



Town of Hamilton Planning Board
PO Box 429, 577 Bay Road
Hamilton, MA 01936
978-468-5584

April 1, 2014 Minutes

Welcome – At 7:30 PM, Chairman Ed Howard opened the meeting and the following Planning Board members were present; Peter Clark, Claudia Woods, Rob McKean, Jeffrey Melick, Brian Stein and Rick Mitchell. Matthew Tobyne introduced himself to the Board as a potential candidate for Alternate. Planning Coordinator Kristine Cheetham was also present.

Agenda Items

Public Hearing (Continued) 354 Highland Street: Canterbrook Estates Senior Housing Special Permit

Jerry Dawson made a presentation to the Board by reviewing the Olson Lewis Architectural designs sheet by sheet.

A1. 0 – The site layout sheet demonstrates the location and orientation of the buildings, parking garages & visitor spaces and the access roadway. The overview was acceptable to the Board. However, Sec. 20 (f) of the Senior Housing Bylaw states that no parking lots or access drives be located between the buildings. The orientation of the proposed parking garages is located between the buildings in a manner that keeps the street view primarily the front of the home. The Board preferred the applicant design and agreed to waive this condition of the bylaw.

A2.0-2.3 – These plan sheets include the floor plans and roof line designs. The homes are intended to be around 2200 sq. ft. They were acceptable to the Board. The applicant stated that there may be a basement level for utilities but not with a height for living space. Although he mentioned that some may have a walk-out area. K. Cheetham confirmed that the upper floor has been designed with an open concept so that these units are only 2 Bedrooms. The Senior Housing bylaw requires all units to have no more than 2 bedrooms. Also, this distinction is important to the public health approval of the waste water treatment system.

A3.0 – This sheet depicts the overall view of the home and the elevation. These renderings include gutters on the houses. The applicant explained how the orientation and rooflines would change between different style homes depending upon how many are combined.

A 4.0- 5. The Board reviewed the overall site plans on the architectural drawings. They also used the Plan Sheets provided by Prime Engineering to guide some questions about the site features.

Roadway:

- Width /Length – The applicant is proposing a road width of 22'. The overall length is roughly 800'.
- Hydrants – The applicant is proposing to locate three hydrants along the roadway. (Demonstrated on Plan Sheet 4)
- Sidewalk – The applicant stated that there will be a sidewalk along one side of the roadway and around the cul-de-sac. (Demonstrated on Plan Sheet 4)
- Postal – The applicant would like to have mailboxes by driveways. However, someone noted that the post office may prefer a central mailbox for a large development. Applicant is to resolve this with the post office.
- Transportation Study – The applicant provided a copy of the revised transportation study to the Board. He stated that he had just received it that day and knew that the Board would not have time to review it at the meeting. K. Cheetham offered to scan and transmit the updated traffic report to the Board and to review it compared to the previous study. She noted the primary review components would be the overall daily vehicle trips and the sight distance at the entrance.
- Adjacent private road: Cross St. – The location of the private way; Cross Street, was also discussed. The property shares ownership of this private way with three other owners. The development does not anticipate use of this road for site access. However, there may be a gravel drive and opening in the fence for septic service vehicles and fire access.

Utilities – The applicant stated that all utilities will be underground. (Plan Sheet 4)

Lighting – The applicant reviewed the lighting designs for the project. There are 10 proposed lamppost style lights for along the roadway. One is at the entrance. They are primarily located on the same side as the sidewalk. The applicant stated that they are dark sky compliant and do not have any spillover from the site. There is some lighting proposed for on the buildings. P. Clark was concerned about how late the lights would be on. The applicant noted that any specifications about the time or management of the lights would be in the homeowners documents. The architectural drawings (5.1) also depict lighting on bollard style features with a lighthouse motif for each building. The exact height and size of this lighting was not provided.

Sign – The architectural drawings (A.5.3) demonstrate an entrance sign made of stone with a lighthouse bollard style lighting feature. The actual size of this sign was not provided. The applicant suggested that it would not exceed 6’ in height. The architectural drawings are not consistent with the engineering plan sheets. (Sheet 4 & 7). The engineering plan sheets demonstrate one site entrance sign and Sheet 7 has a lamppost and sidewalk on the other side.

Trails – The Board discussed the walking trail. It is noted on Plan Sheet 7. The current plan sheet demonstrates access to the trail from Asbury Street. However there is no sidewalk or area to park along Asbury. The Board asked if the applicant could amend the trail to begin along the site roadway and to put a visitor space near the entrance.

