

Marblehead Planning Board

Minutes of Meeting

January 8, 2013

Members present: Phil Helmes, Ed Nilsson, Bob Schaeffner, Jim Bishop, Kurt James and Russell Beck. Others present: Becky Curran – Town Planner

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

ANR – 31 Ticehurst – Hammond ANR - Paul Lynch Attorney for the land owner presented the plan to subdivide the property at 31 Ticehurst Road. No new building lots are being created. The plan was endorsed by the board.

ANR- 9 Blueberry – Blueberry Road LLC ANR – Paul Lynch Attorney for the land owner presented the plan to subdivide the property at 9 Blueberry Road. He explained that the plan had received a special permit from the board of appeals and that was so noted on the plan. The plan was endorsed by the board.

ANR - 485 Lafayette Street - Town of Marblehead - ANR - The town planner explained the plan to re subdivide the property at along the town boundary in order to record. She explained that the city of Salem planning board would also need to endorse the plan. No new building lots are being created, and it is noted on the plan. The plan was endorsed by the board

Public Hearing Site Plan Approval 18 Barnard Street - Willard

A motion was made and seconded to continue the hearing until the board's February 9, 2013 at 7:30 pm with no evince taken. All in favor. (5-0) Helmes, Bishop, Schaeffner, Beck and Nilsson

Public Hearing - Site Plan Approval Special Permit - 354 Atlantic Ave – Rudolph

Project Architect Paul Muldoon of Seimasko Verbridge Architects explained the proposal for the construction of an addition to a pre-existing non-conforming single family dwelling having less than required side yard setbacks and exceeding the maximum building height. The proposed addition will be partially constructed in the side yard setback connecting the existing garage to the main residence. It is a single story addition of approximately 639 gross sq.ft. The addition will consist of an added garage bay built on the southern side of the existing garage and an enclosed area connecting the garage to the main residence. The exterior materials will match exterior - clapboard siding, corner boards details, taking a flat roof and making it a pitched roof adding features to complement the style of house, window trim/casing, asphalt roofing shingles and exterior colors of the existing structure. The property has a long landscaped driveway which is not visible from the street. Three large trees and a birch in the front will be removed.

No one spoke in favor or opposition to the proposal. Letters were submitted from the abutters in favor of the proposal. A letter submitted to the board from Ed and Donna Lang, in favor of the project, was read into the record.

Motion made and seconded to approval the plan as submitted with the standard conditions and conservation commission and board of appeals approval all in favor (5-0) Helmes, Bishop, Schaeffner, James and Nilsson

Cont. Public Hearing - Incentive Zoning Special Permit - 151 Green Street – Green Street Realty Trust

Paul Lynch Attorney for the project explained that they have continued to revise the building plans to address the board's concerns. The revised plans presented tonight address the issue of the accuracy of plan and reduce the height.

John Fuller from Mitchell Fuller architects explained the plans in detail. He also explained their approach which was to study the possibility of utilizing dormers, as suggested by the board, in an effort to reduce the height of the building. They felt this approach did not work for this project because it caused the loss of floor space from the edge of the dormer to the gable end adversely impact the layouts for the level 2 spaces and the client found it less appealing.

Instead he lowered the pitch of the roof to keep within the 35' height limit to a 4/12 roof pitch. He looked a gable roof, also suggested by the board, but it did not look good so they used a hip roof and find the proportions to be acceptable.

He also took into consideration that the top of foundation wall on the approved site plan which was able to be lowered and utilized the detail discussed by the architects on the board, where the foundation is notched to form an interior shelf to accommodate the wood floor framing- this allowed him to bring the floor level to within 12" of adjacent grade and to change all the entry porches from wood to concrete/masonry.

He also reduced the ceiling height on the upper level from 8'-0" to 7'-6"

All of these elements combined have enabled a reduction in the overall height for the structures to within the 35' limit.

Fire Chief Gilliland was also at the meeting and was asked by the board if he was satisfied with the layout in terms of Fire Access. He stated that the changes that had been made gives him adequate access to the buildings

Phil Helmes complemented on work that has been done to date.

Ed Nilsson also appreciated the work to date but felt the design should be varied to individualize the architecture.

The architect stated that they would be varied through subtle ways through color materials. Ed Nilsson noted that first size then shape then color are what is noticed in that order. He felt more variation is needed maybe vary every third or four more in keeping with the town's development patterns.

Discussion ensued on the progress. The board generally agreed that the changes were good but did not go far enough.

Mr. Lynch explained to the Board that because the project is on the corner of Green and Green you do not see the project in its entirety. Russell Beck disagreed stated that it is very visible especially if you approach from West Shore Drive.

The architect explained that these are not single family homes they are duplexes and they are different.

Bob Schaeffner added that the fundamental issue is the design presently does not fit in with the area they must not be as large as they are which is significantly larger than the houses across the street. The design does not fit in with the neighborhood. He thinks their design has progressed but not enough.

After much discussion the general consensus was that houses 1 2 and 3 are situated in a way that lend them to the garage under concept and it works well due to the grade change in that portion of the property. The buildings in back are not as visible but buildings 5 6 and 7 are too tall they are completely out of scale with the neighborhood. The garage under concept does not work there where there is no grade change it just makes an out of scale

The architect stated that they would vary the buildings with color and landscaping Ed Nilsson stated that is not enough.

Kurt James suggested the parking under could be eliminated on those buildings. Paul Lynch stated that they could not sell the units with no garages. Kurt James then suggested a building could be eliminated in order to create enough room to remove the garage from underneath the building and the garages could be next to the building rather than under thus reducing the height. Mr. Lynch objected to this saying they were bound by the Conservation commission order of conditions. Becky Curran disagreed saying any changes imposed by the planning board could be taken back to the conservation commission. Mr. Lynch then suggested that the project was not financially viable if the number of units was reduced. Becky Curran then stated that if that was the argument then they would need to submit the project pro forma analysis so the board could analyze..

Jim Bishop mentioned they also need to be livable and he thinks they are dense and was concerned with the elevator. Becky Curran mentioned an elevator might not be a good idea

for an affordable unit due to maintain ace and inspection costs. Mr. Muldoon offered it would be an upgrade.

The board directed the development team to somehow whether through a redesign or elimination of units they need to do something because as of now the project is out of character with the neighborhood and can be improved. Phil Helmes stated they should continue to squeeze down look at inside of the building if unable to lower then try grade adjustment.

Town Planner noted that the board has still not received the requested regulatory agreement, subsidy information and homeowner association information.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the hearing until the board February 12 meeting at 7:30 pm. (5-0) All in favor

Camille Terrace

A motion was made and seconded to reduce bond held as security from 84,000 to 63,215. 20,785 will be released in accordance with the recommendation of the Planning board's site inspection engineer's recommendation. All in favor. (5-0) Helmes, Bishop, Schaeffner, James and Nilsson

Approval of November and December meeting minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes for November 11 and December 13. All in favor (5-0) Helmes, Bishop, Schaeffner, James and Nilsson

The meeting was adjourned

Respectfully submitted

Rebecca Curran