

**TOWN OF LINCOLN**  
**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD**

**JULY 14, 2020**

**ZOOM MEETING**

PRESENT: Margaret Olson (Chair), Lynn DeLisi (Vice-Chair), Stephen Gladstone, Gary Taylor, Robert Domnitz

STAFF: Paula Vaughn-MacKenzie

**7:00 PM Determination of Minor Change, Section 17 Site Plan Review, Carroll School, 25 Baker Bridge Road, Parcel 142-21-0.** Request to add a temporary modular unit to function as a health center in response to CDC and State guidelines regarding COVID-19.

The Project: The Carroll School is requesting approval to place a temporary modular unit on its campus to function as a health center in response to CDC and State Guidelines regarding COVID-19. The modular unit will go in the same place as the temporary unit approved by the Planning Board in 2018 behind the Copacino building as indicated on the site plan. The unit will be installed prior to August 15, 2020 and will be removed on August 15, 2021. The modular unit will function as a temporary health center with an isolation area and a wellness area for students needing to see the nurse.

The modular unit is located behind a building and not visible from Baker Bridge Road or from any abutting properties.

Submission:

1. Application Cover Form and Non-Residential Site Plan Review Form dated 6/25/2020.
2. Narrative of the project dated June 25, 2020.
3. Site Plan showing location of modular unit.
4. Plans and Specifications of Triumph Silverline Model.
5. Specification sheet for LIL LED fixtures with 3000K color temperature and 800 lumens each.

Process: The Carroll School is requesting the addition of the modular unit to be a minor change to the approved site plan. In 2018, The Board approved a temporary modular unit in the same

location as a minor change to the site plan. That modular unit was used during renovations of the adjacent building. Abutters were not notified at that time and similarly were not notified for this application.

Zoning:

Setbacks: The unit is hundreds of feet back from Baker Bridge Road. The lot is 13 acres.

Height: The height of the modular unit is 12' high.

Dimensions: the modular unit is 60' long by 11'9" wide by 12' high. The unit will have an accessible ramp.

Lighting: There will be three lights, one at each of the two back doors facing the parking area and one at the front, centered door facing the Copacino building. The cut sheet shows full cut off fixtures that are LED. The fixtures emit 800 lumens each and have a color temperature of 3000K.

Danielle Pedreira, Director of Facilities and Projects for the Carroll School stated that they are doing everything to address the guidelines to be able to re-open in the fall. She said that cold water would be hooked up to the modular unit and that they are working with the Board of Health to see if it is possible to hook up to the existing septic. If not, they will have the unit pumped out as needed and directed by the Board of Health.

GT made a motion to consider the addition of the temporary modular unit a minor change to the site plan. SG Seconded. Roll Call: MO aye, GT aye, SG aye, LD aye, BD aye. The motion passed 5-0.

GT made a motion to approve the installation of the temporary modular unit subject to an adequate waste-water disposal plan approved by the Board of Health. SG Seconded. Roll Call: MO aye, GT aye, SG aye, LD aye, BD aye. The motion passed 5-0.

**7:15 PM Determination of a Minor Change, Section 17 Site Plan Review, Nallicheri, 69 Page Road, Parcel 146-3-0.** Request to construct a natatorium as an accessory structure to an existing home.

The Project: The applicant is requesting a Determination of Minor Change for approval of an accessory structure that will house an indoor pool, sauna, and equipment. The home at 69 Page Road is greater than 6500 square feet of calculated gross floor area and sits on 11.94 acres. The accessory structure is set against the edge of the existing tree line and ledge outcropping and is designed to complement the architecture of the existing house. The exterior surfaces match the concrete glass and wood of the house. The new building has a planted roof which visually blends the low building into the surroundings and substantially reduces the energy consumption of the building.

Zoning: This is an accessory structure so that the setbacks must comply with those of accessory structures: An accessory structure must be located 20' from a lot line unless the height of the building is greater than 20' then the setback must be equal to the height of the structure.

Lot Size: 11.94 acres

Calculated Gross Floor Area: The house is 8,874 square feet and the new accessory structure is 2100 square feet.

Height: The height of the structure is 20' 8" high

Setbacks: The accessory structure has the following setbacks:

Front yard setback is 430.3 feet.

