



TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting January 22, 2020
 Document Prepared by Dana Orkin

Meeting called to order at 7:00 PM

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Tony Flynn (TF) - Chair	yes	Imai Aiu (IA) - Town Planner	yes
Leslie Glynn (LG)	yes	Dana Orkin (DO) - Asst. Town Planner	yes
Steve Oppenheimer (SO)	yes	Dave Conway (DC) - Consulting Civil Engineer	no
Alicia Primer (AP)	yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	no
Sue Zacharias (SZ)	yes (remote)		

Italics indicate formal action taken

1.0 Public Comment

Referencing the Rt. 30 new state initiative bike bath project, Barbara Fullerton, TAG, said that Route 30 was a scenic road and should be a PB project.

TF stated that as Route 30 is a state highway it cannot be a designated Scenic Road and therefore the PB has no authority per the Scenic Road By-law.

2.0 Information

2.1 Town Tree Management Discussion

Overview:

TF introduced the purpose of the proposed tree working groups (Private Tree Group and Public Tree Group) which was to bring DPW, TAG and the PB together to collectively agree to management strategies for town trees – to maintain health, beauty, and safety. LG presented why trees are important for the Town of Weston. She stated the need for proper management. IA stated the need for a practical process to effectively remove trees that are a risk. Tom Cullen stated the DPW had conducted a tree inventory for the right-of-way trees which was performed by an arborist who evaluated the risk and condition of the trees. TF opened up the discussion of how to structure the working groups and how to move forward.

Discussion:

LG asked Cullen if he had a graphic for the tree inventories.
 Cullen stated that he does.

TF asked Cullen how many high hazard trees needed to be removed now.
 Tom Cullen stated that he will not get into that.

SZ asked what other towns have done a tree inventory.
 Tom Cullen stated he does not know the answer to that question.
 IA stated he does not know but he can go and ask.

TF asked what guidelines are set in place to remove and prune trees.
 Tom stated that Mass General Law governs shade trees and the Scenic Road Bylaw also sets regulations.

TF asked if Tom and Chris will be in the right of way working group.
 Tom Cullen stated that he will be involved.
 Chris Houston stated that Harvey Boshart will be involved.
 Laurie Hess, TAG, stated she will be involved as well.

LG stated that there is some communal understanding and education that can be had from this process.

TF stated that Tom Cullen plans on distributing a tree survey for the town regarding tree concerns and to collect input.

TF asked if the Town Arborist Jackie Jackson could be involved with the working groups.

Tom Cullen stated that she would be involved.

TF asked who would be involved with the private tree working group.

Chris Houston stated that Laurie Bent would be involved.

Tom Cullen stated that someone from DPW would be involved.

Barbara Fullerton would represent TAG with Laurie as a back-up.

LG asked who, from the PB, would be interested in being a part of the working groups.

SZ, LG, and AP stated their interest.

AP stated that she could be the back-up for each working group.

LG would be assigned to the public working group.

SZ would be assigned to the private working group.

Public Comments:

Dianna Chaplin, Love Lane, asked what LG meant by excessive tree cutting and if that was something they measured or if it was from perception.

LG stated it is something they are right on the edge of being able to measure.

Nina Danforth, TAG, stated the importance for canopy, especially since the earth is getting warmer. She congratulated the PB for walking the streets with Eversource. She stated school trees should be discussed as well. She stated that Lexington has an excellent tree booklet that the town can reference. She also asked if there was a way to identify the trees noted on the Tree Inventory – was there a GPS coordinate.

Tom Cullen said no.

Chris Houston, Select Board, stated that clear guidelines would help the DPW explain why trees are being removed.

Terry Eastman, 50 Pigeon Hill Road, asked if the Conservation Commission should be involved in these working groups.

Rees Tulloss, Con Com, stated that it seems like the PB has it under control.

TF asked if a representative could be involved in the first working group and then they can decide if they would like to continue.

Tulloss agreed.

3.0 Public Hearing

3.1 Jericho Lane, Stonegate Condominiums – Site Plan Approval – Replace existing gas lighting with electric lighting

Representation: Sheila Cummings, Board of Trustees Member at Stonegate

Overview: Sheila stated that they want to replace the gas lanterns with LED lights. There were concerns with break-ins and dim lighting. The plan was to replace all the gas lanterns with dark sky compliant coach lanterns on six-foot granite posts, put two lanterns at entry way, fence downlighting at two areas, motion sensor activated flood lights in the garages, and in one instance provide up-lighting on a tree.

Documents:

- [Photometrics Map](#)
- [Coach Lantern Fixture](#)
- [Fence Downlights](#)
- [Garage Lights](#)
- [Moonlighting](#)
- [Lumen Count Table](#)

Discussion:

AP stated that she walked the site and saw that it was very dark.

