

Scituate Planning Board, May 9, 2013
TOWN OF SCITUATE MASSACHUSETTS

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
May 9, 2013

Members Present: William Limbacher, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Richard Taylor, Clerk; Robert Vogel, Eric Mercer and Robert Greene, Alternate Member.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Ms. Laura Harbottle, Town Planner.

See Sign-in List for names of others present at this meeting.

Location of meeting: Planning Board Office, Town Hall.

Chairman Limbacher called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M. He announced the meeting was being audio recorded and asked if there were any other recordings being taken. The meeting was being recorded for airing on the local cable television station. Mr. Mercer arrived at 7:38 pm.

Documents

- 5/9/13 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Mr. Vogel moved to accept the agenda. Mr. Greene seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Reorganization of the Planning Board

Chairman Limbacher welcomed Bob Greene as the new alternate member. Chairman Limbacher indicated that Dan Monger didn't seek re-election and now Stephen Pritchard is a full member and Eric Mercer was re-elected. Chairman Limbacher thanked Mr. Monger for his contributions to the Board.

The Planning Board reorganized. Mr. Taylor nominated Mr. Limbacher for chairman. Mr. Vogel seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Vogel nominated Mr. Pritchard for vice chairman. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Vogel nominated Mr. Taylor for clerk. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved. The Planning Board decided on liaisons to other boards and committees. See attached list for Liaisons for 2013.

Discussion - Future Zoning Changes, Village Business Overlay District

- Inclusion of properties on the south side of Driftway
- Revisiting increased frontage

Documents

- 50 Country Way Proposal
- Greenbush Business District
- Scituate Zoning Bylaw Section 560 Village Business Overlay District

Brian Sullivan was present to discuss changing the zoning on the south side of Driftway to include other properties in the Village Business Overlay District (VBOD). He indicated that all the properties are zoned commercial and it may be beneficial to have the VBOD district extend to the other side of Driftway. Ms. Harbottle indicated that the zone line would need to be drawn so as to not go through a parcel. Mr. Sullivan indicated one of the selectmen was concerned about large buildings and high rises on the south side of Driftway. He said that the Milliken property is residentially zoned. Chairman Limbacher indicated that it may

make sense to include any special permit parcels in any zone change in this area.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that she was present at the EDC meeting last evening and the consultant for the EDC study will be looking at this issue of expanding the business district and overlay district as part of their scope of work. She indicated that the Selectmen should be asked how they feel on this issue. She suggested that perhaps Larry Koff could be paid to come and meet with the Board and Selectmen to bring everyone up to speed together. Ms. Harbottle said the EDC may want to establish more design guidelines. She indicated expanding the district should be done with more than one parcel in mind. She said nothing has come in under the present VBOD bylaw which may indicate changes are needed. Chairman Limbacher concurred, but was concerned about timing. Ms. Harbottle said the EDC study should be done by the end of this calendar year so the Board may be able to get an article together for town meeting next spring. She indicated part of the consultant's scope is to do a presentation to the Board and Selectmen. Ms. Harbottle indicated that the consultant is MAPC.

Mr. Vogel inquired if property owners in the area are going to be asked about the proposal. Ms. Harbottle indicated property owners will be contacted. Mr. Vogel indicated that expanding the overlay district would increase value. Mr. Sullivan said that adopting zoning in Massachusetts is not arbitrary. He said there were many hearings last time when the district was created and people were aware of its creation and limits.

In response to Mr. Taylor's question, Ms. Harbottle summarized the steps the EDC consultant will take over the next year. She indicated that the consultant will study the area and write some zoning. The Planning Board could then hold a workshop and have MAPC make a presentation. It is possible some of the zoning could be done for the town meeting next year. Chairman Limbacher indicated he would like to have MAPC down to delve into the intent and scope of the study. The intent of the study is to promote Economic Development. Mr. Vogel asked that spot zoning issues be resolved. Chairman Limbacher suggested that the Board talk to MAPC and see what they will be looking at and then talk to Mr. Sullivan. Ms. Harbottle said that Mr. Sullivan could always move ahead with a citizen petition. It was agreed that Chairman Limbacher, Ms. Harbottle and Mr. Sullivan will talk with MAPC to see what exact areas they will be looking at. Mr. Pritchard asked for a copy of the study proposal.