Side yard setback is 152.6 feet.

Rear yard setback is 670.8 feet.

Drainage: Storm water runoff from the roof is mostly (65%) controlled by the Green Roof. The remainder will slowly infiltrate into the ground.

Lighting: The applicant proposes to use an LED recessed light located under soffits as the exterior lighting. The fixture has a color temperature of 3000K and emits 600 lumens each. There are five lights proposed, 3 above a large multi-pane door and 2 above the front door. The locations are shown on the elevations. Proposed lighting is restricted to that required at exterior door per the building code.

Conservation Commission: The Conservation Commission reviewed the project extensively. The project is mostly within the buffer zone resource area with bordering vegetated wetland to the west. All new construction is located a minimum of 70' from the wetlands and a substantial portion of the pool house will be located on an existing impervious patio. The project results in an increase of impervious area of 65 square feet. The Notice of Conditions notes that no large trees will be removed but some shrubs and small sapling trees will need to be removed for the project. The NOI requires that that the applicant convert the existing buffer zone area between the building and the wetlands from lawn to native shrub and groundcover plantings.

The Commission conditioned the approval of the project to ensure that the green roof and buffer zone plantings remain viable in perpetuity.

The applicant submitted an Operations and Maintenance Plan which must be followed. In addition, the applicant must submit a yearly report to the Conservation Department.

Abutters: Since this is the addition of a large structure, the applicant was advised to obtain a certified abutters list. A certified abutters list was issued by the Assessor's office and the abutters were notified by mail. The abutters at 75 Page Road and 83 Page Road requested and received the plans.

Submission:

1. Application Cover Form and Residential Site Plan Review Form dated June 29, 2020.
2. Site Plan by Sullivan, Connors and Associates dated 6/16/2020.
3. Landscape Plan by Goddard Consulting dated 6/16/2020.
4. Elevations prepared by Actwo Architects, dated June 25, 2020.
5. Specification sheets for Juno 2" LED square downlight with 3000K color temperature and 600 lumens.
6. Memo from Thomas Gumbart, Conservation director dated July 1, 2020.

MO asked if there were any comments from abutters. Adam Loren, a direct abutter asked if the natatorium is attached to the house. Thom White, the architect responded that the structure was not attached to the main house. It is separated by approximately ten feet and located over a sunken patio and behind a retaining wall and the driveway. The top of the structure will be about 2 and ½ feet above the driveway surface.

Mr. Loren also asked about construction schedule and hours. MO noted that the Board routinely includes a requirement for a construction schedule for large projects, does not allow construction activity on certain holidays and limits construction times from 7:00am to 5:00pm. Mr. White noted that the construction company that will be involved is very familiar working with these types of restrictions. Construction is anticipated to begin in the fall. The structure is one large room so that initially there will be large scale construction to build the envelope that will transition to small scale activity.

LD asked if there would be a separate driveway to access the natatorium. Mr. White stated that there is no additional driveway.

MO made a motion to determine that the addition of the natatorium is not a minor change to the site plan. LD Seconded. Roll Call: MO aye, LD aye, GT recused, SG aye, BD aye. The motion passed 4-0 with one recusal.

There were no additional comments by the Board.

MO made a motion to approve the project as submitted subject to the applicant submitting a construction plan, and points of contact. In addition, the days and hours of construction activity shall be restricted in accordance with similar project approvals. LD Seconded. Roll Call: LD aye, MO aye, BD aye, SG aye, GT Recused. The motion passed 4-0, with one recusal.

**7:40 PM Business**

Andrew Consigli from Civico, developer of Oriole Landing requested permission to hang a 6'X12' banner "Now Leasing" as a temporary sign. Mr. Consigli stated that they are about 30% leased and said that the Covid virus, the incomplete site, and the lack of visibility from Route 2 were

contributing factors. He thought that a banner that would be visible from Route 2 would be helpful. The site will be completed in the next few days. MO asked how long he thought the banner would be needed. LD noted that she did not want the banner to be allowed for a year. Mr. Consigli did not think that the sign would be needed for a year but rather thought through the fall would be sufficient. MO and SG thought six months was reasonable and SG noted that if at the end of six months, Mr. Consigli wanted an extension, he could come back to the Board.

