



# 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

# OCTOBER 17, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

**Time:** 7:00 – 9:50 pm  
**Location:** Swampscott Senior Center, 200 Essex Street (rear)  
**Members Present:** A. Ippolito, B. Quinn, G. Potts, J.R. Young  
**Members Absent:** B. Isler  
**Others Present:** Pete Kane (Dir. of Community Development), George & Sara Wattendorf (petitioner), Sylvia Belkin (Historical Commission), Rick Jakious (resident), Tony Roossien (architect), Fred Phillips (resident)

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

## MEETING MINUTES

The Board reviewed the minutes from the September 9th, 2016 meeting. There were no comments from the Board members.

MOTION : by G. Potts to approve the meeting minutes, seconded by B. Quinn, unanimously approved.

## SITE PLAN REVIEW

PETITION 16-30

57 ROCKLAND STREET

This filing is a request by GEORGE AND SARA WATTENDORF for the construction of a new 2-family residence. Applicant is seeking a Dimensional Special Permit to reduce front setback from 20' to 16.5 feet, and a Site Plan Special Permit for construction of a 2 family residence containing more than 3,000 SF of gross floor area. Applicant will demolish existing structure.

A. Ippolito began the site plan review by reviewing the proposed plan maps and the petition provided to the Board.

B. Quinn asked if the Planning Board would be approving anything related to the petition tonight. A. Ippolito stated that the Board would only be making recommendations to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

G. Potts asked if there is a map which shows what the house looks like compared to the neighborhood. P. Kane (Director of Community Development) clarified that the name of said map G. Potts is describing is a "LOCUS" map.

A. Ippolito stated the plans provided by Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf as well as the petition provided does not include such a map. A. Ippolito continued to explain as well as show the petitioners and Planning Board members on the map what a locus map would look like, as well as what needs to be included in a locus map. A. Ippolito stated the petitioners need to include distances from and lot lines for all the properties abutting theirs, P. Kane clarified that the maps currently provided need more context, and that they should show the entire building footprint of all abutting properties. A. Ippolito continued to mention that she wants to see what the abutting properties and homes look like in comparison.

B. Quinn asked if there is only one abutter for the retaining wall. A. Ippolito replied there is only one.

Mr. Wattendorf then brought to the Board a map which he believed satisfied the stronger context concerns brought up by the Board. P. Kane explained to Mr. Wattendorf that this map as well is not specific enough, A. Ippolito agreed with ;this.

Mr. Wattendorf mentioned he would bring a more a specific and complete map to the ZBA meeting on October 26.

Mr. Wattendorf then brought forward to the Board a revised plan for the proposed retaining wall.

Mr. Wattendorf explained that the revised plan shows the new design of the wall. Mr. Wattendorf said that he had gone over the revised retaining wall plan with his abutter, Mr. Rick Jakious (who is present), and that the new plan has two retaining walls being built, one connected wall and a terraced area with a second wall above. P. Kane stated that this revised plan would also need to be presented at the ZBA meeting.

A. Ippolito reviewed the plan making sure the heights and grade were labeled on the plan which they were.

A. Ippolito then asked the petitioner to describe their proposed plan for the demolition of the existing structure and reconstruction of a new two-family home.

Before the petitioner began, A. Ippolito described her observations of the existing house on the property, as well as what she believed the petitioner wanted to do, such as demolish and build new. She continued to describe the historic nature of the current house, and that due to this historical significance designation, the property went thru a 9-month demolition delay which was now up. A. Ippolito continued to state that according to Town bylaws, the petitioner now needs to present to the ZBA and have complete approval of their plans before they begin any work on the site.

A. Ippolito stated that even if Mr. Wattendorf had previously dumped fill or other material in site preparation, he should stop immediately and not do any more preparation before approvals are granted or denied.

A. Ippolito continued to explain to the Board that the Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf are looking to exercise their right to demolish the existing house on the property, and that the Planning Board's obligation is to make sure their proposed plans for construction satisfies the Planning Board site plan review. A. Ippolito continued to explain that the Planning Board would does not grant any permits, that is for ZBA to decide, but that the Planning Board makes recommendations with possibility of conditions for the ZBA and Petitioner to follow.

A. Ippolito asked for a description of the proposed two-family house and what the intention of the petitioner. She then explained the next steps of the meeting, that the Petitioner would go through questions with the Board, then next steps to be completed before moving forward to Zoning Board.

A. Ippolito opened up the meeting for Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf to explain.

Mr. Wattendorf began by explaining that he wants to build a two-family home on the property which the zoning allows for. The home will consist of an indoor garage with room for 3 cars, 2 spaces for the “main house” and 1 for “apartment” and then two satellite spots in driveway in front of the garage, for a total of 5 spots.

In consideration of and talks with the abutters, Mr. Wattendorf wants to build the house close to the street. Mr. Wattendorf said that he had heard he is allowed a 20% allowance (4 feet in their case) A. Ippolito then asked from whom he had heard this. The Petitioner did not mention for who he had heard this, and explained he could not remember who specifically told him. The Petitioner mentioned by keeping the house forward, towards the street, it is helping preserve the neighbor’s view of the water at the back. Mr. Wattendorf continued to state that he wants to make the yard more usable than it currently is, and that currently, it is very difficult to take care of the yard due to its grade. Mr. Wattendorf went on to describe the layout of the new construction. He mentioned they are looking for one floor living for him and Mrs. Wattendorf, with guest bedrooms and that he believes they have picked an architectural design that will fit in with the neighborhood.

