



TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

OFFICE OF THE

PLANNING BOARD

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

MEMBERS

PATRICK JONES, CHAIR
ANGELA IPPOLITO, VICE CHAIR
SYLVIA BELKIN
JEFFREY BLONDER
GEORGE POTTS

STAFF

HELEN KENNEDY, SECRETARY
S. PETER KANE, TOWN PLANNER

JULY 9, 2012 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 7:03 - 10:00 pm

Location: Swampscott Senior Center

Members Present: P. Jones, A. Ippolito, S. Belkin, J. Blonder

Members Not Present: G. Potts

Others Present: Pete Kane (Town Planner), Kenneth Shutzer (attorney), Tomasz & Jerzy Wabno (petitioners), Tom Groom (petitioner), Bill Bergeron (engineer), Jim Velleco (architect), William DiMento (attorney), Stewart Lytle (press - Patch), Neal Zolot (press - Reporter), Cyrus Moulton (press - Daily Item), 40+ residents (see attached sign-in sheets)

Meeting called to order at 7:03 pm.

Chair Jones informed the public that due to the scope of the 12SPR-2 review (71 Greenwood Ave), the desire to provide equal time to each petition, and the need to adjourn by 10pm, it may be necessary to request continuing reviews into the August meeting.

MEETING MINUTE REVIEW & APPROVAL

Board members reviewed meeting minutes from June 11 meeting. P. Jones abstained (was not present for June meeting). S. Belkin moved to approve. Unanimous approval of the minutes.

12SPR-2 - 71 GREENWOOD AVENUE (REDEVELOPMENT OF OLD MIDDLE SCHOOL SITE)

P. Jones opened the review of 12SPR-2 and explained the application to the public. This is a PDD (planned development district) which requires an administrative site plan review by the Planning Board. Based on the design of the proposed project, the developer has also filed a zoning relief application which is going before the ZBA on July 18.

Attorney William DiMento then introduced the project team - Tom Groom (developer), Jim Velleco (architect), Bill Bergeron (site engineer), and James Emmanuel (landscape architect).

Bill Bergeron of Hayes Engineering presented the existing conditions of the site - 73% impervious due to building coverage and pavement. Eastern corner is vegetated with a significant grade change. There is currently no drainage into Greenwood Avenue. Most current drainage goes over the rear hill down to Fuller

Ave (without catchment system). There is no stormwater treatment system at the site. There are two driveway access points from Greenwood Ave, but the crest of the hill/road is between these two egresses. There is now a natural gas line into the current building.

Mr. Bergeron then presented the proposed conditions. New drive access moved – one access point at the crest of the hill. Safer and less curb-cut required into Greenwood Ave. Two stormwater systems will be installed – one under the northerly parking area and one under the southwest access to the roundabout. The footprint of the building has been minimized to reduce needed excavations. Roof runoff is directed to the larger northern catch system. The stormwater piping will then slowly release water back into the ground. Parking lot runoff is treated and then connected to the existing drainage system to Fuller. A gas trap system will be installed for the garage. Site access has been reviewed by the Fire Department to ensure full fire truck access and maneuvering. They have identified a number of areas at the site for snow removal/storage. Based on the by-law parking requirements, the development will need 82 parking spaces. They are proposing 87 spaces which meets the requirement and adds two handicap spots and three general visitor spots. They've reduced the impervious cover to 53%. Open space at the proposed development will be 43.7%. The traffic report projects that there will be 25 trips in the morning (peak) and 29 trips in the evening (peak). It also projects a total of 296 vehicles per average weekday (throughout the course of the day).

Jim Velleco explained his architectural experience in the region. He then detailed how they went about deciding siting the building. By making it perpendicular to the street, it helps to appear smaller from the public way. They oriented it in the center of the site to maximize setbacks. The front door is located on the southern side so that primary traffic coming up Greenwood Ave will view the primary access into the building and creates a welcome orientation. The building includes 41 units with garage-level parking. The street is residential – with a dense nature and varying roof forms, bowed windows and terraces. They carried these aspects into the design of the building. Current building is ~99,000 sf; the proposed building is 86,000 sf. The existing building peak (not cupola) is 196 ft above sea level which means its 71 ft tall. The proposed building peaks at 185 ft above sea level and is 60 ft tall. The materials for the building exterior include: brick and wood along the garden-level (garage) and first floor; 2nd and 3rd floor exteriors will be shingles; 4th floor will feature clapboard exterior. There are also gazebos and pergola at the ground level by the primary entrance. The garage entrance is located on the north side and depressed. A fitness room is provided in the garage level. The building is predominantly two-bed (a few one- and three-bed units). The building foundation is concrete with steel and concrete for the first two floors.

