

**Town of Medway
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
Sanford Hall
Town Hall
155 Village St, Medway MA**

MINUTES OF MEETING

June 07, 2017

Present: Chairman David Cole; Clerk Carol Gould; Committee Members: Eric Arbeene, William Kennedy, Brian White; Associate Members: Rori Stumpf, Bridgette Kelly.

Also present: Mackenzie Leahy, Administrative Assistant, Community & Economic Development

Stephanie Mercandetti, Director, Community & Economic Development

Sean Reardon, Tetra Tech

Chairman Cole called the meeting to order at 7:42 PM.

Citizen Comments:

There were no members of the public that wished to make comments on items other than those already on the agenda.

Review of Final Draft for Timber Crest Estates:

The Board reviewed the final draft with amendments from the prior Board meeting.

A motion to approve the final draft decision for Timber Crest Estates as amended was made by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Stumpf and approved unanimously.

Public Hearings:

7:35 P.M. – The Applicant, Ron Mullen, seeks a Special Permit under Section 8.2 to allow for an age-in-place Accessory Family Dwelling Unit, intended to be 1320 s. ft., with respect to the property, owned by Andrea Donnelly, located at 19 Granite Street.

The Applicant, Ron Mullen, appeared before the Board to discuss the request for a Special Permit under Section 8.2 to allow for an Accessory Family Dwelling Unit. Attorney Steve Kenney, of Kenney & Kenney, was also present.

Chairman Cole asked what the relationship was between the Applicant and the home at 19 Granite Street. Mr. Mullen explained that Andrea Donnelly was the homeowner of 19 Granite Street and that he was the contractor who would construct the addition to the home.

Attorney Kenney explained that the home is located in the AR-II Zoning District. The homeowner was requesting a special permit to construct an Accessory Family Dwelling Unit attached to the existing single family

home. The unit would be for Ms. Donnelly's mother and forty-two year old brother with special needs. The attached unit would be two floors, two bedrooms, and one and a half bathrooms, totaling 1320 square feet. The Accessory Family Dwelling Unit would be in character with the existing neighborhood. Mr. Kenney references the May 8, 2017 letter from Ron Mullen, and explained that although 800 square feet is allowed, Section 8.2.C.4 and 8.2.C.8 may allow for reasonable accommodations and deviations from the (Section 8.2.C) Basic Requirements. The second entrance as required in Section 8.2.C.7 was proposed to be accessed from a covered porch. The existing home is "off the road" and not visible from Granite Street. The parking space as required in Section 8.2.C.5 would be provided to the right of the new garage. Mr. Kenney stated that the application met all requirements, with reasonable deviations from the Basic Requirements as needed.

Chairman Cole asked if both family members would be driving a car. Mr. Kenney explained that there would only be one vehicle.

Chairman Cole asked if there was a proposed second means of egress, as required by building code. Mr. Mullen explained that there was a slider at the rear of the building.

Chairman Cole stated that from the look of the proposed front elevations, it appeared as though the existing home was "duplicated" for the addition of the Accessory Family Dwelling Unit.

Chairman Cole asked what would become of the existing garage. Mr. Mullen explained that the garage is currently on the side of the existing home, the garage would be moved to the front of the home on the addition.

Mr. Stumpf asked if there would be room for the cars to turn around. Mr. Mullen explained that the driveway is roughly 36 feet wide. Mr. Stumpf asked if there would be trees removed; Mr. Mullen stated that there would be no trees cut.

Chairman Cole asked if there would be any changes to the existing driveway. Mr. Mullen stated that they would stay within the confines of the existing driveway. Chairman Cole asked if the existing stone wall would be removed. Mr. Mullen stated that it would be.

Mr. Kennedy asked if the home was currently on Town water and sewer. Mr. Mullen stated that the home was on Town water and private septic.

Chairman Cole asked how large the existing dwelling was; Mr. Mullen stated that the home was around 2,500 square feet.

Mackenzie Leahy, Community & Economic Development Administrative Assistant, stated that the items which she had outlined in her correspondence to Mr. Mullen had been addressed and both she and Jack Mee, Building Commissioner and Zoning Enforcement Officer had been satisfied with Mr. Mullen's responses.

Debora Stapleton, of 25 Granite Street, stated that she was supportive of the proposal. Ms. Stapleton asked if the unit would require additional septic. Mr. Mullen stated that it would require additional septic and that he was in the process of getting a septic design plan approved, the septic is in the back yard, and there would be no additional square footage. There were three lines for the system currently and a fourth line would most likely need to be added.

