

Marblehead Planning Board

December 20, 2011

Minutes of Meeting

Abbot Hall

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

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

**Cont. Public Hearing Site Plan Approval - 151 Green Street**

The applicant requested the public hearing be continued until January 10, 2012 they are still working through the Conservation Commission process. The applicant has signed a waiver.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the hearing until 7:30 pm on January 10, 2012 in Abbot Hall

**Approval of Minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the October 11, 2011, October 18, 2011 and November 9, 2011 meeting minutes with minor changes. All in favor

**Cont. Public hearing – Site plan Approval - 7/9 Maple Street - Glover School**

The chairman explained that the meeting was continued from the discussion at the October 11, meeting and the November 9 meeting, at which no evidence was taken. The meeting had been continued in order to deal with the issues of the Traffic Impact and Access Study and the Storm water Report updates and to have the planning board the opportunity to have peer reviews conducted on both studies.

Greg Smolley on behalf of the Glover School Building Committee reported the following actions had been completed since the October 11, 2011 Planning Board Meeting:  
The Applicant submitted to the Town of Marblehead an updated Traffic Impact and Access Study and the completed Storm water Report with calculations.

The planning board completed peer reviews of each document. Gary L. Hebert, Fay, Spofford & Thorndike was hired to review the Traffic Analysis and Scott Miller of Haley and Ward conducted the Storm water review.

Mr. Smalley further explained that on December 11, 2011, the Applicant met with the town Department Heads and the traffic study peer reviewer to review the peer review comments and make the necessary adjustments to the site plans to meet the approval of the Department Heads.

On December 19, 2011, representatives for the Applicant met with the Water & Sewer Department and the storm water report peer reviewer to review the peer review comments and make the necessary adjustments to the storm water design to meet the approval of the Water & Sewer Department.

The planning board's peer review consultant Gary Hebert, PE, Fay, Spofford & Thorndike presented a power point on his review of the Traffic Impact and Access Study.

Mr. Hebert explained that on behalf of the Planning board FST reviewed the Glover School Traffic Impact and Access Study with Appendix dated November 2011 prepared by Nitsch Engineering. He found the study to be based on acceptable and reasonable assumptions accounting for seasonal variations.

He agreed the mid-day parking supply of 53 spaces will be well used and tight commenting the limited parking will encourage car pooling.

He offered the following mitigation recommendations:

1. Restripe Maple Street between Lafayette Street and Humphrey Street to provide 6'-0" wide bike friendly shoulders and to create signed, live parking along the east curb from Cypress Street to the proposed service entry drive.
2. Provide school zone treatments on Maple Street. The treatments could include pavement markings and school zone sign 20 MPH when flashing with optional speed radar.
3. Create new site entrance to the proposed north parking lot eliminating direct access to Cypress Street.
4. Add a pedestrian phase to the traffic control at the Tedesco Street, Humphrey Street and Maple Street intersection.
5. Maximize on-site queuing by reconfiguring the on-site T intersection.
6. Potential vehicular circulation pattern at the proposed site entrance/exits:
  - i. Maple Street -- north drive: ☐ Entrance only during AM/PM peak times. ☐ Exit restricted to right turn only.
  - ii. Maple Street - south drive: ☐ Entrance only during AM/PM peak times.
  - iii. Cherry Street: exit only.

The plans needs the cooperation of school staff

Board asked for a run through of how the drop off pick up would occur.

Bill Corbett 33 Birch Street feels that it is only a partial solution he feels traffic and parking must be restricted.

Michael Mecurrio 7 Cypress Street objects to traffic data Cherry Street is basically one way

Sarah Bates 10 Cherry Street – is concerned with parking and walking. The children's parents are not going to just drop the young children. Where are the parents going to park? Will there be signs and regulations. Tickets and enforcement are needed.

Police Chief Bob Picariello said police enforcement cannot be everyday but periodic enforcement can be done and is every effective.

The chairman stated that any of those changes need to be approved by the board of selectmen  
The behavior needs to be changed .

Greg Smalley's explained the basic premise 2 ways in 2 ways out parking increasing will have an impact on that behavior

Phil Helmes the facilitators must work on operational issues.

Russell Beck asked how was it determined what direction the Eveleth school traffic that is not there now will enter the site

Scott A. Miller, PE, Haley and Ward, Inc. presented his findings after review of the Storm water Report dated December 2, 2011 prepared by Nitsch Engineering.

He stated that found the NEI report to be based on reasonable and valid pre/post construction baseline assumptions.

On December 19, 2011, Charles McCollum, H&W, JCJ and NEI met to bring resolution to H&W's December 13, 2011 comments.

