



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

SEPTEMBER 11, 2017 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 7:09pm – 11:10pm
Location: Swampscott High School, 200 Essex Street
Members Present: A. Ippolito, G. Potts, B. Isler, B. Quinn, J.R. Young,
Members Absent: None
Others Present: Ryan McShera (Architect), Jesse Despo (Petitioner), Jen Despo (Petitioner), Tom Groom (Petitioner), Jim Valleco (Architect), Bill Bergeron (Engineer), James Emmanuel (Landscape Engineer), Jacqueline Kinney (Resident), Kathleen Greehan (Resident), Jodie Godell (Resident), Elle Winkler (Resident), Evan Owsland (Resident), Dan Cobbett (Resident), Ellie Miller (Resident), Peter Kane (Director of Community Development), Andrew Levin (Assistant Town Planner)

Chairwoman of the Board A. Ippolito called the meeting to order at 7:09PM.

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting minutes from the August 14th, 2017 meeting were reviewed, on a Motion from J.R. Young, seconded by B. Quinn, the meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

SITE PLAN REVIEW

PETITION 17-18

57 BELLEVUE ROAD

This is a petition by Ryan McShera (Redbarn Architecture) proposing the demolition of a nonconforming single-family residence located on a nonconforming site and construction of a new residence of greater than 3,000 gross floor area. The petitioner is seeking a special permit (nonconforming use/structure) and a site plan special permit from the ZBA. Planning Board to perform site plan review to provide comments to the ZBA.

Ryan McShera introduced himself and the property owners, Jesse and Jen Despo.

A. Ippolito explained the process of a site plan review.

Mr. McShera began by handing the Board revised plans, and stating that the property is undersized (area of 8,100 sf in a zoning district of 21,000 sf lots). Mr. McShera stated that currently the home has less than 100-feet across the front and on the Northwest side the side setback is violated.

Mr. McShera stated the plan is to demolish the current single-family home and construct a larger single-family home, meeting the required setbacks, building height, coverage and open space requirements.

Mr. McShera showed the Board different photos and views of the property and explained the landscaping plan, which is to keep the arborvitaes and plantings in the back of the property, and also not to remove any trees over 6-inch in caliper. G. Potts explained to Mr. McShera that for the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) meeting he will need to present a full landscape plan.

Mr. McShera stated that all drainage will be captured on site and flow from subsurface to a dry well in the backyard and through gutters.

G. Potts inquired about the change in square-footage, Mr. McShera explained, currently the home is 1,500 sf, but the proposal is for over 5,000 sf, which includes the attic due to the ceiling being greater than 7 feet in height, but that the proposed basement will not count because it is more than 50% below grade.

B. Isler asked about a roofline revision in the plans, Mr. McShera explained that there was originally proposed a widows-walk, but that it had been eliminated.

A. Ippolito asked if the petitioners had spoken with abutters, Mr. McShera mentioned that the abutters are generally in favor and presented a page of abutters signatures. A. Ippolito asked if any abutters were unhappy, he mentioned there was none. A. Ippolito asked if the curb cut will change, Mr. McShera stated the curb cut will remain and be widened on each side. A. Ippolito asked if the owners understood the home abuts the proposed rail-trail, the owners stated they did and are in support of the trail.

A. Ippolito stated that the larger size won't have any negative impacts, and then went through the design and changes with Mr. McShera. G. Potts asked what a specific feature denoted (a bump-out) on the plans will be, Mr. McShera stated it will be for a chimney and fireplace.

Mr. McShera mentioned the air-conditioning condenser will probably be located under the deck, and G. Potts clarified that the condenser should go on the non-abutter side.

A. Ippolito stated that she'd like to see a landscape plan, but is comfortable with the plan to leave the trees in the back, but stated a full plan would be needed for the ZBA meeting, adding what the plan will need, also mentioning that the petitioners must provide a locus map showing the abutting properties.

A. Ippolito asked for public comment, there was none, then the Board for comments, there was none.

MOTION : By G. Potts to recommend favorable action, making sure condensers are on non-abutter side, and a complete landscape plan is presented to the ZBA, seconded by J.R. Young, unanimously approved.

ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW

17SPR-01

71 GREENWOOD AVENUE

Tom Groom, the owner of Groom Construction and the developer and applicant for the petition began by introducing himself to the Board and community members present. Mr. Groom stated that the proposed design has tried to incorporate into it the comments on traffic, size, noise, and site drainage. Mr. Groom also mentioned the proposed footprint will be 50% smaller than the existing, and the proposed building will be setback from the abutters.

Planning Board member Bill Quinn recused himself from the Board, stating his homes proximity to the property.

Project architect, Jim Velleco began his presentation.

Mr. Velleco explained the proposal for the property, mentioning that the plans have worked in some design cues taken from the neighborhood, and also explained the grading of the property and the area where the property slopes down towards Fuller Ave.

Mr. Velleco showed the Board pictures of homes neighboring the property and explained that some design inspiration was taken from these homes, pointing out the “beltcourses”, which he stated help break down the size of the proposed building.

Mr. Velleco explained that the current building has 100,000 sf of gross floor area, while the proposed will have “about” 60,000 sf, adding that the existing building’s footprint is 70,000 sf, while the proposed is 44,000 sf, which Mr. Velleco explained will allow for more open space.

Mr. Velleco described the buildings location on the lot, stating the existing entrance, nearest King Street, will serve as the only vehicle entrance to the property, proposing to widen the existing curb-cut on each side. Mr. Velleco stated there will be 9 parking spaces, with some being handicap, in the front drop-off area for guests. Mr. Velleco explained the proposed garage underneath the building, stating the grade will slope from elevation 124-5 ft to 118 ft inside the garage. Mr. Velleco described the three free-standing surface garages on the north side of the property, which will have 14 spaces dispersed between the three garages, and several outdoor spaces on the property as well. Mr. Velleco explained that the pedestrian circulation will follow the vehicular circulation as best as possible, and explained some of the rules the circulation is regulated by, in terms of handicap accessibility.

Mr. Groom explained the goal is to try and center the proposed building on the lot, with the south side of the building setback approximately 90 feet, leaving enough room for guest parking and a drop-off area in the front, adding the idea was to minimize surface parking. Mr. Velleco explained that the underground garage will have 31 spaces, with two handicapped. There will be an elevator lobby in the garage as well as a concrete block enclosure for the building’s trash and recyclables. Mr. Velleco stated that there will be 7 units per floor, stacked “readily” over 4 floors.

Mr. Velleco explained the “belt-courses” being added at several levels in the design, to help break up massing, adding that the design also took cues also from characteristics seen in the neighborhood including: bay windows, dormers, hip roofs, and other neighborhood elements. Mr. Velleco mentioned the first-floor units will have small private areas, and that there will be a wooden traditional board fence on the property line and behind the garages. Mr. Velleco stated that he took into account comments from the neighbors and made the garages as low as possible.

Mr. Velleco explained that the intent is to repair the area on the stone wall that is damaged.

The absence of a pedestrian entrance (sidewalk) at the vehicle entrance was discussed. Mr. Groom mentioned that the engineering wouldn’t allow for a pedestrian entrance, and stated there is one just past the vehicle entrance.

Mr. Groom explained the garages further, stating they will be wood-framed with wooden shingles, and 9’6” in height, from the floor to the plate of the garage. Mr. Groom mentioned it is up to the neighbors if they would want dormers added onto the garages. Mr. Groom stated the garages will have 5 separate garage doors for 5 separate bays in each garage.

The height and measurement of the building was briefly explained.

William Bergeron of Hayes Engineering, the projects engineer then got up to present.

An audience member asked if the vehicle entrance was wide enough for two cars, Mr. Velleco replied that it is.

Mr. Bergeron began by stating there will be a 40.6% reduction in impervious material on the site and that the petitioner and development team had met with the Fire Department and he designed a parking area that allows for fire apparatuses to operate safely within. Mr. Bergeron stated that a full drainage study was done, which showed reduced peak rates of flow in each of the four directions that water flows from the site. Mr. Bergeron went through these directions of flow and explained how the reductions were achieved. Mr. Bergeron stated that currently the site has no storm-water treatment then described how the new system will work, adding that there is a slight issue, that the new system might put too much drainage into the existing pipe, and that an overflow ware system was designed to help mitigate this, Mr. Bergeron briefly explained the systems design. Mr. Bergeron described the location and grading of the proposed garage, and explained how the new drainage system will capture water that used to go down the embankment better, adding that the drainage system will follow the DEP standards and guidelines, briefly explaining them. Mr. Bergeron stated that the new system will ensure better quality of surface run-off, and described the new drainage system further.

