Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. Moderator, I move 1 that Article 13 be postponed until after action is 2 3 taken on Article 15. The MODERATOR. Is there a second? 4 (Motion seconded) 5 The MODERATOR. Any discussion? 6 7 (No response.) The reason for this is Mr. FAULKNER. 8 that Article 13 refers to RØ district which is 9 created by Article 15. To take 13 up to at this 1 Ø time would require us to amend it now and then to 11 12 amend it again after we vote 13, so the natural order or the order that the articles are written 13 would have 15 be decided first and then 13. 14 The MODERATOR. Sounds like a 15 reasonable explanation. Any further discussion? 16 17 (No response.) 18 The MODERATOR. (After putting the 19 motion) It is so postponed. 20 21 Zoning The MODERATOR. Article 14 is now 22 before you. Redevelopment Board recommends a vote 23

is set forth in their report to change the zoning

district of a parcel of land which is on Winter Street. Mr. Faulkner, is the vote as you have set forth there what you want the town to vote at this time?

Mr. FAULKNER. Yes. I move the article as its printed in our report on page 20.

The MODERATOR. Is there a Mrs.

Atlas? Microphone, please.

Ms. ATLAS. Joan Atlas, precinct three. If you will look at page 21, of your Redevelopment Board report, you will see the house five to seven — on five to seven Winter Street, and you will see the Carriage House sort of towards the back of that property. If you look at Cleveland Street and look at the house which is located along the property line where the Carriage House is, that is my house. The side of that Carriage House is four and a half feet from my back fence and 35 feet from the back of my house.

Although the Carriage House is a very ramshackle, old building and we support the idea of renovating the property, we are concerned about how it will impact upon us. We're not at all happy about the fact that there are two residential units

planned there because it will certainly adversely affect the amount of privacy we have in the back of our house. We have, as you can imagine, now with the Carriage House being unused and the empty lot behind it, we have a substantial amount of privacy now at the back of our house. What is proposed now is to put two residential units virtually looking over our back fence.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

I'm still not sure what position we will take before the Zoning Board on that issue, however, I wanted to make my concerns known on the record now and to state that at a minimum, if the renovation is to proceed, we will seek to have various concerns met, including but not limited to the following: We'd like the lot and back of the Carriage House to be maintained as open space, and that's also a concern of our neighbors. We would like parking since there will be many more cars on the property to be strictly controlled so that not all of the cars are parked in the back of the lot near our property, and the neighbors are also concerned about that. We'd like a number and size of the windows if any are necessary at all on the side of the Carriage House next to our fence to be minimized, and we

would like there could be screening of the property by trees, shrubs and or fences so that our privacy can be maintained.

We understand that we will have further opportunity to be heard on these issues and other issues that might be pertinent, but I wanted to state some of my concerns now for the record. Thank you.

The MODERATOR. Thank you, Mrs. Atlas. Mr. Chaput, microphone, please.

Mr. CHAPUT. Roland Chaput, precinct 12. I believe most of my questions were answered because that was what I was about to ask; what were some of the concerns of the neighbors. Perhaps the Redevelopment Board can enlighten us on any other concerns that were expressed. And I did have a question, where is the driveway?

The MODERATOR. Mr. Faulkner, can you respond to that?

Mr. FAULKNER. This was one of the articles which a number of people did show up to discuss. We held our hearing a number of weeks ago. The concerns were, as expressed by the neighbors, I think this is something that we certainly sympathize

with, and we agree that those need to be addressed if the reconstruction or remodeling of this will property. There were concerns expressed about the density of the housing units on the street, a calculation shows, however, that in fact, these lots are very large on Winter Street, and even with an additional two units on this owner's property, the property is well above the minimum lot size required for the district for the R-2 district. Even with these additional residential units, the density of houses and therefore for cars and other activity on the street is well below the average for the neighborhood.

There were also concerns about the property being retained. This is a historically significant building, and unless there's revenue to pay for the rehab, the building is likely to fall into further disrepair, so one of the concerns was that this was a mechanism to allow that building to be brought up to good, excellent condition.

The MODERATOR. I think you had a question, Mr. Chaput, about where the driveway was. If you could just point them to the map.

Mr. FAULKNER. The driveway is, if

you look at the house from Winter Street, it's to the right of the building. It goes in back of bidding, and there is a large parking area for both the main house five to seven and the Carriage House located in back of the main house. Sufficient parking for both -- for all four units.

The MODERATOR. Are you clear, Mr.