A. Ippolito described the 20% set back by special permit, and that the property is in a A3 zoned area, which means they can request a special permit from the ZBA, but that the ZBA might not grant it. A.Ippolito continued to explain the dimensional requirements that the property will need to have. She continued to state the back of the proposed home and the sides meet the requirements, but that the proposed front does not.

G. Potts mentioned that there could be a possibility of a tradeoff, and gave example of by building closer, less in the back.

A. Ippolito then asked the Board to discuss and review the proposed plans.

G. Potts asked if there was a plan which shows the current house. The plan G. Potts was describing was provided and shown to him.

G. Potts then asked about the proposed retaining wall and the setback and measurements. Mr. Wattendorf showed the measurements and setbacks on the proposed plan provided.

G. Potts asked about the clarifications and descriptions on the provided plans. Mr. Wattendorf then explained in more detail for the Board the plans that were provided.

G. Potts asked if there was something that showed the site plan of the lot. A. Ippolito then showed G. Potts that plan.

A. Ippolito mentioned to Mr. Wattendorf that they need to clearly their labels on the plans for the ZBA meeting.

The Board and Mr. Wattendorf continued to discuss the provided plans.

G. Potts asked if the garage will be three big doors facing the street. Mr. Wattedendorf explained it will be two doors, one larger door, and one smaller door, and that currently there is a 2 ½ car garage on the property. A. Ippolito described this current parking structure as looking like a barn.

G. Potts asked Mr. Wattendorf if he was the architect; Mr. Wattendorf stated he is not but that he is the contractor.

G. Potts asked about if during construction, why Mr. Wattendorf would not be keeping one specific wall on the property. Petitioner said that they are not going to demolish most of house and leave just one wall, which is why he considered the setback.

G. Potts asked about a tree shown on the plan. The Petitioner stated that the tree had already been removed and explained that the tree was smaller than 12-inch caliper and “OK” to remove without approval.

A. Ippolito asked if there will be central air in the proposed home. Mr. Wattendorf confirmed there would be. A. Ippolito asked Mr. Wattendorf where the AC unit would go. He mentioned he hadn’t considered a spot yet. A. Ippolito explained to Mr. Wattendorf that most people buffer their units and that in populated neighborhood most homeowners and neighbors want them concealed. A. Ippolito recommended that the unit could possibly be put in the back of the home.

A. Ippolito continued to discuss with Mr. Wattendorf the drainage plan for the proposed property as well as the current plan for terracing. She stated that there should be a drainage plan showing where the water will be going. G. Potts mentioned that this could be done with something like a drainage water storage tank. Mr. Wattendorf mentioned the current grade on the yard was only 2 percent and the land is permeable, so water drainage shouldn’t be a problem. P. Kane asked Mr. Wattendorf where the water from the house will drain to? Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that water would drain off roof and continue down to the yard.

P. Kane asked Mr. Wattendorf if he had any storm water calculations done for the proposed design and construction on the property. Mr. Wattendorf stated that there had been none. P. Kane stated that these calculations are needed to make sure neighbors and properties down grade are not flooded by drainage from the property. Mr. Wattendorf said that he would have the storm water calculations done. A. Ippolito reiterated that this is a good idea because the back of the house will be altered with the terracing and planting proposal, and that this can cause a shift in the previous drainage. A. Ippolito mentioned that the backyard being permeable is good, but that there needs to be drainage mitigation set up to make sure storm water doesn’t overcome the drainage system and possibly flood neighbors down flow, and that Mr. Wattendorf should consider this.

G. Potts mentioned that there could be a catch basin put in for the retaining wall.

P. Kane stated to Mr. Wattendorf that it is good to get “approvals” before doing site work, to not do anything premature and risk it having to be un-done and the financial loses this would incur.

In regards to the proposed garage, G. Potts asked if the doors on the garage will open overhead, or be styled like a carriage house garage. Mr. Wattendorf said the garage would have two separate doors, and that the doors will “roll” up.

A. Ippolito described the proposed plans on the maps to the Board. A. Ippolito described a first floor and a second floor, and that the second living space attached to the home has one floor living, and a second-floor bedroom. A. Ippolito

asked if there is a basement, to which Mr. Wattendorf said there is. A. Ippolito asked if any bedrooms in the basement, to which Mr. Wattendorf replied there will be none.

A. Ippolito asked if there will be a bathroom in the basement, to which Mr. Wattendorf replied there was not one planned currently.

G. Potts asked if the basement was included in the square footage provided in the application. Mr. Wattendorf and P. Kane mentioned that it was not. P. Kane then explained that because it does not exceed a certain size requirement, that it does not have to be added to the gross square footage.

A. Ippolito continued the discussion by explaining what the Planning Board is looking for when administering a site plan review. Some of these points, A. Ippolito mentioned, include traffic flow and safety (including parking). A. Ippolito explained that this property would be required to have a total of 3 off street parking spots (1 ½ spots per home in that specific zoned area), which the proposed plan satisfies.