Mr. Bergeron described the site lay-out adding where the snow storage areas are and how they are coordinated with the landscaping, and stated that the homes on Greenwood Terrace would no longer be in the shadows. A. Ippolito asked about snow melt drainage, Mr. Bergeron briefly explained.

Mr. Bergeron moved on to discussing the transportation report, stating the analysis indicated no growth in traffic from the previous study done seven years prior, for the previous proposal, adding that there would be no change in the level of service at any of the nearby intersections then previously reported. Mr. Bergeron explained the proposed number of cars, by time of day on weekdays and weekends, and added that only one car accident had been reported in the area in the past years, which he stated was during the winter. Mr. Bergeron mentioned the site meets all stopping distance requirements, which is the capacity to be a safe driveway, and that the parking signage on-site meets all requirements. Mr. Bergeron added that the report mentioned some proposed areas to add stop signs in the surrounding neighborhood as well.

Mr. Bergeron stated the plan is to reuse the current sewer connection, but it will be checked first. Mr. Bergeron mentioned that the electrical and gas lines will be off street.

The Board and Mr. Groom discussed the proposed parking, Mr. Groom mentioned there will be 2 parking spaces per unit, per Town requirement, and that the surface spaces will be 9'x18', with 58 spaces total on property.

Mr. Bergeron went through the lighting plan, sconces will be added on top of the garage doors directing light low, entrance lights which will cast down, and addition of light polls on the property which were explained as being similar to ones seen in downtown Marblehead. Mr. Bergeron stated the measurement is almost 0 at the lot lines on photometric maps. A. Ippolito inquired as to how the lights will work, Mr. Groom stated the lighting in the back will be down low and shielded, and that the lights on the garages will face back towards the building. Mr. Groom mentioned there will be little lighting on the site, and that mentioned that there is no lit signage.

James Emmanuel, the projects landscape architect began by explaining there will be much more green space in the proposed, while also preserving the existing stone wall. Mr. Emmanuel added that there will be a cut out in the wall for a pedestrian access and landscaping around the wall. Mr. Emmanuel stated that the existing second entrance to the property will be filled in with low-maintenance shrubs, to keep look of a continuous green-band. Mr. Emmanuel explained there will be 24 trees added to the site of different varieties, adding a "nice ornamental quality", and smaller plantings added near the property lines to help buffer the fence. Mr. Emmanuel described the proposed landscaping's three layers; trees on the property lines, shrubs around the property, and gardening around the first-floor terraces. Mr. Emmanuel stated the trees, the significant amount of grass, and the plantings will break up the proposals scale and add seasonal color. Mr. Emmanuel explained there will be a biodegradable mat put on the slope to help grass germinate and

eventually stabilize the soil. A. Ippolito inquired about a sprinkler system, Mr. Emmanuel explained the plan is for an irrigation system for the grass, and possibly using “gator bags” or “dripping” for the trees. Mr. Emmanuel and A. Ippolito discussed the landscape plan further, Mr. Emmanuel added that the existing wall will always be seen from the street.

Mr. Groom and Mr. Bergeron discussed with the Board the existing wall, Mr. Groom mentioned that the plan is to reuse stones from the wall to repair some places. A. Ippolito asked if it was possible to add a secondary pedestrian entrance at the vehicle entrance, and explained her reasoning, B. Isler added that there should be a sign pointing to the pedestrian entrance. Mr. Groom stated that to add a pedestrian entrance at the vehicle entrance the wall opening would have to be widened to add a sidewalk. Peter Kane, Director of Community Development mentioned that on the plans provided to the Board of Selectmen, there was a sidewalk along the vehicle entrance, Mr. Bergeron responded that the engineering didn’t work for it. Mr. Bergeron added that the vehicle entrance is the steepest part of the entrance, and if a sidewalk is added, it would add more impervious material which would impede drainage and pose a potential risk for freezing problems. A. Ippolito reiterated that a pedestrian entrance should be next to the vehicle entrance, Mr. Groom responded that they could possibly move the pillar that is there, Mr. Bergeron stated the pillar could stay and the entrance could be made next to it. A. Ippolito explained that the second entrance combined with the original pedestrian entrance could create a “special” green space between the two, and inquired about benches on the property. The Board and Mr. Groom continued to discuss the second entrance possibility further, Mr. Bergeron reiterated the drainage plan proposal for that location.

