

**Marblehead Planning Board
Minutes of Meeting
October 9, 2012**

Members present: Philip Helmes, Edward Nilsson and Kurt James and Russell Beck (at 8:15 pm) Other present: Becky Curran – Town Planner

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

Glover School – 7/9 Maple Street

Dick Nolte, Chuck Adams and Kevin Meager from the School Department were present at the request of the board to address the issues on lighting and landscaping which were raised by neighbors at the board's August meeting. They explained that they are in compliance with the planning board condition on landscaping. Prior to any trees being removed they submitted a tree plan and had the Tree Warden flag any trees to be removed.

Mr. Sutton of 87 Humphrey Street suggested a tree behind his house was very large and had been removed. Mr. Nolte and Mr. Meager stated that no tree was removed that was not slated to remain. . A letter from the project architect was submitted and read into the record.

Abutter Sarah Bates 10 Cherry Street stated that she is concerned with the lighting. The school committee rep explained that they are in compliance with the approved lighting plan and are dark sky complaint. An LED down directed fixture will be used.

Mr. Sutton 87 Humphrey Street asked if a sample light fixture could be put up. The chairman suggested since the abutters have regular meetings with the building committee issues can be further discussed at those meetings and the board can get involved if and when there is an issue

Camille Terrace

The town Planner explained to the board that the developer of Camille Terraces has requested that the covenant be release on the Camille Terrace development and that he provide a sum of money sufficient to complete the remaining work. The roadway has a binder course and all utilities have been installed. The applicant wishes to have the covenant released and the remaining work will be secured through a passbook savings account in an amount deemed sufficient by the board's inspecting engineer not less than \$84,000.

A motion was made and seconded to release lots from the covenant and authorize the chairman to sign on behalf of the board. These funds shall be submitted to the town prior to the signing of the release. All in Favor 4-0

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the September 11, 2012 meeting minutes with minor changes. All in favor 4-0

Public hearing Site Plan Approval special permit - 5 Eustis Road – Roberts

The town planner informed the applicant that there were presently only 4 members present and that a fifth member was expected and gave the applicant the option of proceeding or waiting. The applicant stated they would proceed with 4 members.

Paul Lynch the applicant's attorney explained that this is a proposal to construct an attached garage to an existing house at 5 Eustis Road which is located in a shoreline district. Mr. Lynch explained that the property consists of a single lot of land on the southwesterly side of Eustis Road which contains 21,700 square feet of land and 382 feet of frontage on Eustis Road.

Mr. Lynch addressed the planning board criteria:

- Because the addition is a garage and deck the additions result in no increase in Gross Square Footage. The addition including the area under the deck will be 1,032 square feet.
- The proposed lot and proposed construction does not meet the Dimensional Regulations of the By-Laws. The lot has less than the required area, side yard and exceeds the maximum height. A special permit from the board of appeals must be obtained.
- The location and design of the new structure will result in minimum grade change and disruption of any natural resources.
- The style of the addition is consistent with the architecture of the building and the style of other houses in the immediate area and the use of wood siding is consistent with the area.
- The use of the building will not change.
- The plan calls for the creation of a new driveway.
- The use and construction of the new building will not result in any external emissions or environmental impacts.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition at the public hearing.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application as complying with the requirements for the issuance of a special permit subject to the standard conditions.

All in Favor. 4-0 Helmes, Schaeffner, James and Nilsson

Russell Beck joined the meeting at 8:15 pm.

Cont public hearing - Site Plan Approval Special Permit – 12 Coolidge Rd - Riccio

The Chairman explained that this public hearing was continued until this date to in order to give the applicants architects an opportunity to explore different options to minimize the effects of the construction on the abutters.

Attorney Paul Lynch handed out criteria for planning board and submitted an assessor map of the area showing that all finished areas on Coolidge Road are on average 3700 square feet in size and the proposed house is 3000 s.f. is 700 less than the average on Coolidge Road.

He then went through the planning board criteria:

- The location and design of the new structure will result in minimum grade change and disruption of any natural resources.
- The style of the addition is consistent with the architecture of the building and the style of other houses in the immediate area and the use of wood siding is consentient with the area.
- The use of the building will not change.
- The plan will utilize the same driveway location.
- The use and construction of the new building will not result in any external emissions or environmental impacts.

