



**TOWN OF WELLESLEY, MASSACHUSETTS
PLANNING BOARD**

Staff Report for Case Number LHR 14-03

Project Name	6 Lilac Circle
Project Location	Subject Property: 6 Lilac Circle Map-Block: 148-54
Owner	Len and Peggy Ho
Applicant	Len and Peggy Ho
Representative	Timothy Burke
Applicant's Request	Large House Review Approval

Background/Findings of Fact

The proposed project is located at 6 Lilac Circle (Parcel ID 148-54), within the Single Residence District zoning district and the 10,000 square foot area regulation district (SRD 10). The property gradually slopes to the rear and has an area of approximately 15,190 square feet. The applicant proposes to construct an addition to the existing structure located on the lot.

The Large House Review threshold for the SRD 10 is 3,600 square feet. For additions to trigger Large House Review, the TLAG of the project must exceed the district threshold and increase the existing TLAG by more than ten percent (10%). The existing TLAG of the residence is 2,806.5 square feet. The proposed addition will increase the TLAG by 94 percent (2,640.5 square feet) and at the completion of the project the TLAG of the structure will be 5,447 square feet.

The addition is located entirely to the rear of the existing home, leaving the front façade largely unchanged. The driveway will be extended around the left side of the residence to a parking court located behind the existing home. Taking advantage of the gradual slope of the property, a new two-car garage will be added to the home in generally the same footprint of the existing deck. Above the new garage, the kitchen will be opened into a living room, study, and bathroom. On the third floor, a new master suite will be added. As the addition is intended to support a multiple generation family with elderly parents, an elevator will be added. The height of the addition will not be taller than the existing home.

A new deck, hardscape, and landscaping will be added to the property. No existing trees will be removed.

The complete application was submitted on May 30, 2014. The 90-day review period will expire August 29, 2014.

A complete list of the plans and documents considered as part of the application can be found at the end of this report.

LHR Procedural Requirements

Engineering Review and Comments: Recommendation letter issued June 20, 2014 (see attached)

Design Review Board Recommendation: Meeting on June 11, 2014; Recommendation issued on June 11, 2014 (see attached)

Notice of Planning Board meeting sent to abutters: July 11, 2014

Large House Review Standards and Criteria for Review

Per Section XVID, D. 4., of the Zoning Bylaw, “if the Planning Board finds that the Standards and Criteria for Review have been satisfied, it shall approve the project as set forth in the submissions, provided that it may approve the project subject to conditions or plan modifications.” Per Section XVID, E., the following standards and criteria apply to the subject project. These standards and criteria will be discussed at the July 21, 2014 Planning Board meeting, as will any necessary conditions to aid in satisfying the standards and criteria.

- *Preservation of landscape: The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state insofar as practicable by minimizing any grade changes and vegetation and soil removal. Unique natural areas, topographic features such as ledge outcrops, significant trees and landscaping, and historic features shall be saved or enhanced insofar as practicable.*
- *Scale of Buildings: All new construction shall be sited and implemented in a manner that is consistent with the scale of other structures in its vicinity through the use of appropriate massing, screening, lighting and other architectural techniques such as variation in detail, form and siting. Consideration shall be given to the need for vegetated buffers. To the extent practicable this shall be based on the “Intent, Policy and Recommendations” specified in Part II. Design Criteria of the “Design Guidelines Handbook” adopted by the Design Review Board and otherwise applying good architectural and aesthetic principles. Structures shall be arranged insofar as practicable to avoid casting shadows onto abutting property.*
- *Lighting: Exterior lighting shall be only as needed to accomplish safety and design objectives and shall be arranged so as to minimize the impact on neighboring properties.*
- *Open Space: Open space shall be as extensive as is practicable and designed so as to add to the visual amenities of the neighborhood for persons passing the site or overlooking it from nearby properties. To the extent practicable this shall be based on the “Intent, Policy and Recommendations” specified in Part II. Design Criteria of the “Design Guidelines Handbook” adopted by the Design Review Board.*
- *Drainage: The development shall incorporate measures that are adequate to prevent pollution of surface or groundwater, to minimize erosion and sedimentation, and to prevent changes to groundwater levels, increased rates of runoff, and minimize potential*

for flooding. Drainage shall be designed so that groundwater recharge is maximized, and so that the rate of runoff shall not be increased at the project boundaries.

