

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES October 8, 2020

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chairman; Benjamin Bornstein, Vice Chairman; Patricia Lambert, Clerk; Stephen Pritchard, Rebecca Lewis and Bob MacLean, Alternate.

Others Present: Karen Joseph, Town Planner; Shari Young, Planning Administrative Assistant.

Members absent:

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

Location of meeting: Selectmen's Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chairman Burbine called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was conducted in compliance with the Governor's executive order modifying the Open Meeting Law regulations for remote participation during the COVID-19 health pandemic. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 10/8/20 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Chairman Burbine indicated there was a posted agenda. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion for the posted agenda and the vote was unanimously in favor.

Roll Call to call the meeting to order:

A roll call vote was taken to open the meeting.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

**Continued - Public Hearing – Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for Gas Backwards Building and on additional Commercial Space in the Village Center and Neighborhood District, Greenbush-Driftway Gateway District – New Driftway Transit Village Subdistrict – VCN-GDG-NDTV – 48-52 New Driftway
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-3-9 and 53-3-10F
Applicant: Petro Realty Corp
Owner: New Driftway 4852 LLC**

Documents

- PDF 20-571 Site Plan Review Set(Revised 9.8.2020)
- PDF 48-52 New Driftway VAI Suppl Traffic Review 09.25.20
- PDF Response to Comments Memo_FINAL_Revised_9.10.20 with attachments
- PDF Responses to Chessia Peer Review Comments (9-11-2020)
- PDF Scituate C-Store 09-11-2020
- PDF Scituate C-Store 10-02-2020
- PDF Stormwater Report & Maintenance Plan (Revised 9-20-20)

- Doc REV 2
- Doc Yardley ltr support 48-52 N Driftway
- Email dated 9.28.20 with Fire Department Comments
- Email dated 9.29.20 from John Chessia with additional Peer Review Comment
- Email date 10.2.20 from Aaron Cutler regarding 0 Rear Driftway, a.k.a 44 New Driftway, Scituate, MA
- PDF New Driftway letter_20200919120501
- PDF New Driftway documents _2020091920137
- Doc DRAFT Motion
- PDF 051A-TWLTL 9.8.20
- PDF Study Area Intersections Map

Attendees: Aaron Cutler, Petro Realty; Walter Sullivan Jr., Attorney; John Chessia, Town Consulting Engineer; Jeffrey Dirk, Town Consulting Engineer, Traffic; Kathleen Keen, VHB Traffic Engineer; Hal Choubah, Project Engineer

Ms. Burbine indicated comments have been received from the Design Review Committee (DRC), a letter of support from resident Tom Yardley dated 9.6.20 and comments from the Fire Department.

Mr. Sullivan indicated since the last meeting the applicant has submitted revised plans and met with some abutters to address concerns.

Mr. Choubah reviewed changes to the plans.

- Proposed driveway shifted easterly, away from the existing property to the West, provided a landscape buffer between the driveways
- Island in driveway proposed as concrete rumble strip
 - Letter from Fire Department with approval of the layout
- Tweaked the interior layout of the site for better circulation
 - Provided better access for a large 60' fuel truck
 - Showed fire trucks 40' - 42' can navigate through the site
 - Submitted plan to the Fire Department
 - Submitted plan that a single unit truck vehicle can make the turn in the parking lot and around the fueling area
 - Switched the open area for the building the to the west side of the building as recommended by DRC
 - DRC provided favorable letter of recommendation
- Landscape added to the southwest side of the parking lot and added trees to the back
 - Evergreen trees and Leland Cypress to provide a natural buffer and mitigate any impact to the Riverway Development
- Applicant met with Attorney Ingberg on behalf of the Riverway Development
 - Applicant will address all the concerns about lighting and landscape buffer
- Revised the drainage design as recommended by Peer Review Engineer
- Parking – will be revising parking and referencing Table 1 in the bylaws
- Applicant would like input from the Board regarding landscape and trees at the front of the building
 - Added six trees to the front
- Expanded amenity space to include the front of the building and to the east of the building to accommodate the required 10% of the entire lot

- Provided a loading area for deliveries

Mr. Choubah indicated they addressed many of the concerns from the August 12th review and hope to address some open issue tonight and get some direction from the Board on how to proceed. The applicant will then resubmit a plan with revisions.