At 8:05 pm, Chris Ford and Greg Morse came to discuss the frontage issue at 50 Country Way as the zoning bylaw change to the Village Business Overlay District did not pass at Town Meeting in April. Mr. Ford indicated he was before the Board last year with a proposal of mixed use, but the building inspector identified a frontage issue. The proposal failed at Town Meeting leaving Mr. Ford very disheartened. Mr. Ford indicated he has been talking to Mr. Reynolds. Mr. Morse has been talking with Morning Glories who are not eager to give up any of their frontage.

Mr. Ford passed out 3 sheets. He indicated that Sheet 1 represents what was brought before the Board last year. He indicated that traffic flow and backing up into the exit/egress were main points of concern from the Board. Mr. Ford indicated he has had a traffic consultant review his site who suggested he make use of the existing curb cut and create a traffic pattern around the existing building. This is shown on the second sheet. He indicated 50% of the traffic will be directed and exit the other way. Mr. Ford said that by his rights in the easement, he has 80 feet for all purposes of a road.

Mr. Ford indicated he would like to ask the Board and ZBA for permission to move the building up to the property line. He indicated it would not impact sight lines or visibility. He would like to modify the easement to show 24 foot lanes. He would like the Planning Board to endorse his request for a variance to reduce frontage due to the shape of his property. He has 50 feet of frontage plus a 70 foot deeded easement as frontage. He indicated his attorney, Charles Humphrey, will make the argument.

Mr. Morse indicated that the proposal last year had one entrance at Morning Glories for the proposed development. The existing curb cut can be used during construction and afterwards. The buildings and parking have been modified so people are not backing into the easement. Mr. Morse reviewed the property line and indicated the easement is granted in perpetuity. Mr. Morse indicated that they plan to connect to the bike path on Country Way and will construct a walk to connect the walkways.

Mr. Ford indicated he has talked to Mr. Reynolds to try to get frontage on Drew Street. He also said he may want to argue that Stockbridge Road could be frontage as well as it is barring the elevation and access issues. Chairman Limbacher and Ms. Harbottle indicated that access needs to over frontage and there is substantial case law on that topic. Mr. Pritchard inquired if there is case law that a perpetual easement can be used for frontage. Mr. Ford indicated his attorney did not see why a variance wouldn't be granted. Chairman Limbacher summarized that Mr. Ford is looking for two items from the Planning Board – 1) support for going to the ZBA 2) Asking the Board to try the reduce frontage change to the bylaw again. Chairman Limbacher indicated the latter needs to be done to make the overlay district do what it was intended to do. He indicated it is sound planning for economic development.

Mr. Taylor indicated it seemed like the traffic would be mitigated now. Mr. Morse said he has extended three invitations to Morning Glories to sit down and show them the plan, but this has not happened. Mr. Ford indicated if his new plan fails, he will have to go the 40 B route. He wants to work within the bylaw though and indicated that Morning Glories should realize something will be built. Mr. Morse suggested 40R could be another possibility. Mr. Ford indicated that improvements will be made in the easement and he will take the responsibility to maintain them. Mr. Ford asked for an endorsement letter. Ms. Harbottle indicated the Board would need to see an application before it endorses something. Chairman Limbacher asked the Board if they would support refilling the zoning amendment. There was consensus from the Board. He indicated the Board would look at a letter and endorse it if appropriate. If a variance is received, the application would still have to come to the Planning Board for a special permit under the mixed use Village Business Overlay District. Mr. Ford was reminded that there still needs to be a public benefit under the zoning bylaw.

214 Clapp Road – Second Pre-Application Meeting for Definitive Flexible Open Space Plan

Documents

- Request for informal meeting dated 4/29/13 from Deborah W. Keller, P.E. McKenzie Engineering Group, Inc.
- Conceptual Conventional Density Sketch Plan Sheet 1 of 1 revised dated 4/29/13 by McKenzie Engineering
- Abutter notification for second pre-application meeting dated 4/30/13 by Planning Board
- 5-1-13 Board of Health Comment
- Email dated 5/7/13 containing comment from abutter J. Niland
- 4/8/13 letter from the Planning Board to Deborah Keller, PE
- 5/9/13 email from Laura Harbottle to Board containing comments from Pat Gallivan – Conservation Agent dated 5/7/13, Shan Morrissey dated 5/7/13 and David Anderson dated 5/9/13. Information also sent to Deb Keller on 5/9/13.
- Comment from the Traffic Rules and Regulations Committee dated 5/9/13

Chairman Limbacher informed the audience that this was a second informal discussion for 214 Clapp Road as requested by the Planning Board under the Flexible Open Space Bylaw. No formal application has been submitted at this time. He indicated that the applicant would do a presentation followed by comments from the Town Planner and the Board and then the public would be invited to comment.

