

TOWN OF LINCOLN
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

FEBRUARY 16, 2016

TOWN OFFICES

PRESENT: Margaret Olson (MO) (Chair), Bryce Wolf (BW) (Vice-Chair), Lynn DeLisi (LD), Richard Rundell (RR), Gary Taylor (GT)

STAFF: Paula Vaughn-MacKenzie

7:00 PM DETERMINATION OF MINOR CHANGE, Section 17 Site Plan Review:
Buckland, 76 Old Sudbury Road, Parcel 187-4-0. Application to make changes to windows, doors, roofline, and foundation of an approved site plan. 2/16/2016

Mr. Keith Gross, architect for the project, and Jonathan White, attorney for the project appeared before the Board. Mr. Gross explained that the project began as a modular home. After issues arose with the modular company, the applicant asked Mr. Gross to change the design to a stick built home. Although the dimensions of the home are the same, there have been some changes to the doors, windows and the pitch of parts of the roof. In addition, the main ridge of the roof has increased by 10 1/2 inches to 29' 10 and 1/2 ".

The plans show that the position of the home on the site and the setbacks remain unchanged. The area calculations have been revised to accurately reflect the thicker exterior finishes. The applicant submitted a table showing the dimensional comparisons between the original ZBA approval, the subsequent Planning Board approval and the revised submitted plans. The applicant also submitted a table of exterior changes including changes to windows, skylights, and dormer design, and the addition of a door and accompanying compliant light fixture. A steeper roof pitch for one gable was proposed to match an existing gable roof pitch. A slight design change was made to the front porch. A complete set of revised plans were submitted showing all changes. The requested changes have been approved as de minimus changes by the Chair of the ZBA.

LD made a motion to determine the submitted changes as minor changes to the approved site plan. RR Seconded. Passed 5-0.

GT made a motion to approve the plan entitled Site Plan B, 76 Old Sudbury Road by Snelling & Hamel dated Revised January 25, 2016 and the plan entitled Elevation Changes, 76 Old Sudbury Road, Lincoln, MA revised plan 12/28/2015 as submitted. RR Seconded. Passed 5-0.

7:10 PM DETERMINATION OF MINOR CHANGE, Section 17 Site Plan Review:
Clark/DeLisi, 125 South Great Road, Parcel 160-10-0. Application to add a fence to an approved site plan. 2/16/2016

Lynn DeLisi recused herself as she is the applicant.

Dr. DeLisi explained that the fence will be located approximately 60 feet from a public way and will not require a fence permit under the zoning bylaw. The application is for a determination of minor change to the approved site plan. The applicant has submitted a plan showing the location of the fence as well as a picture showing the specifications of a post and rail white cedar fence. Dr. DeLisi stated that they would have the property surveyed before the installation of the fence and would locate the fence one foot off of the lot line.

There are wetlands on the property but the fence will be located on the outer limit of the 100 foot buffer line. The Conservation Department reviewed the plan and had no objections. Dr. DeLisi noted that the fence would be installed in March.

RR made a Motion to determine the addition of the fence as a minor change to the approved site plan. GT Seconded. Passed 4-0.

RR made a Motion to approve the location and materials of the fence as submitted. BW Seconded. Passed 4-0.

7:15 PM PRELIMINARY HEARING, Section 17 Site Plan Review: Cort, 12 Silver Hill Road, Parcel 164-4-0. Preliminary Hearing for site plan review of a tear down of an existing home and construction of a new home. 2/16/2016

Mr. Cliff Cort, and Mr. Bill Holtz, his architect appeared before the Board to present the project. An existing home will be torn down and a new one built. The Historic Commission has approved the demolition. The lot has a Conservation Restriction held by the Lincoln Land Conservation Trust. The applicant submitted a memorandum written by Geoff McGean that states the proposed plans for a new house and associated infrastructure on the property satisfy the requirements of the CR.

The Board discussed the submitted plans including the Site Plan which showed the proposed house located within the building envelope required by the Conservation Restriction. The applicant submitted a zoning table showing all required setbacks. The plan includes a pool on the left side of the house with white cedar post and rail fencing. Specifications for the fencing were submitted.

The Site Plan shows a ten foot no-disturb line along the left and right lot lines. An erosion control barrier is indicated on the plan as a limit of work line. A story calculation was submitted to confirm that the basement does not constitute a story.