Ms. Keen, Transportation Engineer for the applicant, provided a summary update to the peer review comments from VAI, Mr. Dirk.

Updates from the initial traffic study.

- Provided an analysis of the weekday mornings, not previously included
 - Analysis run for all 3 conditions
 - Existing conditions
 - Future conditions with the project
 - Future conditions without the project
 - Found the project will have minimal impacts on the operation during weekday mornings and the projects trips can be handled within the roadway network
- Trip generation methodology comments from Peer Review applicant provided sensitivity analyses with slightly different trip generation levels
 - Result of analysis - the projects trips are adequately accommodated within the roadway network
 - Verified conclusions in the original study
- Review of mitigation program
 - Added two additional pieces of transportation mitigation
 - Committed to provide a Transportation Demand Management Program for the location
 - Implemented by the Site Owner and Tenants – encourage the use of non-auto trips, public transportation and services for employees to reduce midday trips
 - Proposing modification of striping along New Driftway
 - 2 way left turn lane along center of New Driftway
 - Proposed to carry down to Dunkin Donuts driveway
- Shift of driveway provides more space between the proposed driveway and the driveway to the right

There was discussion if the applicant looked at real peak periods, i.e. when the train is discharging. Ms. Keen indicated they reviewed the periods from 7-9 am and 4-6 pm and that most of those impacts would be handled by the signal at New Driftway and Old Driftway. She said that with the center-turning lane there would not be any backups in traffic due to their site; one to two cars can be stored in the center lane before affecting the intersection, that is all that is needed based on their analysis. There is also still adequate storage for left turning vehicles from New Driftway to Old.

Ms. Joseph asked what the level of service is projected to be with these turning lanes once the project is complete. Ms. Keen indicated the level of service was LOS C or better during the peak periods; a service level of C or D is an acceptable level for the area. Level of service ranges from level A to level F, A being the best-case scenario.

Mr. Cutler provided information on conversations with abutters and access from abutting properties. He indicated he met with Ms. Burbine, Ms. Joseph and two of the owners of the property to the east to discuss a shared access. There were many concerns about the traffic flow and loss of parking spaces from the abutting property; they were not amenable to access the site through theirs to get to the traffic signal. He also indicated that he attempted to work with the abutter at 44 New Driftway and through a series of emails it was determined the abutter is not willing to entertain permitting access to the proposed site through their property since they are currently trying to sell it.

Mr. Dirk, the Town's Consulting Engineer for Traffic, from Vanasse Associates provided comments.

- Applicant has been very responsive to the peer review comments regarding the traffic analysis and the site plan.
- Traffic Study
 - Applicant has used higher traffic volumes
 - Provided morning peak period analysis
 - Showed the projects impact on the level of service remain in an acceptable condition
 - Mr. Dirk confirms that at the access point of the property the level of service is "C" or better and noted that Level "D" is considered to be acceptable
 - All intersections will operate at a "D" or better with the exception of the rotary
 - Even with higher traffic numbers it still works and is not impactful to the point where it causes congestion on the roadways
 - The rotary is operating over capacity, but the project's impact is minimal – increase in queuing of 1-2 vehicles
- Impact analysis – Mr. Dirk said the applicant has satisfactorily addressed the comments
- Capacity analysis
 - Installation of center turn lane is a significant benefit to traffic all along New Driftway
 - Accommodates left hand turn movements from this project entering/exiting, but also accommodates left hand turn movements from other driveways in the area
 - Access level of service to site is Level "C"
 - There is queuing that will happen in the site itself, projected queuing during the peak time periods with the commuter rail is approximately 3-6 vehicles
 - Asked the applicant to provide a double centerline along the driveway
 - Provides better definition to separate entering and exiting traffic.
 - Just striping will not change anything dimensionally or internally to the site
- Site Plan – lots of changes have been made to benefit traffic flow
 - Applicant has made a good faith effort to contact the property owners on either side.
 - Ideally would access the site by way of the traffic signal, but not going to happen without cooperation from abutting properties
 - Driveway moved away from the driveway to the west

