



TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting July 1, 2020

Document Prepared by Dana Orkin

Link to Recording:

<https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=ca9e7c1a-28ac-46cf-97b3-98b3e7239acf&nav=programs%2FPlanning%20Board%20-%20Weston%20MA>

Meeting called to order at 7:05 PM

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Alicia Primer (AP) -Chair	yes	Imaikalani Aiu (IA) – Town Planner	yes
Leslie Glynn (LG)	yes	Dave Conway (DC) - Consulting Civil Engineer	yes
Steve Oppenheimer (SO)	yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	yes
Sue Zacharias (SZ)	yes	Dana Orkin (DO) – Assistant Town Planner	yes

Italics indicate formal action taken

1.0 Public Comment

None

2.0 Continued Public Hearing

2.1 576 North Ave. – Special Permit Flexible Subdivision – 6 Lot Subdivision

Applicant: Henry Tiedemann

Representation: Rob Gemma (Metrowest Engineering)

Documents:

- [Comparison of Subdivision Plans](#)
- [Flexible Subdivision Proposed Site Plan dated 7/1/2020](#)

Overview:

Gemma stated that there had been two public site visits since the last PB Meeting. Gemma presented the site plan of the proposed flexible subdivision. Gemma showed a table comparing the density proof plan, by-right plan, and the flexible subdivision plan setbacks, number of lots, trees cut, etc. He noted that

- Existing trees and added trees will provide a vegetative buffer around the property. 2.4 acres of the 8.06 acres will remain as open space – not part of any lot but part of the HOA. This includes a generous buffer facing Rt. 117.
- The turnaround for the Fire Dept was an “integrated tee” configuration which significantly minimized paving and fits more comfortably into the residential scale.
- There are ongoing discussions with Weston Forest & Trail to grant them a trail easement along the water easement at the west side of the property.

Discussion:

SO raised his concerns about the number of trees being removed within the limit of work. Gemma noted that regrading and construction activities preclude saving trees in the middle of the development. IA stated that the developer could identify pockets within the subdivision where they could save various trees. SZ stated that many of the trees on the site were shorter scrub-like trees and doubted that there were many significant trees in the work area that could be saved.

SO suggested that the trees which are planned to line the new internal street be planted now to give them a head start. SO is concerned about the barren look which developments have when all the trees are taken down. KT agreed. Further she asked that the applicant present a more detailed landscape plan at the next meeting showing surveyed trees.

LG suggested that some of the septic fields be located below the lawns to minimize the number of trees cut.

Public Comments:

Lynne Bower, 345 South Great Road, abutter, stated some concerns. First the removal of so many trees from the middle of the subdivision will increase the noise she hears from the train tracks. Second that the current location of the house on Lot 3 hugs the property line and is very close to her home. She asked that the proposed location be moved farther away from the property line. Further she is very concerned about the effectiveness of the vegetative buffer as most of the trees are deciduous.

SZ moved to continue the public hearing to July 15, 2020. SO seconded. All in favor.

3.0 Public Hearing

3.1 36 Church Street – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval – New House

Applicant: Lingyun Rui

Representation: Matt Harkins (Benchmark Builders), Bill Andrews (Benchmark Builders) Angela Kearny (Minglewood LLC), Al Gala (Gala Simon Associates), Ralph Kilfoyle (RDK Architects)

Documents:

- [Plan set dated 7/1/2020](#)
- [Architectural Plans dated 7/1/2020](#)
- [Arborist letter dated 6/30/2020](#)
- [Arborist report dated 6/30/2020](#)

Overview:

Andrews presented plans to build an 8,059 RGFA, 5-bedroom multi-generational house at 36 Church Street, a 3.1-acre lot with wetlands and significant elevational change. The Applicants have gone through the 1-year demolition delay imposed by the Historic Commission. The current plan locates the new house on a knoll, primarily on the footprint of the house to be demolished. This location allows a large buffer of existing trees to remain to screen the new house from Church St., a scenic road, as well as the Rail Trail.

Gala presented the drainage system plan which was comprised of 21 Cultec chambers to manage the storm water. He stated that the proposed septic system would be located under the proposed parking court. Construction of the house and septic is outside the 100' wetlands buffer.

Kearny presented the landscape plan to plant 22 evergreen trees with understory shrubs and remove 26 trees. She highlighted portions of the arborist report which recommended various trees removed due to poor health and/or growth habit. She noted that some of the trees should come down to minimize shade on future roof solar panels. She noted that the existing stone retaining wall at the front of the house would be rebuilt with the existing stone and no exposed mortar.

Kilfoyle presented the architectural plans for the proposed house. The footprint of the house is 4300 sf, 2.5 stories with a 3-car garage. The 1st floor has 10' ceilings and the 2nd floor has 9'.

Discussion:

DC stated that the stormwater proposal is sufficient.

KT stated that they have worked with the applicants closely on this iteration and that it is unfortunate that a number of significant trees have to come out for the new house.

LG asked if they found any ledge. Gala stated that they did test pits and they found no ledge. LG asked if they could push the height of the house down as the elevation of the 1st floor of the existing house is 198.15' and the proposed is 200.4'. Although the house is within the height allowance it sits on a high point relative to adjacent property. Gala stated that their team would look into it.