Chaput. Does that answer your question? Any other question Article 14? Yes. The gentleman down here in the third row in the center, left section.

Mr. LEIGH. Bob Leigh, precinct 17.

There's a note at the end of the long paragraph in the middle of page 20 which states that the Redevelopment Board was working with the land owner on the details of an arrangement to work out a preservation restriction. I'd like to know what the status of that is and if that was resolved.

The MODERATOR. Can you respond too that Mr. McClennen?

Mr. MCCLENNEN. The preservation restriction has been agreed to. In fact, Mrs. Atlas has a copy of that as well, so that issue has been resolved.

The MODERATOR. Thank you. Does that

answer your question? Yes. Mr. Bartinelli.

Mr. BARINELLI. That's Barinelli, Mr. Moderator, precinct 15. Just a question, the picture on page 20, that's the front of this lot and apparently the Carriage House is the little thing in the back, am I correct? We're talking about that little house in the back on page 20.

The MODERATOR. That's correct. The photograph on page $2\emptyset$ of the report is the house itself.

Mr. BARINELLI. It just seems inconsistent to have somebody be able to built two more houses in somebody's back yard, even though they do own the property. Also it contradicts — you know, we get into Warrant Article 15 about keeping the integrity of the neighborhood. How can you have a couple more houses in the back? That's all.

The MODERATOR. I think the point is that unless you, the Town Meeting, change the zoning district to R-6 which permits that level of development, that he can't put those two units in the back. Mr. Faulkner do you -- It is an extent building which would be refitted.

1 Ø

1	Mr. FAULKNER. That is correct. The
2	builds is already there. It's a Carriage House. It
3	would be remodeled. The exterior would remain the
4	same. It's just that it would be remodeled for two
5	apartments.
6	The MODERATOR. Does that answer your
7	question, Mr. Barinelli?
8	Mr. BARINELLI. Yes.
9	The MODERATOR. There's a gentleman
LØ	there, yes.
L1	Mr. CRONIN. William Cronin, precinct
12	20. If indeed the Carriage House wasn't there,
L 3	could this person build a home there?
14	The MODERATOR. Mr. McClennen, just
15	yes or no.
16	Mr. MCCLENNEN. No, they could not.
17	Mr. CRONIN. So it's used as a
18	Carriage House, what it is now. Just because it
19	happens to be there doesn't make it a good reason to
20	make it into a home. It wasn't meant to be a home.
21	You couldn't build a home if it wasn't already
22	there. It has no frontage.
23	The MODERATOR. Mr. McClennen, can

you comment briefly on that.

Mr. MCCLENNEN. The reason that this article has been submitted and it's taken approximately a year to get it here is that we stand in danger of losing part of the historic character of this town with that Carriage House, and the only way we can do it is to change the zone to permit this to happen. Now, if you do in fact vote to change this district, the building inspector has indicated that the town and the abutters have two other shots if they don't like what's going to happen, because this project will require a special permit and it will also require variance before anything is done that to to that Carriage House. Thank you.

The MODERATOR. Thank you. Yes, the gentleman right behind Mr. Cronin, green shirt there.

Mr. FORD. Bill Ford, precinct 18.

I'm just wondering about the two houses that are on

Winter Street, this is really in their back yard

almost. How do those people feel about all this.

The MODERATOR. Mr. McClennen, do the records of the hearing show they've raised any objection to it.

2.2

1 Mr. MCCLENNEN. I think Mrs. Atlas is 2 the spokesmen for the people who abut this site. 3 In her presentation she talked about the fact she 4 was representing herself and others. 5 The MODERATOR. Is that true, Mrs. 6 Atlas? Take the microphone, please. 7 Ms. ATLAS. Before the hearing before 8 the Redevelopment Board, my husband and another neighbor on Cleveland Street went over to Winter 9 10 Street and knocked on the doors over there and 11 apparently those owners are not resident owners, and I guess for that reason they didn't really care. 12 13 The MODERATOR. Thank you. 14 answer your question? 15 Ms. ATLAS. And they did not appear 16 at the Redevelopment Board hearing. 17 The MODERATOR. All right. 18 Carrigan.

Mr. CARRIGAN. Andrew Carrigan, precinct 21. It seems that we rezoned another piece of property up in the heights based on what someone told us they were going to do, and after we rezoned it, they did what we wanted. I think before we rezone this, I think we ought to have everything

19

20

21

22

23

down in writing. This if they want to rezone it after that, that's fine, but we got burned once doing this, and I hope we don't get burned again.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The MODERATOR. Mr. McClennen, did I understand you to say there is a written preservation restriction entered into by the owner and the historical commission?

