



TOWN OF SWAMPSCOTT

PLANNING BOARD

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

MEMBERS

ANGELA IPPOLITO, CHAIR
JEFFREY BLONDER, VICE CHAIR
CLINTON BENCH
GEORGE POTTS
JR YOUNG

STAFF

HELEN KENNEDY, SECRETARY
S. PETER KANE, TOWN PLANNER

JANUARY 12, 2015 MEETING MINUTES

Time: 7:05– 9:45 pm

Location: Swampscott Senior Center, 200 Essex St (rear)

Members Present: A. Ippolito, C. Bench, J. Blonder (arrived at 8p), G. Potts, JR Young

Members Absent: none

Others Present: Pete Kane (Town Planner), William DiMento (attorney), Lisa Carangelo (applicant), Peter Pitman (architect), Julie Jensen (owner), Dr. Peter Barker (applicant), Kenneth Shutzer (attorney), Robert McCann (attorney), Bruce Paradise (resident)

Meeting called to order at 7:05 pm by Chair Angela Ippolito.

MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve minutes of November and December 2014 meetings made by JR Young, seconded and unanimously approved.

PETITION 14-30

11 BAY VIEW AVENUE

Petition of Lisa Carangelo to make additions (garage, rear addition, rear deck, front entry portico) to an existing nonconforming structure.

Attorney DiMento distributed a satellite image of property and an assessor's map. This project would be on the side of Ms. Carangelo's property next to Myron Stone, where the space "is tight." Petitioner requesting relief for front entrance to build a pathway between property line and garage to be able to access from rear of property. Seeking relief on side yard setback. Height of building (18'8") will be unchanged. Changes will improve the front of Carangelo residence.

Sam Stone, son of Myron Stone of 15-17 Bay View Ave, spoke on behalf of his father, telling the Board his father is the abutter most directly affected and the proposed addition would create a little bit of a tunnel effect. If they had their preference, it would not happen.

Attorney DiMento: They are looking for 2.5' of side yard relief for the garage. Loss of view for neighbors across the street would be huge if they instead had to build upwards.

Chair Ippolito asked if they had considered bringing the garage into the house. Mr. DiMento remarked that doing so would reduce so much of the house space. Ms. Carangelo told the Board this was about her tenth attempt at a redesign for the house. Sam Stone remarked that it would feel better if there were no structure in the driveway (planned location of garage). A. Ippolito mentioned that space is very tight on that side of the property.

There are two air conditioning units on the right side which will be very quiet.

JR Young said he feels the distance is too close. A. Ippolito confirmed that it's a tough call, would rather not see it come so close to neighbor's yard. Noted concerns about fire access. Maybe there's an opportunity to pull it back into the house somehow.

Sam Stone said that any work performed in the backend of the house would not impact them in terms of views. But he remarked that the garage is essentially a building in the driveway where there has never been any structures. G. Potts stated that the best thing to do would be to rearrange it to address the Stone's concern.

Town Planner Kane asked if they looked at putting the garage on the back and utilizing the old right-of-way at the back of the property. Mr. DiMento said they didn't want to move with that option because it would mean accessing Greenwood Avenue on a steep slope, too dangerous in winter months.

A. Ippolito: Not comfortable recommending to Zoning Board of Appeals when it's so tight. It's a lovely plan, but I'm very concerned about the tight space.

Mr. DiMento said that there was an earlier plan to build a second story but they decided that would have an impact on the neighborhood.

G. Potts moved to recommend favorable action to the ZBA except for the garage due to the tight space to the adjacent property; seconded and unanimously approved.

PETITION 14-31

30 MANTON ROAD

Petition of Seger Architects to remove existing two-car garage and build new breezeway and two-car garage with room above.

Representative of Seger Architects explained this petition would remove existing garage and replace with attached garage and breezeway. Addition would include a mud room with exercise room above. Front yard is non-conforming; large driveway, move garage closer to the street. It's important to save the existing trees. Brick pavers will be used at entrance to mud room.

A. Ippolito recommended that the petitioner have a locus plan with building footprints of surrounding properties for the ZBA hearing. She asked if they could clarify if there will be more or less asphalt? The response was that there will be more land coverage but less building. A. Ippolito suggested that they use more opportunity around the edge of the driveway and building by using other materials than asphalt. The petitioner noted that the new garage will be located on land that is currently covered by the driveway.

C. Bench then inquired about stormwater. They discussed the amount of lot coverage (both building and hardscape). From the application, it appears the coverage is increasing from 25% to 28% but the calculations may be wrong for open space. Petitioner said he would revise the plans with the correct calculations. A. Ippolito suggest that the Planning Board make a recommendation that drywells be used so all runoff is not directed into the driveway.

C. Bench moved to recommend favorable action with comments that drainage will not be directed toward street. Motion seconded and unanimously approved.

Board member J. Blonder arrived at 8:10p.

15ANR-1

250 & 270 PARADISE ROAD

Approval-Not-Required application to create a parcel “B” from 270 Paradise Road and merge it with 250 Paradise Road, while also creating a parcel “A” from 250 Paradise Road and merging it with 270 Paradise Road. Properties will retain original lot square footage and street frontage. Properties: Map 14, Lots 76A, 214, 215, 216.

Attorney Shutzer and Dr. Barker explained to the Board that when the building was constructed at 250 Paradise Road, there was a lot of chipping which required a fence to control chipping material. This ANR can help improve the maintenance of the cliff.

Town Planner Kane noted that the two properties are in different zoning districts. The ANR will cause parcels to be in mixed zoning districts. He pointed out that the properties have street frontage as required for an ANR.