- Island provides separation
- Concerns remain about the width of the driveway.
 - Suggested that the island separating the two driveways extend out to the curb line and a shared pathway be constructed
 - Pedestrians and bicycles will have refuge area to cross
 - Raised island could be shrunk to accommodate increase in the landscape island
- Driveway is being designed so the tanker truck can come in the site and not go over the center line
 - Great idea, but results in a driveway that is too wide
 - Typically, the fuel truck is permitted to crossover the centerline with entering and exiting the property on the driveway itself.
 - Without the raised island in the center of the driveway the landscape island separating the driveways could be expanded and extended out to New Driftway
 - Designer on record needs to see if it is feasible and make sure they are comfortable with it. This is just a recommendation.
 - Fuel truck is accommodated when making deliveries
 - Truck does not drive through parking spaces
 - Truck can circulate around the canopy
 - When off-loading the fuel it does infringe on one-way circulation within the site itself
 - Will need restrictions on the time of day when fuel deliveries will take place
 - With restrictions for time of deliveries the driveway could be redesigned to accommodate the extension of the landscape island
- Parking – need to understand number of seats and the number of employees

Mr. Choubah addressed Mr. Dirk's comments. He indicated they looked to extend the island to the curb line, but there would be problems with the traffic exiting eastbound from the existing driveway to the west. He said they looked at a template for a single unit vehicle to make sure they could accommodate some larger vehicles and it did not work, they would have to cross the two lanes and go over the curb line along the north side of New Driftway to make a right hand turn. He also said the concrete rumble strip was recommended by the Fire Department because they need 10' separation between the ingress and egress of the site. Mr. Choubah said he could provide the template with turning radii to show the applicant did try to make the change recommended by Mr. Dirk.

Ms. Lewis asked if the traffic studies were done during COVID. Mr. Dirk indicated that VHB collected the data pre-COVID; that is a good thing. Ms. Joseph indicated it is based on the Drew study and 1% was added per year to come up with reasonable levels. Ms. Keen indicated counts from 2018 were used and they proceeded to grow them at 1% per year to account for general background growth that may have occurred between 2018 and 2020 pre-COVID; the growth is representative of non-COVID conditions.

There was discussion about the recommendation of limited time restrictions. Mr. Cutler said it is acceptable for them to limit times of deliveries. He did mention however, that one of the concerns from the abutters was they would not like to see deliveries while they sleep. He said they are amenable to do what works for everyone.

Ms. Burbine asked if it is possible for the center lane to extend down to the Herring Brook Mall. Ms. Keen said they would have to review that and speak with the developer; they would need to check geometrically if it would fit and if it is an appropriate treatment. Ms. Keen will respond back.

There was discussion if the applicant would need approval from the Board of Selectmen (BOS) to provide the turning lane; the plans would need to be reviewed by the Town's Engineering Department and/or DPW; the applicant will need BOS approval.

The Board discussed once the roadway is painted, does it become the Town's responsibility to maintain; Ms. Keen indicated yes. Mr. Pritchard asked if the applicant would be funding the town to do the work or would there be an independent contractor. Ms. Keen said that would be a discussion with the developer and would be part of the approvals for the project, but it could go either way. Ms. Burbine opined the applicant would put down the initial turning lanes and as time goes by, i.e. they become faded, etc., the town would maintain it. The DPW would have to approve the construction plans, etc. Ms. Burbine indicated this all has to go to the DPW for approval and then ultimately stamped with approval of the BOS. Ms. Joseph will work to get a comment from DPW if they would find things preliminarily acceptable.

Mr. Pritchard asked with the center lane is there any narrowing or any less clearance on the through way lanes. Ms. Keen said there is none, it is all the appropriate width for travel lanes and the existing width for travel lanes would be maintained.

Mr. Chessia gave a summary of his review; he indicated most of his callouts were addressed and additional information was provided.