Deborah Keller, P.E. from McKenzie Engineering was present along with Joseph and Dave Iantosca and Paul Bourque from Fern Properties. Matthew Watsky, attorney for the future applicants, was also present. Mr. Watsky indicated they are here to discuss development alternatives. Their preference is for the Flexible Open Space Development (FOSD), but several alternatives include the Conventional Subdivision Plan or a 40 B with many more lots. Mr. Watsky read the definition of FOSD under the Scituate Zoning Bylaw Section 550.1. He indicated their conventional plan complies in all aspects with the zoning bylaw. He said the number of lots in the FOSD is the same as the conventional. There are 9 in total; there are 8 new lots and the 1731 house will be saved.

Mr. Watsky indicated the Conventional Plan shares the nearly 9 acres to the rear of the site among the 9 lots. He said the FOSD preserves the existing house preserving cultural resources, history and character and also preserves nearly 9 acres in the rear as open space which is adjacent to other town owned land.

He indicated it relates to town owned property to the rear, as well as access through another town parcel and also by Bates Lane. Mr. Watsky indicated the FOSD Plan includes stormwater management features negotiated with the Scituate Conservation Commission with a Settlement Agreement which resulted from a filing with the Conservation Commission. He indicated a conventional subdivision plan was not part of the Settlement Agreement. He said that the Planning Board expressed concern in the first pre-application meeting with a straight road that did not include the Settlement Plan front stormwater area on the conventional plan. This is now incorporated in the conventional plan.

Mr. Watsky indicated that the FOSD has other benefits including less impervious area than a conventional subdivision or 40 B. He indicated there is less density than either as related to the property size. Mr. Watsky indicated his client wants to preserve the parcel to the rear of the property. He indicated that there are 3 key differences from the FOSD to the conventional plan. These include the 30,000 sq. ft. lot size, the frontage on the cul-de-sac and the lot width. Mr. Watsky indicated that the Board has approved these same reductions on other projects. He indicated that stormwater management will be required regardless of the project. He said they will comply with stormwater management in every aspect and their plans will be complete when they submit their application. They are aware it will be peer reviewed.

Mr. Watsky indicated that they are aware a FOSD is a special permit and that a special permit lacks the appeal to a state agency like a 40 B. They know they need a supermajority and will be asking for a straw vote of the Board at the end of the discussion whether the Board prefers the FOSD or conventional plan.

Mr. Watsky turned the floor over to Ms. Keller who thought Mr. Watsky covered everything. Chairman Limbacher suggested that the Board came up with a list of concerns after the first meeting and the Board should review those items. Chairman Limbacher indicated the first two items have been addressed as a second pre-application meeting was happening and a site visit by the Board occurred on 4/27/13. The third item was that the Board needs to be assured that a permit can be obtained from the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program and MEPA. Mr. Watsky questioned if the Board meant MESA instead of MEPA and Chairman Limbacher concurred. Mr. Watsky indicated that they have an agreement from the Heritage Program that the FOSD can be done in the layout presented. He said they have a verbal okay and email, but it is not available as a public record. Ms. Keller indicated that Heritage Program was comfortable with the plan and the conventional plan would be the same.

Ms. Harbottle asked if there was an agreement with the Heritage Program as to the locations of the vernal pools. Ms. Keller indicated that through the Order of Resource Area Delineation, all of the certified vernal pools were identified and located on a plan. Some are shown on the orthophotograph. She indicated that 1 is located onsite and several offsite. She said they all have appropriate setbacks. Ms. Harbottle indicated that she would like to verify this information with Ms. Keller as she believes some of the information is labeled differently and Ms. Harbottle has the information from MA GIS. They agreed to meet to review the data.