MO made a motion to allow the banner for a period of six months. SG Seconded. Roll Call: SG aye, MO aye, BD aye, GT aye, LD aye. The motion passed 5-0.

Minutes: MO made a motion to approve the June 23, 2020 minutes. GT Seconded. Roll Call: GT aye, MO aye, LD aye, BD aye, SG aye. The motion passed 5-0.

Appointing Planning Board member to CPC committee: MO has been the most recent Planning Board representative to the CPC for the past 6 years. She noted that the requirements for spending under the Community Preservation Act are technical and complicated, and there is a steep learning curve. In addition, there is a certain amount of long-term planning that takes place over multiple years. One example is the Lincoln School Project. She volunteered to continue her role if the Board agreed.

BD asked if she reported back to the Planning Board as the CPC rep. MO noted that when an expenditure is planning relevant, she comes back to the Board for guidance. She also noted that there are overlapping issues with Roadside Traffic and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee which makes it a good fit for her as the Planning Board representative of those committees as well. She explained that the CPC committee makes a recommendation to Town Meeting for all expenditures and if all the money is not spent, it stays with the CPC. The CPC committee does not spend all the money every year and keeps money aside if there is a large project on the horizon such as the sledding hill and the school project.

GT noted that CPC money must be allocated for certain projects having to do with housing, historic preservation, and recreation. He noted that if the money allocated for the three categories is not spent then it stays within the specific category. He has also been a prior member of the CPC and would be happy to be the representative if MO wanted to step down.

SG noted that if MO wanted to continue then he would be happy to nominate her. MO said she would be happy to continue.

SG made a motion to nominate MO as the Planning Board representative to the CPC for a period of three years. GT Seconded. Roll Call: SG aye, GT aye, BD aye, LD aye, MO aye. The motion passed 5-0.

Review of SLPAC charge:

MO noted that the SLPAC charge had been circulated and edits and comments from all Board members had been incorporated into this latest draft. Working off this latest draft, the "Gary draft" she asked if any Board members had any further comments or suggested edits.

LD stated that she did have two issues, first, she thought that the charge should not emphasize housing. She thought that the committee itself may decide that housing should be incorporated into its work but that the charge itself should not contain housing. She also thought that a small committee of five should not include a Housing Commission member because again, this is an unnecessary emphasis on housing when there are other Town Boards and Committees, such as the Conservation Commission that needs representation.

MO asked if any other Board members had any significant issues with the latest draft called the "Gary draft".

BD thanked Gary for letting most of his edits survived the last draft. BD said his principal issue was that zoning should not be done by a subcommittee. He stated the same objection at the last meeting where the SLPAC committee would have three members that were not familiar with zoning. He thought the subcommittee could explore the goals of any zoning changes, but that the Planning Board should do the drafting. He also had reservations about the composition of the committee but that his reservations reflect back to the zoning being drafted by the sub-committee. He is focused on who is drafting the zoning.

MO noted that there were many people in attendance that represented different boards and committees and that she would open up comment to them.

Sue Klem: Sue stated that she is happy to bring information back to the First Parish Green Committee and the Green Energy committee. There is a focus at the federal, state, and local levels of achieving net zero by 2050. It is important to start planning for this. She noted that green energy needs to be part of the discussion at the beginning of any project or zoning. Concern is how would any major renovation or new building be done to accomplish net zero.

Sharon Antia: Sharon said that she is very concerned about the make-up of the committee and that it is critical that housing is part of the conversation in South Lincoln especially in this day and age where we know about the ramifications of historic redlining. What is our obligation to the community at-large? It all needs to be taken into consideration of what we do in South Lincoln.

Allen Van der Meulen: Speaking as former representative to SLPIC representing the Housing Commission and the previous chair of the Housing Commission, he noted that the Housing Commission has discussed representation on the new SLPAC committee. The conversation is about zoning, but it is a conversation about how the zoning impacts people living in and around Lincoln Station. He noted that housing takes years to accomplish and Lincoln needs the tools in place to plan for affordable housing at a reasonable rate. One of the few areas in Town that is available for additional housing is South Lincoln. There needs to be participation of the affordable housing community to make sure this happens. Another concern is that housing takes years to develop. We need to have tools in place so that developers understand that housing needs to be part of any project in the South Lincoln area. Housing is fairly technical and is subject to State regulations. Housing needs to be part of the discussion and it is critical that Housing has an official role to play in the conversation.

