

## **SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD    MINUTES    November 10, 2022**

Members Present: Patricia Lambert, Chair; Benjamin Bornstein, Vice Chair; Ann Burbine, Clerk; Stephen Pritchard and Rebecca Lewis

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

Members absent: Bob MacLean, Alternate

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

Location of meeting: Select Board Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chair Lambert called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television and streaming live on Facebook with in-person and remote access available. Mr. Bornstein attended remotely.

### **Documents**

- 11/10/22 Planning Board Amended Agenda

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

A roll call vote was taken, and was unanimously in favor.

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

---

**Public Hearing – Special Permit Accessory Dwelling – 52 Pin Oak Drive**  
**Assessor's Map/Block/Lot**  
**Applicant/Owner: Vincent and Kim Fountaine**

### **Documents**

- PDF 22002 Pin Oak Construction Dwgs 2022 08 02
- PDF Application page 1
- PDF Application page 2
- PDF Bylaw Compliance Statement
- PDF Occupancy Notary
- PDF Scituate – PinOak – 52-6-28-22-cmc-stamp-layout1
- PDF TC filed posting 52 Pin Oak Drive
- Note Impervious Surface Area for 52 Pin Oak Drive
- Email dated 10.13.22 from Karen Joseph with photos
- Email dated 10.18.22 with Sewer Comments

- Email dated 10.17.22 with Water Department Comments
- Doc DRAFT Motion 52 Pin Oak Drive

Attendees: Vincent and Kim Fontaine, Homeowners

Ms. Burbine read the legal ad into the record.

Ms. Fontaine explained they would like to build an in-law addition in which they would live; their oldest child and her family would live in the existing home. She said the family would be able to live in the property, there would be separate living spaces. Her oldest daughter and her spouse work in Cohasset so the commute would be much better for them and they want to raise their family in Scituate.

Ms. Joseph indicated the Accessory Dwelling is the maximize size it can be, 750 sq. ft.; it is more than 40%, but they use the 750 sq. ft. requirement; the property is also in the Water Resource Protection District so all the requirements are going to have to be met and those requirements have been conditioned in the decision.

Ms. Lambert asked if the Fountaines understood what the means; Mr. Fontaine said they understand the rainwater water coming off the house has to go back into the ground and they have already accounted for that to happen.

Ms. Joseph said ultimately all the information will have to be on a plan that is submitted to the Building Department when they apply for a building permit.

Mr. Pritchard asked if the exteriors for the existing and addition will be the same; Mr. Fontaine said yes, they will all be the same, it will look like one house.

Ms. Fontaine explained how the parking works, indicating the existing driveway comfortably fits three vehicles and there is a two-car garage. Mr. Fontaine said the driveway fits all the cars now, so there are no parking spaces being added.

Mr. Pritchard asked if there is any exterior lighting; Ms. Fontaine said she assumes there will be lighting at the front entry. Mr. Fontaine explained there will be no lighting on the side of building next to the neighbors and there is a row of trees along the property that blocks the view. Ms. Joseph also indicated that all lighting must be down lighting is in the conditions.

There was discussion about the second means of egress; Mr. Fontaine indicated there is door going out the back deck.

Mr. Pritchard asked if it is a two-story building; Mr. Fontaine said they are putting in a full basement because they need the storage.

The property is on Town Sewer.

No public comment.

*Motion:*

Ms. Burbine moved to make the following Findings of Fact:

1. On October 12, 2022 applicant Vincent Fountaine applied for a special permit for an accessory dwelling in a single-family home at the property at 52 Pin Oak Drive.
2. According to the Town of Scituate Assessor's records and the deed, the property at 52 Pin Oak Drive is owned by Vincent and Kim Fountaine. Both owners signed the accessory dwelling special permit application.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted with the application, the Planning Board finds the floor area of the Accessory Dwelling to be 750 sq. ft. The floor area of the primary dwelling is 1,422 sq. ft. according to Assessor's Records. The accessory dwelling is 53% of the floor area of the primary dwelling. This meets the size requirements of 530.2F of the zoning bylaw for accessory dwellings as the bylaw allows 750 sq. ft. or 40% of the total floor area of the primary dwelling, whichever is greater. The accessory dwelling is subordinate to the existing single-family home.
4. The Accessory dwelling unit will be a complete separate housekeeping unit and there will be only one accessory dwelling on the lot.
5. The property is in the Residential R-2 Zoning District and Water Resources Protection District. The proposed accessory dwelling structure meets all the required setbacks, building height and yard requirements for a primary dwelling.
6. The proposed accessory dwelling is to be located in a first-floor addition to the single-family home. Access will be via a door at the front of the house and into a stairway connecting to the existing dwelling leading to a deck.
7. The appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the appearance of the primary dwelling.
8. The Plot Plan for 52 Pin Oak Drive in Scituate, MA by C & G Survey Company dated June 24, 2022 shows the location of the existing primary dwelling and the proposed accessory dwelling. The plan shows an existing bituminous driveway which can fit four parking spaces. This appears adequate to provide two parking spaces for the primary dwelling and two spaces for the accessory dwelling. Ample parking appears to be provided.
9. The applicant/owners have submitted a signed, notarized statement that they will continue to reside on the property as their primary residence once the accessory dwelling is complete and they will occupy the accessory dwelling.
10. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water and sewer. The Water Department has commented that a new 1" water line should replace the existing ¾" pipe that currently exists. The Sewer Department has commented that the accessory dwelling will require a ½ sewer connection fee of \$8,000.00 to connect to town sewer.
11. The application **meets** the standards of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit.

Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken, and was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Burbine - yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Burbine moved **to approve** the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling at 52 Pin Oak Drive with the following conditions in addition to the standard conditions for accessory dwellings approved by the Planning Board after a public hearing on 12/17/15:

1. Except for any changes necessary to meet these conditions, any construction shall substantially conform to plans submitted with the application by Designs by Marshall, LLC dated 8/2/2022 consisting of Fountaine Residence, Project No. 22002 in law Addition, 52 Pin Oak Dr., Scituate, MA 02066 Cover Sheet; Demo Floor & Roof Plans D1.1; Basement Plan A1.1; First Floor Plan A1.2; Roof Plan & Square Footage Plans A1.3; Exterior Elevations A2.1; Exterior Elevation & Sections A2.2; Foundation Plan, Details and Notes A3.1; Framing Plans A3.2 ; Plot Plan for 52 Pin Oak Drive in Scituate, MA by C & G Survey Company dated June 24, 2022 April 19, 2022; Subdivision Plan of Land in Scituate by Stenbeck & Taylor dated May 8, 1961 Plan Number 27679 C.
2. The number of bedrooms in the accessory dwelling is limited to one in the location and size indicated on the floor plan submitted with the application. The basement cannot be finished for additional living space in the accessory dwelling as the accessory dwelling is at its maximum size.
3. No further expansion of the accessory dwelling floor area is allowed. ~~without further review by the Planning Board.~~
4. Upon occupancy of the accessory dwelling, the applicant shall provide a notarized affidavit that an owner is living in one of the dwelling units. A yearly certification that the owner occupies one of the dwelling units must be provided by March 1 yearly.
5. All requirements of the Board of Health, Building Department, Zoning Board of Appeals, Department of Public Works, Fire Department and other Town agencies must be met prior to occupancy of the accessory dwelling.
6. The accessory dwelling shall conform to all applicable standards in the building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, fire and health codes and bylaws.
7. Water connection must meet all requirements of the DPW Water Division for the accessory dwelling. The DPW is requiring an updated 1” water service for the existing house and accessory dwelling.
8. Any lighting installed shall be down lighting to not shed light on abutting properties.
9. Construction work shall not begin prior to 7:00 am weekdays and 8:00 am on Saturdays and shall cease no later than 7:00 pm or sunset whichever is earlier. No construction shall take place on Sundays or legal state and federal holidays. Construction includes idling of vehicles, delivery of materials to the site and all other construction activities.
10. Runoff from the proposed accessory dwelling shall not be increased from the property. As the property is in the Water Resource Protection District, rooftop runoff must be designed to

recharge the first inch of rainfall. Infiltration basins or trenches shall be constructed with a three-foot minimum separation between the bottom of the structure and maximum groundwater elevation. An artificial system of recharge shall be required which does not degrade the groundwater as there is more than 15% impervious area for the site. A plan for attaining runoff requirements must be provided to the Building Commissioner as part of the building permit application.