Another point raised by the Board in their 4/8/13 letter from the first meeting was that the Conventional Plan should show the drainage area as agreed on the Settlement Plan and that the rattails be eliminated and the density be examined. Ms. Keller indicated that all of the resource areas approved on the settlement plan are shown. Mr. Watsky indicated they welcome peer review of the conventional density plan. He indicated that although the settlement plan has been referenced, there was no provision for the conventional to be laid out the same way under the agreement. He said the roadway has been adjusted under the conventional plan for the stormwater resources. He indicated that the new conventional plan shows the back parcel being shared by all the lots. Mr. Watsky indicated there was no provision in the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for not having rattails. He indicated the plan complies with the bylaw and would welcome peer review. He said that there is nothing in case law to support the spirit of bylaws and the courts will not enforce it. He indicated that the revised conventional plan does what the Board asked. Ms. Harbottle indicated that Scituate does not have a lot shape factor in the bylaw, but most Boards consider access to the whole lot. She indicated that access to the whole lot is not really reasonable. She said the Board has some discretion as this is a special permit process. Mr. Watsky disagreed saying that the special permit is for the FOSD and

there is no added discretion. He indicated the lots comply. Ms. Keller indicated she found other lots that the Board has approved with narrow areas for percable areas for septic systems and access. She indicated they were the basis for the conventional that the FOSD was approved for Deer Common and Tilden Estates. She said Tilden was approved in 2011 and Deer Common in 2008. Ms. Keller showed the Board some of the unique lot shapes on those plans. Chairman Limbacher indicated Ms. Keller had made her point, but said there was spirited discussion on those plans.

Chairman Limbacher indicated that the Board was also previously concerned about drainage impacts. Mr. Watsky indicated that Ms. Keller can summarize the issues, but full engineering does not occur until the definitive subdivision process. Ms. Keller indicated that the culvert at Clapp Road that was part of the Settlement Agreement is clogged. It will require DPW approval to correct the problem. She said she sent plans to the DPW. She said she has looked at all the cross culvert to see if drainage can be made better. She said the constructed wetland stormwater system at the front of the property is based on peak predevelopment rates of runoff. Basically the basin in the lawn area will be maintained. She said the project will maintain existing vegetation next to the Niland property. Chairman Limbacher asked if screening was talked about with abutters at the abutter April 27, 2013 site walk. Mr. Watsky indicated that in the upper basin there is a 6 foot berm height. The plans of the abutter appear to be on a different datum. Mr. Pritchard asked if the abutter knows he is on a different datum as his comment letter still indicates concern. Ms. Keller indicated she thought so; however, she has not seen the abutter's plan. She indicated the plans are tied into NGVD datum where he probably has an assumed datum. Ms. Keller did concur that surface runoff flows in the direction of the upper basin and offsite down the abutter's driveway. Mr. Vogel asked if the construction would alleviate that problem. Ms. Keller indicated it would. Mr. Watsky said that sheet flow toward the Niland property will be intercepted to the detention basin up to the 10 year storm. Mr. Taylor asked if the upper basin water can go to the lower basin. Ms. Keller indicated that that option has not been fully explored. She indicated it was conceptually feasible. Mr. Pritchard inquired about the overflow water. Ms. Keller indicated it could possibly go to the lower basin or across the street. She indicated the project would do what it needed to get the water across the street according to DPW regulations. She indicated it may need to go into the location where they already have an easement across the street with work including a larger structure and correcting the slope of the pipe.

Chairman Limbacher indicated another concern of the Board was clear cutting/fill/buffers. Mr. Watsky indicated that buffers and screening are important and they desire to have them too. Ms. Keller indicated that they haven't done the numbers for fill, but that on average there is 2 to 3 feet of fill for the road and it extends to the front yards for the septic systems. The backyard grading would meet grade and hopefully be designed as walkouts. Mr. Vogel indicated they would have the opportunity to condition street trees. Mr. Watsky indicated the benefit of the design is that the perimeter is at grade so vegetation would be maintained.

Chairman Limbacher indicated a traffic study will be required. Mr. Watsky said it would be part of the definitive plan and site distance will meet AASHTO standards.

