

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MEETING OF March 14, 2007

A regular meeting of the Lexington Planning Board, was held in Room 125 at Clarke Middle School, and called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairman Manz with members Hornig, Galaisis, Canale, and planning staff McCall-Taylor, Henry and Kaufman present. Mr. Zurlo arrived at 7:45 p.m.

*****SUBDIVISION ADMINISTRATION*****

147 Shade Street, Extension of Time for Action:

The applicant requested a 45-day extension of time from April 9, 2007, to act on the preliminary subdivision plan. On a motion duly made and seconded, it was voted unanimously 4-0 to grant the 45-day extension.

11 Suzanne Road, Mid-Term Review:

Rick Waitt of Meridian Engineering calculated the neighborhood profile. He treated North Street and Suzanne Road as separate neighborhoods and then as a single neighborhood. The footprint for the house on Suzanne Road (Lot 1) is 2,900 square feet, which is smaller than the median of 3,278 square feet for Suzanne Road, and the footprint for the house on North Street (Lot 2) would be 2,550 square feet, which is smaller than the median of 2,793 square feet for North Street. Michael Snow, the landscape architect addressed the concerns of the Board from last meeting. He explained that the new orientation on Lot 2 was roughly the same distance from the Goldman's house and the same distance from North Street. The driveway is more direct which reduces the Impervious Surface Ratio (ISR). There was no adjustment of the lot lines. Lot 2 now has an ISR of 11.5%, which does not include the walkway. On Lot 1 they are trying to maintain the existing curb cut, and lengthen the driveway to reduce the slope. The ISR on Lot 1 is 13.1% and the average ISR between the 2 lots would be 12.4%. The first floor elevation (FFE) was raised a half foot while the garages are lower. The limit of clearing is smaller, and the new plan keeps more of the existing vegetation.

Board Comments:

Mr. Canale wanted to have a better understanding of what is being proposed. Mr. Lord said he is not developing the land; he wants to sell the lots. Mr. Canale asked about how many stories the homes would be and what the visual impact of raising the first floor would be. Mr. Waitt wanted the homes to be six inches out of seasonal high ground water, and based his calculations on the soil testing. Mr. Canale

wanted to know on Lot 2 how much the house gets rotated and why this orientation? Mr. Snow explained he took into account the site contours, the sense of arrival, a functional backyard, and the house's relationship to North Street.

Mr. Hornig wanted to know the FFE and how high the floor is compared to the previous development grade. Mr. Snow said the FFE of Lot 2 would be approximately four feet above the existing grade and Lot 1 would be approximately five feet above the existing grade. Mr. Hornig was concerned about how many stories there would be. Mr. Waitt advised there are no plans so there is no proposed gross floor area or living area at this time. Mr. Hornig wanted the applicant to work within one and a half times the median footprint, present a total height and number of stories, avoid grading and stay within the limit of clearing.

Mr. Galaitis stated that he had been absent the last time this had been before the Board. He liked the layout of the buildings, although he was concerned with the third dimension, and suggested the applicant consider the basement as one story and then one and a half stories, looking at the total mass of the house. Mr. Waitt said there would be one to two feet of foundation showing. Ms. Manz was concerned about massing, but liked the layout. She asked about solar orientation and how intrusive these homes would be. Mr. Galaitis wanted to see details, a building envelope, and have the ISR reduced further by reducing the size of the footprint. Mr. Waitt offered to set up a site inspection before the definitive plans are made. Attorney Ed Grant requested some guidance. He felt that all seemed to be going well, but wanted some flexibility. Ms. Manz stated that the Board can be flexible with the footprint on one site being under the neighborhood profile, and over on the other site, as long as they stay under two times the combined median footprint.

***** ARTICLES FOR 2007 TOWN MEETING*****

TMMA Booklet:

The TMMA Booklets were reprinted in response to concerns that the write-up of Article 4 was biased.

Article 5, Tree Bylaw:

The Zoning Board of Appeals had expressed some concerns with this motion. Mr. Canale made some changes to the motion based on the concerns of the Zoning Board of Appeals, which are as follows:

- 1) adding the words to the new §135-11.B (1)(d) as follows insert “when the subject of the special permit meets any of the circumstances of Chapter 120-4” after “removal of protected trees” and before “(see definition....)”.

- 2) adding the words to the new §135-12.B (1)(c) as follows insert “when the subject of the special permit with site plan review meets any of the circumstances of Chapter 120-4” “after removal of protected_trees” and before “(see definition....)”.

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was voted unanimously to recommend the article to the Town Meeting as amended.

Article 4, Inclusionary Housing:

Mr. Galaitsis mentioned TMMA Chair Gloria Bloom’s e-mail regarding grandfathering the lots for private citizens and asked whether the Board had considered this option, and if they had not, to please consider it. Mr. Hornig stated anyone who is building on a parcel of land is a developer even if he is a private citizen. Mr. Zurlo did consider the grandfathering option, but wondered if it works on parcels of land that apply for conventional subdivision as opposed to a cluster subdivision? Ms. Manz said that long time landowners have enjoyed the use of the land while they paid reduced taxes for all the years they owned the property and in addition receive the value of the land’s appreciation, while a developer who just recently purchased the land has a mortgage. She did not see the fairness in grandfathering current landowners.

Ms. McCall-Taylor said she received e-mail from Mr. Sandy regarding ownership of affordable housing. He would like the inclusionary units to be restricted to rentals only; she is not sure it is legal to require the units be rental, but will forward it to the Board for review. Ms. Manz said the Board is uncomfortable with that limitation.

***** PLANNING BOARD ORGANIZATION SCHEDULE*****

Meeting schedule for March and April: The Board scheduled a meeting on March 19, 2006 at 7:30 p.m., Mr. Galaitsis cannot attend, Mr. Zurlo and Mr. Canale need to check their schedules. The Board confirmed meetings for April 4, 11 and 25, 2007 at 6:00 p.m. prior to Town Meeting if needed, and a regular meeting on April 18, 2006 at 7:30 p.m.

On a motion duly made and seconded, it was voted to move to the auditorium for the TMMA information session and adjourn the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Gregory Zurlo, Clerk