

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 2007

A regular meeting of the Lexington Planning Board held in the Estabrook Room of Cary Hall, was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Manz with members Canale, Hornig, Zurlo and planning staff McCall-Taylor and Henry present. Planning Board member Anthony Galaitis was absent.

***** ADMINISTRATION OF LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS *****

SUBDIVISION OF LAND

88, 92 & 100 Shade Street, Sketch Plan for Cluster/Special Residential Subdivision: Michael Snow, the applicant's landscape architect provided the Board with a brief description of the sketch plan submittal, including the existing conditions of the site, the proof plan for a conventional 12 lot subdivision and the proposed development plan of 26 housing units of varying size and style. The 26 units are split into two areas of development, a northerly area consisting of three new single-family homes on individual lots and the existing structure. The existing home, named Journey's End, may or may not end up being divided into three units, the applicant hopes it can be sold as a single family home, but for the sake of this proposal is depicting it as divided so as to include the maximum proposed development. The southerly area would be a more typical cluster style development with detached single-family homes along Shade Street and attached single-family, townhouse and one-bedroom carriage house units further in the site.

Board Comments: Mr. Canale began by voicing concern over the proposed Lot 7 seemingly segregated from the rest of the (southern) cluster. Also of major concern were the impacts of the development on Shade Street. Mr. Canale suggested that the total development impacts would be better in the 60% range rather than 100% range that the current sketch plan depicts, and that 20 units total would be better than the 26 proposed. He felt that were Mr. Galaitis present he would voice the same concerns. The applicant responded that he was simply trying to build a mix of unit types that the Board has indicated they want. Mr. Hornig was concerned about the access to the units and the necessary site grading. He would prefer a loop street through the southern cluster rather than a dead end, but does have some concerns about site lines. Mr. Hornig likes the housing mix and wants some sort of preservation restriction on the existing home, Journey's End. Mr. Zurlo likes the housing mix, but would prefer lot 7 to be more integrated into the cluster. He stated he would prefer if the cluster impacts employed 12 units to generate the maximum figures, rather than the 13.56 units derived from the cluster by-law formula. Mr. Hornig thought that access to the

usable open space needed to be shown. Ms. Manz favors the proposed mix of housing but does think two means of access/egress will be necessary. The board briefly discussed the proposed width of 18 feet for the internal drive, suggesting 20 feet might be appropriate; a conventional road serving this number of units would require 24 feet of pavement. The Board felt that the proposal as outlined could proceed to the preliminary subdivision plan stage.

11 Suzanne Road, Revised Preliminary Site Development Plan for a Reduced Frontage Subdivision:

Rick Waitt of Meridian Engineering introduced the project team and explained to the board and audience the development process to date, beginning with the proof plan. Mr. Waitt feels that the revised plan addresses most, if not all, of the concerns voiced by the abutters. At the request of the board Mr. Waitt contrasted the shared driveway concept (not favored by the applicant) with the proposal. Michael Snow, the landscape architect, pointed out several advantages of the shared drive when compared to a conventional subdivision, but felt that the proposed concept was superior to even that. The changes from last time were described as a slight reduction in the square footage of the proposed homes, retaining walls were no longer necessary, the height of the proposed house on Lot 2 had been reduced and it would be placed 40 feet to further to the west (away from the North Street abutter), decreased the amount of fill by an amount equivalent to 2.5 feet over the entire Lot 2. In an attempt to respond to abutters' concerns, Attorney Grant offered to condition the special permit to prohibit any changes to Lot 2. Mr. Lord, the property owner of 11 Suzanne Road, closed by reiterating his desire to create a win-win-win for all parties involved.

Board Comments: Mr. Zurlo thought the changes responded to the comments but would like to see the proposed home on lot 2 staked out, to get a better feel of how this project may impact abutters. Mr. Zurlo was not sure that the impervious surface ratio was lower under this proposal as compared to the shared driveway concept. Mr. Zurlo remains uncomfortable with the rationale for using both the frontage waiver and the alternate means of access under one special permit. Ms. Manz asserted that this is not a strained interpretation of the bylaw and has been approved by Town Counsel. Mr. Hornig wished to see a revised drainage report and is not comfortable with the proposed grading on Lot 1, which is proposed to be raised 1 foot. Mr. Hornig would like to condition any eventual special permit with the requirement that both lots be subject to a 12% impervious surface ratio. The applicant believes that this would be very difficult to adhere with and offered 13 or 14% as a more realistic number. The number of plans before the board troubled Mr. Hornig, and he was unsure of what the board was approving. Mr. Canale suggested that the public benefit might

include the improvement of the stonewall on North Street, and insuring public access to Willard's Woods via North Street. The precise details of the benefit must be included in the submission of the definitive site development plan. Mr. Canale also expressed an interest in the wording of any private easements contemplated between the lots. Ms. Manz suggested that the walkways could perhaps be treated differently to help bring the impervious surface ratio down. She also thought that the orientation of the proposed home on Lot 2 would be excellent for solar panels and urged the team to consider it.

Audience Comment: Mrs. Carol Chomsky, 15 Suzanne Road, wanted to know which street Lot 2 would use as an address. The Board felt that this house would use a North Street address. Ms. Sue Hilzenrath, 17 Suzanne Road, explained to the board that she had met with the property owner and that this process has actually created a renewed sense of neighborhood for which many of the abutters were grateful. Mr. Sven Spoerri of 6 Suzanne Road was unsure what height requirements would apply to these lots, the process for any future changes to the lots and the nature of the eventual public benefit. The answer was that the conventional height requirement of 2.5 stories and 40 feet would apply to these lots and that any future changes to these lots would require a revision of the special permit, triggering abutter notification and a public hearing. The public benefit must be proposed in the definitive site development application. Mr. Don Goldmann, 79 North Street, was concerned with the proposed turn-around in front of the home proposed on Lot 2. Mrs. Goldmann was pleased, however, with the revised location of the home.

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to approve the preliminary site development plan with several conditions and, by mutual agreement between the applicant and the Board, to grant an extension of two weeks, until February 12, for the time in which the Board must file their decision. The conditions to the approval were as follows: grading necessary to raise the house above the seasonal high ground water be done only near the houses, not over the entire site; the sizes of the new houses be within the guidelines utilizing the neighborhood profile; trees are to be preserved within 20' of the property lines, except within the first 100' of North Street where the driveway is to be located; a tree management plan be included with next submission; if human remains are found on the site they will be dealt with appropriately, including notification of the jurisdictional state agencies; the definitive submission will include elevation drawings and views from the streets; and, the impervious surface ratio will be calculated and efforts will be made to minimize the amount of impervious surface on site.

***** PROPOSED 2007 WARRANT ARTICLES*****

The Board discussed the necessity of proposed articles for clarifying the term “conventional subdivision” in Section 135-47.A as proposed in Article D, and Article E, zoning corrections. It was determined that both of these articles would not be brought to Town Meeting for action at this time and that the Board of Selectmen would be asked to dropped both from the Warrant. The proposed articles dealing with inclusionary housing, tree management and penalties for violations of the Zoning By-Law would all proceed to the scheduled public hearing on February 28, 2007.

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

Gregory Zurlo, Clerk