



# TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

## PLANNING BOARD

ELIHU THOMSON ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
22 MONUMENT AVENUE, SWAMPSCOTT, MA 01907

**MEMBERS**  
ANGELA IPPOLITO, CHAIR  
GEORGE POTTS, VICE CHAIR  
BETH ISLER  
BILL QUINN  
JR YOUNG

**STAFF**  
S. PETER KANE, DIR. OF COMM. DEV.  
ANDREW LEVIN, ASSISTANT TOWN PLANNER

# NOVEMBER 7, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

**Time:** 7:00 – 9:55 pm  
**Location:** Swampscott Senior Center, 200 Essex Street (rear)  
**Members Present:** A. Ippolito, B. Isler, G. Potts, J.R. Young  
**Members Absent:** B. Quinn  
**Others Present:** Pete Kane (Dir. of Community Development), Robert McCann (attorney), Peter Ogren (site engineer), William DiMento (attorney), Peter Pitman (architect), James Emmanuel (landscape architect), Jill Sullivan (resident), Max Kasper (Assistant Building Inspector), Philo & Joy Pappas (applicants), Lora Lee Pike (applicant), Deborah Harris (resident), Robert Cohen (resident), Ken Ruben (resident)

Meeting called to order at 7:05p by Chair Ippolito

## MEETING MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes from the October 17th, 2016 meeting. There were no comments from the Board members.

MOTION : by JR Young to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by G. Potts, unanimously approved.

## SITE PLAN REVIEW

PETITION 16-32

51 LINCOLN HOUSE AVENUE

This filing is a request of PHILO T. and JOY R. PAPPAS seeking a dimensional special permit, site plan special permit, special permit (nonconforming use/structure), and special permit under the Bransford line of cases to demolish an existing single-family dwelling and build a new single-family dwelling with reduced rear yard setback on a nonconforming lot. Planning Board to perform site plan review to provide feedback to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Robert McCann (attorney for the applicants) opened the discussion and introduced Peter Ogren (site engineer) and James Emmanuel (landscape architect) for project. Peter Ogren walked through the plot plan and the history of the

property having been made up of two parcels previously. He noted the low water mark and high water mark. He then walked through the site plan with the proposed new home's building footprint.

They calculated lot coverage based on the new definition which uses high water mark rather than low water mark.

The project is subject to conservation and will be filing their application.

The seawall has been raised a couple times in the past. They plan to take the very top of the wall off and place a reflector cap on. They then discussed that as part of the merging of the parcels, a right-of-way was relocated to the edge of the new larger property. Mr. McCann then provided a copy of the agreement that moved the easement.

James Emmanuel then presented the landscape plan. The parking area will remain in the current location with some additional parking area and plantings. Near the property outcropping, they'll expand the patio area. A. Ippolito asked how many trees would be removed - eight trees near the southern side of property will be removed and new plantings put in place. Mr. Emmanuel said that six of the trees are planted too closely together right now. A. Ippolito pointed out that per the bylaw we discourage the removal of existing trees due to the buffer (privacy and environmental) they provide. A. Ippolito asked why the patio area would be concrete rather than permeable. Mr. Emmanuel pointed out that the patio is on top of ledge so permeability wouldn't be beneficial. Only the currently paved right-of-way path will be repaved (the rest of path will remain gravel).

Deborah Harris asked if the parking area is being extended and if the existing shrubs would be removed. Mr. Emmanuel said that it will be extended but new large shrubs would be put in. Mrs. Harris then asked about the shrubs along the front of the property. Mr. Emmanuel said that those particular ones would be removed.

Robert Cohen asked about the patio on the outcropping as to what it is. He was curious about what happens with the small cove near there. He's concerned about the change to elevations there that might impact water flow there. Mr. Ogren stated that the outcropping area doesn't affect the cove area that Mr. Cohen was concerned about. Mr. Ogren said that they're looking to fill in the ledge, not change the elevations.

