



Town of Arlington, MA Redevelopment Board

Agenda & Meeting Notice December 1, 2025

Per Board Rules and Regulations, public comments will be accepted during the public comment periods designated on the agenda. Written comments may be provided by email to cricker@town.arlington.ma.us by Monday, December 1, 2025, at 3:00 pm. The Board requests that correspondence that includes visual information should be provided by Monday, December 1, 2025, at 10:00 am. Please note that all times are estimates; individual agenda items may occur earlier or later than the time noted.

The Arlington Redevelopment Board will meet Monday, December 1, 2025 at 7:30 PM in the **Arlington Community Center, Main Hall, 27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476**

1. Review Meeting Minutes

7:30 pm The Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes from November 10, 2025.

2. Public Hearing: Docket #3869, 9-11 Robbins Rd (continued from November 10, 2025)

7:35 pm Notice is herewith given that an application has been filed on August 18, 2025, by Mary Winstanley O'Connor, as counsel for 9 Robbins Road, LLC, 12 Dickson Ave, Arlington, MA 02474, to open Docket #3867 in accordance with the provisions of the Town of Arlington Zoning Bylaw Section 5.9.3, Site Plan Review. The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-family dwelling and construct two buildings with a total of four residential units on the property located at 9-11 Robbins Rd, Arlington, MA, in the R2 Residential District and Neighborhood Multi-Family Housing Overlay District.

- DPCH staff will be provided 5 minutes for an overview of their Public Hearing Memorandum.
- Applicant will be provided 10 minutes for an introductory presentation.
- Members of the public will be provided time to comment.
- Board members will discuss Docket and may vote.

3. 2026 Warrant Articles

8:20 pm The Board will hear from members of the public who wish to bring warrant articles to 2026 Annual Town Meeting.

4. 2026 Proposed Warrant Article Hearing Schedule

9:00 pm The Board will discuss the proposed schedule for Warrant Article Hearings in advance of 2026 Annual Town Meeting.

5. Open Forum

9:15 pm Except in unusual circumstances, any matter presented for consideration of the Board shall neither be acted upon, nor a decision made, the night of the presentation. There is a three-minute time limit to present a concern or request.

6. New Business

9:30 pm

7. Adjourn

9:45 pm (Estimated)

8. Correspondence

9-11 Robbins Rd:

- K. Lubar - 11/29/25
- C. Wagner - 12/1/25

Multi-Family Development:

- J. Cullinane - 11/20/25
- J. Gersh - 11/22/25



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Review Meeting Minutes

Summary:

7:30 pm The Board will review and vote to approve meeting minutes from November 10, 2025.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Meeting Minute (draft)	11102025_DRAFT_Minutes_Redevelopment_Board.pdf	11102025 DRAFT Minutes Redevelopment Board

Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday, November 10, 2025, at 7:30 PM
Community Center, Main Hall
27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA 02476
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMI.

PRESENT: Rachel Zsembery (Chair), Eugene Benson, Shaina Korman-Houston, Kin Lau, Stephen Revilak

STAFF: Claire Ricker, Director of Planning and Community Development; Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development

The Chair called the meeting of the Board to order.

The Chair opened with **Agenda Item 1 – Review Meeting Minutes.**

October 20, 2025 – The Board members made no changes to the minutes. The Chair requested a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 2 – Public Hearing: Docket #3867, 9-11 Robbins Rd (continued from September 15).**

Ms. Ricker explained that the applicant is in the process of making significant changes to the proposal, and they have requested that the hearing be continued to December 1, 2025.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue the public hearing for Docket 3867, 9-11 Robbins Road, to December 1, 2025. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 3 – Public Hearing: Docket #3866, 18 Grafton St (continued from September 8).**

Ms. Ricker explained that the subject property is located within the R2 Residential District and the Neighborhood Multi-Family (NMF) Housing Overlay District, which the applicant has elected to apply to this development. The applicant proposes to demolish an existing single-family residence to construct a new multi-family building with six two-bedroom units. The applicant also proposes a driveway with three tandem vehicle parking spaces, including one with an ADA access aisle, and a storage shed with parking for ten bicycles. One affordable housing unit is required in accordance with Section 8.2 Affordable Housing Requirements.

The applicant was represented by architect Trevor O’Leary and developer Albert Azatyants. Mr. O’Leary explained that the property is located between Mass Ave and Broadway, closer to Mass Ave. The existing house is a 2.5-story single-family home, with 2.5-story homes on either side that are approximately the same size as the proposed building. They intend to retain the two existing street trees and one large tree in the rear corner of the property. The lot has a unique shape, with a curving front property line resulting in a curving front setback and a property depth that is considerably shorter on the left side than the right. The existing house has a large, enclosed porch which encroaches on the setback on its left side. This is intended to be a transit-oriented project; it is within a tenth of a mile from bus routes on both Broadway and Mass Ave and a mile from the Alewife T station. Each floor will have two units. Due to groundwater issues, they are proposing a small crawl space underneath, but not a full basement. The plan includes two window wells to provide access to the crawl space. The proposal includes three parking spaces, two of which are in tandem, and one of which is a 16-foot wide, van-compliant accessible space. The driveway location and orientation will remain the same as on the existing property. The existing garage location will be used for bicycle storage, in a slightly smaller structure than the current garage. The rear yard will contain an outdoor patio and open space. Tree protection is a priority. The project will need relief on both the front and rear setbacks. The rear of the building extends five feet into the setback. The front of the building is oriented to follow the curve of the front setback to some extent, but three corners of different sections do extend into the setback. The six units will be between 650 and 790 square feet, all of which are

below the 40B threshold for affordable units of 850 square feet. If they increase the size of one or more units to meet that threshold, they will need to reduce the overall number of units to 5, in which case the affordability requirement will not be triggered. Both ground floor units are ADA-compliant, with accessible routes from Grafton Street to the front door, and the first floor is at grade level. The total square footage of the project is 4,960.

The building will maintain the orientation and location of the existing building, and it maintains the look of a single-family house from the street. The front and rear of the property contain open space. A subsurface water drainage system will be able to collect up to an inch of stormwater on the site. The new utilities will all be underground. A six-foot privacy fence will extend around three sides of the property. Ten long-term bicycle parking spaces will be available in the rear, and two short-term spaces in the front. The building will be code-compliant, with sprinklers. The design is consistent with that of a single-family in terms of height as well as style. In order to reduce solar heat gain, they propose light-colored paver walkways and a light-colored roof. The mansard portion of the roof has darker shingles, but due to its vertical orientation, it will not absorb as much sunlight as the top of the roof. The proposed building is compliant with the stretch code. It will be all-electric, EV-ready, and solar-ready. It will be LEED certifiable.

The vertical portion of the roof will be dark asphalt shingles. The siding will be red LP Composite siding. The trim will be cream-colored, and either painted composite or wood. The windows be Pella 400 series (or similar) with black frames. The project will have aluminum gutters.

The developer is working with a landscape architect to help utilize the space well. They intend to use native planting, with a well-landscaped design in front.

They tried to minimize interior circulation areas in the building so as to maximize the square footage of the units as they are all relatively small. Each floor has two units, and all units are two-bedrooms.

Mr. Lau said that he likes the aesthetic design of the building, which fits well with the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the Board does not have the authority to give the developer relief from the setbacks, which the current design requires. The proposed building only has a 15-foot rear setback, but the bylaws call for a 20-foot rear setback. The bylaws do allow for some relief for the rear setback for sites that are less than 100 feet from front to back; the rear setback can be reduced to 20% of the total depth of the parcel. The lot at 18 Grafton Street is irregular, with one side considerably deeper than the other, so the average depth would need to be calculated. Mr. Lau said that the applicant must confirm that this relief is allowed with the Inspectional Services Department (ISD), but he believes that that the rear setback can be 20% of the average depth of the property, which is probably larger than the 15-foot setback the applicant has proposed, but smaller than the 20-foot setback typically required.

Mr. Lau also noted that the proposed building encroaches into the required 15-foot front setback. However, the bylaw includes a provision for a development on a street on which the average front setback is less than the required setback, allowing the developer to use the average setback already existing on the street. He encouraged them to determine the average setback on that block of Grafton Street, noting that it might allow them a smaller front setback. Mr. O'Leary replied that they have roughly calculated the average front setback on the street, and it is approximately 15 feet, so it would not reduce the required front setback. He noted that the units are quite small; the bedrooms are already at the minimum size that will work, especially for the accessible unit. Reducing the size of the building even by a few inches will make it infeasible to include 6 units. If they reduce the number of units to 5 or lower, they will not be able to include an affordable unit.

Mr. Lau said that he would be supportive of the requested relief on parking, from six required spaces to three. He also noted that the plans only include space for 10 trash and recycling bins, but there will need to be 12.

Ms. Korman-Houston agreed with Mr. Lau about ways to look at reducing the required setback, because the Board does not have the authority to grant that type of relief.

Ms. Korman-Houston suggested that they consider a shower rather than a bathtub in the accessible unit. She also noted that she did not see an area for mail. She also noted that the HVAC and trash/recycling information varied from plan to plan. She also explained that parking relief requires a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan, which the applicant has not submitted. She noted that the project would need to actually install solar on the roof, not simply make it solar-ready.

Mr. Benson agreed that the Board does not have the authority to grant relief on front and rear setbacks. He disagreed with Mr. Lau's assessment of the possible modification of the rear setback requirement. The underlying R2 zoning allows for reducing the rear setback for sites less than 100 feet deep, but the NMF zoning does not.

Mr. Benson said that Section 5.3.13.B(1) exempts minor accessory buildings from the side and rear setbacks if the gross floor area is not more than 80 square feet and the building height is not more than 7 feet. The proposed bicycle shed, which is in the rear and side setbacks, is more than 80 square feet, and the plans do not indicate the height. Mr. O'Leary pointed out that the shed is an existing building. Mr. Benson said that because they plan to tear down at least some of the walls, he believes that it is a new structure and would not allow it in the setbacks.

Mr. Benson said Section 5.3.9.B indicates that unenclosed decks and steps cannot project more than 10 feet into the rear setback and cannot be closer to the lot line than half the setback. The rear patio as proposed does not comply with either requirement.

Mr. Benson agreed that the Board cannot offer relief on parking without a TDM plan, and that solar installation is required.

Mr. Benson asked what the privacy fence would look like. Mr. O'Leary said that it will be a wooden fence and noted that all the details are in the landscape plan. Mr. Benson said that he believes Section 6.1.10.A requires a vegetated buffer for the parking.

Mr. Benson noted that the problem for this lot is that it is situated where Grafton Street curves. He said that one option, although it would likely be complex and lengthy, would be to approach the Town about purchasing the triangle of property where the road widens and curves, enabling them to enlarge the lot and have the front lot line be straight rather than curving.

Mr. Revilak disagreed about the requirement for installation of solar. He noted that Section 5.9.4.H says that the requirements of Section 6.4, Solar Energy Systems, apply to the Mass Ave/Broadway Multi-Family (MBMF) Housing Overlay District, but it does not mention the NMF Overlay District. As a result, he believes that a solar-ready roof is sufficient, and they do not need to install solar. Mr. Benson agreed.

Mr. Revilak agreed that the Board does not have the authority to grant relief regarding setbacks. He also agreed with Mr. Benson that the possibility of relief for lots with depths of less than 100 feet applies to the underlying R2 zoning, but not to the NMF zoning.

Mr. Revilak said that he believes that if the applicant leaves at least two of the walls of the current garage, that would qualify as preserving a pre-existing non-conforming structure, allowing the garage to remain in its current location to be used as bicycle storage, despite the fact that it does not comply with the side and rear setback requirements. Mr. O'Leary said that they intend to leave three walls standing.

Mr. Revilak noted that including an affordable unit comes with a 10% parking requirement reduction, which means they are requesting a 40% reduction from the requirement, not a 50% reduction. The request for any reduction does require a TDM plan.

Mr. Revilak asked if the units would be rented or sold as condos. Mr. O'Leary replied that they will likely be rented, but that determination has not been made yet.