11. Erosion and sedimentation control devices shall be installed to prevent any erosion or sedimentation from leaving the site during construction. Silt sock shall be used as necessary.

Ms. Lambert cautioned the Fountaines to really pay attention to condition #10 regarding the water because of where their property is located, in the WRPD; everyone has to abide by these requirements and be advised the Board members do drive by projects and know what is going on around Town.

Ms. Burbine reiterated that there should be no parking in the street from either dwelling.

Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion as amended, a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

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

### **Discussion/Vote – Surety and Endorsement – 14 – 16 Old Country Way**

#### **Documents**

- PDF 221101-Surety Estimate Review Memo
- PDF New Deed 9-30-2022
- PDF OCW1Proposal REV #2
- PDF Siteplan 14-16 Old Country Way – Rev 2022-11-01-2

Attendees:

Ms. Joseph indicated the mylars and a set of plans have been received; everything that was conditioned to be on the mylars prior to endorsement has been done. A surety estimate was provided and sent to Horsley Witten for review; Horsley Witten came up with estimate of \$191,015. Ms. Joseph did not know if the Board wanted to amend that number or not. She said there is a 15% contingency in the number and Mr. McGill intends to provide a bond and will record the plans after endorsement. The pre-construction conference was done yesterday, but he is not authorized to start construction; demolition is the only thing allowed and fencing has been put up. Mr. McGill is hoping to get foundations in before the winter. Most information has already been submitted, i.e. truck routes, etc., but he understands all the rules.

*Motion:*

Ms. Burbine moved that the Planning Board endorse the Site Plan for 14 – 16 Old Country Way in Scituate, Massachusetts, prepared by Grady Consulting, L.L.C. dated May 19, 2022 with revisions through 11/1/2022 consisting of 17 sheets. Conditions and changes needed for endorsement have been added to the plan per the Site Plan Administrative Review/Tandem Parking Special Permit in the Village Center and Neighborhood District, Greenbush Driftway Gateway District, Greenbush Village Center Subdistrict. (VCN-GDG-GVC). The property was permitted by 14-16 Old Country Way, LLC, Robert Proctor, Manager. The property is now owned by Malloy Hall, LLC, Donald McGill, Manager.

Ms. Burbine moved that the surety for 14-16 Old Country Way for the Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for Tandem Parking be set at \$191,015.00 based on the applicants' estimate for construction costs reviewed by the Town's consulting engineer Janet Bernardo of Horsley Witten Group.

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

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

### **Discussion/Vote – Plan Change – 6 MacDonald Terrace**

#### **Documents**

- PDF 18-314 Inspection Report – Binder Course of Pavement, Riprap Slope, 11-07-22
- PDF Amendment Request Letter
- PDF Grading-Landscape Easement 1
- PDF Planting Plan
- PDF Site Plan Modification
- PDF Site Plan Pizza take out
- Email from Bob Burwick to Karen Joseph dated 10.31.22
- Photos provided by Mr. Morse at the meeting

Attendees: Bob Burwick, Owner; Greg Morse, Engineer

Mr. Morse said the property is located at 6 MacDonald Terrace, the Board approved a mixed-use building, the building is substantially completed; Mr. Burwick submitted a letter to the Board requesting 5 changes to the site.

- Exterior of the building is substantially done
- Parking lot has been paved
- Performing final landscaping on the site
- Proposed changes:
  - Install 2 fences as highlighted on the plan
    - Back of the parking lot 40'
      - Runs along the lot line to shield the neighbor's garage

- Fence along the Southern lot line along entire edge of the parking lot
- Add pea stone gravel circular patio on side of the building
- Change the proposed grass area behind CP's Pizza to riprap
  - Riprap currently has already been installed
  - Area that is utilitarian, not an area that is seen from the public view
  - Maintenance issue; would be grass area that is neglected for mowing
  - Asking for the riprap to be accepted in place of grass
  - Area is a 1.5 to 2:1 slope and it is industry practice to place riprap on slopes of that nature

Ms. Lambert opined it is not innocuous.