- New building flipped the restaurant to the west side, added storage and office in the basement which affects the parking.
- Landscaping and Trees
 - Trees existing are located, but no indication of the size or type
 - Plans show an existing woods line, but should show a proposed woods line
 - Landscaping Plan – Board should review
 - Plantings added to the west side where the retaining wall is
 - Evergreens added to the back on behalf of the abutters to the rear
 - Canopy and shade trees on the south side
 - 4 trees that meet the street tree definition in the front
 - Applicants engineers says there are 6
 - Not sure there is enough room to put more trees
- Amenity Space – recommends a plan to show what is being counted as amenity space and how it complies with the bylaw
- Frontage Zone – Board should give direction for the applicant
- Contours need to be corrected – does not affect drainage
- Lighting plan – some spill over in different areas, maybe ways to mitigate
- Stormwater
 - Good soils – all sandy soil

- Fairly high with infiltration system
- No discharge - all goes into the underground system
 - System is to the south of the canopy and gas pumps
 - Close to the footings of the gas pumps and close to the retain wall in the southwest corner
 - Meets rates and recharge
 - Walkway along the front of the building labeled as pervious, but does not have any details. Details/data needs to be provided.
 - Catch basins and Stormceptors, infiltration system
 - Applicant exceeds the requirements
- Site as a gas station is a land use associated with higher potential pollutant loads need more detail on several items
 - Oil grit separator with a sizable tank for the storage of floatable oils
 - Comparison of the Stormceptor – does it have equivalent capacity of an oil grit separator
 - More information needed on the electrically actuated flap check valve
 - How is it tested, how do you know it is working if there was a spill
 - Piping proposed is polyethylene pipe, a plastic pipe which is flammable
 - May want concrete pipe in certain sections, upstream of the valve
- Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan (SWPPP) will be required
 - Recommend the SWPPP is approved by the Board prior to construction
- Operation & Maintenance
 - Need information on snow storage – where is going to go

Mr. Choubah addressed the piping and the valve; needs to confirm if the valve is electronic or manual. The valve is in the open position all the time; it is like a gate, the manhole is opened and the valve is turned and shut off in case of emergency. All employees, including truck drivers, are trained on how to access and close the valve if there is a catastrophic event. He indicated all the catch basins on site are equipped with deep sump oil water separators; each sump has the capacity of a few hundred gallons. He said there are 2 Stormceptors and 2 catch basins on site that probably have the capacity of a thousand gallons. Mr. Choubah did say he would provide more detail on the valve. Mr. Choubah had no issue with the pipe and said they will change the pipe to RCP.

Mr. Pritchard asked if there were any standards that should be used for construction of a gas station. Mr. Chessia said there is low specificity on what is required for a valve; there is only a requirement for a “valve”. Mr. Chessia said a gate type valve with a manual operator is what he has seen on other similar projects. In terms of the gas storage there is nothing specific in the regulations, other than an oil grit separator or equivalent is required. He described an oil grit separator; he said the amount of storage needed is not really spelled out and it will have to be decided what an acceptable amount of storage in this circumstance is.

Ms. Joseph's comments

- DRC gave a favorable review of the project
 - Exception of the sign – DRC would like to see again
- Fire Department Comments
 - Happy with the entrance
 - May require additional hydrant
 - Looking forward to discussing fire alarms and suppression systems

- Vertical distance at the fuel pump awning maintained at 13'8"(minimum)
- Building footprint changing to 4,000 sq. ft. from 4,050 sq. ft.
- Outdoor amenity space – 10% of the lot is required
 - Need 4,772 sq. ft.
 - Outdoor terrace by the restaurant is 700-800 sq. ft.
 - Benches around the back
 - Recommendation to extend the walkway in the front across the entire front and connect to the pervious pavement where the mechanicals are; add some benches to engage the public street
 - The Board needs to opine if amenity space is appropriate - Board opined the space was acceptable.
 - Note to be added to the plan with the amount of public amenity space
- Parking
 - 28 spaces are proposed
 - Restaurant to have only 20 seats total inside and outside combined
 - Parking configuration does not need not change and can account for the basement/storage and office space
 - Board is in agreement with proposed parking
- Access
 - One driveway shown, bylaw says there should be 2 means of egress
 - Fire Chief is okay with the entrance
 - Peer Review has comments
 - Board needs to opine if they will waiver that only one driveway works for the site
 - Ms. Burbine indicated that she worked to find a second egress and it did not work
 - There is no option available at this point in time
 - Board will grant the waiver – can't get the pumps in the back without it
- Surety – Board will require surety
- Restaurant
 - Not yet determined, but looking for it to be a local sandwich shop
 - Convenience store in the other part, 4,000 sq. ft.
 - Cannot be self-service gas station per Scituate General Bylaws – an Attendant has to be available – 2 attendants
- Snow if it becomes an issue it will be removed, will be addressed on the next submission
- Light spill over
 - Lights are 14' tall with cut off LED fixtures and some goose neck sconces on the building
 - What is the spillage over the property
 - Spillage is less than one foot candle
 - Applicant will adjust the plans not show any spillage
 - Lighting plan to be done by #1 Lighting Specialist – LSI
 - Suggest warm light as opposed to cool light
 - Ms. Lambert expressed concern over the LED lights and the ecology of area being close to the wetlands
 - LED lights disturb nature
 - Temperature of the lights will be submitted with revised submittal