LG asked what type of Planning project this is – under what part of the By-law is the PB reviewing it?
IA stated that this was a multifamily development back in the 70s and this will be the first site plan approval they have ever gone through.

LG suggested that the flood lights shine up into the car ports. She had concerns about the moonlighting in the tree and stated that the straps that hold the lights on the trunk so the light can shine up into the branches can gird and eventually kill the trees. Asked if they could reduce the lumens at the entryway or add a sconce instead of a post light.

Sheila stated that they could consider mounting the coach lanterns on the side of the posts.

SZ stated that the proposal will be a dramatic change and had concerns with the lights being on all night. and she agreed with LG on the tree lights.

Sheila stated they can have the lights turn off at a certain time. She would like to consult with her Board members about how this will be done.

SO stated that the requirements for single family residences need to match this proposal. Stated 3,300 lumens per fixture is very high.

Sheila stated they had this discussion for their lighting consultant. They wanted the radius of the lights to cover as much area as possible. They wanted the community to feel safe. Stated that the analogy of a single-family home is not a great comparison, they have a street that needs to be lit.

SO requested that they ask their lighting consultant for a lower lumen bulb.

TF asked if they could test the lighting with temporary lights.

Sheila did not comment on a pilot program.

Sheila asked what happens next, if she addresses their concerns.

TF stated they could continue the hearing to the next meeting to review.

Public Comments:

Rebecca Gardner, 16 Warren Place, asked if the tree canopy lights would be turned off at a certain time.

Sheila stated that they will be left on and they will be no brighter than other lights in the neighborhood.

AP stated that the abutter will not be able to see those lights.

Dianna Chaplin, Love Lane, asked if Highland Meadows could give them criteria for lighting in this type of development.

IA stated he can look into it.

Public Hearing continued to February 26, 2020.

4.0 Public Hearing

4.1 15 Evergreen Avenue – RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment- Add Skylights

Representation: Mark Cahill, Contractor; Jordan Menzin, Owner

Overview: Cahill stated their request to install six sky lights at the rear of the home. Additional evergreen plantings are proposed to provide an added buffer. Menzin stated that the existing screening will block out the proposed skylights and that he did not want to reduce the number of skylights.

Discussion:

LG stated that she was concerned with overall light pollution into the night sky.

SO believed that it is only in their purview to analyze how the proposal impacts the abutters.

Menzin stated they will have motorized shades on each skylight.

DO read a note from KT which recommended that the applicants mix up the proposed evergreens with different species such as Norway Spruces.
Menzin stated that they could add some Norway Spruces to the mix.

LG suggested that the PB adopt a regulated policy for skylights and greenhouses.

Public Comments:

None

Decision to be reviewed at February 5, 2020 meeting.

5.0 New Business

5.1 13 Pigeon Hill Rd. – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval Amendment – Unpermitted tree removal

Overview: Applicants requested to continue the hearing to the February 26, 2020 meeting.

Hearing continued to February 5, 2020.

6.0 Decisions

6.1 [148 Sudbury Rd – Scenic Road ROW Permit – Temporarily Remove Stone Wall](#)

SO moved to approve the Scenic Road ROW Permit for 148 Sudbury Road with the changes noted. LG seconded. All approved.

6.2 [15 Pincroft Rd – RGFA Site Plan Approval – New 5,483sf RGFA House](#)

SO moved to approve the RGFA Site Plan Approval for 15 Pincroft Rd. with the changes noted. AP seconded. All approved.

6.3 [140 Country Drive – RGFA Site Plan Approval – Pool House Addition](#)

SO moved to approve the RGFA Site Plan Approval for 140 Country Drive with the changes noted. LG seconded. All approved.

7.0 Special Order

7.1 Election of Vice Chair

SZ was not able to vote on a Vice Chair remotely

Discussion continued to the February 5, 2020 meeting.

8.0 Other Business

8.1 Town Planner Report

a) Scheduling:

1/23/2020 - Select Board Meeting for 255 Merriam St.

2/4/2020 - 10am Site Visit for 31 Beech Rd.

2/5/2020 – Regular PB Meeting

b) Transportation Survey:

Survey had been launched and they already have over 300 responses.

c) Water Master Plan:

Meeting again in February with SZ representing PB

d) Administrative Approvals

8 Lawrence Road removal of three 20” White Pines and one 10” Dead Red Oak. PB was concerned that the excavation cut so close to the trees. The PB approved the removal of the trees since they were a danger of falling on the home. LG wanted permission to visit the property.

8.2 Working Group and Committee Updates

None

8.3 Approve Minutes

SO moved to approve the minutes for 4/10/2020, 4/24/2020, and 5/1/2020. SZ seconded. All in favor.

LG moved to adjourn, SO seconded. All in favor, none opposed.

Meeting adjourns at 9:57 p.m.