A. Ippolito asked how much of the building will be within the existing building's footprint – 80%.

J. Blonder asked if the ground renderings include views of existing surrounding buildings – no.

A. Ippolito asked “what is the need for the two accessory garages?” Project team answered that the garage parking allows some residents to have a choice in space. The accessory garages could also be designed to accommodate ADA-vans as the underground garage is not meant for these vehicles. The team is currently looking into providing bicycle storage at the site per the Town Planner's recommendation. A. Ippolito suggested that maybe one of the garages be used for the bicycle storage. Project team is also looking into a recycling location near the trash dumpster (currently working with the Health Director).

J. Blonder asked if it's possible for building residents to look down into Fuller Ave residences. Velleco answered that they will look into it.

P. Jones then closed the presentation and opened the session to public comment.

Mr. DiMento then asked if it would be possible for supporters to stand – about half of the room was acknowledged as supporters (no formal count taken).

Attorney Ken Shutzer (representing 10 neighbors in opposition to project) spoke on behalf of his clients. Existing is an 1894 school prior to zoning and most homes there. Issue shouldn't be about existing condition. He went into the zoning by-law of 5.4.0.0 with regards to a PDD. Also explained reasons why (based on 5.4.8.1-5.4.8.9) the project doesn't work. They believe it does not fit for the neighborhood. He suggested that the unit count and size is not appropriate. He then stated how the Board is allowed to vote based on the bylaw language. He asked for clarity on visitor parking. Also asked if a shadow study had been done – answer was no.

P. Jones answered Mr. Shutzer's questions and verified that the ZBA will be reviewing the zoning relief request. Mr. Shutzer clarified that this site plan review is independent from the ZBA review.

Ellie Miller (57 Greenwood Ave) asked if 41 units is maximum allowed – answer was yes. She stated that the neighborhood currently doesn't have 41 families. How does it fit? Homes were built in harmony with the hill and harbor. Traffic will be horrendous – this project means possible doubling of traffic. "We need to be protected."

Fiona Barrett (72 Greenwood Ave) wanted clarification about entrance/exit and how will it work with existing traffic pattern. How will on-street parking work? Will there be sidewalks and stone wall retained for pedestrian safety? How will it look from a distance? What will construction period be?

Michael Burke (25 Fuller Ave) asked what environmental actions will be taken during the demolition.

Susan Munafo (Walker Rd) asked if the PDD was passed at Town Meeting to allow up to 41 units – answer was yes, 41 was set as a maximum allowed. She stated she was concerned with the density of the building. The Building Committee had suggested retaining the school building's façade. A. Ippolito answered that the RFP for that concept didn't receive acceptable proposals. Façade retention was removed from the next RFP requirement (as voted on by Town Meeting).

Ellen Winkler (15 Greenwood Tr) stated that primary vehicle movement (in proposed parking lot) will be along Greenwood Terrace side (behind their properties). Lights and noise from cars – pointed out there doesn't seem to be much screening proposed to protect against this.

Michael McClung (Fuller Ave) spoke as an abutter rather than Finance Committee member. Asked for noise, dust, and hazardous material mitigation efforts during construction. Asked for clarification about vehicle trips – answer was that, broken down, there would be one car every 2.5 minutes during the morning peak period.

Mr. D'Agostino (resident) asked how will emissions in the garage be handled.

Eileen Norcott (53 Fuller Ave) stated she was concerned with stormwater. Asked how the project will increase stormwater onto Fuller Ave.

P. Jones stated that more detail should be provided regarding the screening from the parking lot. Also advised that more detail should be given about the dumpster.

Fred Philips (57 Greenwood Ave) said he was concerned with parking. Movie crew is currently parking at the site and has about 40 vehicles there – it feels obscene.

Myron Stone (15 Bay View Ave) stated he was in support of the project. Said that the traffic when it was a school was far worse and this project will not be near as bad. Doesn't understand how people didn't speak up before (when rezoning of the property was proposed and when RFPs were released).

Connie Goudreau (61 Greenwood Ave) stated she was also in support. Feels the traffic and noise concerns are over bloated and that in reality the situation with the proposed building will make things better.

J. Blonder motioned to continue the site plan review of the project until the next meeting. Unanimous approval by the Board.

PETITION 12-16 & 12SPR-1 – 19 & 21 BUENA VISTA STREET (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW TWO-FAMILY HOMES – ONE PER PROPERTY)

P. Jones opened the reviews and stated that the two applications would be reviewed together as both properties are being developed together and share a common driveway.

Tomasz Wabno provided an overview of their plans. The two residential buildings will be over 3,000 sf each which means both require site plan special permit. The property at #19 doesn't have the required frontage and therefore is seeking ZBA relief.

They intend to replace the dilapidated single-family homes on both properties and increase fire access. They will improve the property landscape and building character.

J. Blonder asked why trees were being removed. Two need to be taken down so the drive can be widened a bit for fire access.