Ms. Leahy stated that the Fire Chief usually requires that fire systems for the existing home and accessory family dwelling units are interconnected and asked if the fire system for the unit would be connected with the existing home. Mr. Mullen responded that it would be.

Mr. White stated that the application had a unique circumstance. The letter provided by the applicant and homeowner made him inclined to support the application.

Ms. Kelly stated that the proposed unit seemed appropriate given that it couldn't be seen from the road.

Mr. Stumpf stated that the application was another great example of what the Accessory Family Dwelling Unit special permit was for. Mr. Stumpf felt that the unit would not be detrimental to the existing neighborhood and given the layout of the home to the street the two doors were okay.

Mr. Arbeene stated that he saw no issues and had no problem with the application.

Ms. Gould stated that the one issue she had was how large the house would be after the addition of the unit but because of the setback from the road it wasn't as much of an issue in this case. Mr. Kennedy said that there are other homes of that size in the neighborhood.

Ms. Gould asked for clarification on the set of stairs up the porch to the entry door of the unit. Ms. Leahy stated that there had been a set of stairs to the door on the previous plans but that the set of stairs had been removed on the revised plans and that the fencing of the porch would be continuous with the exception of the existing set of stairs.

The Board found that the applicant demonstrated that the proposed Accessory Family Dwelling Unit met the requirements of Section 8.2 C. Basic Requirements except that (8.2.C.4) the area of the Accessory Family Dwelling Unit exceeded 800 square feet and that (8.2.C.7) the entrance would be provided on the side or rear of the building, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board found that since the proposed Accessory Family Dwelling Unit is to accommodate two eligible persons, not being spouses, the provisions (8.2.C.8) of a second bedroom for an Accessory Family Dwelling Unit is required and an increase in the Accessory Family Dwelling Unit beyond the normal requirement of 800 square feet, that the proposed area of 1320 square feet is reasonable, and that the provision of a second bedroom is authorized, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board found that the applicant provided good reasons why a second entrance on the front of the house was desirable, namely the need to access the Accessory Family Dwelling Unit by a covered porch to minimize slip-and-fall injuries, and that having in regard of the essential invisibility from the road, the provision of an entrance at the front of the house would not deviate from the intent of the Zoning Bylaw, and thus an entrance at the front of the house, in accordance with the plans submitted, is hereby authorized, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board found that the location, quantity, and adequacy of parking has been reviewed by the Board to ensure that the location and appearance is in keeping with the residential character of the AR-II Zoning District and adequately provides parking to the existing and proposed occupants, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board found that grant of the requested Special Permit would not be inconsistent with any of the criteria set forth in Section 3.4. C. Decision Criteria and would not be detrimental to the public good, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board granted to Andrea Donnelly of 19 Granite Street, a Special Permit pursuant to Section 8.2 of the Medway Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Family Dwelling Unit which shall be constructed substantially in accordance with the plans provided and subject to the following conditions set forth in Section 8.2 D. 2, on a motion made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

- The Applicant, Metro West Collaborative Development, Inc., seeks a Comprehensive Permit under MGL. 40B, Section 20-23 as amended, to allow for construction of a 48 unit rental development to be called "Glen Brook Way," of which all units would be considered affordable, on 3.17 acres, comprised of the properties located at 0 Glen Brook Way, 1 Glen Brook Way, 3 Glen Brook Way, and 33 West Street.

The applicant and their representatives provided an overview of the application. Attorney Bobrowski explained that it was a 48 unit rental proposal on 3.17 acres, served by public water and sewer. The units will be sold at 60% AMI.

Dana Altobello, engineer, explained that the property is located on the west side of West Street, about a half mile from route 126. It is located in the AR-II district with about a half an acre of existing resource areas. The topography slopes from a high point on the easterly side of the property to a low point at the westerly side of the property along Hopping Brook. The wetlands were delineated in April 2016 and the Conservation Commission issued an ORAD. The proposal is for 6 buildings. Access for the development is a "U" shaped driveway. The northerly driveway will be 2 ways, and the southerly driveway will be one way. There will be parallel parking on the entry and exits and 90 degree parking at the rear of the property. There will be 72 parking spaces. There will be fire department access between the larger rear buildings 5 and 6. All utilities will be subsurface. The stormwater will be treated through subsurface infiltration. There will be a cultec system for buildings 1-4 and deep sump catch basin systems for buildings 5 and 6 and will then be treated in a subsurface treatment system. Each system will have 4 inspection points. The system is designed to remove 80% TSS.