A. Ippolito explained to the meeting that the front of the property (the street side), specifically the garage, is where Mr. Wattendorf will be requesting dimensional relief from the ZBA. A. Ippolito continued to state Mr. Wattendorf is seeking a Dimensional Special permit to reduce the amount of setback from the structure from 20 feet to 16.5 feet.

A. Ippolito and the Board discussed a plan of the proposed driveway and garage. The Board discussed the measurements for the driveway, and mentioned the plans make it look as if there is enough room even with buffering to fit cars in the garage, but that the spaces in front of the garage are in a spot where cars might encroach on the public sidewalk.

P. Kane clarified that in the Town bylaws, a parking space is defined as being 9' x 18' long, and if Mr. Wattendorf was to have a guest park in front of the garage, then they would be inhibiting the sidewalk which is against bylaws. P. Kane said that even though a car could park parallel, Mr. Wattendorf should not be building this property with the design for error.

Mr. Wattendorf explained the garage needs to be positioned forward due to the size of the proposed house. If the garage was to be moved back, the proposed house would also be pushed back, and the footprint would then be impeding the abutter's view of the ocean. Mr. Wattendorf does not want to change the size and design of the proposed house. He mentioned that he could move the garage back, closer to the abutters, but this is something Mr. Wattendorf and the abutters do not want to do.

B. Quinn brought up the possibility of removing from the proposal a hallway off of the garage which would help reduce the house's footprint. This removal would make it possible to move the garage back which would then satisfy the required setbacks. Mr. Wattendorf was not open to this idea.

B. Quinn continued the discussion with A. Ippolito about removing the hallway from the garage to the house and that it could possibly make enough room to move garage back.

Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that people/guests can park sideways in front of his proposed garage and that on Rockland St there is on-street parking.

P. Kane asked about parking for the smaller unit on the house. Mr. Wattendorf explained the unit is for his daughter, and that her family has two cars. P. Kane mentioned that the proposed design currently is designed for error, because

the plans do not have the 18 feet required for a parking space in front of the garage, and that there is no way to mitigate and prohibit the ability of a car to park in front of garage. P. Kane mentioned to Mr. Wattendorf that he needs to be open to the ZBA, who might make changes to the design at their meeting.

An audience member then mentioned aloud that on-street parking can be hard to find on Rockland St.

A. Ippolito then asked the Board for comments.

G. Potts stated there is an issue, that there is not the required 18' in front of the garage for a parking space. B. Quinn mentioned that it is up to ZBA to approve dimensional relief, and that in his words, a "touchdown" would be to get the setback to 20 feet, which would not require relief. Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that he did not want to redesign the plans. But, B. Quinn mentioned that if a redesign was done, then Mr. Wattendorf would not have to seek relief from the Zoning Board or try and convince them. B. Quinn mentioned the Planning Board would be providing the Zoning Board with notes from both themselves (the Planning Board) and from public comment.

Mr. Wattendorf explained that the garage was being built as close to the street as it is, as a tradeoff with his neighbor. This is being done in consideration of the abutter and their view. This is why the garage is being built closer and why they are seeking relief for the setback.

A. Ippolito mentioned the notes passed on to the ZBA members from the Planning Board would mention the parking situation and lack of size.

A. Ippolito again explained some important factors Planning Board is looking for when doing site plan review. These included: fiscal impact, environmental impact, maximize vehicular and pedestrian safety, minimize visual intrusion from parking or storage, minimize glare from headlights and light, and compliance with provisions of zoning bylaw, which includes parking.

A. Ippolito asked about neighborhood character, and how the proposed design of the residence and property fits in.

A. Ippolito mentioned she had comments on the façade of the proposal and mentioned she knows the petitioners want to have it low in the front and then grow it larger in the back due to grade. Mr. Wattendorf agreed with this description.

A. Ippolito stated the roof height looks like it is in requirement, and asked about mean gradient measurement and asked if the map she had showed current slope? Mr. Wattendorf said that the average height is based on the slope now, the height averages out to 25 feet. Mr. Wattendorf said that there will be fill added, but that this will not raise the height shown on the proposed map, and that their average will be 22 feet, with 10 feet to spare.

A. Ippolito began a discussion about the landscape of the plan by looking at a topographic map showing a 2 percent grade of the property.

A. Ippolito asked about the engineer for the project and the proposed plan.

Mr. Wattendorf responded that he is using Hayes Engineering and that the mentioned map is in the packet provided to the Board.

A. Ippolito reviewed the map and asked the Board about any issues they might have with the height or slope shown.

P. Kane, using the projector in the meeting room, then put the map on the large screen for viewing.

A. Ippolito reiterated concerns about drainage.

A. Ippolito then asked the Board for any questions or concerns

P. Kane mentioned that his concerns and questions were in his notes provided to the Board.

P. Kane then brought up his note about the proposed retaining wall and that at one point the highest point on wall is 15 ½ feet, and mentioned that the landscaping being planted around wall needs to be ½ that height WHEN planted. Mr. Wattendorf replied that this should not be a problem.