Jill Sullivan pointed out that the patio area they plan to fill in is against the seawall at her property. She said that is the corner that gets significant splash over from wave action. She's concerned that it may impact the integrity of her seawall. She's also concerned about the trees they plan to take down along her property line because they are significant in size right now.

Mr. McCann then walked through the various special permits that they are seeking for the project. He noted that they are seeking some special permits that may not be needed but they felt they should request just in case. He noted that the Bransford case states that if you're increasing footprint and square footage of a building on a nonconforming lot, you need a special permit. This project is increasing the square footage but reducing the footprint so it probably doesn't apply. They are increasing the height of the building.

Peter Pitman (architect) then demonstrated the existing building footprint and proposed footprint to show the reduction.

Mr. McCann pointed out that they are staying out of the 25 foot buffer from coastal bank, out of high velocity flood zone, and keeping the right-of-way on the southwest side of property.

Mr. Pitman then walked through the existing and proposed architectural plans. The current home has a number of previous additions. There's no basement in the home. They've revised the architectural plans based on a neighborhood meeting to reduce the overall height. He then showed an overall of the existing and proposed front elevations to show the differences. The major difference in height is due to the pitched roof. The pitched roof offers space for the bedrooms but also storage and mechanical space which would have come from a basement level.

Mr. Cohen asked of the home would be on the existing slab. Mr. Pitman said they plan to raise it by six inches in height. Mr. Cohen then asked if there would be swales at the property lines.

Ken Ruben (57 Lincoln House Ave) then spoke. He pointed out that all abutters were present and that the Pappas have been very accommodating to the neighborhood. He hopes they get a great house but not at the expense of the neighborhood. He feels the project is too large and out of scale for the neighborhood. He doesn't feel all the information has been given to make a thorough review. He also said they haven't been able to review the recent plans provided. He feels it's a very large and tall house that towers over all the other houses. He pointed out that the elevation difference between existing and proposed is a dramatic change. They are concerned about sunlight (they have solar panels on their house and not sure it'll affect them). They'll have a diminished ocean view because of the shift in the footprint location. He thought the zoning meant that when you demolish and rebuild on a nonconforming lot that you need to be conforming. It's a tightly congested area. They want to work with the Pappas to reach a better design. It feels disproportionately large.

B. Isler asked how different the proposed house height is to the other houses in neighborhood. Mr. Pitman pointed out that the proposed home would be three feet taller than the Sullivan home next door. Mr. Pitman said that the Pappas have agreed to do a view study and sun study. Residents pointed out the garage portion of home appears to be twice the height of that same area of the existing home.

A. Ippolito said they need to look at it as a project where they are proposing a full demo so starting fresh. While the new home is in a smaller footprint, it's significant taller and has a major impact. B. Isler agrees that they really need to compare it to what's in the neighborhood. Mr. Pitman acknowledged there are some Capes in the neighborhood which skews the heights. Mr. Pitman then discussed some of the building heights in the neighborhood as well as the changing roof heights on each structure (due to changes in number of floors on portions of homes).

Mr. Cohen was concerned about the sun impact on the new driveway and its heat impact.

A. Ippolito then asked if there are a few things the neighbors would like to see changed, what would they be. Mr. Ruben said it was the overall massing and height. Miss Sullivan said if you look at it as a volume, it feels like a substantially larger house. G. Potts said you can have narrower and taller or shorter and wider. Miss Sullivan said they'd have to actually see it.

G. Potts said that he thinks the proposed house is more aesthetically pleasing than the current home. Understands the need for storage but thinks roof geometry can be changed. B. Isler agreed with G. Potts and sympathized with neighbors' concerns. A. Ippolito said the main issues are the massing of the house and it's significantly more house - the wall effect with cave like sense. She would recommend reducing the roof height, that the view and sun studies be done and shown to neighbors, look at keeping some of the trees planned to be removed, the plans for seawall and patio need to be more defined because of the impact on abutting properties. JR Young is concerned about the structural impacts to

abutting homes. He then asked about the ceiling heights. Mr. Pitman answered its 8 and 9' which is similar to existing home.

