

## Planning Board Minutes

February 22 2016

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

A quorum being present the vice chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM

### Continued Public Hearing 263-269 Pleasant Street – Site Plan Approval & Land Disturbance

The chairman explained that this continued public hearing was originally scheduled for February 8, 2016. That meeting was cancelled due to a snowstorm. It was rescheduled until tonight.

The chairman asked the town planner to go over the list of information that the Planning Board requested at the last meeting. The town planner read the list; impacts of the traffic cuing on Pleasant Street for employees the effect it would have on the intersection of Baldwin, Smith and Pleasant. Specifically would queuing of employee and delivery vehicles turning left onto site in early morning require a separate left turn lane or other traffic control measure; An Explanation of Landscape issues including whether screening of building and car headlights from Mohawk St. abutters should be achieved with 3 foot dense evergreens in lieu of additional 3 foot earth berm that was added resulting in a large 12 foot grade change viewed from the neighbors. Landscape Architect be present to discuss landscaping; The Impact of thru-wall ac units both visually and noise impacts including determination of heating-cooling equipment; 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 abutters to identify which abutters may request views or where the best location might be; Exploration of 22' width driveway rather than 24' including fire department; clarification of facility delivery times relative to school traffic.

Paul Lynch attorney for the project stated that they submitted all of the information in advance of the February 8, 2016 meeting and will present the computer model tonight. He submitted printed copy of the computer model – (This was marked exhibit A). He reviewed the permitting process to date.

### Traffic issues

Vinod Kilkari project traffic engineer VHB of Watertown answered the question of the Pleasant Street driveway at peak time car cueing issues. He stated that it would not necessitate any separate turn lane – he stated that the numbers of cars at the facility during morning rush hours are minimal and would not have an effect. The most number of

cars entering the site during the morning rush hours would be once every 6 minutes (10 cars per hour).

During the afternoon school release the number of cars entering and exiting the site would be one every three or four minutes, the cueing should not be an issue at all. That volume will not cause enough capacity to create any issues. Delivery times for trucks chart presented during board of appeals process, deliveries per day and no large tractor trailers. Peak times in the morning 7:30 am to 8:15 am and 2:30pm to 3:15pm no deliveries operator committed to directing the vendors not to deliver during those times. He also addressed the request to explore a 22 foot wide driveway. He stated it works and they would have no objection to it.

The board asked Gary Hebert Stantec, the peer review consultant for the town if he concurred. He stated that the cueing estimates are reasonable and accepts the results. Regarding the reduction in driveway width (from 24 to 22) he said it would have no impact on maneuverability and many communities reducing lane width to reduce impervious surfaces.

### Landscape Issues

Landscape buffer headlights on Mohawk Road property project the landscape architect explained the question asked by the board at the last meeting in response to what the impact would be on the landscaping berm dimension the effect of the hill by replacing the 3' berm with landscaping.

The LA explained that screening of building and car headlights from Mohawk Road abutters could also be achieved with three foot dense evergreens in lieu of additional three foot earth berm that was added resulting in a large 12 foot grade change viewed from the neighbors. Barton Hyte stated that he trying to visualize this and finding it difficult.

Ed Nilsson asked if the rip rap was being replaced with permanent shrubbery. The LA answered yes.

Al Craepeau showed on the drawing how the stone slope replaced by a 3/1 slope landscaped evergreen trees along the edge deciduous shrubs and would look.

### Thru all air conditioner issues

The architect addresses the mechanical system effect on architecture of the building. Al Craepeau the project architect showed 3D Revit (Check on name of computer program) computer model. He showed the model and the thru all units to understand the building as a whole to show how the thru all ac in apartments.