G. Potts asked if there was landscaping plan provided, to which it was stated there is. P. Kane then went on to explain that if Mr. Wattendorf used the terracing technique in the corner of the property, then it should be done for the entirety of the wall. A. Ippolito agreed with this recommendation.

A. Ippolito mentioned the retaining wall good is idea, and that it is also good Mr. Wattendorf talked to the abutter about the terracing. A. Ippolito went on to explain that terracing will be a good solution instead of a large continuous wall.

A. Ippolito continued the discussion with more questions on the the backyard and terracing.

In regards to backyard safety, Mr. Wattendorf wants to put two fences up, one on top of each retaining wall. P. Kane mentioned that he would only need one, but for safety reasons Mr. Wattendorf wants to put two fences in. P. Kane mentioned again the idea of adding terracing in more places then what was only proposed. Mr. Wattendorf stated that he liked his current landscape plan and that the area P. Kane is recommending be terraced is so overgrown, that the wall if left, would not be noticeable. A. Ippolito mentioned that you can see the wall currently from Humphrey terrace, to which Mr. Wattendorf said that the wall is staying, and that the wall visible from Humphrey Terrace is not his property and that currently no one can see the wall on his property. Mr. Wattendorf explained that there is already an existing wall on his property, and that he will plant trees in front of it, and that the abutting property has tall trees as well which helps create a privacy wall.

P. Kane explained that for the ZBA meeting, Mr. Wattendorf needs to show pictures, which shows you cannot see his wall from Humphrey terrace, A. Ippolito and G. Potts agreed with this.

In regards to the type of retaining wall being built, A. Ippolito explained that she does not want to see a concrete wall. Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that the wall isn't going to be a concrete "looking" wall, but will be made out of blocks. P. Kane asked what the retaining wall blocks will be made of, Mr. Wattendorf explained concrete, but reiterated they will not look like concrete. A. Ippolito asked for the ZBA meeting this be clearly outlined. P. Kane and Mr. Wattendorf both stated it is, in the plans. A. Ippolito searched through the plans and found the information and agreed.

As a recommendation, A. Ippolito showed on the proposed maps how Mr. Wattendorf better present the wall on the maps.

Mr. Wattendorf then showed a side view of the wall on the large map provided. B. Potts asked about vegetation. Mr. Wattendorf asked if it needs to be outlined in detail, the Board agreed, yes.

A. Ippolito said the map should also show proposed drainage from the wall.

A. Ippolito asked Mr. Wattendorf to consider grade and other things with property for drainage.

A. Ippolito asked both the Board and P. Kane for any further questions or concerns.

P. Kane mentioned he had a comment regarding the application sent in by the petitioner. P. Kane continued to state that on the petition form where it asks for existing and proposed conditions, the petitioner under the existing conditions included square footage added on by including the basement, but on the proposed section it was not. P. Kane explained that the information provided was inaccurate and that on the existing it had five thousand plus feet, but that is with the basement included, but the house is really 4k (+/-) square feet. P. Kane said that if they are to include the square footage from the basement in the current, then it needs to be included in the proposed or if excluding it in current, then it must be excluded in both. Mr. Wattendorf believed the extra square-footage in the petition was from including the barn like structure on the property. P. Kane stated that it is not, and then stated that he had added that in to his own calculation and the extra square footage was from something else. P. Kane also mentioned that the extra square-footage did not cause any issues on the application. Mr. Wattendorf stated that he would ask his architect if he might have added the 7ft attic to the measurement. P. Kane stated that the architect probably did not, because that area is not taxable, as the architect is using the accessors data, Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that he would find out.

W. Quinn said the proposed height is 35 feet on the proposal, but it is actually only going to be 29 feet.

It was then mentioned that the existing plan shows 35 feet.

The Board and Mr. Wattendorf discussed the info put on the application, and the Board recommended cleaning up the labeling on the information before meeting with the ZBA.

A. Ippolito reiterated to Mr. Wattendorf to not continue site prep work until he has approvals.

A. Ippolito stated that she believed from the conversation, that Mr. Wattendorf is seeking relief so that their proposed house does not impede their neighbors view.

A. Ippolito moved onto the character of the proposed design for the property.

A. Ippolito mentioned that from what she can see from the maps, Mr. Wattendorf is trying to keep the street facing façade low, but the height increases in the back. A. Ippolito continued to state that it is hard to discuss a new building on the property, when there are so many older styled homes in the neighborhood.

A. Ippolito then received from audience member, who also is on the Historical Commission, recommendations for the proposed design and plan for the property. The Historical Commission members present mentioned that the Historical Commission hopes that Mr. Wattendorf takes into account the recommendation.

A. Ippolito and the Board reviewed the comments, and a recommended change to the house design sketched on the back of the recommendations.

A. Ippolito then went through the recommendations with Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf.

The Board and Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf discussed the proposed gables over the garage and proposed design of the house. P. Kane mentioned that the proposed gable over the proposed garage looks like just added space and that there wouldn't be living space there. G. Potts asked if there will be attic space, Mr. Wattendorf confirmed, that yes, there would be.

A Ippolito stated that the recommendations and proposed changes, the Historical Commission have recommended, have been done to help keep the character of the proposed home similar to the houses in the neighborhood, as well as have a smooth rhythm to the rooflines in the neighborhood. The recommendations also help separate the two living spaces on the proposed house. A. Ippolito thought that in accordance with the neighborhood characteristics, the historic districts sketch of the recommendations for the home would help keep it more similar with neighborhood characteristics.