The Chair asked how the residents can access the bicycle parking shed if cars are parked in the driveway. Mr. O'Leary replied that there is enough space between the two side-by-side vehicle parking spaces that a bike could be moved between them. He also noted that the access to the shed will be from the rear yard, not from the driveway. The rear yard will enable bikes to be maneuvered.

Mr. Lau asked if the applicant is willing to try to reconfigure the design, given the Board's inability to grant relief, or if they intend to create a new, smaller design, without an affordable unit. Mr. Azatyants said they are not yet sure, because in speaking to multiple Town departments, they have been unable to determine which body can grant relief on the setbacks. Mr. Lau said that no other Town body could grant such relief. Mr. Azatyants asked if it made sense to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Mr. Revilak replied that a variance can only be granted based on conditions unique

to the site, due to soil shape or topography, which would create a hardship if the zoning bylaws were strictly applied. The curvature of the lot is unique, so they could make that case to the ZBA.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment:

- Andrew Waite, 15 Everett St, Unit 1 – His house is directly behind 18 Grafton St. He likes the plans overall. He would like to know what the plans are for maintenance of the tree in the back corner that is shared with 15 Everett St. He would like to make sure that any pruning will be balanced and not on one side only. He also wants to know if they have tested for any hazardous materials. He is concerned about the structural integrity of the garage; it already looks like it's falling down, and they are afraid that it could fall over into their yard and damage their property. He would also like more clarity about the rear fence. There is already a fence between the two properties, and he would like to coordinate with the developer about how to handle the fences.
- Adam Storeygard, 15 Everett St, Unit 2 – He is happy to see a multi-family building on this site; his concerns are about the process. He wants to make sure that information about demolition is clearly communicated, and that demolition is done safely. He agreed with Mr. Waite about wanting to coordinate on handling the fence between the two properties; he said they are happy to work together.
- Jen Thompson, 22 Grafton St – She lives next door to the proposed building. There is also a chain-link fence on her side of the property, which connects to a shed on her property. She is not opposed to a newer fence, but she also wants to make sure that she has the opportunity to coordinate with the developer, particularly because the existing fence is attached to a structure. She shares the other neighbors' concerns about demolition, given that the lot is relatively small. She wants to know how demolition will be handled so that it does not impact the neighboring properties or damage the existing trees.
- Chelsea Waite, 15 Everett Street, Unit 1 – She is not sure whose property the rear tree is on. The current fence attaches to the tree, and she would like to know which side of the tree the fence will be on.
- Susan Stamps, 39 Grafton Street – The tree on the property line between 18 Grafton and 15 Everett is one of the largest trees in East Arlington. She suspects that the tree has roots on both sides of the property line. She would like the Board to consider what type of protection is appropriate for the tree roots. Heavy equipment in the yard could damage the roots, which would ultimately cause the tree to die over many years.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, the Chair closed the floor.

The Chair asked the applicant about their approach to hazardous materials. Mr. O'Leary replied that the project will ultimately fall under the jurisdiction of ISD, who will have to issue permits for demolition as well as construction. Mr. Azatyants is licensed as a general contractor, and he is required to follow all state regulations. There will be tests for lead, asbestos, and other hazardous materials, and they will all be removed properly.

The Chair asked the applicant about the rear tree. Mr. O'Leary said that the survey shows that the tree is on the very corner of the 18 Grafton property, but parts of it may be on other properties. All construction activities will stay away from the tree. They have a tree protection plan, which is part of the landscape plan, and they have commissioned a landscape architect who will work with them to make sure that the tree is maintained, as well as the two other trees onsite.

The Chair asked if the applicant would be willing to coordinate with the neighbors before installing any fences. Mr. Azatyants replied that they are happy to coordinate with the neighbors and discuss what type and size of fence is preferable.

The Chair said that cases in which the ZBA also has jurisdiction, the Board has two options for proceeding. In some cases, the Board has referred an applicant to the ZBA as a next step, prior to the Redevelopment Board's approval. In other cases, the Board has approved an application with the caveat that it is subject to the ZBA's approval. She asked the other Board members how they thought it would make sense to proceed. Mr. Revilak said that he thinks it would make sense to pursue a variance from the ZBA prior to ARB approval. Mr. Benson said that he would like to know if the applicant plans to pursue a variance from the ZBA. The Chair said that the Board can continue the hearing to give the applicant time to consider their options. Mr. Azatyants said that they will need time to consider. Mr. Benson said that he thinks the applicant is unlikely to get a variance from the ZBA. The Board can continue the hearing and give the applicant time to decide if they want to pursue a variance or scale back the project, or they can vote to deny the Site Plan Review for

being inconsistent with the zoning bylaw. Ms. Korman-Houston and Mr. Lau both said that they would support a continuance. Mr. Lau agreed with Mr. Benson that a variance is unlikely. Given that, the applicant is faced with difficult choices.

The Chair summarized the items that the Board has identified would need to be changed:

- Front and rear setbacks
- TDM plan
- Coordinate HVAC window wells and trash locations from plan to plan
- Central mail site
- Vegetated buffer alongside parking
- Patio/deck setback requirements
- Confirm whether any walls in pre-existing, non-conforming structure will be preserved
- Snow removal/storage

The Chair said that this is a well-designed project, and the Board would love to find a way to make it work.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue the public hearing for Docket 3866, 18 Grafton Street, to December 15, 2026. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 4 – Public Hearing: Docket #3869, 1513-1515 and 1517-1519 Mass Ave (continued from October 6).**

Ms. Ricker explained that in January 2025, the Board approved a Special Permit for Docket #3821 to demolish an existing single-family and two-family building in order to construct five residential units and one commercial unit at 1513-1515 and 1517-1517 Mass Ave, as allowed by special permit for a property zoned B1, Business Office District. Shortly thereafter, Town Meeting 2025 approved a zoning amendment to rezone all B1 properties to B2A, Major Business District, which was approved by the Attorney General's Office on October 2, 2025. As a result, the applicant has submitted a new application for review under the B2A zoning and, pending approval of the new proposal, requests that the Board revoke the existing permit under Docket #3821. The applicant now proposes to demolish the existing single-family and two-family buildings and construct a mixed-use building containing 15 residential units and one commercial unit on the subject property in the B2A Major Business District. The 15 residential units are a mix of two- and three-bedroom units. Two affordable units are required in accordance with Section 8.2 Affordable Housing Requirements.

The applicants were represented by attorney Matt Eckel and owners Ilya Zvenigorodskiy and Gene Bernshtein from IG Investments. Mr. Eckel explained that the project is proposed for two lots on Mass Ave, near the Lexington border, which together total just under 9,000 square feet and 98 linear feet of frontage. This area includes mixed-use, multi-family, and smaller residential uses. Creating greater density fits with the Town's goals in rezoning B1 properties to B2A. The proposed commercial space is centered on the first floor with large windows to make it clearly visible to the street. The commercial and residential uses have separate entrances. Each unit has a recessed balcony. The fourth floor is set back 7.5'.

The first floor contains the commercial unit as well as 15 vehicle parking spaces, 26 interior bicycle parking spaces, and a large trash area. The building comes up to the sidewalk in order to activate the street. The recessed balconies and the stepped back fourth floor serve to break up the massing in the front. The plan includes planting four street trees along the front sidewalk. The curb cut and driveway to the parking area are on the left side, leading to a partially open-air parking area. The commercial space extends across the center of the front of the first floor. The residential entry is to the right of the commercial space, with a lobby area leading to a staircase. The front right corner includes the sprinkler room. The long-term bicycle parking room is in the back right of the ground floor, separated from the parking area.

The second, third, and fourth floors each have five units per floor. The building has 13 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units. The front units on the fourth floor are slightly smaller because of the fourth-floor stepback, but they have larger decks.

The units will be sold as condos, including two affordable units. The applicant is seeking relief for a special permit for mixed-use. They have not yet determined with the electric company whether utilities will be above or below ground, so they may also need to seek relief for above-ground utilities.

Mr. Revilak asked if the commercial space is intended to be used by IG Investments as their office, and the applicant replied that it will be.

Mr. Revilak noted that landscaped open space is required to be 15% of the lot area, which would be 1,346 square feet. The site plan clearly shows 945 square feet open space along the back. Mr. Eckel said that the side yard is 4.5" wide along the full depth of the building, so that provides additional open space. Along with the exterior decks, the total open space is approximately 1,350 square feet. Mr. Revilak said that the decks and balconies qualify as usable open space, not landscaped open space.

Mr. Revilak asked about the side setbacks of the building. Mr. Bernshtein replied that on the right side, the building is set back 4.5 feet. On the left side, the building goes up to the existing chain link fence at the property line.

Mr. Benson asked if there will be a garage door. Mr. Bernshtein replied that the driveway is open to the front, and the garage is open in the rear. Mr. Benson noted that the rear of the building faces the Minuteman Bikeway, so having open parking may detract from the aesthetics of the view from the bikeway. Mr. Eckel replied that the landscape plan includes plantings and trees that would shield the view from the bikeway. Mr. Bernshtein also noted that the bikeway is considerably lower than the property, so someone on the bikeway would not see much of the building at all. Mr. Benson said that he would like to see a color rendering of the rear elevation.

Mr. Benson said that he did not see a calculation used to determine Gross Floor Area (GFA) and open space requirements. The applicant said they would provide that.

Ms. Korman-Houston said that she is concerned about the health of the street trees with a new, more intensive use, if the utility lines remain above ground. She asked if the applicant has spoken to the utilities. Mr. Zvenigorodskiy said that the utilities generally will not assess a project until it is more fully designed, including information about the expected electric load, which they do not have yet. It will ultimately be the utility's decision.

Mr. Lau said that he likes the fact that the commercial space is centered on the ground floor with large windows, but he thinks that it is still not given enough consideration. The commercial space is very small, and the floor height is only 10'10", which is inadequate for most commercial space. The zoning bylaw requires that commercial signage must be associated with an entry, rather than centered on the entire space. The applicants intend to use the commercial space for themselves, but it needs to be a viable commercial space for other businesses as well, so that at some point in the future, if the building changes ownership or the applicant decides to relocate, it will be an appealing space to a variety of businesses.

Mr. Lau said that in the rear, where the first-floor parking area is open, it would be good to have a band of color along the bottom of the second floor, to articulate the variation between the building above and the open area below. He would also like to see more articulation on the sides, to reduce the boxiness and massing of the building. The scale feels massive compared to the residential buildings next to it, which are set much further back from the sidewalk. He also asked to see a rendering showing more of the context of neighboring buildings.

Mr. Bernshtein said that there will be two clear signs above the entrances to the commercial and residential spaces. He also noted that the balconies are made of different materials to break up the front massing, and he agreed that a band along the sides would be helpful. He noted that the back will include a horizontal board where the siding of the upper floors ends.

The Chair said that she appreciates the articulation of the roof, which echoes the architecture of the neighborhood. She agreed with Mr. Lau that both sides need additional windows or other articulation to break up the massing.

The Chair asked the applicants to submit a lighting plan to clarify what the lighting spill from the open parking area will be like, especially for neighbors and the Bikeway.

The Chair said that having the vast majority of the ground floor used for parking, with only 575 square feet of commercial space and much more extensive residential use above, makes it difficult to consider this building truly mixed-use. The commercial space is very shallow and potentially difficult to use. Mr. Bernshtein said that the relatively small commercial space is driven by the requirement for a parking space for every unit. They feel that it will be difficult to sell residential units, especially at the far western end of Arlington, without parking, so they did not want to request a reduction in the required parking. He said that they have discussed eliminating two parking spaces to make the commercial space larger, but they felt it was important to have adequate parking for the residential space. The Chair said that she understands, but the Board is having ongoing conversations about how much commercial space is necessary to make a project genuinely mixed-use.

The Chair asked how residents will access the bicycle storage, given that there are vehicle parking spaces on either side. Mr. Bernshtein said that there is enough space to access the bicycle room between cars, and they can provide measurements showing that.