- Hours of operation
 - Ideally 5:00 am – midnight/11:00pm
 - Board will take the under advisement
 - Other gas stations in town are only open to 8:00pm
 - Selectmen's office doing some research on other gas stations and convenience stores
 - Applicant would like to mirror the times of the commuter rail
- Existing conditions – Mr. Chessia pointed out some issues that need to be addressed
- Signage
 - DRC wants to see before anything is built
 - 3 tenants there could be 600' of signage
 - Allowed 100 sq. ft. per use
 - Look at signage as a cumulative effect – total limit on the site
 - No internally lit signage - including gas pricing
 - Sign needs to be set back 20' from frontage
 - Mr. Cutler said some of the concern was with regards to the number of signs
 - Entrances on both the New Driftway and Gas Station Side as well as the pylon sign
 - Signage can be condition of approval
 - Mr. Cutler will supply a proposed sign a package for next meeting
- Sewer and Water
 - Connection fees
 - Water tight manholes for sewer are required
 - As-built plans for all utilities
 - Spill control plan
 - 2 new water services for the uses
 - Backflow devices needed
 - DPW has not indicated problems with supply or capacity
- Landscaping – does the Board want the plan stamped by a Landscape Architect
 - Board would like further review – some concerns of proposed plantings and layout
 - 6 Shade trees are needed across the front of the property - Cornus Kousa is an ornamental tree not a shade tree
 - Shrubs along front property line will not last – recommend perennials
 - Varieties and placement could be improved
 - Applicant to engage a Landscape Architect
- Stormwater Management
 - Stone tracking pads(3" plus better) required in and out of the site
 - Limit of work needs to be moved out of the AE16 area
 - Silt sock versus straw waddle needed
 - Remove comment on plan regarding 70% stabilization of the grass
 - Additional issues addressed by Mr. Chessia
- Canopy should have 4' footings - Ms. Joseph confirmed with Building Inspector
 - Inspector not concerned about the proximity of the drainage system
- SWPPP - Board wants to see Draft prior to approval

Mr. Bornstein discussed the idea of striping a pedestrian crosswalk at the northwest corner of the applicant's property to the other side of the street. There is currently an actuated walk signal at the light, but there is not crosswalk on that side of the street. Ms. Keen said that they had looked at that

scenario, but there are many challenges. To incorporate the crosswalk the stop bar would need to be shifted back; the placement of the signal equipment that exists today would be an issue with being able to provide an adequate ramp for people with disabilities to access the crosswalk. It is not something easy to implement and that is why it was not incorporated in this plan.

Public Comment:

Mr. Ken Ingberg resident at 60 New Driftway, The Riverway, indicated he has sent a letter to the Planning Board representing the residents in the Condominium complex that was not discussed at the prior meeting; he opined the letter spoke for itself regarding the concerns of the residents. He said they had a pleasant and productive meeting with project applicant and team and there was a general acknowledgement of issues they are going to look at. He offered to summarize what was discussed at the meeting today for the Board and did request that his letter be discussed point by point at some time. He commended the Board on the job they are doing.

Ms. Burbine indicated they did address the letter at the last meeting and they will address the issues point by point to the best of their ability to ensure people are satisfied.

Mr. Bob Paul, resident at 60 New Driftway discussed traffic and most comments have been made regarding traffic to the west of the property. He indicated the traffic light just east of the property impacts the ability of the Riverway people to enter and exit the property; making a left turn today is difficult. He asked if there is any consideration for providing a turning lane at that point so the residents at the Riverway, Life Care Center, Insurance Company and James Landing can access the Driftway.