Mr. MCCLENNEN. There is a preservation restriction that has been agreed to, and it is understood that that preservation restriction will go in place at about the same time the variance and special permits are acted upon. Because once this goes to registry, that means it can never ever be removed, and what the owner has indicated is, and we had discussions with members of the board also, that we have the preservation restriction agreed to. We've got rezoning that's got to take place because the preservation restriction can't -- I mean, the owner is not going to put it on if he doesn't get rezoning, and the protection is that the building inspector has indicated that before anything can be done to this property, the Zoning Board of Appeals has to act on a variance and special permit. And if those happen, then the preservation restriction and the special permit and the variance will be recorded simultaneously.

The MODERATOR. Thank you. Does that give you sufficient assurance, Mr. Carrigan?
Microphone please.

Mr. CARRIGAN. What if he sells the property next week?

The MODERATOR. Mr. McClennen?

Mr. MCCLENNEN. Mr. Carrigan, if he sells the property next week and it's R-6, the new buyer has to go get a variance special permit as well, and the Redevelopment Board has made it very clear; Mrs. Atlas made it very clear on the record of this Town Meeting that those variances and special permits will probably be appealed.

The MODERATOR. Okay. Does that answer that answer your question, Mr. Carrigan?

It's not -- I think there is a distinction between former times when zoning was voted here and then people did what we they wanted because they have to come back again to the --

Mr. CARRIGAN. About two years ago.
The MODERATOR. Thank you. The

gentlemen in the far back row in a white sweater, microphone, please.

Mr. KAPLAN. Alan Kaplan, precinct

15. What is the total floor area ratio of this

Carriage House? I see these plans but I can't

really read any of the writing, and I'd like to know

the total floor area ratio and square footage. How

many people are going to be living there, and in how

much square feet?

The MODERATOR. Can you respond to that, Mr. McClennen? He wants to know the square feet in the proposed renovated Carriage House and how many people will be living there. We're getting the answer. They're adding up the feet I guess. While they're doing that, Mr. Geary -- You got the answer Mr. McClennen?

Mr. MCCLENNEN. The Carriage house contains approximately 1600 square feet, and architects preliminary design work indicates that you can put two flowing units that Carriage House on two levels.

The MODERATOR. Take to microphone, please. We can hear you up here. .

Mr. GEARY. You say two dwellings,

two two-bedroom dwellings.

Mr. MCCLENNEN. Mr. Moderator, the oweners are present and perhaps it would be appropriate the question be asked directly of Mr. Leon who is a resident the Town of Arlington.

The MODERATOR. Okay. Will the Town Meeting ask that Mr. Leon be recognized. Mr. Falwell? Mr. Leon you want to take the microphone.

Mr. LEONE. Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen of the Town Meeting, thank you for having a --

The MODERATOR. Mr. Leon $m{\ell}$, just for the record could you state your name and address.

Mr. LEON Sure. David Leon , I

live at 53 Auburn Street in Arlington. And I thank

you for the opportunity to address the Town Meeting.

It's been a few years since I've been up here. This

is a very modest proposal. I suppose I could give

you a little background. The Carriage House is

basically, we call it a barn. It used to be a barn

at one time. It sits at the rear of the report.

The property is approximately 19,000 square feet.

It's an L-shaped lot. It's almost -- well, almost

four times larger than the average size lots in east Arlington. At the present time there is a two-family house on the property. In the two-family house which my family has owned almost 40 years, with my daughter and her family and my son and his family. They've occupied the property for the past several years.

The property has been kept up and we've done a lot of remodeling work. We approached the Planning Department well over a yearly ago and explored the possibility of converting the Carriage House into a small two-apartment dwelling. Carriage House is in tough shape right now. They got me calling it the Carriage House. I still think it's a barn. It needs repair. It's a very nice looking building. It has all the amenities one would want.

When we first talked to the board, they said, "Well, you have to get historical commission approval." We went to them, spoke to them. They said, "You have to have an architect draw us up some plans to show us what you would like to do, which we did, at some expense. They didn't like that plan. Well, time went by, we were waiting for Town Meeting and maybe five or six months ago, we reactivated the

project and we got another architect who did draw up some plans. We met with the historical commission on several occasions. They liked what this guy did. I liked like it too. It's a nice little plan. It does the front over. We'll do the siding over. We'll go the whole place over. As I say, it's as Mr. McClennen said it's only about 1600 square feet. I suppose if you stretch here and there you may get two units one on each floor; They'd be small units, admittedly, but they will preserve and they will upgrade that piece of property.