Mr. Lau noted that the required size for a full-size parking space is 8'6"x18', and he would like to see a drawing showing the actual dimensions of the parking spaces. He also noted that some of the spaces can be compact, which would potentially allow the commercial space to be enlarged. Mr. Lau said that he would also like to see a drawing showing all the columns in the parking area, because that will affect the use of the parking area. Mr. Eckel asked how many spaces can be compact. Mr. Revilak said that Section 6.1.11.A says that compact spaces must be 8'x16', and Section 6.1.11.C says that the Board can approve up to 20% of the spaces as compact.

Ms. Korman-Houston suggested that they consider reducing the trash area and/or the sprinkler room to create more commercial space. Mr. Zvenigorodskiy said that the sprinkler room will also have the transformer, because they were told by the engineers that for this size building, the transformer must be inside. Mr. Eckel said that they can look at reducing the size of the trash area. Mr. Lau said that buildings this size typically have a transformer pad outside, so he questioned the requirement that indoor space be used for the transformer.

The Chair opened the floor to public comment. Seeing no one who wished to speak, the Chair closed the floor.

The Chair summarized the items that the Board has identified to be addressed:

- Provide calculations for GFA, open space, and other required zoning items.
- Show dimensions of fourth-floor setback.
- Provide a lighting plan, specifically for spillover light from parking area, and how that will be controlled.
- Add articulation to the two sides of the building to reduce the flatness.
- Provide color renderings for all four sides of the building.
- Ensure that elevations and renderings are coordinated.
- Make sure that storefront entry design is articulated as a commercial entrance.
- Make sure that the height of the first floor is tall enough for a typical commercial space.
- Add a horizontal band on the rear above the parking to terminate the vertical material.
- Show dimensions of parking spaces.
- Review opportunities for compact parking spaces to increase commercial space.
- Determine whether the transformer can be located outside.
- Show the columns and how they affect interior parking.
- Show dryer vents and kitchen exhaust, which must be vented through the roof.
- Show where heat pumps or compressors will be located.

Mr. Revilak asked about the view from the Bikeway. Mr. Bernshtein replied that the Bikeway is significantly below the grade of the building, down a steep slope. Mr. Lau said that the vegetation on the slope is dense enough that the building mostly will not be visible from the Bikeway, except in the winter, and even then, only the upper floors would be visible. He suggested that the applicant provide a photograph from the Bikeway up toward the property.

The Chair asked how the rear edge of the garage will be delineated, both for safety and for aesthetics. Mr. Bernshtein said that they can consider adding some sort of screening. She also asked how the bicycle storage area connects to the back.

Mr. Lau requested that the roof articulation continue along the lower parts of the roof's edge.

Mr. Revilak asked if the applicant's prior special permit would need to be reopened in order to rescind it. The Chair replied that the Board can make rescinding the earlier permit a special condition of the new special permit. The Board can also reopen and rescind the earlier permit after a new permit has been approved and the appeals period has passed.

The Chair asked for a motion to continue the public hearing for Docket 3869, 1513-1515 and 1517-1519 Mass Ave, to December 15, 2026. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – Discussion of 455 Mass Ave.**

Ms. Ricker explained that 455 Mass Ave is currently under a stop-work order. One of the issues is the Verizon storefront. The existing storefront, which was angled back, was removed, and the developer wants to install a new storefront that is parallel to the street. Signage has been installed on the corner of the new storefront. Mike Ciampa, the Director of ISD, has requested that the Board consider the Verizon storefront so that work can move forward.

Mr. Benson noted that the plan that the Board approved in 2021 looks nothing like what has been constructed. The Chair said that the developer's attorney was informed of the issues, but nothing has been addressed. Mr. Lau said that this is the second project by this developer in which they have made significant changes without consulting the Board, and he thinks that it is important to require them to adhere to terms and conditions of the special permit. The Chair said that she does not necessarily want to reopen the special permit, because the Board does not want to change any of what was originally required. Ms. Ricker said that she would contact the developer and ask them to attend the next meeting.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 6 – 2026 Meeting Schedule – January.**

Ms. Ricker said that the proposed meeting schedule for 2026 has been circulated to the Board. At least the January meetings need to be approved so that the Board can begin to schedule hearings and other agenda items. The Board can also choose to approve the schedule in its entirety.

All the Board members were fine with the January dates. The Chair requested that the March 2 meeting be rescheduled for March 9. The other Board members agreed. Some noted that they are not yet sure of their summer schedules, so those dates may need to change. The Chair noted that the Board may need to add additional meetings in the lead-up to Town Meeting, pending the number of warrant articles and the due date for the Board Report to Town Meeting.

The Chair asked for a motion to approve the Board's 2026 meeting schedule with the change of date from March 2 to March 9, on the understanding that additional meetings may be added for warrant article hearings and summer dates may be changed. Mr. Lau so moved, Mr. Benson seconded, and the Board voted unanimously in favor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – Open Forum.**

The Board opened the floor. Seeing no one who wished to speak, she closed the floor.

The Chair moved to **Agenda Item 5 – New Business.**

Mr. Revilak shared some information from the FY2026 tax booklet. The FY2025 levy was \$151,944,000. In the past year, the tax levy has had \$1,283,000 in new growth, which is about 0.8% growth. That is below the state average but is typical for Arlington. 83% of that new growth came from residential, 7% from commercial growth, and 11% from personal property, and there was no new growth from industrial uses. The percentage of the commercial base that comes from natural gas distribution is holding steady at about 21%, which is what Eversource and Boston Gas pay Arlington in personal property taxes for distribution pipelines and other infrastructure.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Lau so moved, and Mr. Benson seconded. The Board voted and approved unanimously.

Meeting **Adjourned at 9:45 pm.**

Documents used:

Agenda Item 1	Draft Redevelopment Board Minutes – October 20, 2025
Agenda Item 3	18 Grafton St – Site Plan Review Application – 8-8-25 18 Grafton St – Dimensional & Parking Info – 10-2-25 18 Grafton St – Impact Statement – 10-2-25 18 Grafton St – Plans & Drawings – 10-1-25 18 Grafton St – Landscape Plan – 10-6-25 18 Grafton St – LEED Checklist – 8-11-25 18 Grafton St – Civil Set Revised – 9-28-25 18 Grafton St – Sustainability Analysis – 8-6-25 18 Grafton St – Stormwater report – 7-21-25 Docket 3866 18 Grafton St – SPR Legal Notice 8-21, 8-28 SPR memo Docket 3866 18 Grafton St -11-05-2025
Agenda Item 4	1513-1519 Mass Ave – EDR Special Permit application – rec'd 08-18-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Impact Statement – rec'd 08-18-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Photos of Existing Conditions – rec'd 08-18-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Plans and Drawings – 07-29-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Landscaping Plan – 08-06-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – LEED Checklist & Narrative 08-18-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Solar Assessment – 12-19-2024 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Proposed Plot Plan – 07-11-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Civil Plan – 07-21-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Civil Engineering Design – 07-31-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Operations & Maintenance Plan – 07-22-2025 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Stormwater Report – 07-31-2025 Docket 3869 1513-1519 Mass Ave – Legal Notice 9-18, 9-25 2025-11-05 EDR memo – 1513-1519 Mass Ave
Agenda Item 5	Certified Decision 455 Mass Ave 11-30-2021
Agenda Item 6	Proposed Meeting Schedule 2026
Correspondence	18 Grafton – 11012025 – Fleming, J Parking – 11092025 – Seltzer, D



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Public Hearing: Docket #3869, 9-11 Robbins Rd (continued from November 10, 2025)

Summary:

7:35 pm

Notice is herewith given that an application has been filed on August 18, 2025, by Mary Winstanley O'Connor, as counsel for 9 Robbins Road, LLC, 12 Dickson Ave, Arlington, MA 02474, to open Docket #3867 in accordance with the provisions of the Town of Arlington Zoning Bylaw Section 5.9.3, Site Plan Review. The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-family dwelling and construct two buildings with a total of four residential units on the property located at 9-11 Robbins Rd, Arlington, MA, in the R2 Residential District and Neighborhood Multi-Family Housing Overlay District.

- DPCD staff will be provided 5 minutes for an overview of their Public Hearing Memorandum.
- Applicant will be provided 10 minutes for an introductory presentation.
- Members of the public will be provided time to comment.
- Board members will discuss Docket and may vote.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
Application	01_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Site_Plan_Review_Application_-_UPDATED_11-24-2025.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Site Plan Review Application - UPDATED 11-24-2025
Application	02_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Photos_of_Existing_Conditions_11x17.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Photos of Existing Conditions
Application	03_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Plot_Plans.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Plot Plans
Application	04_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Proposed_Site_Plan_UPDATED_11-22-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Proposed Site Plan UPDATED 11-22-25
Application	05_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Plans_and_Drawings_BUILDING_A___B_UPDATED_10-24-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Plans and Drawings UPDATED 10-24-25
Application	06_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_color_rendering_UPDATED_10-24-2025.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - color rendering UPDATED 10-24-2025
Application	07_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Landscaping_Plan_UPDATED_11-22-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Landscaping Plan UPDATED 11-22-25
Application	08_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Utilities_Plan_UPDATED_10-24-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Utilities Plan UPDATED 10-24-25
Application	09_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_LEED_Checklist_UPDATED_11-24-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - LEED Checklist UPDATED 11-24-25
Application	11_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Lighting_Information_-_8-8-25.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Lighting Information - 8-8-25
Application	12_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_Tree_information_-_02-18-2025.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Tree information - 02-18-2025
Application	Docket_3867_9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_SPR_Legal_Notice_8-28__9-4.pdf	Docket 3867 9-11 Robbins Rd - SPR Legal Notice

Application UPDATED_11-25-2025_SPR_memo_Docket_3867_9-11_Robbins_Rd.pdf

UPDATED 11-25-2025 SPR
memo Docket 3867 9-11
Robbins Rd

KRATTENMAKER O'CONNOR & INGBER P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ONE MCKINLEY SQUARE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02109
TELEPHONE (617) 523-1010
FAX (617) 523-1009

CHARLES G. KRATTENMAKER, JR., RETIRED
MARY WINSTANLEY O'CONNOR
KENNETH INGBER

OF COUNSEL: RAYMOND SAYEG

November 24, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director
Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
730 Mass Ave., Town Hall Annex
Arlington, MA 02476

Re: 9-11 Robbins Road, Arlington, Massachusetts – Site Plan Reviewe

Dear Assistant Director Suarez:

Enclosed on behalf of my client, 9 Robbins Road, LLC (the "Applicant"), please find the following documents, resulting from the revision of the proposed plans from nine (9) residential units to four (4) residential units:

- 1.e Required Submittals Checklist;e
- 2.e Application for Site Plan Review Cover Sheet;e
- 3.e Dimensional and Parking Information;e
- 4.e Revised Impact Statement;e
- 5.e Photographs of Existing Conditions were previously provided;e
- 6.e Site plan of proposed lot and landscaping plan;e
- 7.e Stormwater management plan;e
- 8.e Drawings of proposed structure, referencing vehicle parking, bicycle parking,e circulation, and bicycle storage; ande
- 9.e LEED checklist.e

We can provide the drawings, photographs, LEED Checklist and stormwater management plan as a PDF so these documents can be enlarged. Please email me and let me know what email to send them to.


PLANNING & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
2025 NOV 25 PM 11:29

KRATTENMAKER O'CONNOR & INGBER P.C.

Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director
Planning and Community Development
Town of Arlington
November 24, 2025
Page 2

Please call with any questions. In advance, I thank you.

Sincerely,

A large, stylized handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke, positioned over the name Mary Winstanley O'Connor.

Mary Winstanley O'Connor

MWO/lm
Enclosures
8096

cc: William Mahoney, Manager

REQUIRED SUBMITTALS CHECKLIST

One electronic copy of your application is required; print materials may be requested. Review the ARB's Rules and Regulations, which can be found at www.arlingtonma.gov/arb, for the full list of required submittals.