MOTION : by A. Ippolito to recommend favorable action with following contingencies: 1) to strike a compromise with the abutters regarding the massing of the house, 2) an overall massing reduction, 3) revisit the landscape plan to reduce the number of trees to be removed, and 4) clarification on the patio area and the structural effects on abutting seawalls. Seconded by G. Potts, unanimous.

## PETITION 16-33

71 KING STREET

This filing is a request of LORA LEE PIKE seeking a dimensional special permit, site plan special permit, and special permit (nonconforming use/structure) to add a two-story addition with garage underneath to existing single-family residence nonconforming structure. Planning Board to perform site plan review to provide feedback to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

William DiMento (attorney for applicant) opened the presentation. Mr. DiMento introduced his applicant (Lora Lee Pike) and contractor (Doug Hurd). They're proposing an addition to an existing home on a nonconforming lot. He said it has no impact on the neighbors and they'll have a petition of support next week. It's a little house on King Street that they want to increase in size by 900 sf.

G. Potts asked if the addition is going where the driveway is currently (yes). The driveway will have enough space to park a car as well.

They noted that the addition won't be any taller than the existing home. No trees will be taken down for the addition. A. Ippolito asked if the house style will be the same (yes).

MOTION : by G. Potts to recommend favorable action, seconded JR Young, unanimous.

## DISCUSSION TOPICS

### POTENTIAL ZONING OVERLAY FOR TRAIN STATION NEIGHBORHOOD

P. Kane went through the revised proposed zoning overlay map based on the Planning Board comments from last month's meeting. He and the Assistant Town Planner, Drew Levin, updated the proposed zoning to include properties only on main roads within ¼ mile of the train station including Burrill Street, Railroad Avenue, Columbia Avenue, Essex Street, and Paradise Road.

The Board then discussed some of the properties included. They asked to include the properties on Pitman Avenue and Elm Place.

P. Kane will update the map and then provide a link to the Google Map to Board members.

## POTENTIAL DOWNZONING

The Board then discussed the proposed downzoning that A. Ippolito had been working on. They discussed how to do the zoning change – should it be a zoning district change, a new zoning district, or a new limit/definition. The Board decided they would move forward with proposing changing to an existing zoning district (so from A3 to A2).

A. Ippolito explained that the issue is there are some A3 properties that aren't large enough for the current uses allowed (by special permit). G. Potts said we're trying to create zoning that describes what's there now and not what could be. The issue of creating multi-families in these areas is that it disrupts the character, views, and feel of the neighborhood.

A. Ippolito would like to do public outreach and education to see what the feedback is about downzoning.

## POTENTIAL LODGING ESTABLISHMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT

B. Quinn who has been working on this was not present. P. Kane said that once he and D. Levin receive a marked up map of the potential overlay area from B. Quinn, they'll create a Google Map of it and provide to the Board.

## JOHNSON PARK REDESIGN CONCEPT REVIEW

P. Kane then introduced the current redesign concept for Johnson Park (on Puritan Road). He said that a group of graduate students from Tufts University developed the design earlier this year after holding a public forum, meeting with abutters and committees. P. Kane is now working to get feedback on their design so that the Town can develop a final design that they'll then raised money for and apply for grants.

The group then discussed the various elements in the design and whether they felt the items should be incorporated, removed, or modified. They liked the rain garden, raised planting beds with benches, trash enclosure, bike racks, stormwater berm with plantings, entrance sign, and rehabilitation of the moon bench (exedra). They discussed the covered walkway. There was universal agreement that the modern canvas style done by the student team wouldn't be appropriate. Some members felt that it should be a pergola covering just like it was when the hotel was there. In the end, the Board felt it best not to cover that walkway at all. While the Board liked the idea of a picnic area, they didn't want it raised nor decking. Instead they felt the picnic area surface should be pavers or crushed stone. They didn't want a changing station or port-o-potty. They also suggested adding interpretive signs for the rain garden and for the hotel's history. They would like to see a footwash installed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:55pm.

S. Peter Kane  
Director of Community Development