G. Potts mentioned that the garage doors should not look like typical garage doors, and mentioned that the solid look of a garage door (one that rolls horizontally to open) would be better to look at than a sectioned door that that rolls up in pieces vertically.

G. Potts asked about the materials of the proposed garage. Mr. Wattendorf responded it would be wood.

A. Ippolito said that from the maps it looks like there will be two garage doors. A door large enough for two cars and a separate door smaller for another vehicle. Mr. Wattendorf agreed with that statement and mentioned that there will be a wall between the garages. The Board and Mr. Wattendorf discussed the proposed separation of the garage.

G. Potts reiterated that a solid garage door that rolls would look nice.

A. Ippolito mentioned asked about the proposed materials, and asked If there would be certain kinds, such as, wood, brick and maybe cedar shakes and the combination of shingles. A. Ippolito then mentioned that the proposal looks like it calls for mostly brick and wood. Mr. Wattendorf agreed and said yes, but that the brick would be stone instead.

G. Potts asked about utilities and if Mr. Wattendorf would need to do any digging.

Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that the utilities are currently not connected at the property, but they plan to use them.

The Board then asked Mr. Wattendorf if the curb cuts will remain the same, Mr. Wattendorf confirmed that they would.

W. Quinn asked about trees currently on the property., A. Ippolito mentioned that in the plan the landscaping is mentioned and outlined, as well as she reiterated that Mr. Wattendorf cease site prep.

W. Quinn asked if blasting would be taking place. Mr. Wattendorf replied that he did not know. W. Quinn asked about rules if Mr. Wattendorf did have to blast on the property. P. Kane stated that Mr. Wattendorf needs to state during the ZBA meeting if blasting will take place or not, and ask the ZBA for an allowance if blasting is needed.

A. Ippolito asked for a demolition description, which she mentioned is required. A. Ippolito stated Mr. Wattendorf needs to create a demolition description based on what the Building Inspector tells them. That this description needs to be in writing. A. Ippolito explained that this description should entail the estimated start date. Mr. Wattendorf mentioned that he had already given something like that to the Health Department. P. Kane and A. Ippolito both said that Mr.

Wattendorf needs to provide a copy as well to the ZBA during their hearing. A. Ippolito mentioned that it has to be very specific.

A. Ippolito asked if Board had any further questions, to which there was none, A. Ippolito then opened the discussion up to public comment.

Neighboring homeowner, and direct abutter, Rick Jakious, 49 Rockland Ave, was present and presented his issues and concerns with the proposed ideas to the Board. Mr. Jakious mentioned his house was built by first physician ever in Swampscott, and explained his love for the design of his home and the property. Mr. Jakious expressed that he wants to be good neighbors and be on good terms, and continued to describe his relationship with Mr. Wattendorf over the past year. Mr. Jakious is worried about the retaining wall as it is currently planned, and he mentioned he is in talks with Mr. Wattendorf about the new plan. Mr. Jakious asked that the Board hopefully protect both the Towns and his rights and that he (Mr. Jakious) is looking to protect the neighborhood character, his family's safety, and his rights.

Mr. Jakious mentioned that in the current plan, Mr. Wattendorfs proposed house is looking straight into his. Mr. Jakious stated that he is greatly disturbed by the current retaining wall plan, and said that the plan does not have appropriate and aesthetically pleasing material, and the he hopes the retaining wall, moving forward, is going to be different than the one that is planned.

Mr. Jakious also stated that he worries about the drainage from the property and the safety and strength of the proposed wall. Mr. Jakious asked if the wall could be stone, which he mentioned would go better with the neighborhood and town, rather than the proposed concrete blocks. Mr. Jakious said his primary concern is the current plan for the proposed retaining wall.

W. Quinn asked if Mr. Jakious had any photos. Mr. Jakious stated he had none currently. A. Ippolito mentioned that it would be a good idea to have photos for the ZBA hearing.

Sylvia Belkin, of the historical commission, not an abutter stated she is Interested/concerned resident. Ms. Belkin stated she loves the historic value of the current collection of houses built on the Rockland Street, and that they are all about same age. Ms. Belkin then asked the Board and the petitioners about the new proposed size, which will be 4,750 sqft. Ms. Belkin mentioned that the house looks monolithic and that basically the house is a mass and that it would stand out well above the other houses on the street with the garage. Ms. Belkin mentioned that the street is a collection of similar houses, and that she is floored by the idea of a concrete retaining wall and the large amount of fill being put into the yard for months. Ms. Belkin stated that if she was an abutter, she would could not imagine living next to the proposed house. Ms. Belkin continued to mentioned that the retaining wall would be inappropriate, and would be concerned if she was an abutter for value of home with proposed retaining wall.

Another audience member then also commented on the size of the proposed retaining wall.

Ms. Belkin then suggested that the expression of the two living units reflect the neighborhood, and that the double gables as mentioned as well as the lot is much larger than others in the neighborhood. Ms. Belkin continued to say that if the garage was to be slightly dropped and the living area raised, it could make the residences look separated. Ms. Belkin mentioned some different ideas to accomplish this.

