



TOWN OF WESTON

Planning Board Meeting October 7, 2020

Document Prepared by Dana Orkin

Link to Recording: <https://weston.vod.castus.tv/vod/?video=4631f536-81b1-4fa3-bde2-cef92901e874&nav=programs%2FPlanning%20Board%20-%20Weston%20MA>

Meeting called to order at 7:03 PM

Planning Board Members	Present	Staff Members	Present
Alicia Primer (AP) - Chair	yes	Imaikalani 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	yes
Sue Zacharias (SZ)	yes	Kim Turner (KT) - Consulting Landscape Architect	yes
Alex Selvig (AS)	no		

Italics indicate formal action taken

1.0 Public Comments

None

2.0 Public Hearing

2.1 10 Hitching Post – Flexible Subdivision Site Plan Approval – New House

Overview: AP stated that the applicants requested a continuation to the October 21, 2020 meeting

SO moved to continue the Public Hearing for the Flexible Subdivision Site Plan Approval for 10 Hitching Post to October 21, 2020. LG seconded. All in favor.

Public Comments:

None

3.0 Continued Public Hearing

3.1 95 Walker St. – RGFA Site Plan Approval – New House

Representation: Jay Lavoie, WSP; Karen Sebastian, Karen Sebastian LLC; Erik Grunigen, Architect; Alaa Alwazzan, Owner

Overview: IA gave an overview of the PB changes requested at the last meeting which included: removing one of the curb cuts or reducing the width of one of the curb-cut entrances, delete the proposed retaining wall along Walker St. in favor of a natural slope, consider reducing lawn size, and relocate the generator and pool equipment to better muffle potential noise from neighbors.

Lavoie stated that they removed the retaining wall facing Walker Street, making the grades more natural. They redesigned the patio and walkway areas to reduce the impervious area and reduced the size of the lawn by of 3,000 sf. Sebastian stated that they had added two canopy trees along Walker St and added plantings in areas where the lawn was reduced. 5,600 sf of plantings have been added since the first submission. She also noted that they reduced the impervious area along the driveway, curb cut, and turnaround area and that the new design maintains the parts of the existing wall along Chadwick which will not block the new driveway. The stones of the wall to be removed would be reused for the retaining wall along the south side of the property. Lavoie stated that they redesigned the proposed pool house removing all but one of the back windows facing the neighbors.

Documents:

- [Civil Plans dated 9/23/2020](#)

- [Architectural Plans dated 9/18/2020](#)
- [Landscape Plans dated 10/1/2020](#)

Discussion:

KT stated that she was fine with the landscaping changes.
 DC stated that the impervious reductions would improve the drainage design which was already in compliance.
 LG stated that reducing the windows in the pool house was great.
 SO applauded the applicants for being receptive to the PB's request.
 SZ agreed with SO's comments.

Public Comments:

IA read a letter from Melissa Curtis at 103 Walker St. stating her concern that the proposed work could increase water flow to her property and asking that we be sure that if the grading along the property line does not direct any more runoff onto their property.
 Lavoie stated that the proposed re-grading design directs all of the runoff to the front of the property.

SO moved to close the Public Hearing for the RGFA Site Plan Approval for 95 Walker with a decision to review on November 4, 2020. LG seconded. All in favor.

3.2 5 Colchester Road – Scenic Road Site Plan Approval – New House

Representation: Jake & Joe Tamposi, Owners; Jim Burke, DeCelle-Burke-Sala and Associates; Bill Lorigan, Lorigan Architects; Joe Hochrein, Blackwater Design

Overview: DO gave an overview of the requested changes since the last meeting which included: enhancing the planted buffer mainly along the rear of the property but also west side, and reduce the architectural massing of the rear façade. In addition, DO and DC had a discussion with the DPW to better understand the current storm water issues noted by abutters. DO reported back that the stormwater issues that exist were a longstanding issue not directly related to this property and that the applicants have reduced the runoff from this property in their proposal. Lorigan presented the architectural changes which included lowering the ridge heights by 6” – 9”, and the bottom of the eaves adjacent to the sliding door at the deck by 2’. Jake Tamposi stated that they are increasing the heights of the Betula Nigra and Pinus Strobus from 10-12’ to 12-14’ in the rear yard. Hochrein stated that they moved some of the plantings further from the 25’ wetland buffer after a request from the Town’s Conservation agent.

Documents:

- [Plan set dated 9/29/2020](#)
- [Architectural Plans dated 9/25/2020](#)
- [Description of Revisions dated 10/1/2020](#)
- [Planting Plan dated 10/7/2020](#)

Discussion:

KT stated that this was about as dense of a planting plan that they typically see and that she could not support any more plantings to be added to the site. Stated that this was a case to plant thick and thin quick or they may crowd each other out over time.

DC stated that the storm water management design was compliant and would not add additional runoff to the neighbors which is a better condition than now exists and that there was nothing else this property could do to solve the overall neighborhood’s drainage issues.