BJ Scheff: Seconded what Allen said and thought that there needs to be a focus on providing a range of housing. Around Lincoln Station is where the mixed income housing needs to be. The State has been advocating for years for cities and towns to provide mixed income housing around train stations in the Commonwealth.

Allen reiterated that we not only need affordable housing but housing that is affordable.

Pamela Gallup: Asked what the charge is. Paula Vaughn-MacKenzie read the first part of the charge into the record. Pam asked if zoning is the only way to achieve the goals of the SLPAC committee? The response was that SLPAC will study the Lincoln Station area and one of the things that was the most controversial was the zoning. SLPAC is not a zoning sub-committee, it is a committee that will study a wide range of topics including zoning.

Jennifer Glass: She stated that she was interested in the current iteration of the charge. As she talks with many people in Town, issues such as sustainability, housing, transportation social justice are being raised. These issues interrelate and should be part of the planning process for the few places in Town that have some flexibility. This is a chance to bring in other voices and all the interrelated issues to the process. Things may come up that are not strictly within the purview of this group and that would be a chance to bring in other boards. She stated that she thinks that the SLPAC committee needs a housing representative because it is important to have housing within walking distance to transportation and other amenities.

Evan Gorman: Evan stated he is also from Housing Commission and wanted to listen and supports a housing member on the SLPAC committee.

Pamela Gallup: Of all things discussed tonight, only Housing addresses equality, social justice, and racism. That is why there are requirements for lotteries and advertising. The housing commission's purpose is social justice and needs to be included.

Connie Ohlsted: Connie agrees with Bob and Lynn that zoning and housing are key issues and made an impact on the election. These major issues should be addressed at the Planning Board level. Having a housing member on the SLPAC committee is a foregone conclusion of what a Housing Commission representative's input and vote would be.

Gina Halstead: Just catching up and seeing the direction of the new committee

Sarah Cannon Holden: Could not unmute.

Michelle Barnes: Here to learn more as others are and as the Chair of RLF to make sure that the RLF is a good partner in this process and supporting the Town's mission. MO asked if supporting housing in South Lincoln is part of the RLF's mission. Michelle responded that using land to achieve the values and objectives of the Town is also part of the RLF mission.

Jonathan Soo: Member of the Green Energy Committee and very interested in the development near the train station. He also lives close to the Town Center. He has been very interested in the process so far and considering what is happening now, it is important to include the goals of social justice, and sustainability in the goals of planning. It is important to tackle the issue and prevent

becoming a rich white enclave. How do we structure things so that we do not have planning by veto, where a very small group of people are able to veto? We need to really understand that.

Ken Bassett: As a member of the SLPIC committee, the Board should understand, there is a very large technical component that was helped by working with MAPC and staff. He thinks that the committee should come up with a road map and the committee should have a schedule of deliverables. MO noted that the SLPAC committee will have regularly scheduled meetings and will solicit broad based feedback.

Terry Morgan: Fully in support of Allen and Jonathan's comments and she is on the Lincoln Foundation.

Ken Hurd: Ken applauded the Planning Board for keeping the Comprehensive Plan alive but emphasized the need to implement results soon. Lincoln needs to be on the right side of history and make a concerted effort to be more inclusive in this lily-white community. He supports the comments of Sharon Antia and Jonathan Soo.

Gary Davis: Experience with the effort so far has been as an aide to the Planning Staff and worked on climate change issues. Climate change is an important part of this as well.

Pam Hurd: Particularly interested in issues related to transportation and the development of housing in the greater Boston area. A Town like Lincoln is very accessible, and Lincoln should push for more housing, including multi-family housing that is so necessary now. She is aware of the Governor's Housing Choice Bill and the reasons it is necessary as Towns say: "not in my backyard". We need to be more proactive in creating a mixed range of housing. Lincoln has been very progressive in the past and needs to continue to be so especially with the current social justice and equity efforts.

MO noted that everyone had a chance to speak and the three remaining issues are 1. whether to include housing in the charge, 2. whether to include zoning as a task in the subcommittee, and 3. the make-up of the committee.