Ms. Burbine opined it looks like a dump truck empty its contents and asked if it could be terraced. Mr. Morse said it was never proposed to be terraced and Mr. Burwick said there is not enough room to terrace. He said beyond CP's Pizza there is sufficient room where it is terraced after the riprap, but there is not sufficient room behind the pizza shop. Ms. Burbine said it looks like it is just sliding into the buildings. Mr. Burwick said there have been at least three downpours and nothing has been affected it; it has been perfectly sound.

Ms. Lambert said there are a lot of eyes on Greenbush right now; she opined it is not a minor change to have the riprap as it jumped right out at her. She questioned what could be planted in the riprap.

Mr. Morse said there is a bit of space between the riprap and the parking lot and all the plantings proposed and approved by the Board are going to be planted. He said the majority of the plantings have already been put in and all the original plantings approved are in line to be planted and there is plenty of room for them.

There was discussion about some of the plants noted on the plans, i.e. hydrangeas that are to be planted on the top along the sides of the riprap.

Ms. Lambert said had the applicant has come to the Board and presented riprap; she does not think she would have approved that because it is the gateway to Scituate.

Mr. Morse explained that immediately behind CP's Pizza was an area that was over grown with weeds, etc., it was regraded for this project and riprap was installed. He said there are several other spots along Driftway, the walking path and dump, where there is riprap in place, it is in other places in Scituate; it is an industry standard to use on a slope of this nature. He opined it really isn't visible from the street when driving by.

Mr. Burwick said they can do additional plantings around it.

Mr. Bornstein said he does not dispute that it is standard operating procedure for helping to stabilize steep slopes and that the applicant will keep the plantings on the top, but he agrees with Ms. Lambert that it is a very inelegant solution to a large change in grade where two properties lines meet. He opined if it was shown on a plan, the Board probably would have asked for a retaining wall to be placed with a nice landscape area above and below rather than a steep riprap slope. He does not know where to go from here since the riprap has already been put in.

Ms. Joseph asked if it has been verified that it is all in the easement; the Town's consulting engineer questioned if the riprap was extended outside the easement. Mr. Morse indicated some of the riprap that was placed about 2' over on to the abutters property, but it has since been removed. If it spills over onto the Rivershed property which Mr. Burwick owns it is a moot point.

Ms. Joseph did not agree that it was a moot point.

Mr. Morse said Mr. Burwick has the right to put riprap on the Rivershed property that he owns; he can place riprap on a slope that he owns. Mr. Morse said he does not think Conservation would go for a retaining wall at this location because it is adjacent to the river and is land that is subject to coastal storm flowage on the embankment and retaining walls are frowned upon in that scenario.

Mr. Burwick said they can do plantings in and around the riprap to provide additional screening.

There was discussion about what some potential solutions might be.

- Mr. Morse suggest a grass coat could be put down, but it will be difficult to maintain.
  - He opined that is what was done in front of the Golf Course
  - It is hard to maintain, but it can be done
- Mr. Pritchard suggested some kind of ground cover that does not have to be mowed, something that is not grass, i.e. myrtle
  - Ms. Joseph suggest something like juniper because it is a very sunny location and it will cover and spread

Ms. Lewis moved the conversation on to the other items being requested to change/review.

Mr. Morse explained the addition of the fencing.

- Fencing:
  - When pulling into the driveway the abutters' garage is in view and there is a pile of debris, the fence is to screen that and add additional privacy for both parties
  - Fence is 6' tall PVC White Fence
  - Second fence is on the left-hand side of the plan and runs along the top of the slope of the Rivershed property and this property, to provide privacy to residents of this property so they are not over looking the ice house and seeing headlights.
    - There are arborvitae plantings along the edge, the fence is just additional screening
    - 6' PVC White Fence
      - Board was concerned it would be too reflective
      - Mr. Burwick said the fence is significantly higher than the Rivershed property so there would be no headlights shining on the fence.
  - Fencing along the side only proposed to be 32' versus the back at 40'
  - Ms. Burbine said when the tenants pull into the parking area the headlights are going to shine on a bright white fence.
    - Mr. Burwick said there are plantings all along the front of the fence



- Ms. Lambert opined it is a bright white scar that goes across MacDonald Terrace.
- Patio:
  - Pea stone gravel area 100% pervious area
  - Provide some outdoor amenity space
  - Fence juts by it and makes a 90 degree turn by the area

The Board said there needs to be a solution to the riprap, that is the biggest issue. Ms. Joseph said the Board should ask for a detail of what is proposed and the Board has to decide if this is a field change or a modification; a modification requires abutter notification and advertising.