Chairman Limbacher said the FOSD must have a public benefit. Ms. Keller and Mr. Iantosca indicated they are waiting to receive a copy of the Conway School report which was just released. Mr. Watsky indicated that it is the intention of the FOSD to dedicate the back piece for open space. Mr. Watsky said he does not know if it will be deeded to the Town as there have been no discussions yet. Chairman Limbacher indicated that he has had an update from the Conservation Agent, Pat Gallivan, who has indicated that all of his original comments still apply. Mr. Gallivan has indicated that it is hard to make any determinations until comments are received from the Heritage Program. Mr. Watsky indicated he has been in contact with the Heritage program and will give the information during the Notice of Intent process. He said the drainage is what the Conservation Commission wanted as part of the Settlement Plan. He indicated they would work with them. Mr. Gallivan spoke in favor of the FOSD; however, he indicated he wants to know the number of lots allowed under the conventional plan and wants to know where the Heritage Program stands before the number of conventional lots is set. He indicated he is aware that as Mr. Watsky indicated the dimensions must work within the zoning bylaw and he added wetland bylaw. He said the Conservation Commission has

a minimum of a 125 foot buffer to a vernal pool, but their jurisdiction goes from 125 to 250 feet which impacts several of the houses shown. Ms. Keller indicated that they are complying with no disturbance within 125 feet of a vernal pool. She also indicated they are not disturbing the 50 foot no build wetland buffer of any wetlands. Mr. Gallivan indicated that in some cases the 50 foot no disturb line comes to the back of houses so there can be no lawn area. Mr. Watsky indicated that it is not the correct time to have a letter from Heritage Program.

Ms. Harbottle indicated in the spirit of transparency, she wanted to inform the applicant that the Town is requesting a two-year stay from Chapter 40 B based on certification of the Housing Production Plan. She said the ZBA approved rentals in January that will count towards the minimum 1.5% of year-round housing stock that is required for this status. Ms. Harbottle also raised a point on the number of vernal pools on and just off the site. She said there could be some type of hydrologic connection and would like to see the Heritage Program's comments on that issue. She indicated the Traffic Rules Committee is also requesting a Traffic Study which sounds like may be in the works.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that according to Section 550 of the Zoning Bylaw, the Planning Board has to find benefits of a flexible plan compared to a conventional plan. The open space, trails and upgrading of public drainage may be benefits. She indicated that the conventional density plan will need peer review to verify it meets zoning and the subdivision regulations. She indicated a supermajority vote will be needed for the special permit and the Board has some flexibility. Ms. Harbottle indicated the FOSD Plan also has benefits for the developer. A narrower road is less clearing and savings for construction. She indicated that if the Board thinks the density is too high, then they should be commenting on that.

Mr. Vogel asked about the blue lines on the plan. Ms. Keller indicated they were the soil types. She said the soils on site are "C" soils and they have been tested to show percability. Mr. Vogel indicated he liked the home spacing better in the conventional plan and the fact that the existing house is retained. He prefers the existing historic house be retained and would like to see a blending of the two plans. Mr. Taylor concurred and indicated that the conventional plan has more appropriate spacing for the homes. He felt that he could not give an answer at this point about the density as the conventional plan had not been peer reviewed. Mr. Pritchard indicated he liked the idea of preserving the open space. He would like to see a compromise on the layout of the homes so they are not lined up like soldiers. He feels the back would not be developed in either condition and that a benefit to the Town would be access to the open space. He indicated that the benefits need to be weighed against the things that are given up.

Mr. Taylor also concurred that it is likely in either scenario that the back land would not be developed. Chairman Limbacher indicated that the contrast between the 2 plans is not like what the Board has seen in the past as with Deer Common and Tilden Estates. He indicated he liked the FOSD because it benefits the Town and developer, but thinks the layout of the homes is nicer in the conventional plan. He said the front piece will be fully developed. He thinks that 8 lots would be better, but if it is shown really to be 9 he will be okay with it. Mr. Pritchard indicated that screening could provide a balance and it should be determined who the density is affecting. He indicated that the abutter Niland was still concerned with the density and drainage for the development.

Mr. Watsky said it seemed that the Board preferred the conventional plan for the site layout. He said the existing house would be lost in that case. He indicated that avoiding the house changes the geometry of the lots. Ms. Keller indicated the road would need to be like the FOSD plan. Mr. Vogel disagreed. He indicated the road can be realigned and lot width can be flexible in the FOSD plan. Mr. Watsky indicated that the road may be able to realigned with more of a curve, but the Board would need to waive the requirement. Chairman Limbacher and Mr. Vogel both indicated they would look to DPW for comments.

Mr. Pritchard indicated that it was an economic decision for someone to see what house they would desire. He said he sees value in the open space and FOSD. He said preserving the open space is valuable. Mr. Watsky indicated that the open space will not be conveyed in the conventional plan. Mr. Mercer indicated he might be happy to keep the tax dollars and was disheartened by the conflict. There can be a better project through collaboration. Mr. Watsky apologized for seeming combative. He said he

was interested in cooperation. Chairman Limbacher indicated the intent was received.