Ms. Burbine said the point is well taken and acknowledge the difficulty in making a left hand turn. She opined it is something that should be looked at, but it is not up to this applicant to deal with. This is something that may need to be addressed with Traffic Rules Committee and BOS. The Board will take the comment under advisement and will pursue the middle lane change for the future.

Ms. Annette Flaherty resident at 60 New Driftway, said she appreciates the research that went into the traffic, but questions whether the road is wide enough to accommodate the center lane; currently she opined it is hard to turn with just two lanes and doesn't know how it will work with three. She is concerned.

Mr. Pritchard commented that addressing the turning lane at the Riverway might be combined with a reconfiguration of the intersection and adding the crosswalk that has been discussed; the Board opined this is a matter that should be addressed by the Town and DPW.

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review and Special Permit for a Gas Backwards Building with additional Commercial Space in the Village Center & Neighborhood District – Greenbush Gateway District – New Driftway Transit Village Subdistrict (VCN-GDG-NDTV) for property located at 48-52 New Driftway until December 10 at 7:00 pm and continue the time for action until February 1, 2021.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Bornstein - yes
Ms. Lewis – yes

**Drew Company – The Residence at Driftway Place – 247 Driftway – Design Changes
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-2-8, 53-2-8B, 52-2-9A, 53-2-10 and 53-2-10A**

Applicant: Drew Co., Inc.

Owner: The Residence at Driftway Place, LLC – an affiliate of Drew Company, Inc.

Documents

- PDF 09-03-20 Planning Board Design Changes
- PDF TD filed Decision minus Zoning Compliance Plan
- PDF 19-023 PB Review Report – Greenbush Development, 9-28-20
- Doc Stormwater and Building Elevations Rev
- PDF Greenbush Station_Zoning Compliance Diagram_08-08-19
- PDF 200415 MBTA Drainage figure REV2 18004
- PDF 18004 HW Greenbush resubmittal 2001911
- PDF 200194 18004 Drainage Report Stamped
- PDF Buildings A, B, C West Elevations
- PDF Building D and E West Elevation_9-29-20

Attendees: Theonie Alicandro, Drew Company; John P. Drew, Drew Company; Chris Morris, Cube3; John Ford, Horsley Witten Group

Mr. Drew indicated they have changed Architects, Cube3 is the new architect, they have been refining the design, working with engineers and the MBTA and the Town to make sure the project is the best possible design it can be. He said changes have been made to the design and they believe they are relatively minor in the scheme of the project and make it better; with certain interior layouts the exterior of the building needed to be adjusted; the fenestration. The design intent is still being met. Mr. Drew indicated changes have been made to the stormwater drainage system that was originally proposed after some additional work with the MBTA; they have upgraded and improved the system.

Mr. Ford walked the Board through the changes made to the stormwater system.

- Runoff from the existing MBTA parking lot will be collected via the catch basin and pipe system that flows underneath Old Driftway to the platform side of Driftway where it is treated and eventually flows to the North River
- Previous plan treated the portion of the runoff within the footprint of the proposed buildings and associated parking for the water quality and bypassed the flow as well as the untreated flow on the Drew side of Driftway from the parking lot around the proposed development bypassing that flow safely around the construction footprint connecting it to the same place under Old Driftway to the MBTA platform side of Driftway
- MBTA requested flows be reduced to the platform side of Driftway
- New proposal
 - Eliminate the quantity of runoff within the proposed development footprint entirely

- Benefit to the town as water will be infiltrated into the ground and removed from the North River outfall
- Change has added 4 subsurface infiltration systems

Ms. Joseph referenced the plans and indicated that the area in pink is now being infiltrated on the site and is a major benefit with less going to the MBTA system and to the North River.

Mr. Morris provided an overview of the building changes.