Architect Jonathan Poore of Gloucester ma explained and presented the alternatives that they explored since the last meeting including the alternative of clipping the roof, shifting the mass of building, reducing the grade of driveway he then showed a by-right volume scenario. In his opinion the alternatives offered minimal benefits that had a negative impact on the design. All of the alternative design drawings and photographs presented were submitted for the record.

Rick Rocket 15 Coolidge Road explained that he objected not to the removal of the house but the plan to move it forward on the site to a higher elevation which impacts his views.

Ed Nilsson asked if they looked a one story garage and felt they should look at that and other ways that they may minimize effects.

Bob Schaefer stated that he thinks that the house is a modest size and an appealing design and maximizes he open land area by pushing towards the street.

Architect Jonathan Poore added that by removing the evergreen vegetation on either side of the building it will open up view corridors which do not presently exist he feels will enhance views.

Phil Helmes stated that it becomes a balance of public views and those of the neighbors. Some are being enhanced and it is a balance to minimize the negative effects.

Russell Beck agreed that this was a balance and the plan represented a good compromise of all of the factors.

Kurt James wondered if some other options could be explored.

Phil Helmes asked what other options could be explored. Discussion ensued

The architect reiterated the design constraints including the ledge, concom regulations, zoning and parcel width.

Phil Helmes summarized that is a modest home that is in keeping with the streetscape and the plan has to balance the constraints and effects on the neighborhood.

The board discussed appropriate conditions including mandating that the vegetation must come down and be limited to species that at their mature height would not exceed the height of the fence from the street. This would be in perpetuity. The board decided they would require a plan that showed this for the recode for control. Also Construction vehicles will park on site as much as practical when construction vehicles cannot park on site they are restricted to parking on the southeast side (even numbered side) of Coolidge Road only. This condition would be enforceable by the Building Commissioner and Marblehead Police Department. Also discussed was the need to get Conservation Commission approval for changes for the original order of conditions.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application as complying with the requirements for the issuance of a special permit subject to the standard conditions and special conditions on landscaping, construction parking and concom approval. (4-0-1) In Favor Helmes, Schaeffner, James, Beck, none opposed Nilsson abstained.

Cont public hearing - 151 Green Street - Incentive Zoning Special Permit

Phil Helmes explained that the board asked for a number of things at the last meeting including revised architectural plans, a landscaping plan and the regulatory agreements for the affordable units and homeowner association.

Attorney Paul Lynch submitted the plans at the meeting. John Muldoon, the applicant and Mr. Lynch and explained to the board the style and size of the units – each would have a garage underneath, 2 bedrooms 2 bathrooms and be approximately 1200 square feet in size. Exterior material used would be asphalt roof, siding would be clapboard and or hardy board (smooth side out) and cedar shingles as shown on the elevations, the trim would be Azek or similar and the windows would be vinyl exterior clad and concrete foundations.

The planner asked if the windows could have the look of a true divided light and not interior mullions and muntions. Mr. Lynch agreed that raised exterior mounted muntions and mullions would be used to resemble true divided light windows.

Mr. Lynch then ran through his meeting with the Fire Chief and reported that the fire lane was adequate as was the grade of the driveway. A question came up about with the concrete reinforced with turf could withstand a fire truck.

Stan Hacky 166 Green Street asked if there could be less bituminous.

Willis Antontelli 164 Green Street stated he felt the development was a monstrosity. The size and impact is too much for the area.

Steve Chassion 165 Green Street asked about the reinforced grass paving be sued to balance the impact. He feels the project is too dense.

Karen Hacky 166 Green Street – I opposed to the project. It is an important open space and should not be developed the traffic and drainage needs to be looked at again.

Willis Antonelli 164 green Street He is concerned about parking on the main road because the guests will have no place to park.

The board began to go through the architectural plans then decided that there were too many inconsistencies between the site plan and the plans presented and gave the applicant some direction on changes that should be made to the exteriors. The board asked that they explore bringing the roofline down by using dormers on the second story. Bob Schaeffner noted that the buildings seem out of scale with the neighborhood.

The board requested that accurate architectural drawings be submitted at least one week in advance of the board's next meeting or it would be continued until the December meeting because the board members needed time to review the plans. In the event that the plans were not received within a week it would be further continued so the board could adequately review the plans.

The meeting was adjourned

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Curran