MO thought that her feelings that housing be included in the charge of the committee has been reinforced by what she heard tonight. SG agreed and noted housing is an important and integral part of this discussion and that even though some people think that they know what housing thinks, that may not always be the case. He agrees that housing is a very important part of the charge.

LD said she did not mean to take housing out completely but the focus on housing seems to leave out planning for other things in the Lincoln Station area. She also feels that there is not enough sensitivity to the people who live there. She is happy to keep housing in the charge and as a member of the committee but wanted to reiterate there is no reason why we cannot enlarge the committee and add a member of the resident community and other boards such as Conservation.

GT noted that Lincoln has been looking at these issues for at least 30 years and he is mindful of the Planning Board's letter in 1971 to the Town where they realized they had implemented exclusionary zoning to protect Lincoln and its open space. They realized it would be exclusive and



noted that the Town needed to think about the lack of housing for employees of the Town and Lincoln Woods was a response. Now we still have these issues as well as additional issues of green energy, housing around commercial areas and transportation. It is our chance to think about this for the next generation. All the issues should be included in the planning board's efforts. The committee should be thinking about a wide range of housing.

Allen Van der Meulen. A big mission of the Housing Commission has not been the development of large affordable housing projects. The mission was to prevent irresponsible housing developments throughout the Town such as 40B projects. Projects that displace people or create incredibly dense housing in areas in Town where the Housing Commission feels is inappropriate will not be supported. LD responded that this statement convinces her that Housing should be on the SLPAC committee.

Bob Domnitz noted that the purpose of zoning in the Town of Lincoln is a balance of interests of the Town. He wants Town Meeting to weigh in on any decisions that need to be made. He thinks the zoning discussion will be easier than we all expect. The zoning currently in place is very liberal if an applicant accepts that the Town Meeting gets to vote on it. He thinks it will not be such a difficult decision. The zoning currently in place could be loosened up a bit as to what can be done by right. He is not thinking about the composition as much as the duties of the SLPAC. He would like to delineate what SLPAC's duties are.

MO noted that it seems that everyone agrees that the topic of housing should stay in the charge.

The next issue is whether the zoning should be a task for SLPAC. Zoning is very time consuming. It usually is done by one or two members doing the technical work that is brought back to the Board. She is not worried about the Board not being informed. She asked if anyone else had changed their position from last meeting when it was discussed. Bob says that he is more relaxed about this now. He wants to specify the duties of SLPAC and the duties of the Planning Board. MO noted the reality of the situation is that the drafting will be done by a Planning Board member. LD says she initially thought that the Planning Board would be the one having all the meetings but realizes these meetings would take up all the Board's time. She noted that if two Planning Board members are on the SLPAC committee, that is sufficient. She really objected to having the zoning done by a sub-committee of a sub-committee without sufficient communication. MO said that the Board realized this and that is why the SLPAC committee will do the zoning and regularly report to the Planning Board.

BD thinks that using a subcommittee to do the work is not as efficient but substance wise it is ok.

LD asked if there is anything else that should be added to the charge. SG thought that the charge had been vetted. LD said that she had two comments on the charge in response to the discussion tonight. First, there should be a timeline and milestones in the charge. MO said we should ask for a schedule but that is not reasonable to ask for a timeline. We should let the committee start its work. LD said the second comment is that the topics of inclusion and diversity should be included in the charge. GT noted that the whole concept for housing is bringing diversity. He does not see including diversity as a separate topic. BD noted it is outside the purview of the Planning Board to

speaking about racial or ethnic diversity. They can speak about economic diversity. GT noted that is implicit in the housing discussion.

Jennifer Glass: If the Board wanted, the charge could reference the Town mission which is stated at the beginning of the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding the committee, the school committee can be used as a model where non-voting liaisons from other departments and other boards and committees can participate and give expertise and feedback. That kind of outreach is one way to expand the input without making the committee unwieldy. MO agreed and said that is an excellent idea and once the committee is formed, the committee can reach out. This would also be a chance for the residents to have a liaison.

