

Marblehead Planning Board

June 9, 2015

Members present: Barton Hyte, Phil Helmes, Jim Bishop, Edward Nilsson, Rosanna Ferrante and Bob Schaeffner. Others present Becky Cutting – Town Planner

Approval Not Required 98 Pleasant Street

Bob McCann representing Andy Rose the owner of the property at 89 Pleasant Street explained that this winter a portion of the roof collapsed on this property. Rather than rebuild they took down a portion of the building which resulted in two buildings on this lot so they seek endorsement of an ANR plan to create two lots. The board examined and endorsed the plan.

Approval Not Required 93/95 Beacon Street

Joey Burke owner of the property at 93 /95 Beacon Street explained that he purchased two lots and was subdividing the 2 lots into 4 lots. The board examined and endorsed the plan.

Cont. Public 22 Foster Street – Sevinor

This hearing was continued for April 14 and May 19 meetings. Paul Lynch attorney for the applicants Meryl and Ralph Sevinor presented new plans and recapped history since last meeting site visit revised the plan based on the input from the board and abutter. He explained that what they have done is pulled the house back 7 ½ feet more from harbor 17' from existing building; they moved away from southerly property which now has a 5' setback and eliminated the 3rd floor. They changed the roof line lower the house. Now the house has a 30' maximum height. He has been working with George Atkins attorney for abutters Nutt. He came tonight to ask for a continuance since George Atkins client is away wanted input in changes made. The plan is to work with abutter coming back July 14

Architect Walter Jacobs reiterated the changes he had made; moved the building back from the water, removed the third floor, maintained the characteristics of boat house, used a mix of materials to break up the shape, set back from property line to 5', existing driveway maintained, moved chimney to the middle of the house, the size of big window corrected it the reason was to get southern light just from top without

Ed Nilsson asked him to explain the roof plan

Rosanna Ferrante applaud effort to address the board's and the abutters comments

Bob Schaeffner and Phil Helmes liked the house and were enthusiastic about the changes made.

Bob Schaeffner commented on the improvement by keeping the driveway in the existing location

George Atkins attorney for the abutter Mr. Nutt, received the plans last Thursday needs some additional information gave some new information not had time to analyze. He also has questions about the height of the building and where the low point is. He stated that the McKiernan's are away they also have some issues and want to look at plan.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the hearing until July 14, 2015 all in favor.

Amendment Site plan approval Special Permit 12 Coolidge Road

Paul Lynch explained that in October 2012 a house was torn down and a new structure proposed and approved by the planning board and issued a site plan approval special permit. There was extensive blasting during the process and during layout a measurement was taken off the wrong point and no one picked it up until an as built plans was done it was discovered that the pool and gazebo moved 1.7' close to 10 Coolidge which is also owned also by the owner of number 12 Coolidge.

They are asking for amendment to approve the shifting of pool and gazebo because its location is conflict with the approved plan of record.

Also the landscape plan that was submitted and incorporated into the decision differs from what was approved. The plan called for specific plantings in specific locations and any changes were to be approved prior to planting. Some planting were changed to other species without prior approval. Also a rhododendron at front of property believed by the architect and owner that the rhodeondron had to be pruned to a certain dimension. It was the understanding of abutters that the line shown on the plan was where it had to be pruned to. Currently it has been pruned to what the owners think is correct.

Jonathan Poore & Poore Company the architect for the house explained that the site was steep rocky site bed lines are what was originally proposed planting pockets between the stone a bit different number of plant materials to be presented and the plants did not make it substitutions needed to be made. Work started at water side as each section was competed it was loamed a seeded

Did not realize that it needed to be precise with the exact placement of boulders and plants

Kate Wiggins landscape architect for the project explained how the plan differs from the approved plan. The intention is the same – space changed a bit and in October plant availability is different than May. A plan was submitted showing what was planted.

She explained that the shape and habit consistent

Jim Bishop - asked if primary consideration was given that the plantings are be hardy in salt environment

Neighbor Adam York 11 Coolidge - told the board that at the meetings there was a lot of discussion of views and then things began and explains how high things were supposed to conform to blue line as shown on the approved plan. The rhodendron is large and above that line.

Rosanna Ferrante asked if the applicant was against pruning

Adam York 11 Coolidge - stated nothing was supposed to be above that line

Board members agreed and Phil Helmes asked why any vegetation was above that line. The intention was to keep things below that line.

Discussion ensued on the rhodendron and the chairman directed them to prune them

Poole suggested that it need to be resolved checked with a laser level. The board disagreed and said use the top of the metal fence post in front as the field control point and the plan of record entitled 'Riccio Residence 12 Coolidge Road Vegetation Massing for Street View' Sheet A-16 as the control plan.

Barton Hyte stated he finds it offensive that the blatantly violated the conditions of approval. The plant should be trimmed to the proper height and maintained

Thomas Egan representing 15 Coolidge Road rhododendron pruned but not to below the agreed upon height. His Clients the Rockets at __ Coolidge Road could not be at the meeting but objected. They had concerns on the location of the gazebo and the landscaping.

Adam York 11 Coolidge Road asked that the plant specifies mugo pine and instead there is a Bosnian pine which grows 10 -15 '

The chairman directed the applicants representatives to prune the rhodendron and make sure all vegetation was below the agreed upon height. The town planner will report back to the board at their next meeting. 30 days pruning July 14 2015 report to board

Tom Egan history of non-compliance and that his client objected to the change in location of the gazebo

Phil Helmes asked if gazebo had changed in height

Neighbor __ York 15 Coolidge road stated that It appears bigger than she thought

Ed Nilsson material no change in substance that concern should be pursued also at the board of appeals

Paul Lynch stated that he went to zba but continued until the issue was resolved landscape resolved

Chris Monaco contractor stated that cannot see the gazebo from the rockets walking down street

Does not seem to be material changes the view to the left

On the landscaping issue, the board clarified that the vegetation, whether new or existing must be pruned in accordance with the plan of record entitled 'Riccio Residence 12 Coolidge Road Vegetation Massing for Street View' Sheet A-16 (attached) and that the control point in the field shall be the top of the front fence post. All vegetation must be pruned to below the height of the top of the front fence post. Additionally a list of substituted plants was submitted which will be reviewed for consistency with original plan.

On the change in location, the board determined that the error in the siting of the pool and gazebo had no impact on material effect on the board's original decision. A motion was made and seconded to allow the change in location of the pool and the gazebo.

Old /New businesses

10 Ocean Ave – Atlantic Veterinary hospital a letter was received for the owner of asking to remove the pavers he had installed in portions of the parking lot at 10 Ocean Avenue with bituminous. The reason is they are failing and buckling and some clients have injured themselves. The board agreed but asked that he submit a letter from an engineer that it can be done without a negative effect on the drainage and that.

A motion as made and seconded to approve the May minutes as written. All in favor

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca Cutting