☒ **Application Cover Sheet (project and property information, applicant information)**

☒ **Dimensional and Parking Information Form (see attached)**

☒ **Impact statement**

Statement should respond to Environmental Design Review (Section 3.4) and Special Permit (Section 3.3) criteria on pages 6-8 of this packet; include:

- LEED checklist and sustainable building narrative as described in criteria 12.
- Summary of neighborhood outreach, if held or planned.

☐ **Drawing and photographs of existing conditions**

- Identify boundaries of the development parcel and illustrate the existing conditions on that parcel, adjacent streets, and lots abutting or directly facing the development parcel across streets.
- Photographs showing conditions on the development parcel at the time of application and showing structures on abutting lots.

☒ **Site plan of proposal. Must include:**

- Zoning boundaries, if any, and parcel boundaries;
- Setbacks from property lines;
- Site access/egress points;
- Circulation routes for pedestrians, bicyclists, passenger vehicles, and service/delivery vehicles;
- New buildings and existing buildings to remain on the development parcel, clearly showing points of entry/exit;
- Other major site features within the parcel or along its perimeter, including but not limited to trees, fences, retaining walls, landscaped screens, utility boxes, and light fixtures;
- Spot grades or site topography and finish floor level;
- Open space provided on the site;
- Any existing or proposed easements or rights of way.

☒ **Drawings of proposed structure**

- Schematic drawings of each interior floor of each proposed building, including basements.
- Schematic drawings of the roof surface(s), identifying roof materials, mechanical equipment, screening devices, green roofs, solar arrays, usable outdoor terraces, and parapets.
- Elevations of each exterior façade of each building, identifying floor levels, materials, colors, and appurtenances such as mechanical vents and light fixtures.
- Drawings from one or more prominent public vantage point illustrating how the proposed project will appear within the context of its surroundings.
- Graphic information showing façade materials and color samples.
- Include lighting plan and fixtures if not provided on site or landscaping plan.



Vehicle, Bicycle, and Service Vehicle Plans

- Parking and loading plans, including all vehicle and bicycle parking facilities located on the parcel or within a structure, showing dimensions of spaces, driveways, access aisles, and access/egress points. Include line-of-sight and turning radius along with length and type of delivery truck.
- If you are requesting a reduction in the amount of required parking, include a Transportation Demand Management Plan per Section 6.1.5.
- Plans of all bicycle parking facilities located on the lot and within any structure, including dimensions of spaces and access routes and types of bicycle racks.



Sustainable Building and Site Design Elements

- A solar energy systems assessment per Section 6.4, which must include:
 - An analysis for solar energy system(s) for the site detailing layout and annual production;
 - The maximum feasible solar zone area of all structures; and,
 - Drawings showing the solar energy system you propose, with a narrative describing the system, the reasons the system was chosen, and how the system meets the requirements of Section 6.4; or
 - A detailed explanation of why the project meets an exemption of Section 6.4.2.
- LEED checklist and narrative per EDR criterion 13.



Proposed landscaping (*may be incorporated into site plan*)

Schematic drawing(s) illustrating and clearly labels all landscape features, including hardscape materials, permeable areas, plant species, and light fixtures.



Plans for sign permits, if signage is an element of development proposal



Stormwater management plan

(for stormwater management during construction for projects with new construction)



SketchUp Compatible Model, if required



Application fee

Previously paid
(See Rule 12 of the ARB Rules and Regulations for how to calculate the fee)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Docket #: 3867

_____ Special Permit Granted

Date: _____

_____ Received evidence of filing with Registry of Deeds

Date: _____

_____ Notified Building Inspector of Special Permit filing

Date: _____

COVER SHEET

Application for Special Permit In Accordance with Environmental Design Review

PROPERTY AND PROJECT INFORMATION

- Property Address 9-11 Robbins Road
Assessors Block Plan, Block, Lot No. 148.0-0004-0006.0 Zoning District R-2
- Deed recorded in the Registry of deeds, Book 83516, Page 497
or- registered in Land Registration Office, Cert. No. _____, in Book _____, Page _____.
- Present Use of Property (include # of dwelling units, if any)
Two-Family Dwelling
- Proposed Use of Property (include # of dwelling units, if any)
Two (2) buildings with two (2) residential units in each

APPLICANT INFORMATION

- Applicant:** Identify the person or organization requesting the Special Permit:
Name of Applicant(s) Mary Winstanley O'Connor, as counsel for 9 Robbins Road, LLC
Organization 9 Robbins Road
Address 12 Dickson Avenue, Arlington, MA 02474
Street City, State, Zip
Phone 781-953-3956 Email bm.metro@verizon.net
- Applicant Interest:** the applicant must have a legal interest in the subject property:
☒ Property owner ☐ Purchaser by land contract
☐ Purchaser by option or purchase agreement ☐ Lessee/tenant
- Property Owner** ☒ Check here if applicant is also property owner
Identify the person or organization that owns the subject property:
Name _____ Title _____
Organization _____ Phone _____
Address _____
Street City, State, Zip
Phone _____ Email _____

4. **Representative:** Identify any person representing the property owner or applicant in this matter:

Name Mary Winstanley O'Connor Title Attorney
Organization Krattenmaker, O'Connor & Ingber, PC Phone 617-523-1010
Address One McKinley Square, 5th Floor Boston, MA 02109
Street City, State, Zip
Phone 617-523-1010 Email moconnor@koilaw.com

5. Permit applied for in accordance with the following Zoning Bylaw section(s)

5 5.8; 5.8.1(A); 5.8.4(D)

section(s)

title(s)

6. List any waivers being requested and the Zoning Bylaw section(s) which refer to the minimum or maximum requirements from which you are seeking relief.

None required.

section(s)

title(s)

7. Please attach a statement that describes your project and provide any additional information that may aid the ARB in understanding the permits you request. Include any reasons that you feel you should be granted the requested permission.

(In the statement below, check the options that apply)

The applicant states that 9 Robbins Road, LLC is the owner ☒ or occupant ☐ or purchaser under agreement ☐
of the property in Arlington located at 9-11 Robbins Road
which is the subject of this application; and that unfavorable action ☐ or no unfavorable action ☐ has been taken by
the Zoning Board of Appeals on a similar application regarding this property within the last two years. The applicant
expressly agrees to comply with any and all conditions and qualifications imposed upon this permission, either by the
Zoning Bylaw or by the Redevelopment Board, should the permit be granted.

Signature of Applicant(s):

On Behalf of 9 Robbins Road, LLC

12 Dickson Avenue, Arlington, MA 02474

781-953-3956

Address

Phone

2025 NOV 25 AM 11:32

DIMENSIONAL AND PARKING INFORMATION

Property Location: 9-11 Robbins Road

Zoning District: R2 NMF

Applicant: 9 Robbins Road, LLC

Address: 12 Dickson Avenue, Arlington, MA 02474

Present Use/Occupancy: No. of Dwelling Units:
Two-Family Dwelling

Uses and their gross square feet:
Residential 2,555 sq. ft.

Proposed Use/Occupancy: No. of Dwelling Units:
Four (4) units residential (See plan)

Uses and their gross square feet:
Six (6) floors containing a total of 6,760 sq. ft.

	Present Conditions	Proposed Conditions	Min. or Max. Req'd by Zoning for Proposed Use
Lot Size	7855	7855	min. n/a
Frontage	57.17	57.17	min. n/a
Floor Area Ratio ¹	.325	1.14	max. n/a
Lot Coverage (%), where applicable	22%	33%	max. n/a
Lot Area per Dwelling Unit (sf)	39275	1963.75	min. n/a
Front Yard Depth (feet)	16.1	19.4	min. 15
Side Yard Width (feet) right side	14.2	12.5	min. 5
left side	28	15.2	min. 15
Rear Yard Depth (feet)	33.6	20.5	min. 20
Height stories	2.5	2.75	stories ² 3
feet	35	35	Feet 35
Open Space (% of G.F.A.) ³	61%	42%	min. n/a
Landscaped (sf)	5215	3295	(sf) n/a
Usable (sf)	5215	2973	(sf) n/a
Parking Spaces (#) ⁴	4	6	min. 4
Parking Area Setbacks (feet) (where applicable)	n/a	n/a	min. n/a
Loading Spaces (#)	0	0	min. 0
Bicycle Parking ⁵ short term	0	0	min. 0
long term	0	6	min. 6

*

¹ FAR is based on Gross Floor Area. See Section 5.3.22 for how to calculate Gross Floor Area. On a separate page, provide the calculations you used to determine FAR, including the calculations for Gross Floor Area.

² Where two heights are noted in the dimensional tables, refer to Section 5.3.19, Reduced Height Buffer Area to determine the applicable height or the conditions under which the Board may provide relief.

³ Per Section 5.3.22(C), district dimensional requirements are calculated based on GFA. On a separate page, show how you determined the open space area amounts.

⁴ See Section 6.1, Off-Street Parking. If requesting a parking reduction, refer to Section 6.1.5.

⁵ See Section 6.1.12, Bicycle Parking, or refer to the Bicycle Parking Guidelines.

2025 NOV 25 AM 11:33

MEMORANDUM

TO: Arlington Redevelopment Board

FROM: Mary Winstanley O'Connor, Esq., on behalf of 9 Robbins Road, LLC
("Applicant")

RE: 9-11 Robbins Road, Arlington, MA (the "Property")

9 Robbins Road, LLC submits the following impact statement in support of its request for site plan approval of its application under Section 5.9 of the Arlington Zoning Bylaw.

- A. Preservation of Landscape: The site to be developed is in the Neighborhood Multi-Family Overlay District. Two trees are to be removed from the site. The permission of the tree warden was obtained by the Applicant. See the attached. The Applicant proposes enhanced landscaping using native species where available and the planting of three trees.
- B. Relation of Building to Environment: The applicant proposes two buildings consisting of two (2) residential units each. The design of the buildings and materials proposed were selected to be compatible with the neighborhood.
- C. Open Space: The open space and landscaping proposed provides an attractive streetscape.
- D. Circulation: The building will be on the corner of Robbins Road and Higgins Street. The vehicular entrance for building B will be on Higgins Street and the vehicular entrance for building "A" will be on Robbins Road. There will be a total of six (6) parking spaces. Two sets of tandem parking spaces off of Higgins Street and one set of tandem spaces off of Robbins Road. Four (4) tandem parking spaces will utilize Robbins Road for access, and two (2) spaces will utilize Higgins Road.

- E. Surface and Water Drainage. See the plan which includes permeable pavers to enhance surface and water drainage.
- F. Utility Service: All utilities servicing the building will be underground.
- G. Advertising Features: The Applicant intends to mount an exterior sign on the building which will contain the address of the Property and contact information for management as required by Massachusetts Law.
- H. Special Features: None.
- I. Safety: There will be wall-mounted lights on the building by the front door. See the plans.
- J. Heritage: Not applicable
- K. Sustainable Building and Site Design: Energy Star appliances shall be purchased for installation. There shall be two (2) EV chargers installed on site. High-efficiency electric heat pumps will also be installed in each unit.



HIGGINS STREET

N/F
MANI & SURUB RAYAMAJHI

N 56°01'41" E

82.93'

10' SETBACK

③ T23

AREA
7,855± S.F.
(REC-7,680± S.F.)

20' SETBACK

2½ STORY
#11 #9

GARAGE

1.2' bk

2 STORY
PORCH

CB

EB

14.2'

BITUMINOUS CONCRETE

PART LOT A

N/F
TRUSTEES OF THE
PAPALIMBERIS ONE
NOMINEE REALTY TRUST

ROBBINS ROAD

OWNER: 9 ROBBINS ROAD, LLC
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE BUILDING IS
LOCATED AS SHOWN.


EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN
#9-11 ROBBINS ROAD
IN
ARLINGTON, MA
(MIDDLESEX COUNTY)

SCALE: 1" = 20' DATE: 1/2/2025



ROBER SURVEY
1072A MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
ARLINGTON, MA 02476
(781) 648-5533
7628EC2.DWG

SCOTT LYNCH, PLS DATE
THIS PLAN MAY HAVE BEEN ALTERED IF
THE SIGNATURE IS NOT SIGNED IN BLUE.



CORNERSTONE ARCHITECTS INC.

