

Town of Marblehead  
Planning Board  
October 11, 2011

Minutes of Meeting  
Abbot Hall

Members present: Philip Helmes, Edward Nilsson, Karl Johnson, James Bishop, Kurt James  
Others present: Becky Curran Town Planner

A quorum being present the meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm

**Cont. Public Hearing – Incentive Zoning Special Permit – 151 Green Street – Redstone Building Corp.**

The applicant requested a continuance and signed a waiver of the time limits.  
A motion was made a seconded to continue the public hearing until the November 9, 2011 meeting. Voted. All in favor 5-0.

**Cont. Public Hearing Special Permit - 90 Harbor Avenue - Richard Case Jr.**

Attorney William Quigley representing the applicant presented photographs of impact of proposed building and discussed changes.

John Shay 86 harbor Ave stated that he still could not tell what the massing would be. The poles showed a partial impact. He feels he need arch photos showing true impact  
Edward Nilsson stated that what is needed is photographs generated form an architectural program to better depict impact.

Jim Bishop stated that the arborvitae has a big impact and he feels vegetation being removed will open up both private and public views.

The applicant's attorney Mr. Quigley agreed to have additional photographs produced. He is scheduled to go to the board of appeals on October 25, 2011.

The board Agreed to hold a special meeting on October 18 2011 for this issue.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the hearing until October 18, 2011 at 7:30 pm. All in favor.

**Public Hearing Site Plan Approval Special Permit - 7/9 Maple Street - Glover School – School Committee**

The Chairman read the public hearing notice and opened the hearing.

Greg Smolley principal and JCJ architects representatives for the school committee presented the project history. The reason this project was being done was that the state had listed the existing Glover School as one of the worst 41 schools in the state. The original building was built in 1916 with additions in 1923, 1950's and 1947. This project combines the Eveleth and Glover Schools. The existing Glover School has 370 students and the proposed school will increase by 80 students. He discussed traffic and circulations plan to minimize impact to Maple Street, existing

curb cuts incorporated into the proposed design with a more organized entrance to the north and re-use of the existing service entrance to the south. Presently the drop off system is not functioning well. The site operates more as an urban school than a suburban school due to the small size of the site. There are no buses to or from the school. The plan is to keep driveways and intersection in same general location although moving the entrance on Maple up slightly to get a better site distance. Existing parking provides 41 spaces; the proposed parking provided 53 spaces in a more efficient, better organized layout. In response to comments received during neighborhood outreach sessions, a defined onsite parent drop-off/pick-up is incorporated into the design. Working with the existing topography, the proposed parking areas and drives will remain about four feet below the neighboring properties that will assist with storm water management and shielding automobile headlights. The plan shows the impervious area stay approximately the same for run off generated by parking and driveways same and the rooftops increase slightly.

The concept is to minimize impact to storm water management on-site blasting and preservation of existing plant material, the proposed building and impervious pavement occupy areas currently occupied by the existing facility. Utilities are readily available in Maple Street and storm water will be collected on-site, distributed through two proposed infiltration systems before discharging to existing storm lines in Maple Street and Cherry Street; additional survey and calculations are required to confirm the capacity of Cherry Street. There are natural and manmade problems with site. Minimize impact on site blasting and ledge removal preserve rock outcropping will be tree removal not specimen trees talking to tree warden to preserve Maple trees

The building is two story with a 40,000 square foot footprint. The northwest corner is entrance picked up cues from existing building the building form incorporates hip roofs and like exterior materials of asphalt shingles, brick veneer, rock face masonry units and insulated glazing.

Site lighting will be controlled to keep light onsite to avoid light trespass on neighboring properties and to be dark sky compliant.

Phil Helmes requested further discussion about the parent drop-off / pick-up. Driveway 4' lower trees remain planting plan drop off and parking conflict.

Architect explained that they would like to save mature chestnut trees and test pits showed overburden and then rocks so might be possible but do not know if it would improve traffic. Overhead wires were a problem for drop off on street. Part of the advantage of drop off on street the proclivity of parents to get out of their car 80 new students does not translate to 80 new cars because there are some siblings of existing students.

Phil Helmes questioned if school protocol will require staff to park in the northern lot preserving the southern lot for visitors and an extension of the parent drop-off / pick-up.

Phil Helmes raised concerns with sight lines exiting Cypress Street onto Maple Street and questioned if there were other options to make parking on-site more attractive than Maple Street

The architect responded that widening Maple Street was discussed but dismissed as cost prohibitive due to the overhead utility relocations costs estimated at approximately \$100K per pole.

Jim Bishop requested clarification of the travel distances from the main entrance and the classroom wing and gymnasium.

Karl Johnson requested clarification of the outdoor recreation areas.

Jim Bishop requested clarification of service drive and confirmation of the number of staff members that would be parking on-site.

Architect explained that they need 43 spaces and are providing 53 including 2 hp. The parking works now with 40 spaces. Presently many of the northern lot spaces remain empty through the day

Phil Helmes asked if teachers would be directed to park in a specific area at the school. The architect felt the school would be amenable to any of those sort of directives.

Ed Nilsson asked if parking restrictions were signed on Cypress St. and if using the flat roofs for play areas was considered; while not explored, JCJ knows from past experience this would be cost prohibitive at this time.