- *Circulation: Walkways, drives and parking shall be safe and convenient and, insofar as practicable, not detract from the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties and Town streets.*

Abutter Input: The applicant contacted neighbors on Lilac Circle to present the proposed plans and request any feedback. According to the applicant, the neighbors who were contacted did not voice any concerns (*see attached documentation from the applicant*).

Upon receiving the postcard announcing the Planning Board's meeting, a rear abutter to the subject property contacted the Planning Department for more information. The abutter, located at 10 Pinewood Circle, expressed concern with the scale of the addition as viewed from his property, illumination from the increased number of windows and new rear entrance, particularly at night, and stormwater management (*see attached letter from Dr. and Mrs. Spielberg, 10 Pinewood Circle*). Staff provided the plans and the stormwater management report via email for review. The abutter's letter was provided to the applicant.

A second rear abutter, located at 6 Pinewood Circle, also expressed concern with the project's size and scale, landscaping, consistency with the neighborhood, and stormwater management (*see attached from Mr. Zaiger, 6 Pinewood Circle*). Staff provided the plans and the stormwater management report via email for review. The abutter's letter was provided to the applicant.

The Planning Board may want to consider conditioning the project on increased planting between the rear property line and the existing tree line of 6 Lilac, as that may be an acceptable solution to the abutters. For example, a potential condition could read: *"Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or approval of Final Inspection by the Building Department, the applicant shall plant evergreen shrubs and trees that will reach a mature height of at least 5 feet between the shared property lines with 10 Pinewood Circle and the existing tree line at 6 Lilac Circle where existing vegetation does not provide adequate screening."* Staff has added this as Condition No. 11. Staff has also contacted the Division of Public Works – Engineering Division to provide further feedback on the Stormwater Management Report understanding that there are abutter concerns.

Design Review Board Recommendation: The applicant attended a meeting with the DRB on June 11 of this year. In general, the DRB was supportive of the proposed project, and unanimously recommended approval with a condition. The abutter's letter was provided to the applicant.

The DRB was pleased that the addition was largely hidden from view behind the existing home, the front façade remained unchanged, and no trees were proposed to be removed. However, as DRB members have expressed in the past on other LHR projects, the original Landscape Plan for the proposed project was inconsistent with the effort put into the architecture of the project. The majority of the DRB found that the Landscape Plan was an afterthought to the building project.

The DRB recommended approval of the project conditioned with improvements to the Landscape Plan, including using specific plants to establish verticality and year-round interest. Verticality and year-round interest will mask the prominent foundation wall on the right side and

rear of the home and addition throughout the year. The improved landscaping will also provide effective screening on the existing and proposed air conditioning units. The applicant has addressed this condition by adding a variety of plants of varying heights, including holly, mountain laurel, lilac, azalea, hydrangea, boxwood, and perennials.

The significant change to the view of the home from the street is the driveway extension to the rear of the property where additional garage space is proposed for the multi-generational family. While there is mature vegetation on the shared property line, the DRB thought the driveway extension deserved additional screening as there would be significantly more activity in that area. The DRB recommended approval with the addition of evergreen to the property line. The applicant has addressed this condition by adding holly and hydrangea to the area between the driveway edge and the property line. The proposed plantings in addition to the existing vegetation will mask headlights from vehicles entering or exiting the property.

Finally, the DRB recommended that the applicant use higher quality material for the retaining wall at the edge of the parking court. The original proposal called for a modular block wall. The DRB recommended using stone rather than the modular blocks, which was incorporated into the plan.

