

Marblehead Planning Board

January 19 2016

Edward Nilsson, Jim Bishop, Bob Schaeffner, Rosanna Ferrante, Barton Hyte. Others present Rebecca Cutting Town Planner, Lisa Mead Town Counsel.

A quorum being present the meeting was called to order by Edward Nilsson Vice chairman at 7:30 pm

263-269 Pleasant Street – Site plan approval special permit and Land Disturbance

Mr. Nilsson explained the process of the permits being requested, a land disturbance and a site plan approval special permit and that the board is required to approve or approve with conditions a site plan approval application if complete. The board of appeals is the board that determines whether the use is allowed by special permit.

The town planner was asked if the application was deemed complete. She confirmed that it was a complete application.

Paul Lynch Attorney representing the applicant described the permitting process to date. They had had several public hearings with the board of appeals and that peer reviews had been conducted by the town's consultants on the traffic, storm water and lighting and changes had been made as a result of those reviews as well as a proposed storage building that has now been eliminated. One of the things that the applicant has agreed to through that process is off site traffic improvements in that area.

Al Craepeau project architect of EGA Architects of Newburyport explained that EGA specializes in senior care and they have designed many assisted living facilities. He went on to describe the project. He stated the site is 4.5 acres in size on a major access corridor. It would house 87 apartments which is 108 beds and includes independent living, assisted living and memory support units. The building is 83,000 square feet in size and has a 30,000 footprint. They are seeking dimensional relief from the 35' maximum height to allow a 42' max height. The majority of the building is three stories high with some areas being two stories. He explained the design concept and that an effort has been made to maintain the character of the site. There would be two two way driveways using the existing entrance locations and maintaining the historic granite walls and front lawn. The building uses dormers to reduce bulk elements to maintain human scale, three wings to reduce the mass of the building and a historic shingle style to match vernacular. Residential elements including wood frame asphalt roof shingles to help maintain a residential look.

Ed Nilsson asked about accessibility to site. Mr. Craepeau stated that all grades on walkways are designed to be accessible by residents.

Mr. Craepeau went on to explain the bylaw has a formula to determine the amount of parking for this specific use. 82 spaces are shown which is in excess of what the bylaw requires. There is snow storage on site. It has the capacity for 24" snow storm – if over 24" would be removed from site. The open space requirement is exceeded. The proposed project is smaller than what is allowed by the bylaw.

Ed Nilsson asked about the "thru all" units. He stated he felt it could be a visual detriment to the look of the building.

Bob Schaeffner agreed. He feels that it is a scale issue and poses a concern and may be visually inferior. He would like to see a mockup or visual of what that will look like and also the acoustic impact of the cumulative effect.

Chris Novak site engineer from VHB Engineering addressed the board regarding the site. He clarified an earlier question that walkways are accessible adding that one site driveway is 6 ½ %. The site is 4.5 acres with 3.5 acres open. One acre in the front is maintained along with some mature trees and vegetation. The building is a minimum of 75 feet from all residential property lines. There are landscaping berms and vegetative perimeters for screening. The Mohawk Road entrance will be widened to 24' this is the buildings main entrance for residents. The deliveries and employees will use the Pleasant Street entrance. There are 82 parking spaces which is more than what the bylaw requires. The spaces are at 9 x 20 in size.

Utilities on Pleasant Street include a 12" gas, 8" sewer 24" drain lines. There are no wetland resources. A storm water peer review was performed by the town's consultant Haley and Ward. He has responded to all of their questions. The storm water system was designed in accordance with Mass DEP regulations. The subsystem is designed to control storm water and capture run off.

Ed Nilsson asked how important it was for the driveway to be 24'. Would they be willing to look at 22' and 9 x 18' parking spaces in order to reduce the paved surfaces

Paul Lynch stated that they could look at a 22' roadway however they could not make the parking spaces smaller than what as required by the bylaw without seeking relief. He also stated that all of the peer review comments from FST have been addressed and incorporated the mitigation has been agreed to. Pushing the curb line out, installing new sidewalks and an enhanced crosswalk with flashing beacon and signage.

Ed Nilsson asked about the service vehicles and delivery trucks turning right. Barton Hyte also had concerns with this. He asked if a truck is stopped there during peak school times will wait to make that left turn into the site result in back up at the light.

Paul Lynch responded that Northbridge controls can require deliveries to avoid peak times but would get a clarification on that point from the traffic engineer.

Frank McElroy Attorney of 3 Front Street representing The Mancuso 6 Mohawk Road and the Stallman's 366 Pleasant Street stated that truck traffic is controlled by the interstate commerce commission and there is nothing the board can do to control the rights of trucks. He informed the board that he has litigated this issue.

Paul Lynch replied that it could absolutely be conditioned that truck trailers are not permitted not to enter a private site. The facility would be controlled by Northbridge and they can dictate the terms and conditions that the vendors that they work with comply with.