Mr. Watsky indicated he was not sure what the Board wanted. He said that if a FOSD is done with the house layout like the conventional plan, engineering wise it may not be possible. Ms. Harbottle indicated that a FOSD allows flexibility. If there are minor differences from the subdivision regulations she said it is probably acceptable if the houses are not lined up straight. Mr. Vogel indicated changing one thing may not have as much impact to the FOSD as they think. He indicated he would like the back piece intact and deeded to the Town.

Mr. Watsky asked his team if they would like a third pre-application meeting. Chairman Limbacher indicated it was acceptable to him. Mr. Watsky confirmed that the FOSD layout with the house situated like the conventional plan with 9 lots is what the Board wants. Mr. Pritchard concurred with Chairman Limbacher's previous assessment that if 9 lots can be legitimately shown he would support 9. Mr. Taylor said peer review of the number would be necessary. Mr. Watsky concurred that would be done at the filing stage.

Mr. Borque indicated he would like the peer review of the conventional plan now as he does not want to engineer things twice. He would like the geometry peer reviewed. Ms. Harbottle indicated there is no authority now as there is no application. Chairman Limbacher indicated the plan could be reviewed conceptually for compliance to zoning. Ms. Harbottle indicated she would obtain an estimate from John Chessia, the next engineer in the rotation. Mr. Pritchard indicated that working off a conceptual plan will provide a conceptual answer. Mr. Watsky indicated it is really a yes or no answer. The development team will provide funds for a review and would like to be back on June 13 for another discussion with the Board. Chairman Limbacher indicated his appreciation in the developer working with the Board and will schedule time at 8:15 pm on June 13.

Form A – 20 Station Street
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 49/01/36
Applicant/Owner: Robert C & Virginia J McWilliams

Documents

- Application and plan of lot 49/01/36 Station Street Scituate, Massachusetts prepared by Keefe Associates for Robert C and Virginia J McWilliams dated 5/2/13
- Transmittal to departments dated 5/2/13

The applicant was not present. Chairman Limbacher indicated that Lot 2B was being created and combined with Lot 1 so that all the buildings on both lots meet setback requirements.

Mr. Vogel moved to endorse, as approval under the Subdivision Control Law Not Required a plan of land Plot 49-1-36 Station Street Scituate Massachusetts prepared by Keefe Associates for applicants/owners Robert C. & Virginia J. McWilliams dated May 2, 2013 as the division of the tract of land shown on the accompanying plan is not a subdivision because it shows a proposed conveyance or change in lot line which does not alter the existing frontage as required under the Scituate Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Mercer seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Minutes – There are no meeting minutes for acceptance.

Liaison Reports – There were no reports.

Accounting Documents

- PO # 13007155(\$85.00), PO # 13007143(\$77.00)

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the requisition of \$85.00 to MAPD Inc. for the Town Planner to attend the annual conference and for \$77.00 to Plymouth County Registry of Deeds for recording of Planning Board member's signatures. Mr. Mercer seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Town Planner Report

Town Planner, Laura Harbottle indicated that Attorney Adam Brodsky sent a letter on 85 Maple Street that the Board should discuss on 5/23/13. She indicated that the 3A Corridor Study is progressing. She inquired if the Board would like to have a meeting, similar to Cohasset's proposed meeting, with the Economic Development Commission and merchants in North to inquire about what improvements they would like to see. Ms. Harbottle doesn't think Scituate's concerns would be fully vetted in a meeting with Cohasset as the study area in Cohasset is so large. Ms. Harbottle indicated she will go to the meeting in Cohasset and report back to the Board for further discussion.

Old Business and New Business

Documents

- Staff report dated 5/3/13 for the 5/9/13 meeting
- Planning Board list dated 5/2/13
- Site Plan Waiver Decision Be Well Studio
- 7 Pennycress Road Accessory Dwelling Special Permit decision
- 4/30/13 letter to Mr. Duval
- 5/1/13 letter on Flood Insurance Rate Maps
- Email on acoustical insulation for 3 Mill Wharf Unit N11
- Email on 3A Corridor Study dated 5/6/13

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Vogel moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:25 pm. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph
Planning Board Secretary

Richard Taylor, Clerk