



Planning Board Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, May 10, 2022, at 7:00 pm – Zoom Meeting

Members Present:	Diab Jerius, Chair	Sally Dale, Vice Chair/Clerk	
	I-Ching Scott	Nicholas Rossettos	
Members Absent:	Kurt Spring		
Also Present:	Brian Szekely, Town Planner	Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary	
	WinCam	Bryan Manter, Assistant Town Engineer	
Others Attending:	Zeina Marchant	Bill Rutnam	Walid Sukarieh
	John Suhrbier	Larry Murray	Brandon Bettencourt
	Zhongjing Duan		

A quorum being in attendance, Chair Jerius calls the Winchester Planning Board (PB) meeting to order at 7:01 pm, noting that the meeting is being video recorded via WinCam and Zoom. Roll call of PB members: Dale, Scott, Rossettos, Jerius in attendance.

1. Updates – Mr. Szekely:

- a. Biennially, Winchester has to update the Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI). Met with Mr. Suhrbier and Ms. Jones (Housing Partnership Board) to review the number. Will be including Cambridge Street and River Street projects. Estimate the total to be around 4.8%.
- b. Met with Mr. Pruitt on the Transportation Grant. Plan to request funds to plan and develop a transportation program instead of asking for a vehicle. Want to include services that interconnect with adjacent municipalities. Also, the Town has one van serving seniors.
- c. The results from Town Meeting include: Carriage House warrant did not pass; the warrant for noncitizens voting did pass; the budget passed as proposed with minor changes.
- d. The Accessory Dwelling Units Committee has an in-person meeting scheduled for May 25th, 6:30 – 8:00 pm at the Jenks Center.
- e. The Transportation Planning Group has a listening session scheduled via zoom on May 19th, at 7:00 pm. Registration is requested for the meeting and a map survey is available. Group is seeking input from town residents.

2. Updates – Chair Jerius: There is a special Town Meeting tentatively scheduled for June 6th to consider the Waterfield Lot disposition.

3. ZBA Petitions

a. Petition No. 3960 – 25 Yale Street:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking a Special Permit so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be located closer to the rear property line than permitted as of right. The property is located in the RDB (Single Residence) zoning district and contains 12,443+/-square feet. The house was built in 2015. The Historical Commission and Design Review Committee have not yet met on these petitions. The proposal entails the addition of an enclosed porch (~200 SF footprint) by demolishing a portion of and expanding an existing deck. The deck is in the rear and abuts the property at 12 Foxcroft, whose residents have written a letter of support for the petition. Due to the limited size and location of the addition, recommends favorable action.

PB Discussion: no comments.

Ms. Scott moved to recommend favorable action for ZBA Petition #3960 for 25 Yale Street. Mr. Rossettos second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Scott, Jeruis in favor. Motion passes 4-0-0 with Spring absent.

b. Petition No. 3961 – 142 Sylvester Avenue:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking a Special Permit under Section 3.5.5 so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be located closer to the side property line than permitted as of right. The property is located in the RG zoning district and contains 7,528SF+/- . This 1.5-story house was built in 1952 and of a similar smaller scale to other buildings in the neighborhood, with most buildings on the street being larger than the project site. The Historical Commission and Design Review Committee have not yet met on these petitions. The proposal entails the destruction of an existing sun porch, deck, and patio area and replace with new vestibule and garage addition which includes a second floor master suite and office. This property abuts Winchester Water Department land to the north and west. The location and materials of the addition are appropriate, but the height of the additions appears slightly awkward even though it is set back and only 4' higher than the main portion of the house. The proposal does not negatively affect the abutters or the neighborhood in general. It allows a more modest house to be preserved (rather than a demolition for example) and recommends favorable action.

PB Discussion:

- Concern that the allowed side setback for a garage is 5' and currently proposing 2.1'.
- Concern that the allowed side setback for living space is 10' and currently proposing 2.1' at the second level.
- Concern that the abutting Town land could be a future subdivision and the next occupants would have to live with a 2.1' setback.
- Concern that the street-facing window for the office above the garage does not look to be the right shape; it is squat and in-elegant; would recommend a window that would grace the building façade.
- Appreciate them keeping a smaller more affordable home and making it more livable.
- The Town land would never be subdivided; it is currently a bike-way.

