



Design Review Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, August 9, 2021
7:30 PM

Board Members:

Deborah Robinson, Co-Chair (P)
Bob Dermody, Board Member (P)
Len Karan, Board Member (P)
Chad Reilly, Board Member (P)
Rana Mana-Doerfer, DRB Recording Secretary (P)
Elisa Litchman, Administrative Assistant, Planning & Community Development (NP)

Applicants & Attendees:

1. Evans Huber, attorney with Frieze Cramer Rosen & Huber, LLP representing Needham Enterprises LLC applying for site plan review for 1688 Central Avenue with revisions.
 - Evans Huber, attorney
 - John Glossa, Glossa Engineering

Ms. Chair, Deborah Robinson, called the meeting to order on August 9, 2021, at 7:30 PM EST.

Ms. Chair notified attendees of new public meeting orders issued by the governor of Massachusetts.

Agenda Item 1:

Needham Enterprises LLC applying for site plan review for 1688 Central Avenue with revisions. – Evans Huber, Esq.

Mr. Huber returned to the Design Review Board to review site plan for 1688 Central Avenue with new revisions.

The site plan has had changes made to it which include a 64-foot set back from Central Avenue, a driveway redesign to help with pick up & drop off concerns, and changes to the west facing façade.

Previously the driveway was comprised of two lanes (an exit and an entry lane). The new design shows the driveway was widened and has three lanes instead of two, each will be delineated with white lines on the driveway separating the cuing lane from the driving lanes. The entrance lane is in the middle and is 11-feet wide, a queuing lane was added which is eight-feet wide, the lane is long enough to allow 10 cars to stack up near the drop off area. The exit lane is 11 feet wide. The island is now shown as a tear-drop shape which better aids the traffic flow by separating the queuing lane and the main entrance lane. The landscaping proposed in the parking area is now shown as low growing and spreading junipers more appropriate to a parking area and landscaping in close proximity to cars.

Concrete stops were added to the parking stalls, and two additional catch basins were added to prevent ponding or water run-off. The façade changes on the west elevation of the building now show gable style roofs added to break up the façade. There are 2' bump outs of the daycare rooms each with a gable roof and each showing bay windows.

Mr. Dermody asked how the applicants decided on a 64-foot set back instead of the previous 50 feet. Mr. Huber said they were trying to achieve a similar set-back to a neighboring home, however they were limited by how far they can go back due to the drop-off area, as well as the size of the building, which was arrived at through a state requirement of a minimum number of square feet per child. Also, while designing the site plan the idea of rotating the building was considered but would have positioned the longer façade facing Central Avenue, so it was decided to angle the building as it is currently proposed.

Mr. Dermody asked if they are planning to keep the existing barn building. Mr. Huber said that they intend to keep the building to serve as storage space as they currently do not have a lot of storage within the proposed new building (there is no basement proposed).

Mr. Reilly said the three-lane approach is better than two. Traffic engineering is not the Board's role however, the Board's review includes the design, uses, scale and architecture. He also felt like there could have been some consolidation work between the new building and the barn to help with the setback, however he understands from a sustainability point of view why they want to keep the barn and utilize it for storage. While he is not a fan of making commercial buildings look residential, in this case it was necessary and is a nicer looking streetscape. The shorter side of the building facing the street is better than previously proposed. The length of the building and height lend themselves to the streetscape. He also asked what the single-story height is and Mr. Huber confirmed it to be 24' high.

Mr. Reilly suggested that people will need to be managed in order to regulate traffic. If the barn was removed the parking could be more efficient but there are trade-offs. He continued to explain that the Town engaged GPI as an independent peer review. One of their observations is that if the existing barn was removed the traffic would be more efficient. We would ask the Planning Board if the three-lane approach is sufficient. If they conclude there are inefficiencies

by keeping the barn, we would at least want them to conclude that keeping the barn doesn't create back-ups of traffic.

Lastly, Mr. Reilly commented that there will be new families joining the facility and people management will be necessary to regulate the traffic. If the traffic and the engineering is worked out while keeping the barn for storage, he thinks it's reasonable to keep the barn.

Mr. Huber said that the facility plans for the first few weeks and to the extent necessary to have police detail during peak periods to help facilitate queuing. A staff member will also be stationed to notify parents not to queue in an inappropriate location. The Director of the facility has been in close communication with families all through the pandemic and would continue same with regard to people management and regulating traffic. Mr. Huber also stated that this traffic design is a result of a meeting with Jack Gillon, Traffic Engineer of Needham Enterprises and the Town's Peer Reviewer, John Diaz.

Ms. Robinson said she thinks the extra lane will help considerably but the project is still disappointing in modulation and massing. She asked if they have plan for when the drop off lane is full, and the parking spaces are filled. Mr. Huber said the parking lot was designed according to two different metrics required by the Town. They have more parking spaces than required. They have enough spaces for the staff, as well as ample spaces for parents to park. The site could contain 40 vehicles in addition to the staff cars already parked.

Ms. Robinson also mentioned that the pedestrian circulation is a concern. She pointed out an area within the parking lot that she thinks should be a designated walking route instead of the currently proposed walking area. People want to walk the most direct route so a pedestrian crossing should be painted in. Mr. Reilly stated that taking children across moving traffic isn't a good idea; adults would do it but it's a concern with little children. Mr. Huber said he would bring this comment back to his client.

Mr. Dermody wanted a sense of the tree planting ratio. Mr. Huber stated that the trees along Temple Aliyah that were cut down were diseased. They were pine trees which also did not provide any screening. More trees and landscaping are proposed to be planted than taken down. When asked about the large Maple tree on the site Mr. Huber stated that it is just outside the proposed footprint of the structure. If it can be saved, they will save it.

Mr. Dermody requests that a non-shiny material be used for all fencing. He said to bring it up to the client by saying "strenuously use wood". He also encourages the client to not raze the barn but move it on site. Mr. Huber questions the integrity of the structure but agreed to tell his client.

Lastly the lighting on the site is higher than some of the neighbors' properties due to topography. The lights according to Mr. Huber will synch with the hours of operation and therefore they will be off by 7pm. There won't be irritating night time lighting. Mr. Dermody asked about the actual type of fixture and whether there will be any shielding of the lights. Mr. Huber said he would bring this to the attention of his client.

Ms. Robinson will write a memo to the Planning Board along with the previous comments from the Design Review Board.

Minutes:

Motion to approve the minutes of June 28th, 2021, by Mr. Dermody.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Karan.

Name	Aye	Nay
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	

Motion to defer the minutes of July 19th, 2021, to the meeting of August 30th by Mr. Karan.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Dermody.

Name	Aye	Nay
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	

Motion to Adjourn:

Motion to adjourn the Design Review Board meeting by Mr. Dermody.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Karan.

Meeting adjourned at 8:23 PM.

Name	Aye	Nay
Bob Dermody	Aye	
Chad Reilly	Aye	
Deborah Robinson	Aye	
Len Karan	Aye	

Future Meetings:

August 30, 2021	Via Zoom
September 13, 2021	Via Zoom
October 4, 2021	Via Zoom
October 25, 2021	Via Zoom
November 15, 2021	Via Zoom
December 6, 2021	Via Zoom
December 20, 2021	Via Zoom