Elevations were submitted by Bensonwood. The plans show the height of the structure to be 25.59 feet as measured from the lowest exposed point to the highest ridge. The elevation plans also show all lighting locations. The applicant is proposing two lighting fixtures. One is a recessed down light (A), the Juno recessed downlight which delivers 600 lumens per fixture with LED bulbs at either 2700 or 3000 CCT. The second fixture (B) is the Stealth step light which delivers 216 lumens each with an LED bulb of 3000 CCT. There are four (A) lights located in the porch ceilings and 11 exterior (B) lights around the perimeter of the house.

The Columbia Design Group submitted a Civil Site Plan detailing the drainage plan for the site, the existing and proposed grades, and the location of the septic system.

The Civil Site Plan also shows a new location for the driveway. The applicant proposes a double curb cut driveway. Mr. Cort stated that the property currently has two curb cuts. He would like to keep one existing cut and add another cut closer to the lot line. One existing curb cut would be eliminated and landscaped. He advocated that the two curb cuts would be safer than one.

BW noted that she was concerned with the proposed two curb cuts. She noted that the Board rarely approves two curb cuts unless there is a specific safety issue. She thought that if a new curb cut was important, the original cuts should be closed.

The Board discussed the drainage and noted that the site will be built up so that the water will flow away from the house. Mr. Holtz explained that currently the water drains down from the road. The septic system will be raised because of the high water table and the site will be raised approximately five feet at the deepest point.

The style of the house is limited by the Conservation Restriction to one and one half stories. The applicant submitted a story calculation by his engineer, Peter Gammie, determining that the basement does not constitute a story.

The Board asked if any lighting for the pool was contemplated. Mr. Cort noted that he had not finalized the lighting for the pool but thought that he would want interior pool lights. The Board reviewed the lighting locations as shown on the elevations and noted that there are lights at all exterior doors and many low lights around the perimeter of the building. RR noted that more low lights embody both the regulatory requirements and the spirit of the lighting guidelines.

Mr. Cort stated that there would be no generator.

The Board next revisited the driveway design. The Board strongly advised Mr. Cort to redesign the driveway to be one curb cut. They noted that a turn-around would be acceptable. Mr. Cort asked what the process would be to request two curb cuts. The Board responded that the Selectmen have jurisdiction through the General Bylaw but that the Selectmen ask the Board for their review and recommendation. According to the General Bylaw, one curb cut is allowed unless there is a compelling safety issue. The Board noted that in one instance where the Historic Commission insisted on preserving an historic bridge, the Board granted another curb cut because the original bridge could not support a public safety vehicle. The Board noted that it was not enough to say there is a safety issue. If one curb cut is not safe, two does not make it safer. The Board would prefer a well-designed driveway and curb cut that is safe. GT noted that if there were two curb cuts existing, he had no objections to approving a two curb cut design. BW disagreed advocating that the Board should avoid more entry ways into a property to avoid the "estate" look to properties. She stated that it was not sufficient to want two curb cuts for aesthetic reasons and the Board has declined to approve such requests in the past. The applicant would need to establish a site line issue. MO noted that they would review a plan that necessitated preserving the streetscape or addressing a safety issue. LD noted that there appears to be enough room to establish a one curb cut driveway that should be safe. RR noted that having 2 curb cuts because one is not safe is not a solution and that the applicant should choose the one safe curb cut.

Mr. Holtz noted that there would not be an extensive landscape plan because the house currently sits in a meadow and they would like to preserve that look and feel.

Mr. Cort asked if the Board would care if he moved the front door. The Board responded that they would have no objections.

7:40 PM DETERMINATION OF MINOR CHANGE, Section 17 Site Plan Review:

Benchmark Senior Living, 1 Harvest Circle, Parcel 111-12-0. Request for Planning Board to approve minor changes to the approved site plan and to vote that conditions of special permit have been met for certificate of occupancy. 2/16/2016

Bill Cook, Director of Development for Benchmark Senior Living appeared before the Board to address three matters. The first was a request for the Board to review and approve some minor changes to the approved site plan encompassing the construction at 1 Harvest Circle and subject to a Special Permit dated March 11, 2014. The proposed changes were detailed in a letter from Crystal Maring, Landscape Architect, Stantec Consulting Services, dated January 27, 2016 and shown on a set of plans by JSA Architects dated January 27, 2016. The Board reviewed each of the changes and had no objections.

BW made a Motion to determine the requested changes as minor changes to the approved site plan. RR Seconded. Passed 5-0.

BW made a Motion to approve the changes as detailed in the Stantec Memorandum dated March 11, 2016 and shown on the plans by JSA Architects dated January 27, 2016 pages L-2.0, L-3.0, L-4.0, and L-5.0. RR Seconded. Passed 5-0.