A straw vote was taken.

Mr. Bornstein opined the fencing and the addition of the riprap is a significant modification to the original landscape plan and intent of the site. He is inclined to call it a modification.

Ms. Burbine and Mr. Pritchard both agreed. Mr. Pritchard opined he does not think this is something the Board would have approved and would have looked at it much more closely; it is a modification.

Ms. Lambert said the Board views this as a modification and not a field change; the Board would like to see a detailed plan. Ms. Joseph added there will need to be a public hearing, abutters will need to be notified. Ms. Joseph indicated depending on when information comes in the project could be heard either December 8<sup>th</sup> or December 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Morse asked some follow up questions.

- What if the riprap was eliminated and grass was put in and the fence along that side was eliminated in its entirety, but the fence along the back of parking lot remained could that be considered a field change.
- Would the patio be considered a major change, it was originally proposed to just be lawn area?

Ms. Lambert, Ms. Lewis and Ms. Burbine had no issues with the fence along the back or the pea stone patio area.

There was discussion about what would happen to the riprap area; Mr. Morse said he and Mr. Burwick would discuss if they would forego the fence and riprap along that side and if they did then grass would be planted as originally proposed. Mr. Morse said it was essentially a grass area that was overgrown and they would put it back as grass. Mr. Morse said it sounds as though if the riprap and the fencing was removed they may be able to move forward with the other items, the patio, the fence along the back of the parking lot.

Mr. Pritchard was still concerned about the slope. Mr. Morse said it would be a 2:1 grass slope, the same as in front of the Golf Course along the parking lot. Ms. Joseph said it would not be able to be maintained by mowing. Mr. Morse said a weedwhacker would have to be used, not a traditional lawn mower.

Mr. Morse discussed the fifth item they are seeking to change; the trash bin enclosure at the corner of the property they are proposing to change to a dumpster. There is already a trash truck coming to the property next door at 18 Ford Place it would be easier for the residents of the building. It would be an enclosed dumpster pad.

Ms. Lambert opined if the riprap is removed and the fence is removed then the applicant would be asking for a field change for the balance of items instead of a modification. She asked the Board members their feelings.

Mr. Bornstein said it is less of a change than the original plan and is less visually impactful than those two items; he said it is a shame that at the end we are talking about these issues. He said the building is coming out nicely and it is not the best-looking solution for the space, but if that was on the original plan and that is the intent to be followed then he does not see how it is a major modification because that is what was approved.

Ms. Joseph asked what the grade was on the original slope that was approved; Mr. Morse indicated 2:1. Ms. Joseph said the Board should start requiring the slopes be required on the plans.

Mr. Morse said they are asking for the fence in the back along the neighbor's garage, the patio and the dumpster in lieu of individual enclosures. He said on the slope they will remove the riprap and plant grass and won't put a fence on that side. There are no changes to the original plantings.

Mr. Pritchard said it is not an excuse that because a lawnmower cannot get out there should not be maintained when it is restored with the original slope and grass as approved; it has to be maintained.

Ms. Joseph said if all they are proposing is the 40' fence in the back, the patio and the dumpster a Board member could make a motion to do those as a field change.

*Motion:*

Ms. Burbine made a motion for those three items, 40' fence in back, patio and dumpster change.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Burbine - yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Joseph said there can be not sediment leaving the area when the riprap is removed.

## **Discussion – Zoning - Section 760 – Parking Requirements**

### **Documents**

- DOC 2 Section 760 Parking Requirements

Ms. Lambert opined the changes are mostly housekeeping in her view.

Ms. Burbine said she wants to get rid of tandem parking. Ms. Joseph said she does not advise that and gave the example of 14-16 Old Country Way that is technically tandem parking. Ms. Burbine said after going to Traffic Rules there are concerns about safety. Ms. Joseph said if there are concerns the Board does not need to approve the special permit because tandem parking is a special permit.

Ms. Lambert said she does not think it is feasible for there to always be two-car garages.