CORNERSTONE ARCHITECTS INC.

46 Augusta Way - N. Chelmsford, Ma. 01863

(ph) 617-694-5356

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

9 - I | ROBBINS RD - ARLINGTON, MA



Revisions	



Scale: 3/16" = 1' - 0"


Job No: 2502 Date: 10-24-25




Drawing No:


S-1.0













CORNERSTONE ARCHITECTS INC.

46 Augusta Way - N. Chelmsford, Ma. 01863
(ph) 617-694-5356

PROPOSED BASEMENT & 1ST FLOOR PLAN

BUILDING "B"
9 - I I ROBBINS RD - ARLINGTON, MA


180018

$$\frac{1}{4} = 1 - 0$$


No. 2502	Date 10-24-25
----------	---------------

wing No.


B-1.0




BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN




FIRST FLOOR PLAN



SECOND FLOOR PLAN



THIRD FLOOR PLAN



CORNERSTONE ARCHITECTS INC.

46 Augusta Way - N. Chelmsford, Ma. 01863
(ph) 617-694-5356

PROPOSED BUILDING CROSS SECTION

BUILDING "B"
9 - I I ROBBINS RD - ARLINGTON, MA


182018

$$\frac{1}{z^2} = 1^2 - O$$

No. 2502	Date 10-24-25
----------	---------------

wing No

B-1.4







LEED v4.1 Residential: Multifamily
Project Checklist

9-11 Robbins Road
24-Nov-25

Note: Scores are approximate and subject to change due to unforeseen circumstances.

Y	?	N		
0	0	0	Integrative Process	1
0	0	0	Credit (D) Integrative Process	1
			Option 1. Installation Contractor Training	1
			Option 2. Integrative Process	1
12	0	0	Location and Transportation	15
			Credit (D) LEED for Neighborhood Development Location	15
2	0	0	Credit (D) Sensitive Land Protection	2
2			Option 1. Previously Developed Land	2
			Option 2. Avoidance of Sensitive Land	1
0	0	0	Credit (D) High-Priority Site	1
			Option 1. Historic District	1
			Option 2. Priority Designation	1
			Option 3. Brownfield Remediation	1
4	0	0	Credit (D) Surrounding Density and Diverse Uses	5
2	0	0	Option 1. Surrounding Density	3
2			Case 1. Surrounding Density	3
			Case 2. Compact Development	1
2			Option 2. Diverse Uses	2
3			Credit (D) Access to Quality Transit	3
1			Credit (D) Bicycle Facilities	1
0	0	0	Credit (C) Reduced Parking Footprint	1
			Option 1. No Off-Street Parking	1
			Option 2. Reduce Parking	1
			Option 3. Carshare	1
			Option 4. Unbundling Parking	1
2	0	0	Credit (C) Electric Vehicles	2
1			Option 1. Electric Vehicle Charging	1
1			Option 2. Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure	1
7	0	0	Sustainable Sites	9
Y			Prereq (C) Construction Activity Pollution Prevention	Required
1			Credit (D) Site Assessment	1
1	0	0	Credit (D) Protect or Restore Habitat	1
1			Option 1. On-Site Restoration	1
			Option 2. Financial Support	1
1	0	0	Credit (D) Open Space	1
1			Option 1. Onsite Open Space	1
			Option 2. Access to Open Space	1
3	0	0	Credit (D) Rainwater Management	3
			Option 1. Percentile of Rainfall Events	3
3			Option 2. Permeable Lot Area	3
1			Credit (D) Heat Island Reduction	2
0	0	0	Credit (D) Light Pollution Reduction	1
			Option 1. BUG Rating Method	1
			Option 2. Calculation Method	1
5	0	0	Water Efficiency	12
Y			Prereq (D) Water Use Reduction	Required
Y			Prereq (D) Building-Level Water Metering	Required
5	0	0	Credit (D) Water Use Reduction	10
5			Option 1. Total Water Use Reduction	10
			Option 2. Outdoor and Indoor Water Use Reduction	9
			Path 1. Outdoor Water Use Reduction	3
			Path 2. Indoor Water Use Reduction	6
0	0	0	Credit (C) Water Metering	2
			Option 1. Meter Water Subsystems	1

Y	?	N		
3	0	0	Materials and Resources	13
Y			Prereq (D) Storage and Collection of Recyclables	Required
Y			Prereq (C) Construction and Demolition Waste Management Planning	Required
0	0	0	Credit (C) Building Life-Cycle Impact Reduction	5
			Option 1. Historic Building Reuse	5
			Option 2. Renovation of Abandoned or Blighted Building	5
0	0	0	Option 3. Building and Material Reuse	4
			Path 1. Maintain a combination of Structural and Non-Structural Elements	4
			Path 2a. Maintain Existing Walls, Floors and Roofs	3
			Path 2b. Maintain Interior Nonstructural Elements	1
			Option 4. Whole-building Life-Cycle Assessment	4
3	0	0	Credit (C) Environmentally Preferable Products	6
3			Option 1. Environmentally Preferable Products	6
0	0	0	Option 2. BPDO - Environmental Product Declarations	2
			Path 1. Environmental Product Declaration (EPD)	1
			Path 2. Multi-Attribute Optimization	1
0	0	0	Option 3. BPDO - Sourcing of Raw Materials	2
			Path 1. Responsible Sourcing of Raw Materials	2
0	0	0	Option 4. BDPO - Material Ingredients	2
			Path 1. Material Ingredient Reporting	1
			Path 2. Material Ingredient Optimization	1
0	0	0	Credit (C) Construction and Demolition Waste Management	2
0	0	0	Option 1. Diversion	2
			Path 1a. Divert 50% and Three Material Streams	1
			Path 1b. Divert 50% using Certified Commingled Recycling Facility and One More Materials Stream	1
			Path 2a. Divert 75% and Four Material Streams	2
			Path 2b. Divert 75% using Certified Commingled Recycling Facility and Two More Materials Streams	2
			Option 2. Reduction of Total (Construction and Demolition) Waste Material	2
10	0	0	Indoor Environmental Quality	16
Y			Prereq (D/C) Minimum Indoor Air Quality Performance	Required
Y			Prereq (C) Combustion Venting	Required
Y			Prereq (C) Garage Pollutant Protection	Required
Y			Prereq (C) Radon-Resistant Construction	Required
			Case 1. New Construction	
			Case 2. Renovation of Existing Building	
Y			Prereq (C) Interior Moisture Management	Required
Y			Prereq (D) Environmental Tobacco Smoke Control	Required
Y			Prereq (C) Compartmentalization	Required
1			Credit (C) Enhanced Compartmentalization	1
			Credit (D) No Environmental Tobacco Smoke	1
2	0	0	Credit (D) Enhanced Indoor Air Quality Strategies	4
1			Option 1. Walk-Off Mats	1
1			Option 2. Filtration	1
			Option 3. Enhanced Local Exhaust	1
			Option 4. Balanced Whole-Dwelling Unit Ventilation	2
2			Credit (C) Low-Emitting Materials	4
1	0	0	Credit (C) Indoor Air Quality Assessment	2
1			Option 1	1
			Option 2 (1 additional point)	1
1	0	0	Credit (D) Thermal Comfort	1
1			Option 1. Radiant Comfort	1
			Option 2. ASHRAE 55-2017	1
			Option 3. ISO Standards	1
1	0	0	Credit (D) Daylight and Quality Views	1
			Option 1. Daylight	1
1			Option 2. Quality Views	1

--	--	--

Option 2. Meter Dwelling Units

1

20	0	0	Energy and Atmosphere	34
Y			Prereq (C) Fundamental Systems Testing and Verification	Required
Y			Prereq (D/C) Minimum Energy Performance	Required
			Option 1. Energy Performance Compliance	
			Option 2. Prescriptive Compliance	
			Option 3. Dwelling Unit Energy Simulation	
			Case 1. New Construction	
			Case 2. Major Renovation	
Y			Prereq (C) Energy Metering	Required
Y			Prereq (D) Fundamental Refrigerant Management	Required
2	0	0	Credit (C) Enhanced Commissioning	6
1			Option 1. Supply Air-Flow Testing	1
1			Option 2. Pressure Balancing	1
			Option 3. Enhanced Commissioning	3
			Option 4. Enhanced and Monitoring-Based Commissioning	1
			Option 5. Envelope Commissioning	2
12	0	0	Credit (D/C) Optimize Energy Performance	18
			Option 1. Energy Performance Compliance	18
			Option 2. New Buildings Institute Family Guide	13
12	0	0	Option 3. Dwelling Unit Energy Simulation	18
12			Case 1. New Construction	18
			Case 2. Major Renovation	18
1			Credit (D) Whole Building Energy Monitoring and Reporting	1
0	0	0	Credit (C) Grid Harmonization	2
			Case 1. Demand Response Program Available and Participation	2
			Case 2. Demand Response Capable Building	1
			Case 3. Load Flexibility and Management Strategies	2
3			Credit (D) Renewable Energy	5
1	0	0	Credit (D) Enhanced Refrigerant Management	1
1			Option 1. No Refrigerants or Low-Impact Refrigerants	1
1			Option 2. Calculation of Refrigerant Impact	1
1			Credit (D) Domestic Hot Water Pipe Insulation	1

2	0	0
1		
1		

Credit (D) Acoustic Performance

2

Option 1. HVAC Background Noise

1

Option 2. Envelope Acoustic Performance

1

1	0	0	Innovation	6
0	0	0	Credit (D/C) Innovation	5
			Option 1. Innovation	1
			Option 2. Pilot	1
			Option 3. Additional Strategies	3
1			Credit (D/C) LEED Accredited Professional	1

0	0	0	Regional Priority	4
0	0	0	Credit (D/C) Regional Priority	1
			Type here to specify credit	1
0	0	0	Credit (D/C) Regional Priority	1
			Type here to specify credit	1
0	0	0	Credit (D/C) Regional Priority	1
			Type here to specify credit	1
0	0	0	Credit (D/C) Regional Priority	1
			Type here to specify credit	1

58	0	0	TOTALS	Possible Points: 110
----	---	---	--------	----------------------

Certified: 40 to 49 points, Silver: 50 to 59 points, Gold: 60 to 79 points, Platinum: 80 to 110

(D) Design Prerequisite or Credit*

(C) Construction Prerequisite or Credit

*Note that prerequisites and credits awarded during the design review are still subject to verification by the Green Rater during the site visit. If the status of the prerequisite or credit changes based on the site visit, the updated form and documentation must be submitted and reviewed by GBCI.

[Home](#) > [Brands](#) > [Livex Lighting](#) > [Wall Sconces](#) > Livex Lighting 7551

Shipping to: [Chelmsford, MA](#) ▾

Livex Lighting Hamilton 17" Tall Outdoor Wall Sconce

Model: 7551-14 | Item: bci4108174
from the [Hamilton Collection](#)

★★★★★ (1)



\$85.90

Finish: Textured Black - 134 In Stock

Free Shipping!

Leaves the Warehouse in 1 to 2 business days - [Shipping to 01824](#)

—

1

+

Add to Cart

43 of 66

Details



Features

- Constructed from aluminum
- Includes a clear beveled glass shade
- (1) 100 watt maximum medium (E26) bulb required
- Intended for outdoor use
- Rated for wet locations
- Covered under a 1 year manufacturer warranty

Dimensions

- Height: 17-1/4"
- Width: 6-1/2"
- Extension: 6-1/2"
- Product Weight: 4 lbs
- Backplate Height: 6"
- Backplate Width: 4-1/2"

Electrical Specifications

- Number of Bulbs: 1
- Max Watts Per Bulb: 100 watts
- Bulb Base: Medium (E26)
- Bulb Included: No

Additional Livex Lighting Links

- [View the Manufacturer Warranty](#)
- [Browse all Livex Lighting Products](#)
- [Livex Lighting Hamilton Collection](#)

Dimensions and Measurements


Backplate Height	6 in.
Backplate Width	4.5 in.