LG asked for the applicants to reconsider cutting down trees designated #3 and #4 and see if they could be saved. Kearney had doubts but would revisit the decision with the arborist and builder.

SZ asked where the reserve area for the septic was. Gala replied that it was between the trenches of the new septic trenches.

AP stated her concerns that the row of plantings proposed along the front of the house are too uniform and should be arranged in a more natural manner. Kearney agreed to rectify that.

AP remembered from the Historic Com. Meeting that the existing bracket supported canopy from the historic house to be demolished was requested to be reused in this new house. AP stated that the entry door near the garage would be a great place to relocate this historic architectural feature. The design team agreed to consider this change for the next meeting.

Public Comments:

Alex Lee, 10 Pigeon Hill, stated his concerns that the house would be a source of light pollution due to the high elevation of the home site. He is also concerned about screening views from the Rail trail and Church St. and asks that more trees be saved.

SO moved to continue the public hearing for the Scenic Road Site Plan Approval of 36 Church Street to July 15. LG seconded. All in favor.

4.0 New Business

4.1 44 Oak Street – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval Amendment – Sunroom Addition

Applicant: Hungha Wu

Representation: Beth Nolan, Attorney; Kevin Kieler (Brady Built Sunrooms)

Documents:

- [Landscape plan dated 6/17/2019](#)
- [Sunroom elevations dated 7/1/2020](#)
- [COA Amendment dated 6/19/2019](#)
- [Conservation Commission Minor Plan Change Approval dated 1/30/2019](#)

Overview:

Nolan stated that the homeowners at 44 Oak have rectified the eight items that were in violation of the Planning Board conditions attached to a Site Plan Approval Amendment dated 6/17/2019 as well as ConCom minor plan change approval dated 1/30/2019 and were proposing adding a glass “sunroom” by Brady Built Sunrooms to the second floor.

Discussion:

LG asked about the status of the property with regard to Conservation Commission noncompliance issues. Nolan stated that Michele Grzenda was reviewing the as-built plans for compliance but that everything else has been corrected.

LG asked if KT and DO agreed that the property was now in compliance per their inspection of the property. KT stated they did an inspection a couple months back and that everything was in accordance with the approved decisions.

SO stated his concerns for excessive light pollution from the full glass walled sunroom. Kieler said that the glass had a tint. SO said he would like to see a sample and/or specifications. Keiler said he would send a sample and/or specification.

Public Comments:

William Bradley, 38 Oak Street, abutter, questioned if the driveway was in compliance. DO confirmed that the driveway was in compliance and referenced the COA Amendment of 6/19/2019 to show this.

Bradley stated his concerns for excessive light and glare coming from the sunroom at night. The Planning Board cannot regulate interior lighting, however the owner said that the room would have only one down light.

Bradley asked the PB to verify that the plants were the standard approved size. DO and KT stated they would double check for the next meeting.

SZ moved to continue the public meeting for Scenic Road Site Plan Approval Amendment for 44 Oak Street to July 15. SO seconded. All in favor.

4.2 101 Concord Road – Flexible Subdivision Site Plan Approval Amendment – Patio Expansion

Applicant: Julie and Jared Freed

Representation: Jeff Plant, MacDowell Co.

Documents:

- [Site plan dated 6/23/2020](#)

Overview:

The original Flexible Subdivision Site Plan approval was dated October 11, 2017. Plant presented a plan to add a patio with a fire pit and additional plantings.

Discussion:

SZ stated concerns for the fire pit safety especially how close to a flammable deck a fire pit should be located and that burning real wood will emit smoke which could bother neighbors as well as live embers as a fire hazard. AP stated that the PB should work with the Fire Dept. to define a fire pit policy going forward.

Public Comments:

None

SZ moved to approve the revisions for 101 Concord Road to be approved in a memorandum. LG seconded. All in favor.

4.3 99 Westcliff Road – Approval Not Required

Overview:

DO stated that the plan was to divide 99 Westcliff Road into two lots.

SZ moved to sign the approval not required for 99 Westcliff Road. LG seconded. All in favor.

3.0 Decisions

3.1 [183 Ridgeway Road – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval, New Home](#)

SZ moved to approve the Certificate of Action Scenic Road Site Plan Approval for 183 Ridgeway Road with the changes noted. LG seconded. All in favor.

4.0 Other Business

4.1 Administrative Approvals

104 Meadowbrook Rd.

KT stated that the applicant would like to plant larger trees than was approved. The PB agreed that this change could be handled administratively.

4.2 Approve Minutes

SZ moved to approve the [2/26/2020](#) Minutes with the changes noted. LG seconded. All approved.

SZ moved to approve the [3/18/2020](#) Minutes with the changes noted. SO seconded. All approved.

SO moved to approve the [3/25/2020](#) Minutes with the changes noted. LG seconded. All approved.

4.3 Merriam Street Sidewalks Update

LG gave an overview of the site walk on Merriam Street. She showed pictures from a site walk with the Town Engineer, contractor and town arborist of the proposed stone wall locations and stone wall mock up. She asked the Planning Board for comments and questions. The PB agreed that LG should continue to monitor progress.

LG moved to approve the stone wall mock up with the comments LG gave to DPW. SZ seconded. All in favor.

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.