LG stated that the neighborhood could organize and request the DPW perform water management studies and propose solutions.

SO stated that he was struggling with the view from the house at the rear but believed that the house was far away and that the barn and trees would sufficiently screen the view over time.

AP drove by the property last week and believed that the barn was more like a shed than a barn. Stated it would not sufficiently buffer the view.

Tamposi stated that it was 17 feet tall and certainly a barn.

Public Comments:

Michael Margolies, 111 Conant, asked if they could increase the height of the screening trees by two feet on the east side as his property looks directly at the proposed house.

Hochrein stated that the revised design presented today does increase the height by two feet.

SZ moved to close the Public Hearing for the Scenic Road Site Plan Approval for 5 Colchester with a decision to review on November 4, 2020. LG seconded. All in favor.

4.0 New Business

4.1 15 Laurel Road – RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment – Pool House/Pool

Representation: Mike Curadossi, ML Curadossi Landscape Design; Matt Harkins, Benchmark Builders; Richard Kraska, Owner

Overview: IA stated that this property was reviewed by the PB and received RGFA Site Plan Approval which included an outdoor pool on June 20, 2018. The applicants were looking to modify the pool location and configuration which had not been built yet. Due to these modifications, IA wanted the PB to review the new design before they applied for a building permit. Kraska stated that especially during the pandemic he wanted to provide a pool for his family on the property and that they have proposed more screening along the property line.

Documents:

- [Landscape Plan dated 10/5/2020](#)
- [Architectural Plans dated 9/2/2020](#)

Discussion:

DC stated the pool was a similar size and the stormwater calculations were still valid.

KT stated that she had attended a site visit with the applicants where she advised that they add more plantings to their proposed landscape plan in a certain area. Stated that their new proposed landscape plan accounted for those requests and that she was satisfied with their design.

SZ asked if there would be any additional lighting being added.

Kraska stated that they have added minimum dark sky compliant lighting for the pool area, which Harkins described as path lights with “china hat” metal shades, approx. 2 ft tall and spaced roughly 8 feet apart.

IA asked the applicants to explain the proposed fence. Kraska stated the fence will be cedar with a black wire mesh infill along the sides of the house, the rest of the perimeter would be black chain-link with no top bar.

Public Comments:

None

LG moved to approve the RGFA Site Plan Approval Amendment for 15 Laurel Road with a decision to review on October 21, 2020. SO seconded. All in favor.

5.0 Other Business

5.1 Strategic Planning Initiatives:

- HPP Committee: AP had agreed to be the PB representative.
- Signage Guidelines: IA stated they would be scheduled for the next JST and rail trail meetings.
- Climate Resilience Plan: Ongoing with Kim Lundgren Associates as the consulting team.
- Guardrails: IA talked with Nitsch Engineering about potential new work based on discussing and recording locations in town where wood, Cor 10 and galvanized guardrails may be most appropriate.–SO asked that their fee proposal to be sent to Tom Cullen of the DPW.
- Water Usage Policy: Implementing stages

- Pollinator Demonstration Parcels: Working with RATC to get DCR permission to plant strips along the Rail Trail in Weston.
- Right of Way Trees: On hold until end of October due to DPW scheduling. IA will call TC and get a date on his calendar.
- Private Trees: IA working to arrange a meeting based on member availability.
- Transit Planning: Pilot implementation on hold due to changes in traffic patterns and suitability of mass transit as a result of the pandemic.

5.2 Brainstorming Projects

- Reusing/recycling materials during demolition
- Modifications to Site Plan Approval to encourage smaller homes on scenic roads and adding a special permit for homes built to a certain size. SO suggested to add the 5,999 RGFA loop hole into the discussion.
- Rules revisions with a possible consultant to take a look at.

5.3 Intake Meeting Statement: IA presented language to more fully describe the role of the Town of Weston consultants which would be part of the standard informational handouts. After discussion the PB approved of the following version.

“The Applicant understands that the consultants are contracted by the Town of Weston (the “Weston consultants”) and not the Applicant. The Weston consultants assist the Planning Board of the Town of Weston (the “Planning Board”) in its evaluation of a project under MGL Chapter 44 Section 53G but do not determine whether any project or aspect thereof will be acceptable to the Planning Board. The views expressed by the Weston consultants during any meetings and correspondence with Applicant are not binding on the Planning Board and so are in no way any indicate ~~ion~~ or guarantee that the Planning Board will approve the Applicant’s proposed project, or will agree with Weston consultants’ or the Applicant’s opinions. Accordingly, the Applicant acknowledges and agrees that the Weston consultants have no duty to the Applicant, and the Applicant will hold harmless Weston consultants with respect to the determinations of the Planning Board. Weston consultants are an intended beneficiary of this paragraph.”

5.4 Approve Minutes

SO moved to approve the [9/23/2020](#) meeting minutes with the changes noted. SZ seconded. All in favor.

5.5 Town Planner Report

- a) Meetings & Site Visits
 - a. PB Regular Meeting on October 21 at 7pm

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.