Ms. Dale moved to recommend favorable action to ZBA Petition #3961 for 142 Sylvester Avenue with the following comments: the PB noted the setback being very close to the Town property and to provide a more attractive window treatment on the front of the house over the garage. Mr. Rossettos second the Motion.

Ms. Scott moved to amend the Motion to make the second floor setback closer to the required 10 feet. PB comment: This setback would have to be for the entire addition on that side. Ms. Scott withdrew her amendment.

Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Jeruis in favor. Scott opposed. Motion passes 3-1-0 with Spring absent.

c. Petition No. 3962 – 11 Watson Place:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking a Special Permit under Section 3.5.5 so as to be permitted to construct an addition that will be located closer to the front property line than permitted as of right. The property is located in the RG zoning district and contains 4,932SF+/- . This house was built in 1915, is located in MACRIS but the B-form is not available. It is also part of the Sheridan Subdivision Area Form, and 11 Watson Place was called out as "being enlarged by a one-story, three-bay-wide

addition on the left side, lacking exposed rafter ends, 11 Watson has dentils on the dormer to evoke that “craftsman-style element”. The Historical Commission and Design Review Committee have not yet met on these petitions. The proposal entails the addition of 520SF of living space to an existing 1,740SF house. Watson Place is a mix of older and newer single and duplex dwellings of varying sizes. The existing footprint will not change as a result of the proposal. The roof lines between the proposed and existing structures are matching, however the new façade feels flat compared to the rest of the house. The proposal is not a detriment to the neighborhood or the abutters, based on the significantly larger houses on the street, and the fact that neither the height nor the footprint is increasing. Recommends favorable action.

PB Discussion:

- Would like to see the exterior architecture more articulated; incorporate some of the details from other homes in the neighborhood (suggestions of #14, #9)
- Recommend adding more of the dentils.
- Concern that the roof area is very flat; suggestion to add dormers to be more in character with the original design.
- Appreciate them keeping a smaller more affordable home and making it more livable.

Mr. Murray: On behalf of the petitioners, requested PB to recognize consider this addition and whether this change is substantially detrimental than the existing nonconformity.

Ms. Dale moved to recommend favorable action to ZBA Petition #3962 for 11 Watson Place with the following comments: revise the roof design and add exterior architectural details to reflect the character of the original design and neighborhood. Mr. Rossettos second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Scott, Jeruis in favor. Motion passes 4-0-0 with Spring absent.

d. Petition No. 3963 – 121 Church Street:

Mr. Szekely: The petitioners are seeking a Special Permit under Section 5.1.10(1) so as to be permitted to have the width of the driveway entrances greater than 10’. The property is located in the RDB (Single Residence) zoning district and contains 15,997+/-square feet. The Historical Commission and Design Review Committee have not yet met on these petitions. This is the first Special Permit of this kind since the driveway curb cut bylaw was amended several years ago. The Planning Board, along with the Engineering Department felt a Special Permit process should be allowed in order to deal with requests for widening curb cuts under specific circumstances. One of the examples that was used as a potential Special Permit application dealt with a narrow, busy road that prevented a vehicle from making a right into the driveway under a safe condition without having to go into on-coming traffic to swing in. Driveways that are 10’ wide along a busy road preclude the driver from being able to make a right without either hopping the curb or crossing the yellow line. The proposed widening is in line with the intent of the bylaw and should pose little concern to the abutters or the neighborhood in general. Recommends favorable action.

PB Discussion:

- Is it possible to reduce the 15’ opening to 12’ or 13’? Seems like a big jump from 10’ to 15’.

Mr. Manter: There is radius curbing making it more efficient but also wider. The concern is for safety.

Mr. Bettencourt: Before the driveway was changed, it was 12’ wide and still difficult to maneuver a turn safely without going over the curb. When the driveway was made circular, it had to go to 10’.

Ms. Scott moved to recommend favorable action to ZBA Petition #3963 for 121 Church Street.