- Building footprints, general forms and massing of the buildings, stair and elevator locations, one and two bedroom unit placement within the buildings has remained the same
- General changes focus around the building fenestration arrangements
 - Internal layout changes in the units, partitions, kitchen placement, etc.
 - Changes based on FHA and MAB requirements for clearances, etc.
 - Sliders all 5' versus some at 5' and some at 6'
 - Windows 4 over 1 versus 6 over 6 divided light windows and eliminated the detail on the sliders
- Building A
 - 2 dormers made narrower
 - One facing South – courtyard
 - One facing North
 - Dormer facing MBTA station remains the same
 - Focuses entrance on this as main entrance, with 2 secondary
 - Retail spaces are the same
 - Apartments have been relocated
 - One apartment on 2nd floor
 - One apartment on 3rd floor
 - 2nd floor office space
 - Roofing will be simulated slate asphalt roof not metal roof
 - Evergreen color
 - Metal roofing not available in the market place
- Building B
 - South Gable - stairway on right hand side
 - Stone bases changing to simple granite panels – change affects all buildings
 - Shed dormer was added
 - Board thought the layout of windows on the gable above the retail space looked odd
 - Architect will review
- Juliette Balconies
 - Tube rail balconies too heavy
 - Harbor aesthetic - in general and amenity space areas
 - Proposing wire mesh, 2x2 squares, balcony, lighter feel
- Building C
 - Gable ends facing MBTA station
 - North and South Gables spacing adjusted
 - Sliders on top floor removed

Ms. Joseph opined this is a natural progression of taking a schematic design to a constructible plan. The applicant has elaborated the changes in the windows which were to make the units more livable.

She opined the changes are relatively “insignificant” and are a result of switching architects and putting the plans into real design; she provided 50 Country Way as an example of doing the same thing.

Ms. Joseph indicated she provided the Board with a DRAFT letter and recommends the Board send the letter as drafted.

Mr. Pritchard expressed concerns over the layout of the windows on the third floors and he does not get a sense for what the balconies look like; he is concerned about the wire mesh and is concerned that it is not in keeping with the design, i.e. Greek revival.

There was discussion about the image of the balconies. Mr. Morris said there are code changes regarding rails and opined these were like fish net and tie into the nautical details. The Board was mixed about the railings. The Board asked the applicant to work on other options for balcony railings, i.e. something less industrial.

Public Comment:

Ms. Jennifer Kuhn resident at 20 Carrie Litchfield Lane asked that the project go back to the Design Review Committee. Ms. Burbine said the Board will take the comment under advisement, but it will not be going to back the DRC.

The Board agreed to send the letter with minor changes asking for more balcony input.

The applicant will provide additional options for the balcony next week.

**6 MacDonald Terrace – Mixed Use Special Permit – Request for Extension of Time
Assessor’s Map/Block/Lot 53-5-21 and Parcel A
Applicant/Owner: RJB Development Company, Robert Burwick**

Documents

- PDF 9-14-20 extension letter
- PDF TC filed Special Permit 6 McDonald Terrace
- Email dated 3.22.19 Mylar Plans for McDonald Terrace
- Doc DRAFT Motion

Attendees: Bob Burwick, Property Owner; Greg Morse, Morse Engineering

Mr. Burwick addressed the Board and referenced a letter sent to the Board on September 14, 2020 from Mr. Morse with a request for an extension of the special permit at 6 MacDonald Terrace. The letter outlined a number of reasons why he is requesting the extension.

Mr. Pritchard asked if this could be taken as step-by-step process and provide a one-year extension and then have the applicant come back when getting close to that time frame and give a status update. Mr. Burwick was not opposed to a one-year extension as suggested.

Mr. Pritchard opined he would like to see it as a one-year extension with an option for another year along with an update of the project. The Board was in agreement.

No public comment.

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to accept Gregory J. Morse's, P.E. request on behalf of Robert Burwick of RJB Development Corporation to extend the Special Permit for a Mixed Use Development in the Village Business Overlay District for 6 MacDonald Terrace for one year until December 12, 2021 in accordance with the letter submitted by Mr. Morse dated September 14, 2020 with a one-year option for extension if necessary.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein - yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Discussion – Senior Center – Parking Monitoring Plan

Documents

- PDF Cond 16 and 17 SPAR Senior
- PDF Letter to OPM on pkg plan
- PDF Scituate Senior Center – Parking Monitoring Plan Rev 1
- Email dated 9.28.20 Scituate Senior Center Recreation Center Meeting Minutes #39

Attendees: Steve Kirby, OPM; Linda Hayes, Director of Council on Aging

Ms. Joseph indicated the Board has received the latest parking-monitoring plan and several members asked for it to be on the agenda. She indicated the building signage is not on the agenda tonight the applicant has asked that it be held until the next meeting.