Peer review consultant Scott Miller of Haley and Ward stated that he reviewed the application on behalf of the board appeals of and planning board. He did an initial letter dated ___ with 20 items including ownership and responsibility questions of drain input and applicant responded and supplemented the operations manual and report with clarifications of existing utility inverts concern about the nature of underground storage facilities soils suitability for infiltration all responses and been received and deemed adequate existing drainage goes north east and west the system has been set up to direct to Pleasant Street and it is an improvement over what is there now.

A question was asked if there would be any back up that effects the library drainage that is on Pleasant Street. Mr. Miller replied the town installed a large drain in Chestnut Street and has made other system improvements to help that situation. This project will not hurt any ongoing issues at the library. He is satisfied with the steps the applicant has taken. He referenced his January 6th letter.

Jim Bishop asked about stormwater maintenance.

Mr. Miller responded that this is spelled out in the stormwater report that was submitted and could be further conditioned in the land disturbance permit.

Barton Hyte asked about what was being done in the back to screen properties. What type of landscaping, what are the size of trees and bushes?

Chris Novak described the planting and referred the board to the submitted landscape plan.

Ed Nilsson stated that it was not a monolithic solution rather a mix of berms, landscaping, siting.

The Architect ran through a solar study on screen in the memory care courtyard. Ed Nilsson noted lack of sunlight in the courtyard during certain times of day and asked if the building orientation could be adjusted to bring more sunlight into that area. The architect responded that the building location was fixed and to cite it they had to weight many concerns including the 75' setbacks.

Barton Hyte asked about blasting. Al Craepeau stated that there will be blasting required in some areas. They will try to minimize the amount of blasting done. Barton Hyte asked If they do blast how will it impact the abutters and if it does what happens. He shared a personal experience when he had damage to his home and was not compensated and did not want this to happen to anyone else.

Attorney Lynch explained that the blasting permit was done through the fire department the contractor has to do a preblast survey and submit a blasting plan and other regulations. They hope to do the smallest amount of blasting.

The chairman asked opened the hearing for public comments

Phil Mancuso 6 Mohawk Road - He wants to know what the project will look like from the abutter's property. He had issues with the scale of the rendering presented. The chain-link fence shown is existing and 5' and the person in the rendering is twice as tall. He questions the scale and wants an accurate scaled rendering.

Lisa Mancuso 6 Mohawk Road – Also wanted an accurate rendering or a model so people can see what this will look like from their properties.

Discussion ensued on the berm that was proposed behind 6 Mohawk and the height of it and could screened be achieved through vegetation and a lesser berm to eliminate the rip rap slope.

Rosanna Ferrante agrees it would be helpful.

Leanne Rauhala 5 Higgins Road – stated that she is looking at the plan and sees that there is very little distance from some abutting properties to the parking lot. The proposed building is 50 times the size of her house. The building is surrounded by single family residences. She thinks it will have a negative effect.

Al Craepeau stated that the entire building is residential scale. The height, materials, finishes window size and it is 75 feet from any property.

Bob Schaeffner would like a physical model to show how it relates he does not think the building is as much of a concern as the neighbors think it is but they can't see it. They are fighting it because it is not a clear representation. The developer is only hurting themselves by not showing the neighbors exactly what it will look like.

Peter Reuner 271 Pleasant Street he wrote a letter to the board of appeals and will get the planning board a study that he did on various assisted living facilities. He thinks this one is too large. He expressed concern about parking so close to his back porch.

Dan Waslo 1 Mohawk he lives across the street from the Mohawk access he objects to this project. He is concerned that the new building will block his western sunset views. He feels that it will change the neighborhood and impact light, noise, car traffic.

Albert Mundo 36 Jane Road stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for 41 years he is concerned with traffic. From Ocean Ave to Mohawk there is a lot of traffic congestion.

Jim Landregan 273 Pleasant Street stated there should be renderings from Higgins Road and Mohawk road to show residential what it will look like and the impacts.

Frank McElroy stated that model should include all of the properties within 300' of the site. The town planner suggested that he may be confusing the site plan requirement with the notification requirement which requires abutters to abutters within 300' of the property be notified of the public hearing. Lisa Mead Town Council confirmed that the requirement in the bylaw is that the site plan shows all the names of all owners of record of adjacent properties. The submitted plan complies with this requirement.

The planner listed the items that the board requested a minimum of one week before the next meeting. Clarification on impacts of the traffic cuing on Pleasant Street for employees the effect it would have on the intersection of Baldwin Smith and Pleasant; An Explanation of Landscape issues including how screening of building and car headlights from Mohawk St. abutters should be achieved. That the Landscape Architect be present at the next meeting to discuss landscaping; The Impact of thru-wall ac units both visually and noise impacts; A View of what the back of the building will look like either a model or a computer model or renderings from a few different properties architect agreed to meet with Jim Landregan to identify where the best location might be; Exploration of 22' width driveway rather than 24'; clarification of facility delivery times relative to school traffic. Also request that traffic engineer be at next meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the public hearing until February 8, 2016

At 7:30 PM in Abbot Hall. All in favor unanimously approved 5-0

The meeting was adjourned

Respectfully submitted

Rebecca Cutting