Ed Nilsson asked about the sound. They referred to the submitted decibel levels chart. Worst case scenario and all units ran at once 30 on 20' away from the building it would be under the required 60 level adding that that is at 20' and the closest property line is 75 away. He stated that the grille looks like architectural louver. This allows them to specify high efficiency unit high end units. He stated that in his experience heat is sought more than air-conditioning even in the summer months. He showed under the windows punch out a small wall mounted sleeve unit. Rooftop common area requires heat in a facility. This is an effective way to provide a high end heating system.

The architect continued through the computer model stating that the building was designed to be an interesting object from all sides. It creates as a full object interesting on all sides. He continued through the model showing on screen in all directions. Texture striate the building and breaks down the massing residential unit multiple dwelling have the appearance as a residence broken down in elements in siding ground floor clap board and shingles above the stone veneer inside main entry identifies as an entry more human scale and stone veneer.

Ed Nilsson asked if there could be more stone than on just one side in the court yard or around the back of the building. The architect replied that the stone gives prominence to the entry to indicate to people that it is the main entrance.

Town Planner asked what color the building would be. The architect stated that the lower level would differ from the stain on upper by slight variation. The color would be a silvery gray weather wood pallet slightly tan gray neutral tone darker grey color roofing

Bob Schaeffner suggesting the fencing looked out of place and should tie the fencing into vocabulary of building. The architect stated it would be stained to match. It just had not been done so for the model.

The architect then went through the courtyard lighting study for December 22 which was not shown at the last meeting. He stated at this time of year there is the least light in the courtyard. It is also the coldest time of year, a time when people generally are not in the area. Ed Nilsson asked if the building could be re oriented to get more light into that area. Al Craepeau answered that reorienting would be a determinate to the function of the building. Much care and consideration was given to the orientation of the building to minimize blasting and adhere to the 75 setbacks.

The architect then showed the photo renderings from neighboring properties one from 8 Mohawk Road showing proposed building size in relationship to the view with day one landscaping as planted and 271 Pleasant Street which is 5' or 6' higher than the proposed grade 5 ½ feet building recessed west side of building day one plantings.

Two unnamed persons voiced concerns that the snap shot was from 271 and 8 Mohawk only. They were expecting more views.

Lisa Mancuso 6 Mohawk Road questioned pictures looking at picture at 8 Mohawk Road wanted to know what kind of lens was used. She felt it was deceptive. She told the Board she was a professional photographer. Discussion ensued. She then showed a rendering of what she thought the reality was. Bob Schaeffner suggested that since the ridge of the proposed building is 12 ' lower than the existing building that could not possibly be an accurate representation and that the mock up she displayed was not at all accurate. He said the developer's photo was probably taken with a wide angle lens and understood what she was saying. The architect confirmed that it was.

Ed Nilsson stated that he believed it was done in good faith. More views would not change the plan. He feels the plans are adequate for the board to make a decision.

Bob Schaeffner stated that although the board can read the plans he felt the abutters concerns were valid, not everyone can interpret plans and a 3d model would help them do that. Additional screening and planting additional photos would help. The problem with the computer model is that it does not show the building in context with the surrounding homes. People don't trust it. A physical model done to scale is easier to understand.

Barton Hyte said that 271 Pleasant seems to be the closest and the rest are further away. He asked how far away. The architect stated that at the closet point it is closest 76' and at the furthest to 118' away. He also thinks a physical model would be better.

Ed Nilsson stated that it is a significant distance away more than any other use in zoning is required to be and one thing the board can do is to minimize the visual effect is to increase the landscaping planted.

Shelia Macready Frost Lane – The abutting houses are lower picture from persons backyard.

Al Mundo 36 Jane Road relative scale is off. He is concerned with the size of the building. It is too large.

Barbara Kittredge 36 Mohawk Road had concerns about the size of the building. She said it is three times larger than the Tedesco Country Club. It is just too large for the site.

Stallman 266 Pleasant Street the traffic report is inaccurate she has seen more cars than they think there are 7:20 to 8 am very busy time.

Robert Stallman 266 Pleasant Street – He said the traffic report is wrong the traffic goes from 7:15 am until 9 am then again 2:30 pm to 4 pm the traffic is bumper to bumper. He asked not to be told that there will not be more traffic.