Ms. Belkin asked for a 3D rendering of the house had been done? A. Ippolito specified this as being called a photometric plan, an audience member agreed. A. Ippolito mentioned that one is not needed for residential construction plans.

Ms. Belkin asked if a 3D rendering could be done so you can see the adjacent structures and back of house? Ms. Belkin mentioned that the current plan makes it hard to see characteristics of the house.

A. Ippolito asked Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf if they would consider doing a 3d rendering? Mr. Wattendorf stated he would not do it, due to costs, but said would if Historical District paid for it then they would.

A Neighbor from 39 Rockland St, mentioned she was concerned about proposed parking situation. She mentioned currently, parking on the street is very hard. She then asked if the petitioners had observed the parking, and had made sure there is no problem and to make sure they have enough space for all their vehicles.

The neighbor also mentioned that she thought the proposed plans look great and that she likes the new proposed plan of separating the house with design. She continued to mention how the neighborhood is very friendly and there are lots of children. She stated that many residences sit on their porches and interact with other neighbors walking the street, the neighbor then asked if the garage will be blocking the residence?

Petitioner explained the houses configuration in regards to the street.

Mr. Jakious asked if the parking space in front of the garage will be screened.

A. Ippolito mentioned that screened means the space would be buffered and hidden by hedging or plantings. The neighbor from 39 Rockland Street stated it would be nice if no hedging or screening was done so people can see house.

The neighbor also mentioned how congested the street can get with the current parking, and mentioned this will become an issue with the proposed parking idea the petitioner presented. Mr. Wattendorf said he had talked to almost all the abutters, and that the abutters did not have any issues or concerns, and stated to the Board to notice that there are no direct abutters (besides Mr. Jakious) currently at the meeting. Mr. Wattendorf stated that everything he is doing is within right, and will take the recommendations seriously, working with Mr. Jakious on the retaining wall and will look at changes possible for the façade. Mr. Wattendorf stated that no matter what they do, people will find fault with their plans and that it is very hard for him to please everybody. Mr. Wattendorf mentioned there needs to be approval to start building, and then from there he could add on recommendations from the building permit.

Mr. Wattendorf stated that he believes he has done his homework and put together a good plan, but could in future make changes, material wise, but stated he believes the current plan to be good.

A. Ippolito stated that the two big issues with the property are parking and that the neighborhood has a emotional attachment to the current house on the property, which will be demolished. A Ippolito mentioned that this is hard, and that she is happy to hear that the Wattendorfs are open to changes with the façade, and that they would be willing to work on issues.

A. Ippolito mentioned some safety issues that pertain to the proposed plans, specifically drainage and that Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf should look closer at it.

P. Kane clarified to Mr. Wattendorfs that once the ZBA makes approves a set of plans, large changes cannot be made. Only slight changes can be made after approval, and that the Building Inspector decides if the change is minor or not. Mr. Wattendorf agreed to this, and mentioned they might not build the wall even if it is approved. A. Ippolito explained that the if ZBA approves a plan, then they need to build that plan. If the ZBA does not find approval on an item, or a large change is to be made, then a petitioner would have to come back and re-file their petition.

Mr. Wattendorf, in regards to the retaining wall safety concerns previously brought up, stated that the wall is being designed by a structural engineer and that safety concerns should not be a issue.

J.R. Young stated that the retaining wall will be designed by an engineer and not an architect, which means it might not come out aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Jakious again reiterated his concerns over the style and look of the retaining wall being proposed. Mr. Wattendorf asked Mr. Jakious if he wants the house moved forward or a visually pleasing wall. Mr. Jakious and Mr. Wattendorf privately discussed the retaining wall.

A. Ippolito stated that during a site plan review, “visual intrusion” is one of the categories the Board needs to take into account.

A. Ippolito mentioned that if building a large new retaining wall, the Planning Board will be sending recommendations and comments to the Zoning Board. A. Ippolito stated that this is important, to make sure the both the wall and property are aesthetically pleasing for everyone.

The Petitioner mentioned other large walls built on Rockland street to which A. Ippolito stated the wall at 57 Rockland Street is the only wall they are discussing. A. Ippolito reiterated these recommendations are for the ZBA to take into during their hearing.

A. Ippolito asked if there were any more questions.

B. Quinn also reiterated that the Planning Board can only make recommendations and not approve anything in this petitions case.

J.R. Young asked for the Board to go over the points on the application.

P. Kane clarified that the Board can discuss setback as in regards to siting but cannot approve.

A. Ippolito began by explaining that the parking issue the Board has previously discussed stems for the proposed plan which only allows for 16.5 feet for parking in front of the proposed garage. 16.5 feet according to the Town bylaw is not considered enough space for a vehicle parking space. P. Kane stated that if designed for error, error will happen, and that if someone parks in the spot (the one that is too small) the cars will be impeding the sidewalk.

A concerned audience member asked about snow removal. G. Potts mentioned there is a spot on the side of the driveway for snow.