The DRB unanimously recommended approval of the project at their meeting on June 11, 2014. The applicant incorporated the DRB's recommendations.

Engineering Review: The Engineering Division issued a recommendation memorandum on June 20, 2014, with a number of plan modifications identified and additional information requested. The Engineering Division's initial comments concluded that the applicant has taken the necessary steps to reduce stormwater runoff to abutting properties and the street, but must supply some additional information to confirm this position. The applicant provided the additional information and revised the proposed plan, which were reviewed by the Engineering Division and found to be sufficient on June 30, 2014 (*see email from D.Hickey, dated June 30, 2014*).

The proposed project will capture stormwater via two infiltration systems. Downspouts will carry water from portions of the existing roof and the entirety of the new roof to the infiltration systems. A trench drain will be installed at the top of the existing driveway to capture runoff from the existing roof prior to traveling overland to the street. The proposed driveway extension and parking court will be graded to direct water to a catch basin which is connected to the infiltration systems. The edge of the driveway extension includes a curb to keep runoff on the driveway, directing it to the catch basin. An operations and maintenance plan has been developed.

The Engineering Division did not identify any necessary conditions for approval for the Planning Board's consideration. However, as part of an ongoing effort to address the long-term maintenance and effectiveness of subsurface stormwater controls, the Engineering Division and the Planning Department recommend a condition that requires annual reports to be submitted which summarize inspection and maintenance activities, review the performance of infiltration systems, and provide recommendations for repair or remedial measures required to maintain the performance of the system (*see condition No. 14*).

Other Department Input: No other Department input is required at this time.

Planning Department Staff Comments: Staff notes that there is no limit to the amount of garage space per the Zoning Bylaw. However, side-facing garages such as the one proposed must be setback at least 30 feet from the nearest property line. The proposed side-facing garage is setback approximately 47 feet.

As the project is subject to Large House Review, the Tree Bylaw is not applicable and the Planning Board has jurisdiction over all trees on the property. Most of the trees on the property are outside of the proposed erosion barrier and therefore presumably outside of the limit of work. However, a single tree, a 12-inch sugar maple, is located inside of the proposed erosion barrier and grading will occur around the base of the tree. This tree should be protected in a manner consistent with the Tree Bylaw. Staff recommends that a Certified Arborist prepare a mitigation plan for the 12-inch sugar maple consistent with the requirements of the Tree Bylaw to document the existing health of the tree, how the tree will be protected during construction, and the required post-construction monitoring to maintain the health of the tree (*see condition No. 8*).

Staff's Recommended Conditions for Board Consideration:

If the Board approves the project, Staff recommends that the Board consider imposing the following conditions:

1. The project shall be subject to the requirements as listed in Attachment 1 of the Large House Review Rules and Regulations.
2. The applicant shall record this Approval Agreement at the Norfolk County Registry of Deeds and provide evidence of recording to the Planning Director and Building Inspector prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
3. All construction activities shall comply with the submitted application materials, listed above, except where revisions are necessary to comply with required conditions. Where revisions are necessary, the applicant shall present them to the Planning Director per Part D of Section XVID of the Zoning Bylaw.
4. This Approval Agreement shall not relieve the applicant of complying with all other applicable regulations.
5. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, Planning Department Staff shall review and certify that the building plans submitted to the Building Department for permits are substantially consistent with those approved under the LHR Decision or Section XVID of the Zoning Bylaw.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, Planning Department Staff shall review and approve the installation of the erosion barrier shown on the Proposed Site Plan, prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, dated May 29, 2014, revised June 30, 2014. Thereafter, Building Department Staff shall be responsible for verifying that the erosion barrier remains in place during construction.
7. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the DPW - Engineering Division shall review and certify that plans submitted to the Building Department for permits, which shall

include all necessary information pertaining to stormwater and utility facilities to be installed and/or altered, are substantially consistent with those approved under the LHR Decision or Section XVID of the Zoning Bylaw.