Ms. Dale second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossettos, Scott, Jeruis in favor. Motion passes 4-0-0 with Spring absent.

4. **Washington/Swanton Streets Request For Proposals (RFP):**

Chair Jerius: Provided brief background history: originally this site was slated for the “mega-cvs”; that proposal did not make it through land court. The Town purchased the property for affordable housing through eminent domain last year. Town Meeting put the restriction that 100% of units have contribute to the Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI). This RFP is being reviewed and will be going to the Select Board soon.

Mr. Szekely: The PB comments should focus on the evaluation criteria matrix.

PB Comments:

- Page 4 – change “15-minute walk” to language that is not subjective. Putting in the time reflects the speed of which a person can walk. Suggestion to provide a distance.
- Page 5 – second paragraph, where it says, in addition “it will be important to assure”, change it to “must assure”.
- Concern that there needs to be flexibility in the document requirements.
- Concern that the Design Review Committee needs to comment on the RFP prior to the RFP being issued.
- Want the building design to be something the Town can be proud of.
- Page 10 – the narrative “waters down” the SHI. Town Meeting wanted all rental units. Confusing to say in the RFP that condos are an option considering the SHI requirement. Mr. Szekely clarified that the minimum threshold is for all units to count for the SHI. Not all will be affordable.
- Town Meeting also required that the purchase price is recovered.

PB Discussion on the evaluation criteria resulted with the following conclusions/recommendations:

- Sustainability and Mitigation section on Page 5 needs more detail regarding the physical plant and not just the amenities (as well as review input from Mr. Pruitt).
- Reorder the evaluation criteria: Price, Affordable Housing, Development/Design, Sustainability, Traffic, Retail.
- Weigh Evaluation Criteria #1 (price) and #2 (affordable housing) at 5 points each.
- For Evaluation Criteria #3 (development/design) use 4 points for the weighting.
- Make Evaluation Criteria #6 (sustainability) the fourth priority at 3 points.
- Make Evaluation Criteria #5 (traffic) at 1 point.
- Make Evaluation Criteria #4 (retail/commercial space) also at 1 point.

Mr. Suhrbier: Noted that the \$5.27 M price is based on the highest and best use of the land. A second appraisal was done using the land for affordable housing; not sure of the results but should be lower. Also noted that the number of affordable housing units is confusing. The only way to achieve 100% SHI with condos is to make them all affordable.

Mr. Szekely: Clarified that recovery of the \$5.27M is one of the goals.

Additional PB Comments:

- Page 18 – Elements of Form, introduction paragraph; after Planning Board, add in Design Review Committee.

Chair Jerius: Will summarize the comments and forward to the Select Board.

5. **MPIC Selection Committee:**

Chair Jerius: Outlined that within the next 3 to 4 weeks, a few meetings will be taking place to select the MPIC committee from the volunteer candidates. There are 4 Master Plan themes from which the

candidates will be selected: Sustainability, Building Community, Balancing Preservation and Development, and Connecting People to Places. Need a PB representative for each. Results after PB discussion: Chair Jerius will serve on Sustainability and Building Community (pending input from Mr. Spring); Ms. Scott will serve on Balancing Preservation and Development; Ms. Dale will serve on Connecting People to Places.

6. Position Description for Town Planner:

Mr. Szekely: Noted he had made a few edits to his job description (included in the packet).

7. Town Meeting Process Document:

Ms. Dale: Referenced her revised document of April 29th in the packet.

PB discussion focused on the timing, who needs to review working drafts, when and to whom to bring final draft. Ms. Dale to make changes based on discussion. Chair Jerius to translate into a Gantt Chart.

8. Education/Outreach: postponed for a future meeting.

9. Adjourn:

Ms. Dale moved to adjourn the PB meeting of May 10, 2022. Mr. Rossetto second the Motion. Vote: Dale, Rossetto, Scott, Jerius in favor. Motion passes 4-0-0 with Spring absent. Meeting adjourned at 9:34 pm.

Nancy Polcari, Recording Secretary

Sally Dale, Clerk