A. Ippolito asked the Board if they had any questions.

G. Potts asked about a fifth story, Mr. Groom responded the top floors are penthouses with two floors, but the second is not a full story. Mr. Groom added the mechanicals will all be in the underground garage. Mr. Valleco clarified that there will be a pea-stone surface behind the surface garages.

B. Isler inquired about winter sidewalk clearing, Mr. Groom mentioned they will follow whatever the Town requires, P. Kane clarified there is no sidewalk clearing bylaw.

Mr. Groom then explained the proposal further, there will be a trash compactor in the underground garage, and the trash will be picked up by private contractor, and added that water will not drain into garage.

B. Isler asked about the subsurface parking in the rear and inquired about the possibility of adding a space, Mr. Bergeron explained the turning radius would not allow it to work. The project team then explained to the Board why the rear parking area was designed as it is. Mr. Bergeron explained that all of the proposed driveway is in the pavement area of the existing parking lot, and that the proposed pavement area will be below an embankment.

A. Ippolito asked if they expect to find additional ledge on the slope, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Groom responded by stated they will not know where all the ledge is until testing. The Board and Mr. Groom then continued to discuss the site, Mr. Groom mentioned that some test pits had already been done and no ledge had been found in the back.

Mr. Groom explained the blasting process, adding that blasting will take place in a hole at a minimal depth. Mr. Groom stated that he will make public when blasting and the demolition schedule for neighbors and abutters. An audience member asked about dust mitigation, Mr. Groom mentioned they have met with the Town DPW and will use water from the Towns hydrants to wet the debris. Mr. Groom mentioned the first piece of demolition is asbestos mitigation, and that the property had been thoroughly analyzed and the locations where asbestos has been identified, but removal will take a long time.

J.R. Young inquired about a replica of the original copula being added to the plans, Mr. Groom explained that there was a replica drawn in on the original maps but both the projects architect and a Town hired architect stated that it did not work, adding that a same size replica would look strange with the new building size and that the proposed building will be seven feet lower than the existing, so a scaled replica would not be seen.

J.R. Young asked if the architects could revise the plans, working the copula in, Mr. Groom mentioned a possibility of creating a plaque with the original copula on it and the buildings history. Mr. Valleco reiterated why he did not believe a copula or steeple would work with the proposal.

J.R. Young and Mr. Groom discussed parking on the site, Mr. Groom stated each resident will be assigned one space, and described the possible parking characteristics of residents. P. Kane explained that the property's zoning district is the most restrictive, and that the project is overbuilding the parking.

A. Ippolito mentioned a list provided by the Historical Society of items to salvage, stating they want the top part of the copula and the chalkboards as well, Mr. Groom mentioned that this would be fine.

P. Kane asked about possibly adding a guardrail where the driveway curves, heading to the rear parking lot. Mr. Bergeron stated the grade of the new road will be below the existing and there will be 6-inch non-mountable granite curb and then a raised shoulder. Mr. Groom mentioned that if there is a spot that looks unsafe they will put a safety feature in.

P. Kane asked about snow storage on the curved part of the road, Mr. Bergeron mentioned it will be plowed and then lifted over the grade.

P. Kane asked when an underground storage tank will be removed from the existing building, and mentioned the agreement with the Town was for it to be removed within 90-days. Mr. Groom mentioned that they have not dug the tank up yet, but that it needs to be tested and taken out before demolition. Mr. Groom and P. Kane then briefly discussed the history of the tank.

A. Ippolito asked about an egress and path in the rear, Mr. Groom mentioned that the first-floor units will not have exits from the units to the back, but small private backyards.

A. Ippolito then opened the discussion for public comment.

Jacqueline Kinney of 64 Fuller Ave asked about rodent control, Mr. Groom explained the plan is to use an exterminator and that there is a process to follow for demolition, A. Ippolito mentioned the petitioner would need to present a pest-control plan. A. Ippolito added that the exterminator chosen and rodent plan is overseen by the Board of Health and DPW. Ms. Kinney asked if Mr. Groom will give abutters a list of contacts and blasting schedule. Mr. Groom mentioned there will be a project manager, supervisor, and himself to contact, P. Kane mentioned he would add contact information on the Town website.

