

MEETING MINUTES FOR JUNE 28, 2012

Milton Planning Board

The 25th meeting of the Planning Board for fiscal year 2012 was on Thursday, June 28, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. in the Carol A. Blute Conference Room, Milton Town Office Building.

In attendance were Planning Board members Alexander Whiteside-Chairman, Edward L. Duffy, Emily Keys Innes, Michael E. Kelly, Planning Director William Clark and Administrative Assistant Jean Peterson.

** Member Bernard J. Lynch, III was not present for the 6:35 p.m. Public Hearing on 37 Canton Avenue . Mr. Lynch was present for the Public Hearing on 131 Eliot Street through the remainder of the meeting.*

1. ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS

The Minutes of June 14, 2012 were approved as amended by the Planning Board.

The Board confirmed the next regularly scheduled Planning Board Meetings for July 12th and 26th, 2012 starting at 6:30 p.m. in the Carol A. Blute Conference Room, Town Office Building.

2. CITIZENS SPEAK

Richard Shea, representing the Pastoral Council of St. Elizabeth's Parish and the Archdiocese of Boston, addressed the Board in reference to certain lots on the parish property. Mr. Shea erroneously thought that an Article, pertaining to the above-referenced property, had been submitted by the Planning Board for the October Town Meeting. *The Planning Board noted that it had not submitted such an Article for the October Town Meeting.*

3. TOWN PLANNER'S REPORT

Mr. Clark updated the Board relative to:

- Scenic Road driveway at 700 Canton Avenue/Merjwood Drive – ZBA hearing scheduled for July 9th.
- Application for 333 Hillside Street – Public Hearing scheduled for July 12th.
- Preliminary Sub-division at 683-685 Brush Hill Road – notice sent to abutters.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

*6:35 p.m. **37 Canton Avenue, Scenic Road Hearing, stonewall opening***

Matthew Talbot appeared before the Board to seek approval for an opening in the stone wall at 37 Canton Avenue as he plans to build a new home and driveway at that site. Mr. Clark informed the Board that the Building Commissioner does not have any issues with this request.

Comments:

Stephen O'Donnell, Chairman of the Historic Commission requested that the applicant cap portions of the wall and leave the driveway as is.

Robert Orchard of 43 Canton Avenue stated that he understands that it is a buildable lot but he is of the opinion that the way the house is sited is aggressive and unfriendly to the neighborhood.

Member Innes noted that the house had not yet been permitted.

Mr. Talbot agreed to the request of the Historic Commission. The stonewall opening was approved unanimously by the Board under the conditions discussed.

6:45 p.m. 131 Eliot Street Special Permit, Hendrie's Building

William McDermott, Attorney for the developer, Stephen Connelly, began the hearing by addressing the status of the outstanding issues of height, commercial space in the basement and setbacks. Warren Daniel, the architect for the project, presented before and after comparisons which were designed towards eligibility of the FAR bonus. Member Whiteside informed the Board that this is a Special Permit Application and with Member Lynch's absence and Member Kelly's ineligibility to vote, the Board would be unable to vote on the application. He then suggested that this meeting might be considered merely as a discussion. Member Innes stated that changing the status of the meeting should not be done since a Public Hearing had been advertised. The Board then contacted Member Lynch and delayed the hearing until he arrived. The hearing was then restarted from its outset with the same presentation of matters. Member Whiteside asked Mr. Connelly why the awarding of an FAR bonus would be important to him. Mr. Connelly stated that a bonus is needed for a successful development and also to create a marketable project. Prior to hearing citizens' comments, Mr. Whiteside stated that a decision should be made at this meeting determining whether to award the bonus so that Mr. Connelly can plan accordingly. The following colloquy took place between Members Lynch, Whiteside and Innes:

Member Lynch: "From time to time I inspect property for the Connelys. I have been in touch with the people at the state house, town counsel, etc. As required, I've issued a document," pursuant to GLc268A chap.23 (b)(3)", disclosing that from time to time I do inspectional work for the Connelys."

Member Innes: "I believe you had mentioned before that you had filed disclosure with the Town Clerk."

Member Lynch: "Yes I did, and at several Planning Board Meetings."

Member Whiteside: "Well it is always good to mention it again."

Comments:

Ellen DeNooyer of 83 Capen Street presented a petition containing 165 signatures which supports the re-development of the property, but with certain modifications, as stated in the petition. She encouraged the Board to enforce zoning requirements and setbacks. She commended Mr. Connelly for his efforts, but feels that the building still does not comply with zoning requirements.