Dr. Barker said that the swap will make it easier to clear up loose rock. G. Potts asked if an easement could just be created instead. Dr. Barker responded that they would prefer outright property rights.

C. Bench moved to accept the subdivision plan 15ANR-1 as approval not required. Seconded by JR Young, unanimously approved.

ZONING AMENDMENT REQUEST

Bruce Paradise asked the Planning Board to consider recommending a zoning change for three properties from A-3 to B-2. The properties in question are 129 Essex St (Parcel 6-195), unnumbered Pitman Rd (Parcel 6-198), and 35 Pitman Rd (Parcel 6-199). This also includes rezoning 21 Elm Place (Parcel 6-118) which is both B-2 and A-3 to just B-2. *Continuation from previous meeting*

Attorney McCann distributed documents to the Board showing various details of the parcels in question. He told the Board the neighborhood is mostly residential. All commercial uses would be replaced by 100% residential use. Attorney McCann said Mr. Paradise would need support of the Planning Board to get approval at Town Meeting.

Mr. McCann said an A3 would allow them to do up to 8-unit structures. The B2 designation would mean a larger residential structure would have to go through site plan review process and ZBA for special permit, pointing out the green area on the handout that would be area to be built. He doesn't have the elevation information. The current concept is one-, two- and three-bedroom units in the building. This presentation is a very preliminary concept of what could go there. Mr. Paradise currently owns all the property in the proposal. He doesn't know what the square footage would be – it would be a four-story building with parking underground and a courtyard. With exception of height, open space will be maintained but may have an effect with overall height.

J. Blonder asked where the vehicle entrance to the site would be located. Mr. Paradise pointed out that the site abuts three different roads but the vehicle access into the garage would be from Elm Place.

A. Ippolito inquired if they had looked into accessibility to the train station from this development. They have thought about it but haven't looked into it yet.

Planner Kane reminded the Board that the request is to change the zoning from A3 to B2, not necessarily this particular project. He said that the B2 designation opens the door to many possibly uses which is what the Board should be looking at.

A. Ippolito confirmed that what they are looking for is Planning Board support. She said to do that, she has to be able to say to Town Meeting the reasons this is a good plan.

Attorney McCann noted that the whole area has turned residential. Mr. Paradise said he knows the residents currently living on the property. This would be a lot easier for them to deal with (not having warehouses next door). This property is about two acres where 120 units could be constructed. The Zoning Board of Appeals would have control over dimensions.

Planner Kane said he wouldn't recommend a zoning change, but suggested a zoning overlay such as the 40R smart growth overlay recently adopted for the General Glover site. It would allow for a project similar to the one presented, but not open the door to other options that the B2 designation would create.

Mr. McCann said they had looked at 40R but the commercial tax rate in town is prohibitive. Mr. Kane noted that the current 40R bylaw in Swampscott allows for mixed use or solely multifamily. He also said that overlays are less contentious because it provides property owners options – either go with the standard underlying zoning or file with the 40R which provides for increased density while creating community benefits.

Mr. McCann pointed out that Essex St is a congested school zone. The multifamily building would create less congestion than the businesses currently there. P. Kane stated that may not be completely true; a traffic study would be needed. It may also be possible to make Elm Place a one-way street to help better direct vehicles and reduce the intersection issues in the vicinity, maybe even relocate the traffic light at Burpee Road.

P. Kane suggested that the Planning Board recommend an overlay for the general area due to the accessibility to bus lines and the train station. A. Ippolito said that a 40R would provide Mr. Paradise with the option to file for his current concept. There's a lot more to be said in a positive fashion if there is an overlay. We already have it for the General Glover site. Design guidelines have already been laid out, lot of flexibility which might be helpful. P. Kane said he would send additional information about the town's 40R to McCann/Paradise. A. Ippolito stated that a 40R will help deal with a lot of potential issues.

The Board closed the discussion with McCann/Paradise planning to looking into a 40R overlay recommendation instead.

SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS

JR Young and G. Potts will work with Planner Kane to begin revising the current subdivision rules & regulations. Planner Kane noted that there's been an increased focus on stormwater management in town and they should

make sure to emphasize and strengthen this portion of the rules & regs (such as requiring all stormwater be retaining on properties by actions such as drywells).

HUMPHREY STREET OVERLAY DISTRICT

A. Ippolito said it'll be important that they articulate the "vision" for Humphrey St when presenting the new bylaw language. She and P. Kane are working with Peter Spellios; there are weak spots in this material, e.g. the use table is confusing, there are gaps in number of units and what the maximum number of units should be. Per Spellios: this doesn't tell you what you can do, it tells you what you can't do.

A. Ippolito said it will help to have renderings of the redevelopment of the Hawthorne property. How do we increase the beautification of buildings, need structure of how to make it happen.

P. Kane noted that unlike last May, the Board shouldn't have Town Meeting vote on design guidelines – those should be a Planning Board decision. He also suggested it's important to not focus solely on Hawthorne.

C. Bench suggested articulating some vision that will include details of "placemaking."

A. Ippolito said that a clearly articulated vision will then lead to a strong bylaw.

A. Ippolito and P. Kane are suggesting to have step meetings:

1. Present the vision,
2. Define the design guidelines,
3. Present the bylaw that would have to be voted on by Town Meeting.

MASTER PLAN

P. Kane said that the Town is close to securing MAPC to do the work on the new master plan. As part of that process, there will need to be a Master Plan Committee with a representative from each precinct and many town boards. The Board discussed who would appoint the committee and accept applications – most likely the Board of Selectmen. P. Kane asked the members to think about possibly being the representative from the Planning Board on the Master Plan Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

Helen Kennedy
Planning Board Secretary