Fencing – The architectural drawings C 1.0 depict an equestrian style fence. The engineering plan sheet Landscape 7 denotes the location of the proposed fence. It does not surround the entire site. The applicant stated that it would be white vinyl.

Landscaping – J. Melick asked to review the landscape plan (Sheet 7 on the Engineering submittal). He was concerned that site trees are typically small at planting. The caliper at planting is designated on the landscape sheet.

Marketing – C. Woods asked if the applicant felt confident that the market place for senior housing would support this type of investment. The applicant responded that the \$600 range of the homes is similar to other developments in the nearby region and that they are selling.

Public Comment – Chairman E. Howard opened up the discussion for public comment. Cammi Beckman stated that she felt this project was the right size for the area in comparison to the previous proposal. She is a neighbor and was supportive of the concept.

ACTION: R. McKean made a motion to continue the public hearing. C. Woods seconded. All voted in favor.

General Discussion

1. Annual Report – K. Cheetham distributed an outline of the topics for the Annual Report. C. Woods agreed to work on the project by reviewing the minutes of the year and adding in details. K. Cheetham also agreed to establish a link on the Planning Board webpage for a listing of the report.
2. Sub-Committee Updates
 - a. CPC – E. Howard made a brief presentation to the Board regarding his participation on the Community Preservation Committee. He noted that the Hamilton and Wenham CPC’s cancelled their joint meeting because the pool project was tabled from both of the town meetings.
 - b. HDC – B. Stein reported to the group that the Hamilton Development Corporation would be requesting an appropriation of the meals tax funds at town meeting. He

noted that the group had worked on a planning project last year as well as the potential to purchase the McRae property at 59 & 63 Willow St. He added that the HDC may purchase the property via a loan from Salem Five that pays interest only for the first two years. This will enable the HDC to secure a commercial use for the building along with the rent from Mr. McRae. The HDC hopes to initiate a planning effort to discuss the potential for the site in the long term. He also noted that the HDC will be promoting a zoning change for the downtown to allow more mixed use development and design review guidelines.

R. McKean asked if the HDC minutes were available. K. Cheetham noted that the minutes are available through her by request but can also be put on line on the HDC website.

- c. PAC – P. Clark recently met with the Patton Advisory Committee to make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen regarding the two bids received for the development of the Patton Estate. Of the two bids, the PAC felt that the local firm CP Berry was the preferred developer. The plan is to sell off roughly a 4 acre parcel of the Patton Estate for the development of 12 modestly priced homes. They may be permitted through either a senior housing or open space special permit. The sale of the land will be for roughly \$1 million. The developer offered to provide a payment in lieu of the inclusionary unit on site. The proposed access road is adjacent to wetlands and may require mitigation. P. Clark noted that the details of the final agreement have yet to be finalized. Many of these details are resolved during the permit process. The funds from the sale will go towards an endowment for the Patton Homestead. The PAC is pursuing a grant with a cultural commission that requires a cash match.

R. McKean asked for clarification about the town meeting vote. P. Clark noted that the vote would be for the town meeting to agree to sell off a portion, roughly 4 acres, of land for the price of \$1 million.

P. Clark asked the Board to discuss their interpretation of the GPOD and permits at the Patton Estate. K. Cheetham provided the Board with two maps; the GPOD as reprinted in 2009 and the latest DEP Zone II map that demonstrates the closed well at the Patton site. She informed the Board that the zoning for the Patton Estate is RA (80,000 sq. ft. & 175' frontage) which is similar to the zoning required for land in a GPOD which calls for 80,000 as a minimum lot size. Therefore, she explained that the base yield would be the same for any development.

P. Clark asked if the Board would take a vote or make a motion regarding their understanding that the site could be developed so that the PAC could make a statement at town meeting.

The Board agreed that they did not support taking any vote on a potential project without an application before them. The Board also did not want to take a position on a matter that was before town meeting.

March 13, 2014 Special Meeting

R. McKean initiated the discussion by distributing a letter and a report of the 3/13/14 meeting. He asked the Board to hold off on discussing the meeting minutes. He noted that he had come to Town Hall to review the minutes of the meeting and the executive session minutes because he was unable to attend the special meeting. In his opinion, he did not like the tone of the minutes. He provided a report of the special meeting created from a private tape recording of the session by Janet Aldrich.

J. Melick stated that he would like to review the minutes of the meeting and resolve the matter. He stated that no judgement was made about the actions but the matter needs closure. He would prefer not to have another separate meeting but to perhaps come in earlier at the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting. The Board agreed. A time of 7 – 8 PM was set aside for the April 15, 2014 meeting.

Adjourn – At 10 PM C. Woods made a motion to adjourn. P. Clark seconded. All voted in favor.