Does the Board feel the parking monitoring plans is sufficient; there were questions as to when the monitoring would start. The Board referred to the condition in the decision; the condition says at full occupancy/operation. The Board opined that the monitoring should start when the applicant is fully moved in and operational; it may be hard to put an exact date on it.

Mr. Kirby said they do not know an exact date of when the center will be in full operation; it is anticipated there will be substantial completion end of January and targeting February 1st for furniture move in. His understanding is the parking monitoring plan is to start when the building is fully operational, the staff has moved in and people are using it, it would be 6 months from that point. He opined they could not put a start date. He indicated that he send a plan and then revised it to meet concerns from Ms. Joseph. The applicant is hoping that the Board is in agreement with what is proposed now; it will not go into effect until the building is being used.

Mr. Pritchard suggested the applicant develop an occupancy plan, a move in plan and a use plan as the get closer to completion and come back to the Board with an estimate when the center will be fully operational and when the study would be begin. Mr. Kirby agreed.

Mr. Kirby indicated he wants to make sure the Board is okay with the counts, hours, days of the week, etc. for the parking plan; when it starts is when the building is fully operational. Mr. Pritchard suggested they make sure to count the cars along pathways, etc. if people disobey where there is designated parking. Mr. Kirby said they would like to avoid that and some enforcement will have to be involved.

The Board opined they were happy with the revised parking plan.

Ms. Joseph indicated that when the applicant comes back prior to the start of the parking monitoring plan at that time they should be prepared to talk about the programming per condition #16.

Ms. Hayes asked what kind of lead-time does the Board want before they come back if there are remaining COVID restrictions after February. The Board said to come back when in substantial completion, February.

The Board does not want to do the study during a soft opening.

No public comment.

Minutes

Documents

- Meeting minutes 9.24.20

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the meeting minutes for September 24, 2020.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion, a roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein - yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Accounting

Documents

PO #2103007 (\$11.27), PO #2102967 (\$1,710.00), PO #2103061 (\$1,000.00), PO #2103063 (\$1,800.00), PO #2103075 (\$3,470.70)

Ms. Lambert move to approve the requisition of \$11.27 to WB Mason for office supplies, for \$1,710.00 to Horsley Witten for peer services for Seaside at Scituate, for \$1,000.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review of 14-16 Old Country Way, for \$1,800.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer

review services of 247 Driftway/Drew Company, for \$3,470.70 to Ken Duval for Stormwater Bond refund with interest and unexpended funds for peer review services at 11R Elm Park.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis - yes

Liaison Reports:

Master Plan - reported by Mr. Bornstein:

- October 13th final Master Plan community workshop at 7:00 pm

CPC – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- 12 applications
 - Greenbush Park – Scituate Concerned Citizens - \$350K
 - Park on Stockbridge Road
 - West Gate stone wall repair - \$20K
 - Wall opposite Merritt Property on Country Way
 - 143 Border Street Land Purchase - \$5M
 - Widows Walk - parking lot and frontage improvements - \$737K
 - WPA Building – funds to be determined
 - Thoreau's Way Library Green Space - \$75K
 - Benches at Hyde Park – Cedar Point - \$6K
 - MBTA Berm Crossing - \$100K
 - First Herring Brook Watershed Protection - TBD
 - Beach Nourishment Construction Phase - \$4.350M
 - Beach Stairs Access \$80K - \$296K
 - Emergency Rental/Mortgage Assistance - \$100K

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- Board will need to make decision on some projects before the end of the year
- Hal Stokes not seeking re-appointment to the DRC
 - Recommend Paulette O'Connell - Board agreed
- Need to get comments in to finalize Draft for Housing Production Plan

Documents

- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 10.1.20 with meeting materials for Drew Company, 48-52 New Driftway and 6 McDonald Terrace.
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 10.2.20 with agenda for 10.8.20
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 10.5.20 with meeting materials for 48-52 New Driftway
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 10.5.20 with meeting minutes from 9.24.20
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 10.6.20 with AMENDED agenda for 10.8.20

- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 10.7.20 with meeting materials for 48-52 New Driftway
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 10.8.20 with meeting materials for 48-52 New Driftway

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:41 p.m. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis -yes

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young

Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Patricia A. Lambert, Clerk

Date Approved: October 22, 2020