8. Prior to the issuance of a Demolition and/or Building Permit, a Certified Arborist shall review the 12-inch sugar maple located within the limits of construction (i.e. not protected by the proposed erosion barrier). The Certified Arborist shall submit to the Planning Department a mitigation plan consistent with the Tree Preservation and Protection Bylaw that documents the existing health of the tree, protection measures during construction, and post-construction monitoring. A Demolition and/or Building Permit shall not be issued until the Planning Department submits documentation to the Inspector of Buildings that this condition has been satisfied. Building Department Staff shall be responsible for verifying that any protection measures remain in place during construction.
9. While the Building Permit is active, the frontage of 6 Lilac Circle, and any other portion of Lilac Circle affected by this project's construction-related activities, shall be swept and cleaned of debris as needed to maintain the existing condition of the public way.
10. All construction activities, including the parking and storage of all trailers, machinery, equipment, and materials, but not including personal vehicles, shall be confined to the subject property and the portion of the right-of-way that abuts the frontage of the subject lot. The parking of personal vehicles within the right-of-way shall comply with Town Bylaws, but all efforts should be made to reduce the number of personal vehicles in the right-of-way.
11. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or approval of Final Inspection by the Building Department, the applicant shall plant evergreen shrubs and trees that will reach a mature height of at least 5 feet between the shared property lines with 10 Pinewood Circle and the existing tree line at 6 Lilac Circle where existing vegetation does not provide adequate screening
12. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or approval of Final Inspection by the Building Department, Planning Department Staff shall review and certify that the project has been executed consistent with the plans listed above, or as modified and approved by the Planning Director per Section XVID of the Zoning Bylaw.
13. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or approval of Final Inspection by the Building Department, DPW - Engineering Division Staff shall review and certify that the project has been executed consistent with the plans listed above, or as modified and approved by the Planning Director per Section XVID of the Zoning Bylaw.
14. In perpetuity, prior to December 31st of each year, the annual report required in the Operation and Maintenance Plan for 6 Lilac Circle, Wellesley, MA, prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, shall be submitted to the Town Engineer and the Planning Director. The annual report shall be prepared by a drainage professional, and summarize inspection and maintenance activities, review the performance of infiltration systems, and provide recommendations for repair or remedial measures required to maintain the performance of the system.

Plans and Documents

The following plans and documents are considered to be part of this application:

- Large House Review Application Form
- Large House Review Statement of Intent
- Section XVID Review Affidavit
- Property Record Card
- Storm Drainage Report, Prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, dated May 16, 2014, revised June 25, 2014
- Operation & Maintenance Plan, 6 Lilac Circle, Wellesley, Massachusetts
- Halo LED ICAT Housing for New Construction Specification
- Portfolio 11.5-inch H Black Motion Activated Outdoor Wall Light Specification
- Cascadia Lighting 75-foot Ultra Warm White LED Rope Light Specification
- Sheet G1.1, Neighborhood Delineation Plan, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet G1.2, Contextual Views, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet X0.1, Existing Site Plan, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 1, 2014
- Sheet X1.0, Existing Floor Plans, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A0.2, TLAG Diagrams, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A1.0, Proposed Plans, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A1.1, Proposed Plans, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A2.1, Exterior Elevations, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A2.2, Exterior Elevations, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A2.3, Exterior Elevations, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A3.1, Building Sections, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet A9.1, Exterior Elevations - Colored, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014
- Sheet C-1, Proposed Site Plan, Prepared by Columbia Design Group, LLC, dated May 29, 2014, revised June 30, 2014
- Sheet L1.0, Landscape Plan, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated June 13, 2014
- Sheet E1.0, Lighting Plan, Prepared by Timothy Burke Architecture, dated May 29, 2014