Cheryl Tougias of 660 Canton Avenue urged the Board to address the scale of the building and the significant public amenity. She encouraged the Board to use care with regard to the awarding of any bonus.

Adam Gilmore of 22 Valley Road stated that he feels that the massing is out of scale and that parking should be entirely below the building. He feels that the project does not fit into the historical context of the neighborhood.

Margaret Donovan of 41 Central Avenue encouraged the Board to not rush through the process. She feels that the answers to the outstanding issues remain vague and confusing and that the building is massive and unattractive.

Keith Mills of 39 Hawthorn Road commented that this is a very important decision for the neighborhood and urged the Board to make careful decisions. He feels that an FAR bonus should not be awarded.

Peter Klint of 15 Cliff Road is of the opinion that the building shown in the picture is typical of a city building rather than what would be seen in the Town of Milton.

Robert Murray of 12 Columbine Road questioned who would be responsible for maintaining the public space.

Peter Jackson of 14 Capen Street commented that he feels that the public area is ill-conceived. He asked the Board to encourage the developer to talk with neighbors and asked the Board to use care in any action taken on this project.

Andrea Palmstrom of 151 Eliot Street stated that parking, traffic, lighting, noise and height of the building are concerns for the Eliot Street neighbors.

Peter Mullin of 19 Gaskins Road spoke on behalf of George and Barbara Fournier of 34 Waldo Road and Robert Rosofsky and Laurie Stillman of 29 Waldo Road who are not in favor of the current proposal. Mr. Mullin suggested that the Board not award the FAR bonus and reminded them that they are permitted, not required, to award a bonus. He assured the Board that neighbors want re-development on the site.

Member Whiteside stated that he is not prepared to vote until he reads the petition. Member Innes suggested to Mr. Connelly that he meet with the neighbors prior to the next meeting. The hearing was continued to July 26, 2012 at 7 p.m.

8:00 p.m. 36-50 Eliot Street, Milton Hill Project: site plan approval

Ned Corcoran, the Attorney representing the Sullivan family, owners of the property, began the hearing by responding to various outstanding issues. He described aesthetic changes on the Eliot Street side of the building and the inclusion of an Eliot Street entrance. He stated that the appearance of the balconies has been improved and that a significant landscape plan will be done. Mr. Corcoran was not prepared to address the issue of storm water and drainage. The Revitalization Committee was present and offered recommendations. The Committee expressed concern regarding the unattractive appearance of the balconies as well as their concern that the Eliot Street façade be more attractive. The Committee's recommendations include: a shadow study, a traffic study, a landscape plan, ensuring the safe arrivals and departures of trucks, preserving the character of the architecture of the "Henry House", benches for pedestrians, a design review process, and tying the district together with lighting, trees, and a sidewalk pattern. Mr. Corcoran stated that balconies are a critical component to the project from the developer's perspective.

Comments:

Danielle Chauvet of 12 Morton Terrace stated that she hopes that the conditions to which the developers have agreed with the neighbors are enforced. She informed the Board that the neighbors have supported this project contingent on various promises about matters including snow removal and landscaping. She expressed concern that the balconies may be used for the storage of unsightly items.

Mr. Whiteside encouraged improvements to the design of the balconies and noted that outstanding promises made by the developer should be kept.

The hearing was continued to July 12, 2012 at 8 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

683-685 Brush Hill Road, Preliminary Sub-division

Ned Corcoran, the attorney representing proposed developer Gerry Rankin, informed the Board that he spoke with residents and addressed most of their issues. He introduced James DeCelle, the project engineer, of Decelle Burke and Associates who made a presentation. Mr. Rankin commented that there is a 50-foot buffer in front of the property that he does not want to disturb. It is a vegetated area that needs care.

Henry Carr of 675 Brush Hill Road is concerned with water. He also wants to preserve a stonewall and asked the developer to not cut through the landscape.

Member Whiteside made a motion to approve the concept and move the matter to a definitive sub-division application. The motion was approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

704 Randolph Avenue – Proposed Assisted Living Facility

Paul Sullivan, Developer for the proposal, presented a conceptual siting of an assisted living facility. Member Whiteside stated that there must be adequate setbacks and landscaping around the building. The presence of a right of way cutting the lot in two seems to preclude adequate setbacks. The right of way probably needs to be relocated for the facility envisioned. The matter was continued to July 12th.

Master Plan

Member Innes stated that the RFP went out.

ADJOURNMENT:

The Meeting adjourned at 11 p.m.

Edward L. Duffy
Secretary

