

MARBLEHEAD PLANNING BOARD

April 14, 2015

Members present Ed Nilsson, Phil Helmes, Bob Schaeffner, Jim Bishop, Paul Elser and Rossana Ferrante. Others present Town Planner Rebecca Cutting

Public Hearing on zoning articles for Town Meeting

The chairman read the public hearing notice. The town planner explained that in accordance with the provisions of M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 5, the Marblehead Planning Board is required to hold a public hearing on any proposed amendment to the zoning bylaw. This year there is one and it is a planning board sponsored article. The article seeks to amend section by adding a fifth member to the design review board. This article was drafted by the planning board.

The Town Planner explained why the board is proposing this amendment. Presently the design review board had four members which, makes it difficult at times to get quorum at meeting. This will resolve that by adding a fifth member

The chairman asked if anyone from the public wished to speak on this article. No one spoke

The chairman explained that the board could recommend the article be amended, be indefinitely postponed or be adopted by town meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend that Article 12 be adopted by town meeting. All in favor (5-0).

Public Hearing Site Plan Approval - 22 Foster Street – Sevinor

Paul Lynch attorney representing applicants Ralph and Meryl Sevinor explained that the proposal was for the removal of an existing former boat house that was at one time used as a dwelling and the rebuilding of a new single family structure on the lot. The new dwelling would exceed the allowed height and be located on a lot with less than the required lot area, lot frontage, sideline and rear yard setbacks. The applicants will also apply to the board of appeals for dimensional relief. The completed house will contain 6895 square feet of gross floor area including and an attached two car garage. The open area ration will be 1:1.36

The owners had previously received a site plan approval special permit from the planning board. That Prior application was 17% larger than this building.

Mr. Lynch stated that the lot is less than required however he claims that 73% of the houses on the neck are less than 21,000 square feet.

The new house is being moved back 11 feet from harbor. There is a height issue due to a severe drop off towards harbor the height is measured lowest to highest max height 38' 88% of the house is no higher than 32'.

A Notice of Intent from the Conservation was filed and an Order of Conditions was issued on October 9, 2014 to construct the dwelling as proposed.

Walter Jacob project architect presented the plan. He showed a picture of house as completed. He explained that the existing building is not practical to renovate. It is a thin site and he worked with the grade moved back 11 feet from water the 3' from lot line

The building steps down at street level stone, and typical New England materials are being used.

Ed Nilsson asked about the height of house and asked if it could be moved back another 10 feet. He asked for a plan showing setback from water of other houses.

It was determined that the site plan adequately showed this information.

Phil Helmes asked about the driveway. There is an easement on property to on north which would remain.

Ed Nilsson mentioned that if moved back 4' then the building would be 35' rather than 38' the architect said it is a careful balance between the program and minimizing the amount of relief need from the Board of Appeals.

Discussion ensued

The architect explained that the stone structure would be backfilled to replace stone and wood decks.

Bob Schaeffner asked about the south elevation without the 3rd floor. The south elevation scale is massive. If the elevation could be brought down and the third floor eliminated it would have a huge effect on height and mass. Any oblique angle shows more of a mass if the house was inverted and seems unbalanced as it sits on site. Mr. Schaeffner went on to say he had serious concerns with the proposal and takes exception to the statement that the house fits the character of the area. This building site is unique, the structure was built as a boathouse and the site is not conducive to traditional large home like others on the Neck. If the existing boat house was in better shape someone would have renovated it. He understands that it may be in too poor shape to renovate and needs replacement however, the replacement should attempt to emulate the character of the boat house. Mr. Schaeffner

again expressed concern with the proposed third floor. Elimination of the third floor from the design would allow second floor to be nestled into roof volume similar to the existing. As proposed the third floor shows an office and a bathroom.

George Atkins Attorney representing William and Deborah Nutt who own the property to the south. He explained the history of the site and that the planning board approved a previous plan which was then appealed. However the Zoning board application was withdrawn because there were issues with granting the relief sought.

Mr. Atkins stated that consideration built into bylaw compliance with purpose and intent Scale of building must be in harmony with neighborhoods and impact on abutting properties. His clients are not opposed to a structure on this lot. Mr. Nutt appreciates that it has moved back but is still concerned with the height. They would like story poles to be put up to see the impact.

William Nutt 1 Parker Lane and 20 Foster Street ran through the history of the neighborhood. The property at 24 Foster Street was completely rebuilt in 2010/2011 the owners moved it back on the other side 18 Foster Street rebuilt in 2009 and pulled it back hoping that it could be reconstructed. He feels that their property is most impacted because it is one huge wall 3 story high. The design is inconsistent and deleterious to neighborhood

George Atkins suggests the site visit. Height is a problem. He feels this was obviously an ancillary building feels forced and entirely out of scale. Way too much mass for site

Phil Helmes stated he is in favor of a site visit and asked that the applicant revisit massing

Story poles should be installed to show at least the eave and ridge line

A motion was made and seconded to continue the public hearing until May 19, 2015. All in favor. Unanimous vote.

A site visit will be held on May Saturday 9th 9 am

Tower School - Discussion

Robert McCann Attorney representing the Tower School explained that this was an overview of a plan for informational purposes only. While that is more than a year away, the School is starting the process as early as possible so that comments may be shared. The tower school is planning a change in their campus to make more of a campus and eliminate on going on road traffic issues that occur with drop off and pick up at the school. They are seeking feedback from the members so that reactions can be communicated to the Board of Selectmen for their consideration. There may be other informational meetings requested as they move forward towards the 2016 Town Meeting.

