after the trees are marked to review the reasons for removal. IA listed items that should be prepared for this visit.

LH asked about tree maintenance, and Mr. Cridlin said they will prepare recommendations for the owners. Requiring tree maintenance was discussed as part of the decision.

Motion: *LG moved to continue the public hearing to November 17, 2021. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

4.2 Zoning Bylaw Amendment – Historic Heritage Overlay Designation – Weston Planning Board Applicant

Overview: IA explained that the name had been changed to “Designation” (from overlay), and it will be voluntary. It will be a provision of the Flexible Subdivision, and he explained how the proposed framework would work. He outlined the proposed procedure for this type of development.

IA outlined the questions that the Board would need to provide input on including various incentives, and rules & regulations vs. bylaw regulations.

Documents:

- [Historic Heritage Overlay Zoning Bylaw Amendment](#)
- [Letter from 99 Westcliff Representatives](#)
- [Overview Presentation](#)
- [Proposed Rules and Regulations for Historic Heritage Overlay District](#)
- [Slide Presentation on Updates to Zoning Bylaw Amendment 3-17-21](#)

Discussion:

Al Aydelott, Historical Commission, said the primary goal is the preservation of significant houses that are normally on large lots. He sees it as a limited category for preservation to offer incentives to preserve older houses and the lots on which they are located. He suggests the bylaw be structured so the house, lot, and neighborhood maintain their character. He added that the process shows the Planning Board receiving the application first, with the property being assessed after that. The Historical Commission has formed a subcommittee to identify the guidelines for this process, with a draft becoming available in March or April.

AP emphasized that an important part of this designation should also be preservation of natural landscape features that are important to the character of the town – not just the building but the building in its natural setting.

LH asked if this is a new idea for the area or if other communities do something similar. AP said there are towns that offer tax relief, but Weston may be working on something new.

LG asked if any of the affordable housing organizations have been involved in the process. AP identified the people that have been contacted.

LG suggested there should be a clear understanding about when the bonus units become ancillary buildings. She also suggested that it's not only the significant house that could become multi-unit, but it could be the new construction (which could be easier), so there should be flexibility to go either way.

There was a discussion of the stock of significant houses and whether smaller historic homes could also be considered.

SO asked if the designation would require a preservation restriction. AP said this has not been determined yet and outlined some of the possibilities. This was discussed.

SO pointed out that a Merriam Street redevelopment could have been different if this designation had been available. He said there should be some sort of preservation requirement, which AP explained is part of the proposed designation, and this was discussed.

Public Comments:

Diana Chapman said she hopes the proposal doesn't get stuck on SHI and ignore other brackets of affordability that might not qualify. There was general support for this comment.

Terry Eastman asked if it would be helpful to launch a survey of what other towns have done to perhaps use it to convince the town to accept this proposal at Town Meeting. Ms. Eastman offered to help with this effort, which was accepted.

Adrienne Giske explained some of the research done at the Council on Aging in support of Ms. Eastman's suggestion.

Don Sallay, 555 Wellesley Street, asked the Board to think about three things: having as much flexibility as possible so there are options based on each situation, minimizing red tape to make it easier for homeowners, and to do the analysis to determine what the real value/cost is to the homeowner to preserve a house to ensure the incentives make it worth it.

***Motion:** LG moved to continue the public hearing to January 5, 2022. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

5.0 Decisions

5.1 0 Wellesley Street – Local Initiative Project – 6 Unit Affordable Housing Development – Habitat for Humanity, Applicant – Comment Letter

***Motion:** LG moved to approve the 0 Wellesley Street – Local Initiative Project – 6 Unit Affordable Housing Development memo as edited. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

6.0 Other Business

6.1 Approval of Minutes

***October 20, 2021:** SO moved to approve the minutes of October 20, 2021. LH seconded, and the motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

7.0 Future Meetings

November 17, 2021
December 1, 2021
December 15, 2021

8.0 Adjournment

***Motion:** LG moved to adjourn, LH seconded. The motion passed unanimously by rollcall vote.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Peghiny

Recording Secretary