Ellen Winkler, of 15 Greenwood Terrace asked the site-plan process, and if communication with project management can be adopted in the site-plan. P. Kane explained this site-plan review is part of the land agreement, and explained the jurisdiction of the Planning Board. Ms. Winkler mentioned that there are typos in the application, A. Ippolito added she noticed them as well. Ms. Winkler also inquired about rodent control, Mr. Groom responded that they will hire an expert, P. Kane clarified that rodent control is part of the Board of Health requirements, A. Ippolito added the land agreement will help clarify.

Dan Cobbett, of 28 Greenwood Terrace asked for clarification on a chain-link fence what type of fence will go behind the surface garages, Mr. Groom stated he will discuss with the abutters what they want.

Mr. Cobbett, Mr. Groom and Ms. Winkler discussed the current conditions behind the garages, Mr. Groom mentioned he will speak with the abutters about specifics.

Mr. Cobbett inquired about the plan for the entrance being filled in, Mr. Groom mentioned that due to issues with matching stone, shrubs will be put in place of the entrance. Mr. Cobbett asked about repairs to the front sidewalk, Mr. Groom mentioned that the sidewalk will “probably” be redone.

Mr. Cobbett and Mr. Groom discussed the drainage plan and driveway briefly.

Bill Quinn, of 60 Greenwood Avenue mentioned that he believed there will need to be a guardrail placed on the curved part of the driveway, and mentioned he would want it to look nice.

Mr. Quinn briefly discussed grading with Mr. Bergeron, Mr. Bergeron stated the new driveway will be 3 feet below the existing. P. Kane asked for a specific section detail of the area in question. The Board, Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Quinn continued to discuss the sites grading.

Mr. Quinn stated that the copula is very important to the Town and that it can be seen from many places, adding that one should be appropriately proportioned to fit on the proposed building, reiterating a replica is important. Mr. Groom responded that both the Town hired architect and the projects architect stated a replica looked bad, Mr. Quinn reiterated it needed to be scaled appropriately.

A. Ippolito asked about previously proposed cell phone towers, Mr. Groom responded that has the right to do them, but it is up to the phone companies, adding that they would need to find a way to hide the towers from the street, and stated the Town communication tower was moved to the water tower.

Evan Owsland, of 31 Greenwood Terrace asked for clarification on the trees being planted, Mr. Emmanuel reiterated that 24 trees are being planted, Mr. Groom added that there is an agreement with the Town to provide buffering.

Ellie Miller, of 57 Greenwood Avenue asked about the conduit pipe and drainage plan, Mr. Bergeron clarified the proposal will reduce the existing peak rate, volume, and amount of water that drains to Fuller, and clarified where the water will be draining to. Mr. Bergeron explained that the catch basins are cleaned 4 times a year as a base, but this schedule can be adjusted accordingly.

Ms. Miller asked about traffic during construction, and proposed an idea to help with congestion, Mr. Groom mentioned different plans to mitigate construction traffic, P. Kane clarified the Traffic Study Committee has jurisdiction over traffic modifications.

Jodie Godell, of 66 Greenwood Ave asked about lighting, Mr. Groom stated there would be no floodlights and Mr. Bergeron clarified where the pole lighting will be, and clarified the photometric map. Mr. Groom added the plan is to have no lighting to shine off property.

Ms. Godell asked for more clarification on the driveway, mentioning concerns over the “tight” entrance and possibility of light pollution from headlights. Mr. Groom and Mr. Bergeron explained the reason for keeping the entrance, and explained that there would not be anything changing that would make light pollution hit her home.

Kathleen Greehan of 79 Greenwood Ave asked about lights on the building, Mr. Valleco clarified the lighting, and mentioned building lights will be low and below grade, and reiterated no flood lights. Mr. Groom clarified there will be

sconces on the garage doors, and the “Marblehead styled light poles” on property as well for ambient lighting. Ms. Greehan asked about equipment on the roof, Mr. Groom mentioned there will be condensers on the roof, but they won’t be seen or heard, due to height and location.