Peter Ruener 271 Pleasant St – He thinks the computer model shows that this facility is large in a densely populated area. He stated that no other facility in the state is this large on this size lot with this many residential abutters and that he submitted a report. He states 300 cars a day next door is a lot of traffic and he does not believe photograph. He thinks it is not accurate and that is pretty obvious. He is also concerned with the grade being lower and may cause “runaway”. He has concerns about blasting. His house is 100 years old and he is concerned about damage. The service entrance is nearest to his house and is afraid beeping and ac units facing his property would be noisy he would like to see the buffer improved on that side.

Ben Rhodes 8 Mohawk Road stated he is a direct abutters and is in favor. The property will not stay as it is. It will be developed and other options that we have if 14 or 15 houses which have more of an impact and just as much or more traffic.

Jim Landregan 273 Pleasant Street showed a picture of an accident at Baldwin and Smith and talked about how familiar he is with the number of accidents at that location. He showed a picture of a memo from Gary Hebert Traffic Engineer and stated that the people of Marblehead voted down the traffic plan that Gary Hebert gave in 2009 (sic), and that the proposed traffic improvements make no sense. He questioned why the town would use the same engineer for the peer review.

Town Planner interrupted to clarify that he has said this a few times and again the record needed to be corrected because what he is saying is not correct. The 2010 annual town meeting voted to approve the traffic plan. The funding at an override did not pass. The Town is proceeding with these improvements. It is the approved plan for Pleasant Street and is being done by the town incrementally as funding allows.

Mr. Landregan then stated that he does not believe the traffic experts. He expressed concern over the riprap that it would attract rats live in rocky voids. He stated it is the building is the size of the YMCA. He said he has concerns with the stormwater system. He also has concerns about the space for snow removal. He stated and that currently there is a logging business going on at the site which is illegal. He wants to know what it looks like and cannot tell from what has been submitted. He said that there is no need for this facility because on is being built in Vinnin Square, Swampscott. He feels the proposal is incomplete it does not have an existing plan or blasting plan

He felt what was notably absent in the 3d model was there were no cars in the view scale is missing it doesn't say NTS said that they're being deceptive. He feels it is inappropriate and also used the YMCA size analogy.

Ed Nilsson explained that there was an existing plan submitted and pointed to it and the blasting plan would be submitted to the fire department when a blasting permit was sought. It is not required at this time.

Vinod Kalkari the project traffic engineer stated that what was agreed to is in fact consistent with 2010 plan approved by the town. A portion of the plan incorporated as mitigation. The Project is not causing these problems in the roadways but they have agreed to make the changes to eliminate these problems. The right turn only – on Pleasant Street – was only proposed because the original configuration without improvements had limited site lines that were not adequate. With the changes it will and it improves the site lines.

Lehanne Rauhala 5 Higgins Road expressed concerns with the size stating that the proposed building is 50 times the size of her house. As it relates to the abutters, no parking is shown in the computer model or renderings. There are, in the drawing, 80 parking spaces some 17' from the property line. She thinks it is too close does not believe the number of service vehicles that was stated. Also she is concerned with all of the residents and their personal traffic generation – hairdressers, podiatrists and housecleaners etc. She does not believe the traffic study. She submitted a list of conditions for construction and asked if the board received. The town planner acknowledged receipt.

Ed Nilsson stated that enhanced screening could have a positive impact on some of her concerns and the board can add screening conditions.

Mira Bishop 77 Cornell Road – she told the board she has master in architecture. She thought there has not been enough talk about the rock blasting – distance is too small to properties she is concerned about structural damage. She asked who investigates the blasting. ? The chairman informed her it was regulated by local fire dept.

Barton Hyte stated that he was offended by hearing it is the fire dept. he personally had problems when the Glover school was built.