The Board next reviewed applicant's request that the Board allow certain landscape and punch list items to be completed in the spring after a certificate of occupancy has been issued. The applicant submitted a list of work to be completed as detailed in a memorandum from C.E. Floyd Company dated January 27, 2016 and shown on plans by JSA Architects dated 1/27/2016, pages L-2.0, L-4.0, and L-5.0. The items contained in this memorandum were landscape related items including planting, walkways, fencing, and entry signs. The memorandum from C.E. Floyd also mentioned a punch list of items that are being currently worked on but may not be completed until this spring. The punch list entitled Punch List - #001 was prepared by Crystal Maring and Tony Moura of Stantec Consulting Services dated January 12, 2016. This punch list has been reviewed by the Town of Lincoln's building inspector who required three items to be completed immediately. Benchmark submitted evidence that the three requested items have been completed.

The Board had no objections to a certificate of occupancy being issued before the work detailed in the C.E. Floyd memorandum and the punch list memorandum being completed in the spring.

The Board next addressed the applicant's request to determine that the conditions required to be met before a certificate of occupancy can be issued as detailed in the Special Permit dated March 11, 2014 have been completed. Conditions 8-15 of the Special Permit were reviewed. Conditions 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were discussed. Conditions 9, 14, and 15 had either been met or were moot.

Condition 8 requires that the applicant provide for peer review and Planning Board approval a Storm Water Operations and Maintenance Plan. The applicant submitted a plan entitled Operation and Maintenance Plan prepared by Stantec Planning and Landscape Architecture, PC which was stamped by Frank Holmes Civil Engineer.

Condition 10 requires that the applicant submit to the Planning Board for review, approval, and amendment as necessary a Final Signage Plan that shall require complete installation, with subsequent review and amendment as necessary 6 months after occupancy. The applicant submitted a signage plan by JSA Architects entitled Signage Plan dated 7/25/2014 and revised 1/27/2016. This plan showed the location of the two entry signs and other signs in the complex. The Board noted that the applicant would need to return to the Board with dimensions and design of the two entry signs. In addition, any proposed lighting for the entry signs would need to be approved by the Board. The Board noted that downlights would be appropriate but no marketing material would be allowed on the entry signs.

Condition 11 requires that one half of the total number of exterior street and pedestrian lights be turned off after 9:00 p.m. and that the applicant shall restrict all deliveries and trash removal between the hours of 10:00pm and 6:00 am. William Cook, Director of Development for Benchmark Senior Living, submitted a letter dated January 27, 2016 to the Planning Board stating that Benchmark Senior Living would comply with the requirements of Special Condition 11.

Condition 12 requires that the applicant submit for review and approval by the Board and Town Counsel, a Covenant to ensure proper completion and ongoing maintenance of all landscaping, utilities and access systems and infrastructure. As of the date of this meeting, the attorney for Benchmark and Town Counsel were working on this Covenant. Town Counsel had delivered comments to Benchmark's counsel and was awaiting his response. Mr. Cook noted that he would agree to Town Counsel's suggestions but the lawyers were still looking at it. The Board stated that Town Counsel would need to be satisfied with the final language of the Covenant.

Condition 13 requires that the applicant submit specifications, subject to review and approval by the Public Safety Department, for installation of a compatible radio system that allows public safety personnel uninterrupted communications throughout the new construction. The applicant has been working to install an E911 system that meets the State requirements. Mr. Cook stated that it should be operational by Friday.

BW made a Motion to conditionally approve compliance with the conditions numbered 8-15 of the Special Permit dated March 11, 2014 provided that the Fire Chief inspects, tests and approves the E911 system as compliant with State regulations and that the Covenant required in Condition 12 is completed and executed to the satisfaction of Town Counsel and submitted to the Planning Department. In addition, all items contained in the C.E. Floyd memorandum dated January 27, 2016 and the Punch List #001 prepared by Stantec dated January 12, 2016 must be completed by September 1, 2016. GT Seconded. Passed 5-0.

8:00 PM Liaison Reports

Agriculture Commission: BW reported that the Ag Comm has decided not to move forward with their proposed amendment for this year's Town Meeting. Instead they will concentrate on public outreach during the coming year and look forward to bringing an amendment before Town Meeting next year.

Minuteman: GT reported that a Special Town Meeting will be held on February 23rd to see if the Town wishes to pull out of the regional agreement. He noted that accurate financial information is now available to the public so that an informed decision can be made.

8:20 PM Business:

GT made a Motion to approve the January 26, 2016 minutes as amended. BW Seconded. Passed 5-0.

8:30 PM BW made a Motion to adjourn. RR Seconded. Passed 5-0.

Submitted by Paula Vaughn-MacKenzie

Approved as amended March 8, 2016