The School is notifying the neighbors of the meeting, and letting them know that with the exception of the Landscape Plan which is new information, the information that is being presented to the Planning Board is the same that has been given to the neighbors in two previous meetings that the School has had with them. Traffic history plan was explained by project engineer Peter Ogren who is working with school dept. and made this presentation to selectmen. In a year or so they will be going to town meeting with an article to abandon Colgate Road. They plan to be back before next year informational meeting with more detailed information. The headmaster stated the plan addresses High-level of traffic congestion, pedestrian movement, off street parking and with the creation of 65 parking spaces, traffic can absorb most of the traffic impact of the school. They would give back land to allow widened of Colgate to make more on street parking. The plan makes more of a campus feel objectives safety cohesive campus feeling. They have had two meetings with neighbors, one with selectmen, and school department. Dean Sidell explained current cuing 160 cars in morning 100 in afternoon two roads of traffic get cue off Colgate Road parking needed for events.

Ed Nilsson thought it would be great to see a site plan of the whole campus to show the traffic flow. He asked what sort of things can be done to relive the west shore drive all of west shore drive cue onto this loop they can legislate that.

Peter Ogren added that removing pervious area reducing the amount of impervious surface will improve drainage.

Bob Schaeffner asked about green space and what it would be used for. Dean Sidell answered that it would be a field open space

James Emmanuel landscape architect presented plan stating the neighbor were concerned about what they would be looking at. Neighbors were concerned about what they would be looking at. James Emmanuel explained the landscape plan first object maintain as an open lot and perimeter are going to be surround by existing and proposed trees and a few interior trees but maintain open field in center the main objective . Low stone wall or entry maybe incorporated.

Bob Schaeffner asked if they look at other geometry to help yield and the playing field better yield of rectangular will look at and it would be useful to see a site plan of entire campus and a lightning plan. He appreciates the dialog.

Tower school stated they will keep the board apprised and be back later in the year.

Continued Public Hearing - 33 Bradlee Road - Blue Thalassa LLC

Bob McCann Attorney recapped what has happened since the last meeting - Peter Dunning represents three of the abutters and they hired a land planner neighbors hired consultant

Nicholas Kracknel of Keystone Planning & Design who met with the architect met and made some progress. They are willing to continue to work on this and do not expect any action by the board tonight but they wanted to come back to get reaction of planning board four options.

Craig Bosworth Architect explained option come from multiple meeting he had with the land planner for the neighbors. The first option labeled A represents the original proposal with modifications to a portion of the driveways in order to provide a greater setback from the face of the structure to the edge of paving. It could also be further adjusted if agreeable with the board. The second option B is a new design to the Carriage House and location. He took the land planners sketch and developed it to work for our program. The footprint of the building is closer to the existing pool area. This option eliminates the circle and provides for a larger two-way traffic drive access for the neighbors. This new driveway would be 18'-0" wide, which is much wider than the 10' drive which is a majority of the access width of driveway up to this point. Better for fire access with a hammerhead turnaround on Halsted's property to allow for fire access. Landscaping would be done. Option C uses the same floor plan and exterior elevations of Option B, however reworks the driveways to maintain a circular drive. The location of the carriage house is identical with placement adjacent to the pool area. In order to maintain a circular drive after our construction he recommends a 42" buffer of grass between the carriage house and the pavement, and a new 10'-6" drive which will tie into the existing drive off Halsted's property. Three trees in the circle will need to be removed from Halsted's property, and some rework of the paving would be required. The fourth option A1 is a scaled back building which has been scaled down in scale size and proportion. This option reduces the scale of the building by 26% reworked he driveways. It is still a two car garage and office above open space and bathroom still have dormers reduce square footage scheme a hammerheads reduce the circle.

Ed Nilsson asked about blind corner from behind the building.

The chairman asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak.

Christina & Kimon Pandapas owners of 10 Mooring Lane had concerns with siting.

Richard and Elaine Spencely's letter read and entered into the record

Dunning Attorney for Alan and Charlotte Raymond, Lou and Nancy Pocharski and Daniel and Janet Nolan stated that his clients remain opposed to the original concept in the circle. He has the two recorded deeded easements. He appreciates the work done since the last meeting but they are not there yet. He introduced Nick Cracknell Land use planner

Mr. Cracknell explained that he was looking at the options. He feels the scale issue is important as an observer the structures need to fit in with the wooded rural environment. The Hallstead house every much an estate settling. The house is an AM Stern house and

tying in vernacular with preferred option expansion of existing garage 12/12 pitch gate the original proposed location was 125' away which is too far to have any cohesive feel. Want to keep working. Shifting road works but they can't move them without ok of neighbors the rights of way are defined.

Bob Schaeffner appreciates dialog. He likes the idea to engage the pool feel like an estate court yard with pool beautiful even if road needs to be changed. If road need to be moved some mature trees need to be removed

Nick Cracknell explained he stepped structure back a bit slid back try to improve if can be slide forward and be separate.

Mr. Halstead there is a benefit of two towers but no storage which he wanted and the second tower inside pool enclosure.

Phil Helmes stated that things seem to be going in a good directional and urged the parties to continue to work together rather than the board design this project for them. He did agree that any changes to the deeded easements would require the consent of the owners with those deed rights.

Both parties agreed that they were happy to continue working.

A motion was made and seconded to continue the public hearing until May 19, 2015. All in favor. Unanimous vote.

Camille Terrace

Motion made and seconded to recommend that Camille Terrace be accepted by the town. All in favor. Unanimous vote.

Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the February 9, 2015 minutes and the March 14, 2015 minutes. All in favor. Unanimous vote.

The meeting was adjourned

Respectfully submitted

Rebecca Cutting