Peter Reuner 271 Pleasant Street again stated that he has a 100 year old house and doesn't know what will happen

Chris Nowak VHB Engineer stated a small amount of blasting and small charges were anticipated. The site design tried to minimize the amount of blasting.

Frank McElroy – 3 Front Street Attorney representing the Stallman's and Mancusco and other people that do not want to be identified.

Mr. Lynch stated he should identify the other people he is representing.

Attorney McElroy felt that the application was incomplete because there is no blasting plan, there is no snow removal plan. In the close up of building the ac units in each window changes the look and not in a good way. He asked if there were roof top units for HVAC. If there are 100 thru wall units in addition the visual impact there will be vibration. He told the board that windmills also cause vibration and that has been verified that it can be very detrimental. He would like to see sample of roofing and siding submitted. Also there were no story poles. He stated that the criteria listed for the special permit – he feels that the board cannot show how anything is minimized with the criteria. He thinks that there is not enough information for this board to act. There is a restaurant, with no information on food prep odors. Storm drainage is concern drainage of the site will be negatively affected the project covers the entire parcel. Loss of privacy is another issue. The project will have surveillance cameras which will intrude on the neighbor's private property. There is nothing here to justifying a project. Conifers planted where they are not now will cause shade and 450 casement windows that will be common areas. This is actionable and he is concerned. He stated he was also concerned about the courtyard and expressed concern for the people living in the assisted living facility it is healthy for people to look at sunlight. It is important for wellbeing.

Ed Nilsson stated that a blasting plan is not required at site plan approval they will submit a blasting plan to the Fire Department. There is a process.

The architect stated snow storage plan has been submitted. It can carry a snow load of 24" snow storage once it exceeds that amount, if ever, it will be removed. It has been engineered to carry a 24" snow load.

Chairman clarified that the board may ask for story poles, they are not required. They did not ask for them.

Phil Mancuso 6 Mohawk Road told the board that he conducted his own traffic study and that he found there were more cars than the traffic study indicated.

Bruce Treff 38 Ocean Ave is concerned with safety of the residents driving and walking in the area.

Elisha Hart 33 Pond Street stated that the Killiam Estate is an iconic building. It is not a protected building but feels it is a fine building that is historically significant and a loss to the town if demolished.

Maeve Rice 14 Mohawk Road was concerned with exit onto Mohawk and had concerns about employee parking and parking in general on the site.

A discussion ensued on the need for a physical model. Ed Nilsson felt there is 75 feet between the buildings and building is a residential height. Barton Hyte thought a model is

necessary that is what he thought they were getting tonight. The 3D computer model does not give the information the neighbors need. Rosanna Ferrante also thought it would be helpful.

Attorney Paul Lynch objected to the request. The architect was concerned about the time it would take to produce such a model and how to accurately show the neighboring properties without having survey information. The architect stated that he would like clear direction to make sure they produce that the board is looking for.

Discussion ensued on the scale of the model. Bob Schaeffner said the model should be at a scale of one inch equals 16 or 20 feet. It should include the direct abutters out to the four Roads; Higgins, Mohawk Baldwin and Pleasant. It does not need to cross the streets. It should, include contours and as for the abutting houses the contours should go to the property line. The board does not expect the applicant to survey the abutting properties to produce the model. He suggested that using Google earth and GIS to determine the house shapes, sizes and location would be sufficient and that the abutting houses did not need to be exact replicas simple to show the massing.

Motion was made and seconded to request the applicant to produce a physical model showing 1' foot contours at a scale no smaller than 1" =20'. All in favor.

Motion made and seconded to continue the public hearing 28<sup>th</sup> at Abbot Hall 7:30 PM

Several unnamed residents then asked when the model would be available.

Ed Nilsson asked the applicants. They thought it would take at least a month to have made. It will be here by the next meeting and hopefully before. Ed Nilsson said anyone could contact the town planner to check if it comes in before the meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted

Rebecca Cutting  
Town Planner