There was a brief discussion regarding traffic and neighboring roads, P. Kane clarified that this is outside the jurisdiction of the site-plan review.

Ms. Greehan asked about the trees on the property, Mr. Groom explained a majority will stay but that some will be removed, and that the erosion on the site will be dealt with. Mr. Groom A. Ippolito, and Ms. Greehan then discussed the planting briefly, Mr. Valleco helped clarify the planting.

Ms. Winkler asked about fencing during construction, Mr. Groom explained where the fencing will be placed, but mentioned the difficulty of setting fence up on the sloped side of the property. Ms. Winkler asked if the trees being planted could be a larger caliper, G. Potts explained that larger trees will not survive as well. Ms. Winkler also mentioned that water pressure is an issue in her area, Mr. Groom mentioned that this could be a specific problem to her street, and clarified where the water mains are.

B. Quinn asked mentioned that he agreed that the sidewalk being added to the vehicle entrance would not work, The Board clarified the proposed idea as well as why they believe it would work. B. Quinn mentioned that he would like to see the wall stay as is, Mr. Groom mentioned that there are multiple parts of the wall in bad shape.

A. Ippolito closed the public hearing, and explained the next steps in the site plan review.

A. Ippolito began the reviewing the social and economic needs serviced by the project. A. Ippolito mentioned that currently the property is a fire hazard, and added that the proposal is trying to save pieces of the property, while turning the site into an income tool. A. Ippolito also mentioned that the proposal is in line with strategic goals stated in the Master Plan, as the developers will be contributing to the Affordable Housing Trust fund. A. Ippolito added the property is a priority investment site.

A. Ippolito moved on to the proposed traffic flow and safety, stating she is in favor of the one egress, adding it is the safer of the two, but mentioned there should be a small stop sign at the exit approach. A. Ippolito mentioned that at the end of the review the Board could consolidate their recommendations.

Adequacy of utilities and public services; A. Ippolito mentioned that as long as the developers work with DPW, and that DPW is satisfied with utilities, snow storage, and trash, then she is satisfied.

Neighborhood character and social structure; A. Ippolito inquired about the type of wood being used, Mr. Valleco explained that wood or azek material would be used, Mr. Groom added that there would be wood, azek, or composite shingles used, and that it wouldn’t be vinyl.

The Board, Mr. Valleco, and Mr. Groom then briefly discussed the possibilities of keeping the copula. P. Kane clarified what the Town hired architect had explained about the copula.

Impacts on the natural environment; A. Ippolito mentioned she likes the upgrades and also mentioned that the site will be an improvement to the Towns tax base, and that funds will be going to the Affordable Housing Trust.

Minimize volume of cut and fill; A. Ippolito clarified the proposal and mentioned 24 trees will be added.

Maximizing pedestrian and vehicle safety; A. Ippolito mentioned that she would like to see the second walkway at the vehicle entrance which was previously discussed, B. Quinn mentioned that there would have to be steps for the second

walkway. J.R. Young mentioned that guardrails being added in certain places, and B. Isler recommended the sidewalk in front of the property be redone.

Minimize obstruction of scenic views; A. Ippolito mentioned the proposal will open up the space more than the current large building.

Minimize visual intrusion of parking; A. Ippolito stated that she believed it was designed well, and agreed with the design for parking in the front. A. Ippolito added that she did not believe headlights to be a problem, and mentioned she thinks the lighting is appropriate. P. Kane asked if lighting sconces will be on the main entrances, Mr. Valleco mentioned there are no plans yet for sconces at the doors, but added that the entrance will be under a canopy which will have lights under it.

A. Ippolito and Mr. Groom briefly discussed the private patios on the first floor.

Groom and Angela clarify the patios on the first floor.

Minimize detachment from scale of neighborhood; A. Ippolito stated the building will be newer, but that the current building is "monstrous", and that the proposal does not "feel" as if it will be a departure. Mr. Groom added that they have tried to bring in neighborhood architectural elements.

Minimize contamination of groundwater; A. Ippolito stated that she believes the drainage and water mitigation was well thought out, Mr. Groom mentioned that the contractors for the asbestos mitigation will have strict regulations.

Compliance with Zoning Bylaw; A. Ippolito stated that it the proposal is in compliance with Zoning.