PATHFINDER I LED Outdoor Wall Mount

52120 / 52120PCH

- Aluminum & Glass
- 3000K Color Temperature
- CRI 90
- Wet Location
- 120-277V input
- Photocell option available
- Dark Sky option available

Job Name : _____
Job Type : _____
Quantity : _____
Comments : _____



PRODUCT DESCRIPTION

With solid Die-Cast Aluminum construction and powered by a range voltage input driver, Pathfinder is a high performance down light for commercial and residential installations. Choose from triangular or spherical profiles as they discreetly extend from the wall. Available with a photocell option, these archetypal forms purposely blend into the architectural landscape creating safer spaces that shine light on locations of interest. Available in Black, Architectural Bronze, or Metallic Silver

- Always consult a qualified electrician before installing any lighting product
- Installation Requirements:
Ceiling fan attaches to electrical junction box securely anchored and capable of withstanding at least 35 lbs

FINISHES OPTION

- Architectural Bronze
- Black
- Silver

*Photocell option available in Architectural Bronze only

MATERIAL

Aluminum,Glass

RATINGS

cETLus
Wet Location
JA8 Listed ADA
DARKSKY



ADDITIONAL


INSTALL UP/DOWN: UP
OPERATING TEMPERATURE:
-20°C (-4°F), 40°C (104°F)
PHOTOMETRIC: Report Found Online

MEASUREMENTS

DIMENSION : 5.5" W x 5.5" H x 4" Ext
BACK PLATE : 5.5" W x 5.5" H x 2.75" HCO
HANGING WEIGHT : 2.03 lb

LAMPING

INPUT VOLTAGE : 120-277V
LUMENS : 1,270 Rated (820 Del.)
BULB : 1 x 15W LED PCB Integrated , 15W Total
BULB INCLUDED : (Integrated)
DIMMABLE : Yes
CRI : 90 CRI
COLOR_TEMP : 3000K



WESTERN DISTRIBUTION CENTER (HEADQUARTER)
253 NORTH VINELAND AVE | CITY OF INDUSTRY, CA 91746
EASTERN DISTRIBUTION CENTER
101 GARDNER PARK | PEACHTREE CITY, GA 30269
P. 626.956.4200 | F. 626.956.4225 | maximlighting.com



TOWN OF ARLINGTON

Department of Public Works
Office of Tree Warden
51 Grove Street
Arlington, Massachusetts 02476
Office (781) 316-3114

February 18, 2025

William Mahoney
DBA Metropolitan Builders
12 Dickerson Ave
Arlington, MA 02474

RE: Article 16 Arlington Tree Bylaw, 9-11 Robbins Road

Dear Mr. Mahoney,

Thank you for submitting your Tree Plan to comply with, Article 16 "Tree Protection and Preservation." There are no trees located in the Setback. **There are no qualifying trees to be removed according to your plan.**

For each protected tree identified in the Public Right of Way you have agreed to protect the 'main stem' and 'critical root zone' according to ISA International Society of Arboriculture best management practices during construction projects.

The Tree Plan you have submitted is consistent with the requirements of the Bylaw, I approve your plan and commencement of work.

Sincerely,

Timothy A. Lecuivre, MCA, MQTW



Accredited Tree Care by Certified Arborists

Bill Mahoney
Bill Mahoney
12 Dickson Ave
Arlington, MA 02474

Home:
Mobile: 781-953-3956
Office:
e-mail: Bm.Metro@Verizon.net
Alt e-mail:

February 7, 2025
Proposal #: 85907

Job Site: 3
Bill Mahoney
9-11 Robbins Rd
Arlington, MA 02476

Phone:
Email:
Alt Phone:

Tree and Shrub Care Recommendations on 2/7/2025

Description of Services

- Tree # 1
Ash
DBH - 24"
Critical Root Zone - $r = 12'$
Protection Method - 3
- Tree #2
Norway Maple
DBH - 29"
Tree protection Method - None (Removal)
- Tree #3
Norway Spruce
DBH - 23"
Tree protection Method - None (Removal)

Thank you for considering Barrett Tree Service East, Inc. Sincerely,

Ben Tartakoff
Certified Arborist



This proposal is valid for 45 days, assuming there are no changes to the site (driveway, plantings, buildings etc. remain unchanged).
All work performed in accordance with ANSI A300 Standards.

Payment due upon completion of work. 1 1/2% per month, 18% per year on unpaid balances.



Massachusetts Arborists Association



**Legal Notice of a Public Hearing, Arlington Redevelopment Board
Docket #3867, 9-11 Robbins Rd**

Notice is herewith given that an application has been filed on August 18, 2025, by Mary Winstanley O'Connor, as counsel for 9 Robbins Road, LLC, 12 Dickson Ave, Arlington, MA 02474, to open Docket #3867 in accordance with the provisions of the Town of Arlington Zoning Bylaw Section 5.9.3, Site Plan Review. The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-family dwelling and construct a nine-unit residential building on the property located at 9-11 Robbins Rd, Arlington, MA, in the R2 Residential District and Neighborhood Multi-Family Housing Overlay District.

A Public Hearing will be held on Monday, September 15, 2025, at 7:30 pm, Arlington Community Center, Main Hall, 27 Maple Street, Arlington, MA.

Plans may be viewed at the Department of Planning and Community Development on the first floor of the Town Hall Annex, 730 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington, MA, during office hours (Mon-Wed, 8:00-4:00; Thu, 8:00-7:00; Fri, 8:00-12:00), or at arlingtonma.gov/arb.

**Arlington Redevelopment Board
Rachel Zsembery
Chair**

8/28/2025, 9/4/2025



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts
Department of Planning and Community Development
730 Massachusetts Avenue, Arlington, Massachusetts 02476

Public Hearing Memorandum

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the Arlington Redevelopment Board and public with technical information and a planning analysis to ensure compliance with M.G.L c.40A, § 3A

To: Arlington Redevelopment Board
From: Claire V. Ricker, AICP Secretary Ex-Officio
Subject: Site Plan Review, 126 Broadway, Docket #3867
Date: November 25, 2025

I. Docket Summary

This is an application by 9 Robbins Road, LLC, 12 Dickson Ave, Arlington, MA 02474, to open Site Plan Review Docket #3867 in accordance with the provisions of the Town of Arlington Zoning Bylaw Section 5.8.3, Site Plan Review.

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing two-family dwelling with detached garage and construct two three-story residential buildings with two units each on the property located at 9-11 Robbins Rd, Arlington, MA, in the Residential Two-Family District (R2) District and Neighborhood Multi-Family (NNF) Housing Overlay District. Six (6) residential parking spaces are proposed.

Materials submitted for consideration of this application include:

- Architectural Plans and Drawings, dated 10/24/2025
- Application for Site Plan Review, dated 11/24/2025
- Dimensional and Parking Information, dated 11/24/2025
- Impact Statement, dated 11/24/2025
- Plot plan, dated 1/2/2025
- Existing Conditions Photographs
- Stormwater Information & Utilities Plan, dated 10/24/2025
- Lighting information
- Tree Plan Approval, dated 2/18/2025
- LEED Checklist, dated 11/24/25

The subject property is located within the Neighborhood Multi-Family Housing (NMF) Overlay District, which the applicant has elected to apply to this development.

Section 5.8, Multi-Family Housing Overlay Districts, provides a process for the Arlington Redevelopment Board (ARB, or the Board) to review and potentially impose reasonable conditions through Site Plan Review for As of Right Development proposals located within a Multi-Family Housing Overlay District. The ARB shall provide Site Plan Review for projects using the Environmental Design Review Standards set forth in Section 3.4.4 of the Zoning Bylaw.

II. Multi-Family Housing Overlay Districts (Arlington Zoning Bylaw Section 5.8.2)

All site plan reviews applicable to developments under Section 5.88 shall be consistent with the purposes of Section 5.8 and with M.G.L. c. 40A, § 3A, and any Compliance Guidelines issued thereunder, as amended. The purposes of the Multi-Family Housing Overlay Districts are:

- A. To respond to the local and regional need for housing by enabling development of a variety of housing types,
- B. To respond to the local and regional need for affordable housing by allowing for a variety of housing types with affordable housing requirements,
- C. To promote multi-family housing near retail services, offices, civic, and personal service uses, thus helping to ensure pedestrian-friendly development by allowing higher density housing in areas that are walkable to shopping and local services,
- D. To reduce dependency on automobiles by providing opportunities for upper-story and multi-family housing near public transportation,
- E. To encourage environmental and climate protection sensitive development,
- F. To encourage economic investment in the redevelopment of properties,
- G. To encourage residential uses to provide a customer base for local businesses, and
- H. To ensure compliance with M.G.L. c. 40A, § 3A.

III. Site Plan Review/Environmental Design Standards (Arlington Zoning Bylaw, Sections 5.8.3 and 3.4.4)

1. SPR/EDR-1 Preservation of Landscape

The landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practicable, by minimizing tree and soil removal, and any grade changes shall be in keeping with the general appearance of neighboring developed areas.

The applicant proposes to expand the existing lot coverage to approximately 2,955 SF, an increase of 4%. The applicant further proposes new patios and walkways of impervious concrete and pervious pavers to provide useable outdoor space. While there is no landscape minimum under the NMF Overlay District, the proposed landscape area will be enhanced based on the landscape plan with a variety of shrubs and plantings throughout the site and three street trees.

2. SPR/EDR-2 Relation of the Building to the Environment

Proposed development shall be related harmoniously to the terrain and to the use, scale, and architecture of the existing buildings in the vicinity that have functional or visible relationship to the proposed buildings. The Arlington Redevelopment Board may require a modification in massing so as to reduce the effect of shadows on the abutting property in an R0, R1 or R2 district

or on public open space.

The subject property is zoned R-2 Residential Two-Family and is within the Neighborhood Multi-Family (NMF) Overlay District. The neighborhood consists of a mix of single, two-family, and multi-family properties.

3. SPR/EDR-3 Open Space

All open space (landscaped and usable) shall be so designed as to add to the visual amenities of the vicinity by maximizing its visibility for persons passing by the site or overlooking it from nearby properties. The location and configuration of usable open space shall be so designed as to encourage social interaction, maximize its utility and facilitate maintenance.

Landscaped open space is proposed for the front yards on this corner lot. The front setback will be enhanced with plantings and walkways. The rear and side yards will include additional lawn areas and a common space with side porch entries and stone pavers in between the two buildings. Each of the units also has a balcony on the third floor. The applicant should clarify if any fencing is proposed along the rear and side property lines.

SPR/EDR-4 Circulation

With respect to vehicular and pedestrian and bicycle circulation, including entrances, ramps, walkways, drives, and parking, special attention shall be given to location and number of access points to the public streets (especially in relation to existing traffic controls and mass transit facilities), width of interior drives and access points, general interior circulation, separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic, access to community facilities, and arrangement of vehicle parking and bicycle parking areas, including bicycle parking spaces required by Section 6.1.12 that are safe and convenient and, insofar as practicable, do not detract from the use and enjoyment of proposed buildings and structures and the neighboring properties.

The applicant is proposing to access to the property via foot, bicycle, and automobile. A total of six (6) tandem parking spaces are proposed. The existing driveway apron and curb cut on Robbins Road will be maintained, with a second driveway to be accessed from Higgins Street. The applicant should request relief for four (4) compact parking spaces from the Board in this new parking area. Six long-term bicycle parking spaces are located in an enclosure in the rear yard. Staff notes that the enclosure may be subject to a 6-foot setback from the property line. Section 6.1.12.D. of the Zoning Bylaw requires that the computed number of required spaces be rounded up to the next whole number, thus one (1) short-term bicycle parking space is required. The Board may wish to discuss a practical location for the short-term bicycle parking space with the applicant.