The resolution developed a simplified approach to the site drainage including the following recommendations:

1. Eliminate the infiltration basins.
2. Use surface drainage where possible to reduce/consolidate the number of catch basins and/or yard drains.

Direct drain pipes from the upper plateau to run below the classroom wing; detail the drain pipes to be a double wall construction to facilitate future repair/replacement, if necessary.

All storm water to drain to Maple Street; no connection to Cherry Street.

New fire hydrant on-site near Cherry Street; water service to new fire hydrant to be an eight (8) inch water line from Maple Street.

Final plans to be reviewed by the Water & Sewer Department before a building permit is issued.

Phil Helmes asked if the baseline report was good information. Mr. Miller responded that it was valid

Sarah Bates 10 Cherry St asked if it would solve the "Lake Glover" problem.

Chuck Mccollum Superintendent of water and Sewer stated that it would help with that drainage problem

Scott Miller clarified the proposed stormwater drainage plan addresses the deficiencies of the existing stormwater drainage system that generates a large pond during a storm event known as Lake Glover.

A motion was made and seconded to close the public hearing. All in favor.

After discussion, the Planning Board voted unanimously to approved the Special Permit for Site Plan Approval for the Glover Elementary School with the following conditions:

- Traffic engineer to provide signage recommendations for the Cherry Street / Cypress Street neighborhood subject to review and comment by the Department Heads. Once approved by the Department Heads, the Planning Board will present the recommendations to the Board of Selectmen for their consideration.
- Final site plans to include a tree protection plan; tree warden to approve.
- Final site plans to be reviewed by Water & Sewer Department before a building permit is issued.
- Construction vehicles limited to maple street no cherry or cypress street
- Construction vesicles must be parked on site.
- The school administrator is required to develop a plan to educate the parents and teachers Parking and drop off procedures to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed plan and minimize the negative effects on the abutters.

### **Cont. Public Hearing – Site Plan Approval - 22 Foster Street**

Attorney for the applicant William DiMento informed the board that he would be taping the meeting.

At the last public hearing the planning board requested a continuance in order to allow the applicant to rework the drawings to reduce the massing at the water's edge.

The applicant's representatives both architects Thad Seimasko and Paul Muldoon of Seimasko and Verbridge went through the plans showing the changes to the plans.

Lowered the building 10" overall across the whole building. Mass at the water edge the building was pulled back 4' 3" a reduction of 1700 cubic feet.

Ed Nilsson asked if any dormer space was added. The architect confirmed that 5 square feet was added.

George Atkins Attorney for abutter William Nutt stated that there was no personal interaction with the changed design

The architect ran through a massing study of buildings in the area that showed that this was smaller. Stating that lot sizes vary along the coast

Ed Nilsson said the building was non conforming in every dimensional category and the height should try to be maintained at the requirements of the shoreline district because it is new construction.

Phil Helms said that the town is not served by flat roofed buildings that meets the height requirement.

A long discussion ensued on the size and massing of the building.

William Nutt 20 Foster Street immediate abutter Foster st the wants to see the size reduced height brought down biggest objection is that it is only 34' away and it will impact the value of their property negatively. He says his house is larger but was built in 1888 before zoning.

William DiMento stated that he thinks the new construction will increase the value of the neighboring properties.

A motion to close the public hearing was made and seconded to close the public hearing. All in favor.

#### Board Discussion

Phil Helmes stated that he did not think the building was contradictory to the shoreline district and does not see it being detrimental and that it actually opens some views from the neighboring property and has no effect on the street views.

Kurt James agrees and approves the changes they made to reduce the size and height

Jim Bishop stated that the board of appeals has the ability to exceed minimum dimensional requirements. Seems reasonable for this board to approve the plans.

Ed Nilsson stated that he still has a problem with the massing at the water. He was looking for more of a reduction. He has been on the board for years and feels the shoreline district is important and the building should come into conformance with the height requirements. He objects to the current scheme.

Jim Bishop does not have a problem, it is appropriate to the neighborhood, majority of the houses are larger – even though it is outside the zoning bylaw and undersized in every respect.

Karl Johnson felt the massing is appropriate he does not see any negative effect from the harbor as the plans are drawn. He thinks the architect did a good job with the plans and is in favor of the project.

A motion was made a seconded to approve the revised plans with the usual conditions and a condition that the previously discussed tree limb on the property be removed.

4 in favor (Helmes, Bishop, James and Johnson) 1 opposed (Nilsson).

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn t e meeting at 9:50 all in favor.

Respectfully submitted

Rebecca Curran