Minimize adverse traffic impact; A. Ippolito mentioned that the traffic study is good, Mr. Groom mentioned that the construction traffic will not pick up until towards the end of the project, and mentioned that there will be a trailer on the site. A. Ippolito mentioned the need for the site to be roped off.

A Ippolito asked if any more comments from the Board or P. Kane, there was none.

The Board then discussed the consolidated revisions and recommendations they would like seen. The Board and Mr. Valleco briefly discussed recommending that plans be made with a copula drawn in. The Board voted on this, A. Ippolito, B. Isler, and B. Quinn voted against, J.R. Young voted for it.

The Board then consolidated their recommendations to the following:

1. Additional pedestrian access adjacent to the vehicle entrance, up to developer to leave the existing column or move column over.
2. Better detailed plans of the driveway where it curves.
3. Stop sign at the exit approach
4. Inclusion of historical feature

The Board also mentioned that they want to make sure communications with neighbors is secured and schedules are provided.

A. Ippolito asked about the comments the Fire Department submitted, Mr. Groom mentioned they had met with the Fire Chief.

The Board discussed signage, the petitioner and their team mentioned they did not have any current plans for signage, and mentioned some possibilities. Mr. Groom stated that he would come back before the Board if he wished to put up a sign.

A. Ippolito stated that a rendering of a plaque with the sites history be added to the proposal, possibly in the area between the wheel chair accessible entrance and the vehicle entrance, Mr. Groom mentioned he is fine with this recommendation.

The Board and Mr. Groom discussed the next steps if the project was to be approved that evening, Mr. Groom mentioned that he could send the recommended revisions to P. Kane. P. Kane stated that Mr. Groom wouldn't be able to get feedback without a public hearing and clarified the procedure. A. Ippolito and P. Kane briefly discussed next steps with Mr. Groom.

B. Quinn asked the size on the proposed plaque, Mr. Groom and the Board discussed, P. Kane mentioned it could be similar to the rock element in the Town Hall parking lot. Mr. Groom and A. Ippolito discussed the plaque further, P. Kane clarified what the Board wants in regards to the placard on the plans.

A. Ippolito opened back up public comment.

B. Quinn asked how to verify the cross-section plans (of where the driveway curves), and what the acceptance criteria would be, P. Kane mentioned that he would work with the Town Engineer to make sure they are accurate. P. Kane and G. Potts discussed this briefly with the petitioner and their team, it was clarified that when the driveway is cut down to the elevation being proposed, the berm on the shoulder will be three feet high and the curb 6-inches high. B. Quinn, G. Potts, and Mr. Bergeron continued to discuss, Mr. Bergeron stated that they will provide sectioned plans, but added if there is not three feet between curb and berm, a guardrail will be added.

MOTION : by G. Potts for conditional approval, based on plans to be revised to show new sidewalk next to or near driveway, stop sign exiting site at driveway, a location for a memorial placard on the site, and in addition, a section detail of the curve in the driveway demonstrating a three-foot wide shoulder or guardrail on Southeast side of curve in driveway, seconded by B. Isler, unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION – HUMPHREY STREET OVERLAY DISTRICT

P. Kane handed out edits made in the Overlay Districts table of uses, and briefly explained the modifications, that hotels or inns in residential areas of Humphrey Street Overlay would need a special permit from the ZBA or go through Planning Board. P. Kane also explained that motels would not be allowed in any A3 district, and only allowed in B1 through the ZBA. P. Kane stated that Bed and Breakfast's would need a site-plan special permit.

The Board had no questions.

MOTION : by A. Ippolito to submit to the Board of Selectmen for inclusion on the Warrant, seconded by J.R. Young, unanimously approved.

DISCUSSION – POTENTIAL 40B DEVELOPMENT, 133 PURITAN ROAD

A. Ippolito mentioned that she will submit comments to MassHousing regarding the locations site eligibility, and that the comments would focus on safety on the site and state the list of actions that the Planning Department has done to increase affordable housing in Town. A. Ippolito mentioned that she would send the letter to each member separately. G. Potts and P. Kane discussed the process for building within the 100-foot barrier. P. Kane discussed and clarified the next steps for the Board.

MOTION : by J.R. Young to adjourn, seconded by B. Isler, unanimously approved, meeting adjourned at 11:10 PM.

Andrew Levin
Assistant Town Planner