West Street is fairly flat and straight, posted speeds of 30 MPG would require a 200 foot sight distance, but a more conservative approach of 40 MPH would require 300 feet. Looking out from the north entrance, there is 400 feet, looking south, there's about 500 feet.

A landscape designed was provided by CBA Architects. They have proposed two hedge rows at the northerly and southerly property lines. They proposed a sidewalk along West Street, concrete walkways and flagstone pavers, decorative shrubs and plantings around the building foundations, as well as a children's play area between buildings 1 and 4. They have also proposed lighting with everything shielded or facing downwards to minimize and spill on adjacent properties.

The applicant has met with the Fire Department to ensure that they are satisfied with what is being proposed.

Wetland impacts have been kept to a minimum with 6,600 square feet or 9.9% of the 200 foot riverfront altered. To ensure that there is no sedimentation of the wetlands resources, the applicant has proposed silt socks and fencing along the limit of work.

Michael Wolfson, Architect, explained that there are two building types—buildings A and B (1 through 4) and buildings C1 and C2 (5 and 6). They have met with the DRC twice to discuss the look and feel of the buildings. The design has been to keep the units as small as possible and the buildings as small as possible. The units have flat units on the ground floor and townhouses on the 2nd and 3rd floor. The units have been designed with mansard roofs to minimize the look of the height of the building with clapboard siding. There will be accessible units and a management office in building 4. The management office will have some “eyes” on the playground and other buildings.

Jennifer VanCampen, applicant, explained that Metro West Collaborative has been working on this site for about a year. Metro West works with communities to meet their affordable housing goals. There are currently 1,500 households in Medway that are eligible to live in the proposed developments. Many of the homeowners in Medway are cost-burdened. When the applicant initially looked at the site, they had proposed 32 units. When they met with Town Departments, they suggested trying to acquire another parcel which made it possible to create the “U” shape and add additional units.

Ms. Leahy explained that there had been two interdepartmental meeting prior to even applying to the Board.

Chairman Cole was concerned with the parking spaces for the development. The applicant explained that, unfortunately, with these types of units, owners often can’t afford to have more than one car, and have excess parking in both of their existing properties.

The applicant stated that maintenance traveling and would not be full time.

The Board stated their concerns for the sewer capacity.

Chairman Cole asked about the setbacks and whether they were being met. Mr. Bobrowski stated that they would be seeking a waiver from the side setback requirements.

Mr. Wolfson explained that there would be individual trash closets/sheds for trash bins. Management would pull out the bins on trash day to have them removed. There would be two large 70 gallon containers for regular trash and two recycling per building.

Mr. Reardon asked if the applicant was avoiding more than 10% impact to the riverfront. Mr. Reardon stated that increasing the impact would increase the amount of space that the applicant had to work with onsite, especially for parking, drive widths, snow removal. The applicant explained that they wanted as little impact to the riverfront and as minimal a process with Conservation Commission as possible.

The applicant stated that all the buildings would be sprinklered. The walls between the buildings would be firewalls.

Basements will be for storage and laundry.

Ms. Leahy went through a number of her comments from her comment letter provided to the Board and requested that the applicant provide answers to those comments.

Mr. Reardon when through a number of his comments from the first general review letter provided by Tetra Tech.

Public Comments:

Glen Trindade of the Board of Selectmen spoke in favor of the proposed development.

Traffic Impact Study:

A motion to approve the spending of \$24,885 for Tetra Tech to provide a Traffic Impact Study option 2 for Glen Brook Way and to authorize the Director of Community and Economic Development to sign for the Board was made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White, and approved unanimously.

The Board discussed a prospective agenda for Glen Brook Way.

A motion to continue the hearing to 7:35 pm on June 21, 2017 was made by Chairman Cole, seconded by Mr. White and approved unanimously.

Any other business that may properly come before the Board:

None.

Approval of Minutes:

Tabled.

Upcoming Meetings:

One new application was received and scheduled for July 5, 2017.

Correspondence:

None.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Arbeene, seconded by Mr. White and approved unanimously. The Board adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mackenzie Leahy
Administrative Assistant
Community and Economic Development