The architects explained that a large rock outcropping is significant to science dept uses for teaching have been trying to work around that rock.

Kurt James understood the main public concerns as noise on and off the site, lighting on sidewalks plot unlit some for safety on sidewalk, traffic and drainage.

The chairman asked if there was anyone form the public that want to speak on the application.

Bill Corbet 17 Cedar Street - Stated that aesthetically he likes the building but feels the project is not ready to build due to two problems; traffic and drainage. He feels the drainage can't go onto Cherry St because the area is already over burdened. Last week the rainstorm left a foot of water on Cedar and Cherry so in order to add to the system clearly the system would need to be in expanded. Also he is concerned about the sidewalk extension on to cherry st funnels onto Cherry Street where there are no sidewalks. Get traffic flow under control people park on both side in winter cypress and cheery become impassable safety issue no place sidewalks should be put in or a stop sign at cedar and cherry and traffic enforcement and parking controls.

Phil explained that the board would be asking for an independent peer review on traffic and drainage to tell this board whether the plan works and what could improve it which will be presented at our next meeting.

Temple Smith 8 Cypress St stated that Cypress turn is very tight about 130 degrees and Cypress is a disaster when school is in session. Cypress is a cut through and a one way system could not

work. He is very concerned about traffic and drainage. The area “lakes” with very little rain as it is. Trees backyards 5’ above the school property. If it isn’t done well the ancient maple trees on right on the property will be damaged.

Phil Helmes asked about plans to protect roots during construction and asked for a staging plan for construction.

Jennifer Niosia 2 Cypress St stated that she is located right where drive will be. She is concerned with drainage and traffic and parent drop off line gate locked after drop off being locked but presently it is plowed though all the time in the winter. She also brought up the point that the ages of the children kindergarten to 3<sup>rd</sup> grade means that parents don’t drop off. They stop get out and walk the child. A majority do it now and with the addition of kindergarten it will increase. Also parents socialize and need place to park.

Sue McNamara 12 Cypress is concerned with trees. The maple trees are huge trees with large roots systems. Work may damage roots and preventive maintenance to secure roots needs to be planned before during and after construction to prevent this from happening.

Sarah Bates 10 Cherry Street - questioned drop off plan and the fact that the traffic study was based on traffic model out onto Humphrey not Cherry and cypress needs to be updated. Parents park and walk children and will continue to and will increase due to kindergarten parents - they don’t drop off and traffic plan does not seems to consider this.

Ed Nilsson asked for the traffic study to be updated before the to peer review consultants review.

Barbara Lavoie 7 Cheery St. cannot back out of driveway during drop off and pick up on school days for 20 minutes. Very dangerous no sidewalks traffic study seems to address front of building and not side streets and this need to be addressed. Emergency vehicle access during drop off and pick up times cannot work.. Drainage has problems now likes the project drainage no storm drain on Cypress St

The architect responded that there will be a projected 60 increase traffic trips

Peter Pound 2 homestead Rd - in favor of project but concerned with blasting. Asked what is done to protect the surrounding homes and what is protocol. Also concerned with drainage functioning concerns and traffic. Wants to make sure Homestead remains one way.

The architect explained that they have a the blasting study will require the contractor do a pre-blast survey of all the building in a radius. Will bring quantity to next meeting and recommendation for radius.

Tom Sutton 87 Humphrey Street - Handed out a letter stating his concerns. He likes the design and is in favor of the project. Concerned with encroachment of school, tree replacement and removal and light pollution. Want to be informed of changes that will affect outside look and site design.

A motion made and seconded to continue the public hearing until Meeting November 9, 2011 unless the traffic study needs to be updated in which case they will ask for a further continuance to the board's December meeting. All in favor.

Phil Helmes summed up the issues:

- Safety issues with the absence of sidewalks on Cherry Street and Cypress Street to connect with the proposed on-site sidewalks.
- The absence of parking and traffic control and enforcement on Cherry Street and Cypress Street.
- Appropriateness and functionality of the parent drop-off for school demographic questioned.
- Congestion of parent cars in and around the existing Glover School site during arrival and dismissal compromise emergency vehicle access for twenty minute periods.

For the next meeting the applicant will:

- Revisit parent drop-off design;
- Amend drainage design and calculations;
- Amend traffic study, if required;
- Develop construction management plan to define site staging;
- Consult with geotechnical engineer to define impact area of blast surveys.

### **Public Hearing – Site Plan Approval and Subdivision Control – Modification – Camille Terrace/Field Brook Road – Angenica**

Russell Beck recused himself from this agenda item.

The public hearing was open and the notice read.

Engineer Eric Lane of Hayes Engineering representing the applicant explained that this is a modification to the roadway. He explained that they think that raising the profile of the road 5.6% to a steeper grade will reduce 75% of blasting and there will be less trucking and quicker to build. This would result in the lots being raised up. Custom homes would be built.

Larry Alexander 9 Longview Drive west

Has reviewed the profile and all info and wants to make sure all conditions are kept. Asked whether houses would now be taller than those that abutt them.

The board asked the applicant to prepare for the next meeting a condition by condition assessment of the difference and impact on each of the conditions so the board and neighbors can determine the overall impact.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the public hearing until November 9, 2011 at 8:30 pm. All in favor.

The meeting was adjourned

Respectfully submitted,  
Rebecca Curran