I heard someone mention what do neighbors on Winter Street think. Well, my son who lives right next door to the neighbors did go and speak with the neighbors, and they had no objection. Now, I don't know if they're owners or non-owners, and whether they are or not I think they've lived there for a considerable period of time, and they certainly had no problem with what we were proposing. We showed them the plans; we showed them the proposals and what we intended to do. I should add that the barn is probably 35 or 40 feet away from their house. Now their neighbors next door are only 15, 20 feet away. So really this thing is

quite a bit removed from them.

almost 5,000 square feet which is about the size of the two lots that are in the front of the barn on Winter Street, 5,000 square feet each lot. So it's a considerable amount of land that we're speaking about here. And we're not about to sell the property next week, Mr. Carrigan. We've owned the property for a long time. As I say, I've maintained it. In fact, we've just remodeled the interior of both departments in the house, for my own family at a considerable expense, and we are prepared to spend quite a bit of money to fix this barn over.

I really don't know that we would do anything that would be detrimental to the neighborhood in any way whatsoever. I realize that Mrs. Atlas has some concerns, and I'm sure she'll express them. I don't think that it's going to be -- The property is not going to be any closer after we finish the property project to her property than it is now. It will still be the same number of feet away.

I would be happy to answer any questions that I would be able to answer. If not, I think I

have to trust to your good judgement and to my -- I hope some integrity in town, having served on this board for a good number of years and appreciating the situation in Arlington, having been a resident of Arlington myself for 40 years, I'm not about to I'm not about to sell that house. It's been around for a long time and I intend to keep. We have signed a preservation restriction guideline that will be recorded with the registry of deeds. did have a sticking point with that in what one respect. They wanted me to do it in accorance with the statutes and even though I am a lawyer, I do know what they are obliged for me to do and not obliged for me to do in this situation. So we have $\stackrel{ au}{ au}$ town would have $_{\Lambda}$ a perpetual easement over the conduct of that house, which means, that any attempts to remodel it beyond what the Zoning Board of Appeals grants us permission to do, would be --It would be impossible. It just can't be done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Board of Appeals is going to have to pass on a variance which the building inspector has stated we would need, and quite frankly, I'm not too sure what the variance is. I understand he's calling it an apartment house, we have to seek a

variance from the fact that we're building an apartment. We are asking for what is basically an apartment house zone, and we also realize that we need a special permit which imposes on us certain obligations. We've got to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood; We've got to preserve the amenities; we've got to conform to what the landscaping requirements would be. There are really a lot of obstacles to us getting a special permit. If we need meet them, we've met all of the requirements of the zoning bylaw, so there is your protects.

Also, another factor of the perpetual easement, and that's exactly what it is, is that we will never do anything to that barn that you are not allowed to do to a two-family house. So it's going to be treated as a two-family house in every respect, in spite of the fact that it would be zoned R-6, which is apartment house to a sense. But in the restriction guidelines, it says we can't do anything to it that you can't do it a two-family house. We also can't do anything to the outside of the building. The two-family house that currently exists there -- And right now I can do anything to

the outside of that building. I could put aluminum siding on it. I could put vinyl. I could change the shape of windows. But I am restricting myself to the dictates of the historical commission of the town or the state by saying that I won't do anything to the outside of that building, existing two-family house, without the express permission of the two historical committees, and also of course the barn once it's remodeled.

1 Ø

I don't know what more I can offer the town, except to say that I think it's going to be a good looking building when it's I know its finished, one I would certainly be proud of. And quite frankly, I'm going to tell you something, I think it's going to costs so much money that I'm not going to make a dime out of it. It's not going to meet the mortgage payment; I'll tell you that right now. Why am I doing it? My parents lived there for a good many years; it's been my house for a long time; my kids live there now; my grandchildren live there now, and I certainly want the property to stay. And I don't think my kids are going to go anywhere. They can't afford to buy a house anywhere else right now. If you have any questions, I'll be glad to

answer them. I'm sorry I don't mean to assert your authority, Mr. Moderator.

The MODERATOR. Thank you, Mr. Leonż.

Are there any specific questions for Mr. Leonż.