Vehicle Parking Requirements		
Required parking spaces	4	
Proposed parking spaces	4	
Bicycle Parking Requirements		
Use	Long-Term Parking	Short-Term Parking
Required Bicycle Parking	6	1
Proposed Bicycle Parking	6	0

4. SPR/EDR-5 Surface Water Drainage

Special attention shall be given to proper site surface drainage so that removal of surface waters will not adversely affect neighboring properties or the public storm drainage system. Available Best Management Practices for the site should be employed, and include site planning to minimize impervious surface and reduce clearing and re-grading. Best Management Practices may include erosion control and stormwater treatment by means of swales, filters, plantings, roof gardens, native vegetation, and leaching catch basins. Stormwater should be treated at least minimally on the development site; that which cannot be handled on site shall be removed from all roofs, canopies, paved and pooling areas and carried away in an underground drainage system. Surface water in all paved areas shall be collected in intervals so that it will not obstruct the flow of vehicular or pedestrian traffic and will not create puddles in the paved areas.

In accordance with Section 3.3.4, the Board may require from any applicant, after consultation with the Director of Public Works, security satisfactory to the Board to ensure the maintenance of all stormwater facilities such as catch basins, leaching catch basins, detention basins, swales, etc. within the site. The Board may use funds provided by such security to conduct maintenance that the applicant fails to do.

The Board may adjust in its sole discretion the amount and type of financial security such that it is satisfied that the amount is sufficient to provide for any future maintenance needs.

The applicant will apply best practices and comply with the Town's Stormwater Management bylaw, during and after construction, as approved by the Town Engineer. A stormwater recharge system underneath the second driveway is proposed, as is the use of pervious pavers on site.

5. SPR/EDR-6 Utilities Service

Electric, telephone, cable TV, and other such lines of equipment shall be underground. The proposed method of sanitary sewage disposal and solid waste disposal from all buildings shall be indicated.

Utilities serving the building will be located underground.

6. SPR/EDR-7 Advertising Features

The size, location, design, color, texture, lighting and materials of all permanent signs and outdoor advertising structures or features shall not detract from the use and enjoyment of proposed buildings and structures and the surrounding properties.

As this is a residential development, no advertising features are proposed.

7. SPR/EDR-8 Special Features

Exposed storage areas, exposed machinery installations, service areas, truck loading areas, utility buildings and structures, and similar accessory areas and structures shall be subject to such setbacks, screen plantings or other screening methods as shall reasonably be required to prevent their being incongruous with the existing or contemplated environment and the surrounding properties.

The proposed site plan shows eight (8) trash and recycling receptacles and a condenser for each unit located in the common area between the buildings.

8. SPR/EDR-9 Safety

With respect to personal safety, all open and enclosed spaces shall be designed to facilitate building evacuation and maximize accessibility by fire, police and other emergency personnel and equipment. Insofar as practicable, all exterior spaces and interior public and semi-public spaces shall be so designed to minimize the fear and probability of personal harm or injury by increasing the potential surveillance by neighboring residents and passersby of any accident or attempted criminal act.

The interior and exterior of the building is designed to facilitate building evacuation. The proposed building will have access for fire, police and other emergency vehicles, as well as personnel and equipment from Broadway.

9. SPR/ EDR-10 Heritage

With respect to Arlington's heritage, removal or disruption of historic, traditional or significant uses, structures or architectural elements shall be minimized insofar as practical whether these exist on the site or on adjacent properties.

The property at 9-11 Robbins Road is not listed on the *Inventory of Historically or Architecturally Significant Properties in the Town of Arlington*.

10. SPR/EDR-11 Microclimate

With respect to the localized climatic characteristics of a given area, any development which proposes new structures, new hard surface, ground coverage or the installation of machinery which emits heat, vapor or fumes shall endeavor to minimize insofar as practicable, any adverse impacts on light, air and water resources or on noise and temperature levels of the immediate environment.

Equipment for heating and cooling will be located in the common area between the buildings. The roof plan includes an area designated for a solar array. A solar array assessment was not submitted. No other mechanical equipment is shown on the site plan.

11. SPR/EDR-12 Sustainable Building and Site Design

Projects are encouraged to incorporate best practices related to sustainable sites, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources, and indoor environmental quality. Applicants must submit a current Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) checklist, appropriate to the type of development, annotated with narrative description that indicates how the LEED performance objectives will be incorporated into the project.

This applicant has completed a LEED checklist. The applicant should clarify whether two or four parking spaces will have access to an EV charger. The development will comply with the Town's Specialized Stretch Energy Code and the Fossil Fuel-Free Bylaw which ensure a maximum level of energy efficiency is achieved.

IV. Findings

The following findings are for the Board's consideration:

1. The nature and use of the property is consistent with the purpose and intent of Section 5.8, Multi-Family Overlay Districts.
2. The project is consistent with Site Plan Review/Environmental Design Review standards per Sections 5.8 and 3.4 of the Zoning Bylaw.

V. Recommended Conditions

1. Any substantial or material deviation during construction from the approved plans and specifications is subject to the written approval of the Arlington Redevelopment Board.
2. The Board maintains continuing jurisdiction over this permit and may, after a duly advertised public hearing, attach other conditions or modify these conditions as it deems appropriate in order to protect the public interest and welfare.
3. Applicant will obtain the necessary building permits and work with the Town Engineer to ensure compliance with all applicable codes.



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

2026 Proposed Warrant Article Hearing Schedule

Summary:

9:00 pm The Board will discuss the proposed schedule for Warrant Article Hearings in advance of 2026 Annual Town Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Reference Material	Proposed_Warrant_Article_Hearing_Schedule_2026.pdf	Proposed Warrant Article Hearing Schedule 2026
▢ Reference Material	2026_ARB_Town_Meeting_Process.pdf	2026 ARB Town Meeting Process



ARLINGTON REDEVELOPMENT BOARD

TOWN HALL, ARLINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02476

TELEPHONE 781-316-3090

2026 Proposed Warrant Article Hearing Schedule

- February 23 – Hearing #1, on ARB zoning articles (except zoning map changes).
- March 9 – Hearing #2, on the Citizen Petition warrant articles (except zoning map changes).
- March 16 – Hearing #3, on zoning map changes (confirm petitioners' availability).
- March 30 – Deliberation and Vote on all warrant articles.
- April 6 – Vote to approve Board Report to Town Meeting.
- April 27 – Town Meeting starts.

Note: March 23 is reserved for an additional meeting in case the hearings for proposed zoning amendments are continued to that date.



TOWN OF ARLINGTON

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING and
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TOWN HALL, 730 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
ARLINGTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02476
TELEPHONE 781-316-3090

Page | 1

Redevelopment Board Review Process and Schedule for 2026 Annual Town Meeting

Date	Process	Description and Action Items
November 2025- January, 2026 ¹	Submission of ideas for zoning amendments	<p>Preliminary ideas for warrant articles may be submitted to the ARB.² DPCD staff will schedule time for discussion with the ARB at a hearing in November or December.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: Share ideas for citizen petitions with DPCD Director, Claire Ricker (cricker@town.arlington.ma.us) to be scheduled for a discussion period at an ARB hearing.</p>
December 2025- January 2026	Preliminary discussions with ARB	<p>At its December and January meetings, the ARB will be available for previously scheduled preliminary discussions with petitioners. The purpose of these discussions is to discuss the petitioners' intent for the warrant articles, and to provide recommendations and guidance in advance of the close of the Town Meeting warrant.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: Review preliminary information submitted by authors of potential warrant articles, provide guidance on next steps.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: Prepare brief presentation or discussion notes on intent of warrant article.</p>

¹ These steps are not required under the public filing process requirements, but it is recommended to ensure that submissions meet legal requirements and are suitably crafted for consideration by Town Meeting.

² Petitioners may include the following under M.G.L. c.40A: the Redevelopment Board, Select Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, an individual owning land to be affected by change or adoption, registered voters of a town pursuant to section ten of chapter thirty-nine, or a regional planning agency (Metropolitan Area Planning Council).

Date	Process	Description and Action Items
December 5, 2025 – January 30, 2026 (65 days before Town Meeting)	Warrant Opens and Closes	<p>The Town Meeting warrant will open December 5, 2025 and remain open until noon on January 30, 2026. The Select Board establishes the final date for submission of articles to the Town Meeting warrant.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: The ARB will submit any zoning articles to the warrant.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: Members of the public will submit any zoning articles to the warrant. The ARB recommends that petitioners reach out to the Director and Assistant Director for Planning and Community Development to discuss their article and to learn more about the review timeline. The Planning and Community Development staff is available to provide technical assistance to petitioners throughout the process.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: This is the due date for topics (articles on zoning or other topics) to be submitted to warrant for consideration by Town Meeting beginning on April 27, 2026.</p>
February 5 and February 12, 2026 (+14 days after warrant closes)	Legal Notice Published/ Zoning Warrant Articles Posted	<p>As required by M.G.L. Chapter 40A, The Zoning Act, a legal notice will be placed in a local newspaper that identifies the hearing dates, location, and the topics. At the same time, a document will be published that compiles all of the zoning warrant articles and amendment text (known as a main motion) if available.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: On behalf of the ARB, DPCD staff submits the legal notice and the compiled zoning warrant articles. Additionally, the DPCD staff will communicate the hearing schedule to all petitioners and other interested parties.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: At this time, it is important for petitioners to be in touch with DPCD Director and Assistant Director to review the amendment text (main motion) and other relative resources and documents. The DPCD staff is available for technical assistance to any petitioner.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: Once the legal notice is published, the hearing schedule will be published. If you are interested in any of the zoning topics, you can save the date to attend a public hearing with the ARB.</p>
Potential dates: Feb. 23, 2026 March 9, 2026 March 16, 2026 (first hearing + 14 days after	ARB Public Hearings	<p>M.G.L. Chapter 40A requires that the ARB hold public hearings to obtain feedback on all of the zoning warrant articles proceeding to Town Meeting.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: The ARB will hold public hearings on Mondays in February and March to obtain feedback. The number and dates of hearings will depend on the total number of zoning amendments to be reviewed. On behalf of the ARB, the DPCD Director and Assistant Director will</p>

Date	Process	Description and Action Items
legal notice published)		<p>communicate the hearing schedule and protocol to all petitioners and coordinate obtaining materials from petitioners for inclusion in the ARB's meeting packet which is publically accessible.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: At least a week in advance of a petitioner's hearing date, petitioners should provide to the DPCD Director and Assistant Director your amendment text (main motion) and other relevant materials. The petitioner should prepare to make a short presentation (no more than 3-5 minutes) at the public hearing and answer questions from the ARB members regarding the petition.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: All public hearings are open for attendance by the general public. You may join and provide feedback based on the information presented or just listen. Written comments are also welcome. All materials will be posted online at arlingtonma.gov/arb.</p>
Proposed dates: March 30, 2026 and April 6, 2026	Continued hearing dates: ARB Deliberates and Votes on Zoning Articles and Votes on Report to Town Meeting	<p>M.G.L. Chapter 40A requires that the ARB vote on each article and prepare a report for Town Meeting. The ARB can vote to recommend action or recommend no action to Town Meeting. The Report to Town Meeting, which outlines the votes taken and why, is drafted and voted on at the final ARB meeting. The Report is provided to Town Meeting Members and posted online on the Town Meeting webpage.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: After hearing from all petitioners and interested parties, the ARB will vote on each article and outline their reasons for each vote. The Report to Town Meeting will be finalized and voted on and submitted to Town Meeting Members and posted online for review.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: Prior to the ARB's vote, each Petitioner should work with the DPCD Director and Assistant Director to finalize their amendment text (main motion) for consideration by the ARB. Any other relevant information should be provided by the petitioner.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: At this stage, all feedback has been obtained by the ARB either verbally or written, the public hearing has closed, and the ARB will vote on each article individually.</p>
March and April 2026	Public Information Sessions	<p>Arlington Town Meeting Members will hold precinct meetings in March and April 2026 prior to the start of Town Meeting. Additionally, the ARB may hold public information sessions on the zoning warrant articles.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: On behalf of the ARB, DPCD Staff and ARB members may hold virtual or in-person public information session(s) to provide an overview the zoning articles to be considered by Town Meeting. The public information session will include time for questions and answers.</p>

Date	Process	Description and Action Items
		<p>Petitioner Action Item: Petitioners may want to attend the precinct meetings and ARB public information sessions to provide information about their zoning warrant articles.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: Attendance at the precinct meetings and at public information sessions will provide a venue to seek additional information and to let your Town Meeting Members know your opinion on any article.</p>
April 27, 2026	Town Meeting Begins	<p>Town Meeting begins on April 27, 2026 and continues on Mondays and Wednesdays until completed. The Town Meeting Members will vote on each article. In most cases, zoning articles require an affirmative vote of two-thirds majority of Town Meeting.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: The ARB Chair will provide a presentation of the warrant article. DPCD staff may be on hand to provide additional information to respond to Town Meeting Member questions.</p> <p>Petitioner Action Item: If the petitioner is not the ARB, the petitioner will be given a chance to present and answer any questions from Town Meeting Members.</p> <p>General Public Action Item: The general public can watch the Town Meeting proceedings through ACMi.</p>
Post Town Meeting	Submission to the Attorney General	<p>Towns are required to submit to the Attorney General’s Municipal Law Unit information about zoning articles, the process, and the votes taken. Unless otherwise described in the article, the effective date of a zoning amendment is the date Town Meeting voted.</p> <p>ARB Action Item: On behalf of the ARB, the DPCD staff work with the Town Clerk and Town Counsel to prepare and submit the appropriate forms and update the Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>There are no action items for Petitioners and the General Public.</p>

If you have any questions about this timeline and process, please contact Sarah Suarez, Assistant Director, Department of Planning and Community Development at 781-316-3096 or ssuarez@town.arlington.ma.us.