A. Ippolito continued the conversation by discussing what the ZBA will be looking for at their meeting. A. Ippolito mentioned that the proposed plans satisfy the required off street parking amount needed, but that the issues over

parking arise from the size of the extra spaces. A. Ippolito explained that this is where the ZBA will decide whether or not to grant relief. The Board and audience discussed impacts of the proposal to set the house further back. G. Potts asked Mr. Jakious what has more impact, moving the house back or the proposed retaining wall. P. Kane clarified the abutter is located above the property.

P. Kane asked Mr. Jakious what view would be impacted by the construction, Mr. Jakious explained his view is of Boston and Fisherman's Harbor, and that if the proposed house is setback any further it would impede their view-line.

P. Kane stated that the proposed house is over 5,000 square feet, and that what is at cause is moving the garage either forward or back. P. Kane explained that by reducing floorplan size, it would help cut down on many issues. P. Kane stated that the furthest part back of proposed house is what would impede Mr. Jakious's view the most.

P. Kane then stated that the house size is not a given and not a right, to which Mr. Wattendorf explained he is happy with the proposed design of the house. Mr. Wattendorf also mentioned that the he does no believe the house is being built in error, and that they cannot stop a person from parking in their space and on the sidewalk.

Mr. Wattendorf re-stated that it is hard to make everyone happy.

G. Potts asked the retaining wall is being built on the side of the property without going on the abutters property? Mr. Wattendorf stated that he had ten feet of clearance on that side.

Board reviewed and discussed the proposed map that shows the retaining wall.

A. Ippolito stated that the plans provided by the petitioners were not complete, that they are missing a full locus map, drainage calculations, specific retaining wall cross sectional, and a demolition plan. A. Ippolito stated she prefers and feels that the Planning Board should provide the ZBA with recommendations based on plans they have. As a recommendation A. Ippolito stated that she would like to see that Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf go before the ZBA with a full set of plans.

A. Ippolito stated she cannot make a recommendation to the ZBA that is unfavorable, but also is not comfortable in giving a full recommendation without reviewing a full set of plans.

A. Ippolito stated she would send a letter to the ZBA explaining the discussion that was had and the recommendations based on the incomplete plans provided.

A. Ippolito stated that her and P. Kane her would put together list.

W. Quinn stated there would be some soft and strict recommendations provided.

A. Ippolito stated to Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf that they need to get the discussion points and recommendations made on proposal in line.

A. Ippolito then went over with the Board the proposed motion and events of the site plan review. She began the timeline by stating the Board met and discussed 57 Rockland Street, but that the Petitioners did not have a full set of plans for their proposal. She continued that the Board reviewed the site plan with the plans provided. A. Ippolito continued to state that in terms of the retaining wall and locus map, they both need to have more detail and that there

needs to be a more complete landscape map for the ZBA hearing. Due to the incomplete plans the Planning Board did not feel as though they had enough adequate information to make a complete recommendation. However these are the recommendations that the Planning Board was able to make.

A. Ippolito then began the process of drafting a motion to for a member to put forward.

Planning Board Reviewed the Site Plan Special Permit and felt that we had incomplete information and could not make a formal recommendation. However, for the following criteria to be satisfied and a formal recommendation to be made, and be acceptable by the Zoning Board of Appeals these issues must be resolved. The recommendations provided to the ZBA will list the issue with a portion of the plans missing, plans including a locus plan, locus plan with full building footprint and abutting lots, a demolition plan, a drainage plan, and a landscape plan that included the retaining wall. Other recommendations include recommendations on the siding of the building, and certain suggestions on modifying the façade to fit in with the neighborhood, such as adding gables above the garage. Other recommendations revolve around the issues caused by the request to reduce the front setback in front of the proposed garage. And the issues that arise from pushing the garage back. Visual intrusions of the retaining wall were discussed, both its appearance and materials, and that they must be satisfactory to the Zoning Board and Neighbors. The Planning Board also asks that photos of the side yard are taken and presented to show what the retaining wall would look like. The Planning Board also asks that a confirmation of blasting be decided. The Planning Board also asks that no additional site prep be done until approval,

A. Ippolito specified that her motion was neither favorable or unfavorable.

Before the motion was stated, Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf thanked the Board for their time and discussion.

A. Ippolito mentioned to Mr. and Mrs. Wattendorf to call P. Kane if they have any questions.

MOTION : by W. Quinn to approve the draft motion, J.R. Young seconded, unanimously approved.

Mr. Jakious asked the Board about the recommendation and A. Ippolito and the board clarified they cannot not make a favorable recommendation without the full information.

## PETITION 16-31

89 GALE AVE

Petition by DOUGLAS & PATRICIA BURDEU to build a 25' x 49' upper level addition on the existing house, and to include three bedrooms and a bath. They also wish to extend an existing garage by 8' x 20' deep for storage. The applicant is seeking a Site Plan Special Permit and a Nonconforming Uses and/or Structure Special permit.

Tony Roossien, the architect of the project was present and prepared to give a overview and answer questions.

A. Ippolito asked if the petitioners (who were not present) would be taking anything down on the property. Mr. Roossien stated that they would only be adding on the property.