P. Jones asked about the property line revision shown in the plans. Asked why the petition hadn't filed an ANR (approval not required) to subdivide a portion of #21 and add it to #19 as shown in the plans. Petitioner stated they weren't yet the owners of the property when they filed the plans which would have made the ANR request difficult. They are now the owners and can file that application.

J. Blonder asked if all fire concerns were met in the plans (revised site and landscape plans were provided at the meeting). Answer was yes. Because they will be installing sprinkler systems in the buildings, the Fire Dept approved their revised site/landscape plans.

There will be no blasting as there are no plans for basements in the buildings. They will be doing the construction themselves through their own company.

P. Jones asked about materials. Tomasz Wabno stated that there will be no vinyl used, instead hardiplank. They also plan on using energy-efficient windows.

P. Kane asked about the location of the AC units which appear on the side of the homes (essentially along the street side). Tomasz Wabno answered that due to the grade and trees, the units will not be visible from the street.

P. Jones asked about the fencing shown in the renderings. Tomasz Wabno clarified that the existing fencing will be taken down and there will be no new fencing added. The fencing in the rendering was used to represent the property line. The existing 6' tall fencing along the property line with #39 Buena Vista St will be kept.

Jerzy Wabno stated that most of the trees to be removed to create the hammerhead driveway are young (under 12' tall).

PETITION 12-16 – 19 BUENA VISTA STREET

J. Blonder motioned for favorable recommendation to the ZBA with condition of review and approval of site utility plans by DPW. Unanimously approved.

12SPR-1 – 21 BUENA VISTA STREET

P. Jones motioned for approval of the site plan special permit based on the revised site plan and landscape plans (dated 7/9/2012) with the condition of review and approval of site utility plans by DPW. J. Blonder seconded. Unanimously approved.

ZONING BYLAW REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

P. Jones suggested that the Planning Board move forward with creating the subcommittee (by essentially reconstituting the former Zoning Bylaw Review Committee). Stated that the subcommittee will be chaired by a representative from the Planning Board. The Board will advertise for interested parties to join the subcommittee by sending a letter of interest to the Town Planner. Board members then discussed the benefits of having a standing subcommittee (allows the Board to focus on site plan reviews and master plan, provides constant review of bylaws). J. Blonder suggested the subcommittee focus on a small number of items at a time. Selectwoman Sullivan has stated she would like to be on the subcommittee. Town Planner was requested to write a piece for the Swampscott Patch and send a letter to the Board of Selectmen about the subcommittee creation. Chair Jones will reach out to the ZBA to request a representative from that board to sit on the subcommittee.

COMMUNITY SURVEY REPORT

P. Jones motioned to approve the report dated April 9, 2012. Unanimously approved.

COMMUNITY PRESERVATION ACT

J. Blonder had brought up the subject due to the previous defeat when CPA was brought to vote in Town. Feels it is worth trying again, considering the proposed changes to the system at the state level. New rules will

allow funds to be used on existing parks/open space (previously could only be used to create new parks).
Funding from state is proposed to be doubled.

Motion to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

S. Peter Kane
Town Planner



TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

OFFICE OF THE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

S. PETER KANE
TOWN PLANNER &
ENERGY EFFICIENCY MANAGER

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

SIGN-IN SHEET

Planning Board
(Meeting/Event)

9 July 2012
(Date)

NAME	ADDRESS	AFFILIATION
Jan Abbott	28 Greenwood Ter.	Neighbor
Fiona Baron	72 Greenwood Ave	Neighbor Abutter.
Linda S Hinchey	4 Didio Rd	
Jay Keely	31 Greenwood Terr.	Abutter
Ellen Winkler	15 Greenwood Ter	Abutter
Ted Empe	20 Greenwood Ter.	neighbor
Karen Engle	20 Greenwood Ter	Neighbor
Freddy Therap	57 Greenwood Ave	Abutter
Esie Miller	97 Greenwood Ave	Abutter
Eileen Norcott	53 Fuller Ave	Abutter
Neill Norcott	53 Fuller Ave	Abutter
Scott Rosenbery	95 Greenwood Avenue	Abutter
Dan Santandello	6 Supreme Ct	Supporter
Michael Burke	25 Fuller Ave	Neighbor
Andrew Epstein	99 Rockwood St.	Neighbor - ^{NOT ENOUGH PARKING} IN OPPOSITE DIRECTION ^{TRAFFIC}
Jill Sullivan	43 Lincoln House Pt	Selectman + supporter
Benny Goudreau	61 Greenwood Ave	abutter
Cornel Goudreau	61 Greenwood Ave	Abutter
Walter Marshall	14 Northwick Ave	Careworn Citizen
Bob Cary	20 Fuller Ave	Abutter
Janet Morrison	- - -	-
Denise Seiberg	57 Fuller Ave	abutter