Town of Arlington, Massachusetts

Correspondence

Summary:

9-11 Robbins Rd:

- K. Lubar - 11/29/25
- C. Wagner - 12/1/25

Multi-Family Development:

- J. Cullinane - 11/20/25
- J. Gersh - 11/22/25

ATTACHMENTS:

Type	File Name	Description
▢ Correspondence	9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_11292025_-_Lubar__K.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Lubar, K - 11292025
▢ Correspondence	9-11_Robbins_Rd_-_12012025_-_Wagner__C.pdf	9-11 Robbins Rd - Wagner, C - 12012025
▢ Correspondence	Multi-Family_Development_-_11202025_-_Cullinane__J.pdf	Multi-Family Development - Cullinane, J - 11202025
▢ Correspondence	Multi-Family_Development_-_11222025_-_Gersh__J.pdf	Multi-Family Development - Gersh, J - 11222025

From: Ken Lubar
Sent: Saturday, November 29, 2025 4:10 PM
To: Claire Ricker; Rachel Zsembery
Subject: Public input for 9-11 Robbins Road (12/1/25 Meeting1

Richel, Clair

As an Arlington resident and frequent walker on Robbins Road, I am deeply concerned about the footprint, height, and overall plot coverage of the proposed 9-11 Robbins Road development. Put plainly, doubling the number of units on such a small lot represents inappropriate development—too tall, too large, and consuming far too much of the available space. The reduction in lot area per dwelling from nearly 4,000 square feet to less than 2,000 square feet speaks for itself. This proposal is yet another example of a developer attempting to squeeze too many units onto a small parcel.

While I recognize and support the need for additional housing in Arlington, the current proposal—constructing faux single-family houses on undersized lots—is not the right solution. A thoughtfully designed three-family building could achieve the goal of expanding housing options without significantly undermining the character of the neighborhood. If a four-unit structure is ultimately approved, I strongly urge the Board to limit the number of driveways to one, and parking spaces to four. This would reduce unnecessary hardscape, and given the site’s proximity to public transportation, fewer parking spaces would not impose a hardship on future residents. Moreover, the proposed driveways on both Higgins Street and Robbins Road raise serious concerns about traffic flow and pedestrian safety. Consolidating driveways to a single street would be a straightforward improvement that benefits the neighborhood.

Although not an expert in LEED multifamily, I question the accuracy of the LEED multifamily checklist submitted with the proposal. For instance, credits were claimed for both “electric vehicle charging” and “electric vehicle infrastructure,” despite only one of those options being permissible. Similarly, credits for “heat island reduction,” “rainwater management,” and “water use reduction” appear unsupported, as none of these measures are addressed in the current design.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Arlington Redevelopment Board to return the proposal to the developer and request a design more appropriate to the site and the surrounding neighborhood.

Thanks,

Ken Lubar
33 Gray Street
Arlington, MA 024767

From: C Wagner

Sent: Monday, December 1, 2025 9:43 AM

To: Rachel Zsebery; Stephen Revilak; Kin Lau; Shaina Korman-Houston; Eugene Benson; Claire Ricker; Jennifer Joslyn-Siemiatkoski

Subject: Regarding ARB Dec 1 Agenda Item: 9-11 Robbins Road

Dear Members of the ARB:

Please include this correspondence in the record.

I am writing because it seems that the development planned at 9-11 Robbins Road, under MBTA-CA, has numerous issues and glaring problems.

The loss of a large, healthy tree should not be allowed.

The adjacent house at 9 Higgins St is located directly on the lot line shared with this property.

A second driveway and parking area directly along that boundary will result in paving right up to 9 Higgins' home and should not be allowed.

Per our Zoning Law, only one driveway is permitted for this type of residential property unless the second driveway can be shown to protect nearby homes and property values. Given the paving and proximity, it should not be allowed.

Also per our law, parking areas must include at least 5 feet of on-site screening or fencing to buffer abutting residential lots. This would be impossible if the driveway/pavement is allowed as requested.

I am including a 'before'/'after' picture.


Thank you for your review and respect for the existing abutters and residents in this matter.

Regards,

Carl Wagner

Edgehill Road

Town Meeting Member Precinct 15



Before

After

Mr. Michael Cunningham, Town Counsel
50 Pleasant St, Arlington, MA 02476

November 20, 2025

Dear Town Counsel and Members of the Select Board,

After this Monday's ARB meeting re 126 Broadway, many people are upset that there is no consensus on what our provisions on MBTA-C Act overlay bonuses say versus what various members of the ARB interpret it as saying. The degree to which ARB members themselves disagree on those interpretations is equally alarming. Town Meeting members voted on the language of the law so it would seem prudent to look at the clear language of the law, and the clear math presented to them for a vote.

At yesterday's meeting, we learned that two members of the Board read the words "at least 22.5% of all units" as a firm threshold for affordability in the bonus provisions of the MBTA act law. They stated compelling reasons for that straightforward reading. They noted that the words "at least" and "to exceed" (our IZ rules) both bolster the idea that no rounding down is allowed. Section G never contained thresholds or bonuses of any kind.

Three members thought rounding down is fine, but they did not point to anything in the law to show why other than .. Section G. Yet it was necessary, as we know, for section G to refer back to the base MBTA act regulations because the Town asked for the base component of affordability to be upped from 10% to 15%. Neither residents nor TMMs could have anticipated the interpretation that it now refers also to bonuses, for which new minimum *threshold language* was crafted ("*at least*"). To attain "at least 22.5%" affordability, with 14 units total, there would need to be 4 affordable units.

One member of the board weighed in that 60% ground floor commercial, in and of itself, gets a developer double bonuses over and above the base zoning allowance. He stated that the affordability issue is moot if developers comply with the first bonus provision because that earns them two bonuses at once. The automatic nature of multiple bonuses is not stated anywhere under E(1) (below).

The language states only that the developer gets a reduced setback ("the front yard setback is reduced to zero") and implies that they *may try to qualify* for one more floor to reach a new maximum height allowed . Maximum height allowed, or automatically conferred?
Please clarify how two bonuses are automatically both conferred under bonus option E(1).

Once again, there was shaky math regarding mixed use. Under a split interpretation of the bonus rules tied to commercial space, some ARB members thought that the required space for a mixed-use bonus may be adjusted downward from 60% of the actual ground floor to 60% of (not clear what???) and that it is fine to exclude open parking space from those calculations. Yet this creates no lower limit whatsoever. Are we to believe nobody noticed that when crafting an equation that intended to exclude accessory parking all along? It is simply not possible.

The language of the law speaks clearly of “the ground floor at street level.” Some members of the ARB seem to be substituting a definition of Gross Floor Area, which excludes accessory parking, among other things. That specialized term appears nowhere in the language of E(1): “*The ground floor at street level* will be at least 60% occupied by eating and drinking establishments...” This language, voted upon by Town Meeting, is as clear as “at least 22.5%.” This building would require 2,040 sq ft of commercial space as $.60 \times 3,400 = 2,040$. Simple.

Everyone gets bonuses with minimal commercial space?

Affordability bonuses watered down from the 22.5% threshold in the law?

This is the result if we were to allow new language and new math to prevail, rather than the clear language contained in the law that was presented and voted upon.

Clarity is particularly important for rules on by-right zoning. Members of the public in attendance who had the chance to speak (allotted only 12 minutes total) were clear that they want no watering down of agreed-upon rules as the first project appears before us. I have asked the Select Board to take this up and I hope to hear back soon.

Thank you,
Joanne Cullinane TMM 21

CC Select Board members

CC: Arlington Redevelopment Board

District Regulations / 5-53			
(10) Except as noted in Section 5.8.4.E. Bonuses, the dimensional requirements are as follows:			
District	MBMF on Mass Ave	MBMF on Broadway	NMF
Max Height in Stories	4	4	3
Max Height in Feet	52'	52'	35'
Minimum Front Yard Setback	15'	15'	15'
Minimum Side Yard Setback	5' each side	5' each side	Each side: minimum 5'; sum of two sides: minimum 20'
Minimum Rear Yard Setback	20'	20'	20'
Required minimum front yard setback areas shall be available for uses such as trees, landscaping, benches, tables, chairs, play areas, art, or similar features. No parking spaces are allowed in the required minimum front yard setback.			
E. Bonuses			
(1) In the MBMF Overlay District, for properties abutting Massachusetts Avenue, where the ground floor at street level will be at least 60% occupied by eating and drinking establishments, businesses services, childcare, or retail uses, there are no residential units on the ground floor at street level, the second floor may be at least 40% occupied by eating and drinking establishments, businesses services, childcare, health, business, professional, or medical services, and the frontage on the ground floor is at least 80% occupied by said non-residential uses, the maximum height is 6 stories and 78 feet, and the front yard setback requirement is reduced to 0 feet. In the MBMF Overlay District, for properties abutting Broadway, where the ground floor at street level will be at least 60% occupied by eating and drinking establishments, businesses services, childcare, or retail uses, there are no residential units on the ground floor at street level, and the frontage is at least 80% occupied by said non-residential uses, the maximum height is 5 stories and 65 feet, and the front yard setback requirement is reduced to 0 feet.			
(2) In the MBMF Overlay District, one additional story may be added if the total percentage of affordable units exceeds the requirements in Section 8.2.3 Requirements of this Bylaw for a total of at least 22.5% of all units. In the MBMF Overlay District for properties facing Massachusetts Avenue, a second additional story may be added if the total percentage of affordable units exceeds the requirements in Section 8.2.3 Requirements of this Bylaw for a total of at least 25% of all units.			
(3) In the MBMF Overlay District, one additional story may be added for projects that are minimum LEED Gold certified or equivalent level of an alternate green building standard reviewed and approved by the Redevelopment Board.			
(4) The height with all bonuses shall not exceed 6 stories, 78 feet in the MBMF Overlay District on Massachusetts Avenue, 5 stories, 65 feet in the MBMF Overlay District on Broadway, and 3 stories, 35 feet in the NMF Overlay District.			
F. Off-Street Parking and Bicycle Parking			

From: Jon Gersh

Sent: Saturday, November 22, 2025 9:33 AM

To: Rachel Zsembery; Kin Lau; Eugene Benson; Shaina Korman-Houston; Stephen Revilak; Claire Ricker

Cc: Jon Gersh

Subject: Needham 14-unit

I presume you've seen this picture already, but if not, here's an example of a duplex-to-multi redevelopment that actually looks good! Fits the character of the town. Has 1 space per unit. Obviously, it can be done, so why are we only seeing hideous infill boxes? Just a thought. Happy Thanksgiving, Jon G., TMM P18



New MBTA zoning enables 14-unit apartment plan on Hillside Ave.

needhamobserver.com