Now, gentleman over here, Mr. Candura, just if you have questions for Mr. Leonż.

Mr. CANDURA. The only question I have -- By the way my name is Joe Candura, precinct 13. The only question that I have is what are the provisions of the parking for the additional two apartments?

MR. LEONY: As I stated this is almost a 19,000 square foot lot. Now, if you know what your own size lot is, picture what a 19,000 square foot lot is. Of course the parking requirements have been discussed with the board. They would have to be positioned so that they conform to the requirements of the Zoning Board of Appeals and of the bylaw. We need to have enough parking on the lot and in a position that will satisfy the Zoning Board of Appeals. There is enough room to park. It's just a question of where they go. And that's something that will have to be ironed out with the Zoning Board of Appeals. We

have some preliminary thoughts in where the parking spaces would go, but they may not be in confority with the wishes of the board and we certainly have to be flexible. We can't build this or get involved with this unless we meet that requirement. I think we need one and a half parking spaces per each new apartment.

The MODERATOR. Thank you. Mr. Geary is next. Microphone, please.

Mr. GEARY. Tom Geary, precinct seven. We have now, R-2 and you want to make it R-6. Would this allow the existing five and seven Winter Street be used as a four-family residence if you pass this?

Mr. LEON. Not at all, not at all.
Mr. GEARY. I'm asking the moderator.

The MODERATOR. Well, I think I'll defer to Mr. McClennen on that. The R-6 zone does allow a more intense level of development but as I understand it under the preservation agreement that's been entered into, the houses would be limited to R-2 uses. Is that correct, Mr. McClennen?

Mr. MCCLENNEN. Yes, it is.

1 The MODERATOR. Does that answer your 2 question, Mr. Geary? Thank you. Mr. Barinelli, second time. 3 Mr. BARINELLI. Joe Barinelli, 4 Mr. Leoni, nice to see you again. precinct 15. 5 6 Just one question, why do you have to change to 7 apartment house zoning if the intent is to have a two-family? 8 Mr. LEONY. Well, we can't do it any 9 10 other way. I mean, you can't put more than two 11 families in an R-2 district, and this would be four families when we're finished; two in each building. 12 13 And there isn't any in between zoning as far as I've 14 been able to find. It's the only way to do it. 15 Mr. BARINELLI. Because it's on the 16 same lot, you have to change the lot. The entire lot has to be changed to R-6? 17 18 Mr. LEONI. Correct. 19 Mr. BARINELLI. The other way to do 20 it would be to possibly subdivide the lot? 21 Mr. LEONI. I can't subdivide the 22 lot. 23 Thank you. Mr. BARINELLI.

Mr. Nelson,

The MODERATOR.

1	microphone, please.
2	Mr. NELSON. Andrew Nelson, precinct
3	eight. Mr. Moderator, are we at the point where
4	we're asking questions to Mr. Leoni, or are we under
5	open discussion?
6	The MODERATOR. We are under open
7	discussion. I just thought if anyone had any
8	specific questions to towards Mr. Leonf, it would be
9	go it good if is ask him while he's there. However
10	if you wish to ask other aspects
11	Mr. NELSON. Before you rule me out
12	of order then, my intent in standing up was to call
13	the previously question, to call the question to the
14	chair first.
15	The MODERATOR. Motion by Mr. Nelson
16	to terminate debate. Is there a second.
17	(Motion seconded)
18	The MODERATOR. All right. (After
19	putting the motion)
20	FROM THE FLOOR. Mr. Moderator?
21	The MODERATOR. Take the microphone,
22	please.
23	FROM THE FLOOR. Before he madehis
24	motion to terminate debate, he spoke on the

The MODERATOR. No, sir, he did not.

He raised a point of order which I think is

legitimate. He did not participate in the debate or

otherwise urge us to terminate debate. I think that

was a two-thirds vote. We'll now on the the article

itself.

(After putting the question) Clearly two-thirds vote, but we must have it standing because of the requirement. Same Tellers.

(A standing vote was thereupon taken and the Tellers returned the count.)

The MODERATOR. 143 in the affirmative, 23 in the negative. It is approved.

Article 14 is closed. We will now take a ten-minute recess.

(Whereupon a recess was taken.)

Zoning

The MODERATOR. Town meeting please come to order. Article 15 is now before us. Would everyone please take their seat. Article 15 is before us. The Redevelopment Board recommends a vote as set forth in their report starting on page 23. Mr. Faulkner. Would everyone please stop private conversations and take their seats. Would