Make-up of the Committee: MO is personally happy with the make-up of the committee. SG agreed. BD stated at this time he is agnostic. LD liked Jennifer's suggestion of liaisons and would like it in the charge rather than leaving it up to the committee. MO wants to have the committee to have the flexibility to reach out rather than write it in the charge. BD asked if SLPAC should be a non-voting entity so we do not have to worry about the composition and can just provide the Planning Board advice. MO was not sure what the suggestion is. Do we want all voices to be heard or just the majority opinion? SG noted that the Board should hear the different opinions. It is a matter of good communication between the Planning Board and the sub-committee. MO noted having the sub-committee report once a month will help enormously with this.

Allen noted that there will be two Planning Board members on SLPAC so if there is any controversy, the Planning Board will know about it. MO agreed. BD said for example if there is a water issue, are we relying on SLPAC to reach out to the Water Commission for input. SG confirmed that SLPAC will reach out to the different boards. LD stated that is why she wants it in the charge. P V-M noted that the charge already allows the committee to reach out to other boards and committees and tasks them with ordering relevant feasibility studies. She referred the Board to the tasks section of the charge. She also noted that there are two Planning Board members on the committee and the committee is tasked with reporting monthly to the Planning Board to increase the communication. MO agreed and said until the Committee starts its work, we will not know the complete list of questions it may have. GT noted that the whole purpose is to get to "yes" and the way to get there is to listen to people and not leave out any significant interest. In order to reach consensus, the committee cannot ignore any significant interest in Town. MO agreed.

MO noted that she did not hear any objections to the composition of the committee.

BD wanted a requirement that minutes be posted on the Town website to be put in the charge. BD also wanted some regularity for meetings for the benefit of residents and suggested Tuesday night. MO said the committee needed staff and morning meetings are better. Right now, the Planning Department is only Paula. PV-M noted that the morning meetings were well attended by residents and that the committee is tasked to report to the Planning Board once a month. MO agreed that this way residents can have a choice of either morning meetings or Tuesday night Planning Board meetings. BD asked if the zoom meetings are recorded and PV-M said all the zoom meetings were

recorded as a matter of Town policy. In addition, minutes are posted on the website. BD said he was satisfied. MO asked if there were any other technical issues. BD said no.

MO made a motion that the Board accept the "Gary Draft" with the addition of a sentence that minutes will be posted on the website. SG Seconded. Roll call: SG aye, BD aye, LD aye, MO aye, GT aye. Motion passed 5-0.

The Board next discussed the Planning Board representatives to SLPAC. MO nominated GT to be on SLPAC. MO also volunteered to be on the committee. LD nominated BD. BD said he did not want to be on the committee. Rather he wanted to be the person on the Planning Board asking the questions to the committee. As long as the Planning Board is communicating, he wanted his position to be reviewing the committee's work. Bob then nominated LD. Lynn said she could not go to morning meetings and nominated SG. SG said we should let the people who really want to be on the committee be the representatives.

SG made a motion to nominate MO and GT as the Planning Board representatives to SLPAC sub-committee. MO Seconded. Roll call: SG aye, BD aye, LD aye, MO aye, GT aye. Motion passed 5-0.

The Board next discussed the Technical Assistance Grant from MAPC. PV-M explained that this was a technical assistance grant that had been in the works. It is for technical assistance with MAPC to work on South Lincoln planning. PV-M noted that she had spoken to Mark Racicot and explained the current thinking reflected in the change of the committee and that the Planning Board will be more involved. Mr. Racicot agreed that they could be flexible. MAPC could function in more of an advisory role to the Planning Board. The Town would not be tied to every part of the scope but the scope includes a lot of public outreach which is a big part of the current thinking. The application had already been submitted and the last document needed is a letter of support from the Town Administrator. MO thought the technical expertise would be helpful if the Board chooses to draft zoning and that organizing public meetings takes a lot of time and effort. LD stated that she thought it was a great idea and it should be put through. GT noted that SLPAC could think of ways to use the grant and come to the Planning Board for approval. LD agreed.

MO made a motion to direct the Town Administrator to issue a letter of support for the EEA grant. GT Seconded. Roll call: SG aye, BD aye, LD aye, MO aye, GT aye. The motion passed 5-0.

MO made a motion to adjourn GT Seconded. Roll call: LD aye, BD aye, SG aye, MO aye, GT aye. The motion passed 5-0.

Approved July 28, 2020