Mr. Roossien then gave an overview of the property and project. He explained that currently there is a one-story ranch styled home that's property is on an island in the neighborhood. There is one other home on the island as well. The project being proposed need a dimensional Special Permit as they are extending square-footage by over 800 square

feet. The homeowner wants to expand and add on to the garage on the property as well with wide facing garage doors, and expand the garage for storage. The garage currently has a 17-foot-wide garage door, and Mr. Roossien mentioned really only one car can get in at moment. Mr. Roossien stated the homeowner is looking to separate the garage into two areas, one for storage the other for vehicles. The main piece of this expansion is the addition of a second floor on the existing home. The design calls for the addition of a gable on the garage side. Mr. Roossien stated that he and the homeowners had looked at designs to keep the home one story living, but going with second floor, which is why they are looking for a Special Permit to build more than 800 square feet.

A. Ippolito asked if there had been any abutter feedback. Mr. Roossien mentioned that the plans would be distributed this week and shown to the abutters, and neighbors. It was then mentioned that the property sits one row back from the ocean, and that houses in front are two stories tall, and that a direct neighbor has gone up in height, and it was mentioned that the houses around this property have also grown taller.

A. Ippolito stated that it would be good to have a locus plan to show where the abutters are for the Zoning Board of Appeals.

A. Ippolito stated she does not have any issues with the plan and asked about the driveway. Mr. Roossien stated the driveway will stay the same, only the garage will get bigger. P. Kane asked if curb cuts will stay the same. Mr. Roossien answered yes, and that currently there are pavers in the driveway and the plans call for feathering in additional pavers to welcome the larger garage.

A. Ippolito asked about the patio extension shown on the petition. Mr. Roossien explained the current patio extends 2 feet past the roof line, and that it is currently stone. But that that the new plans show its replacement, making it 3 feet longer and out of wood.

A. Ippolito asked about air conditioning on the property. On the map provided to the Planning Board, Tony showed that on the direct abutter side, there is a rectangle on the map, which represents the bulkhead, next to that bulkhead is the existing AC which will remain. The Board then asked if it will be screened in (buffered). Mr. Roossien stated it will not be screened, and that there is very little landscaping currently on the property and that it is a very flat piece of property. A. Ippolito stated that she wonders why there has never been much landscaping, and then described the past uses of the lot as a large and beautiful hotel. Mr. Roossien mentioned that some of the original character of the hotel will be retained. He continued to mention that the roof will be shingle on the second floor, which is the same as neighbor next door. Mr. Roossien also added that there will be a little flare over front door to help meet the two materials on home.

W. Quinn asked about elevation of property and proposal. A. Ippolito showed on the map that abutters homes are all above the current house.

A. Ippolito mentioned that from the plans it looks like the petitioners will be taking the roof off of the home and expanding from there. She then asked if there were any structural concerns. Mr. Roossien mentioned that there were none.

G. Potts asked if petitioners will be able to see the water from second floor? Mr. Roossien mentioned yes.

MOTION : by G. Potts to recommend favorable action, J.R. Young seconded, unanimously approved.

# DISCUSSION TOPICS

## POTENTIAL ZONING OVERLAY FOR TRAIN STATION NEIGHBORHOOD

P. Kane handed out a draft map to Board members. The draft map showed all areas to be zoned Massachusetts General Law 40R within a quarter mile of the train station, specifically on only main roads. It was then explained that Transit Oriented Development would be recommended for areas outside of the quarter mile.

The Board discussed the draft map.

A. Ippolito asked about M.G.L 40R and T.O.D. rules and regulations. P. Kane explained that Transit Oriented Development does not need to be approved by Department of Housing and Community Development, but that there is no financial incentive, and that M.G.L 40R has to have affordable housing. A Ippolito mentioned that some areas proposed to be TOD areas fall within her proposed zoning changes. P. Kane specified that this map was to only be used as a visual tool to describe where M.G.L 40R and TOD could be implemented.

G. Potts mentioned that he wanted to make sure in areas that If someone was to propose to make an 8-unit residential unit in an area, that they protect and take into account open space. P. Kane specified you can modify the zoning based on the underlying. A. Ippolito thought that some A3 zoned areas allow for too much density.

P. Kane asked the Board to focus on M.G.L 40R for right now, and specifically only within the quarter mile radius on the main roads. G. Potts mentioned that M.G.L 40R would help with certain properties and protect them and regulate them. P. Kane mentioned you write the zoning how you want it. The Board and P. Kane discussed a certain property and proposed development. P. Kane mentioned that zoning should be based on what the community wants.

A. Ippolito liked the idea of having New Ocean and Burrill Streets be potentially zoned as M.G.L 40R, but that Pine Street should not be included. A. Ippolito asked for a bigger more specified map to use. P. Kane mentioned that for the next month's meeting, he can come back with a bigger map for just areas zoned M.G.L 40R. A. Ippolito wants to go street by street and block by block to look at potential areas for M.G.L 40R.

P. Kane mentioned that when doing zoning, changes need to be thought of as effects for the future, that the bigger picture needs to be kept in mind.

The board discussed potential zoning and spaces that M.G.L 40R could possibly be implemented, and the board discussed the layout of each area currently.

W. Quinn said stated he would email P. Kane his revised version of the hotel overlay map he had created.

A. Ippolito will study the map and have recommendations for the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50pm by motion of G. Potts, seconded by J.R. Young, and unanimously agreed

Andrew Levin  
Assistant Town Planner