The Board discussed the proposed changes.

- Off-site parking requirements
  - Outside seating cafés are not exempt from proposed parking requirements
    - Discussions with Building Department, there is no difference if there is seating inside or outside, parking is still needed
    - Zoning originally done to encourage outdoor-cafes, but parking is parking and parking is tight everywhere
    - Projects going forward would need to evaluate what they have for outdoor seating and provide parking for that seating as well as indoor seating
    - This change does not apply to anything pre-existing
    - 15-20 outdoor seats would require 4-5 spaces for outdoor seating in addition to indoor seating. (1 space/4 seats)
    - Currently only indoor seating needs to meet requirements of (1 space/4 seats)
  - Board can decrease off street parking, cannot increase it.
    - Language makes more sense, clarifies the language
    - Could also apply to outdoor seating reduction
  - Off-site parking
    - Currently Board can allow for employees
    - Proposed to strike “only for employees” will allow off-site parking for the use so long as all other requirements are met, i.e. long-term lease, etc.
- Street Screen
  - Can be a wall or a fence plus landscaping
  - Wrong word “impervious” used implies there are no gaps

Ms. Lambert said this off-site parking would be helpful for the Harbor and North Scituate at some point.

Mr. Pritchard wanted to make sure that the Board had flexibility with regards to outdoor seating; he wants to still encourage people to have outdoor seating. The Boards should have “discretion” regarding the outdoor seating, that needs to be added into the language.

Mr. Bornstein agreed with Mr. Pritchard that it makes sense for the Board to have discretion. He gave an example if a new ice cream store wants to open and they want to have a couple of picnic benches; he opined that is different than a restaurant that is adding full table service, wait staff, reservations, etc., what is the actual use.

The Board all agreed and changes will be made next week for the Zoning workshop.

**Minutes**  
**Documents**

- Meeting Minutes 10.27.22

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the meeting minutes for October 27, 2022.

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

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

**Liaison Reports:**

**Zoning Board of Appeals – reported by Ms. Lambert:**

- Old Oaken Bucket postponed until January
  - Reduced from 32 to 24 units
  - Issue with water in the basements
  - Project is moving right along

**Community Preservation Committee – reported by Ms. Burbine:**

- Pickle Ball request for \$500k
- Wheeler Park Windows request for \$500k
- 5 items will be discussed next Monday night, total of 12 applications came in
- Purple Dinosaur Park funding request
  - Doing a lot of fundraising
  - Great playground for little kids
  - About 25 years old
  - Playground does need some love
- Playground at Wampatuck School funding request
- Additional funding request for the North Scituate Train Canopy

**Traffic Rules and Regulations Committee – reported by Ms. Burbine:**

- Committee blown away by Ms. Joseph's knowledge and ability to explain the upcoming projects at 61 New Driftway and 33 New Driftway
- Meeting again on November 30<sup>th</sup>
  - Hoping Ms. Joseph will attend
  - Going to provide written comments for both projects, 61 New Driftway and 33 New Driftway
- Mordecai Lincoln looking to become one-way
  - Not possible because of fire truck access issues
    - Truck cannot go over the bridge
- Additional items discussed about traffic signs and speeding

**Select Board Meeting – reported by Ms. Burbine:**

- Sidewalk on Hatherly Road cost is over \$6M

- Sidewalk from Egypt Beach to lights a Gannett and Hatherly Roads
- People walking with double strollers and dogs to get to the beaches
- Going to revamp the Sidewalk Committee
  - 2007 Sidewalk study some has been done
  - 2019 Complete Streets Report Summary
  - Pattie will be the representative from the Planning Board
  - Meeting to be set up with several members of the Town

The Board discussed different types of sidewalks; Ms. Lewis asked why sidewalks are not concrete. Ms. Joseph said concrete is more expensive.

Ms. Lewis asked for someone to tell her why you can't get a double stroller down Country Way, she would like Ms. Lambert to discuss that at the Sidewalk Committee meeting she attends. Ms. Joseph said there only needs to be enough width to be ADA compliant and a double stroller is larger than that width. There are telephone polls and mailboxes, but the sidewalk meets the requirements.

They continued to discuss the sidewalk on Hatherly as having a lot of issues to get it done, i.e. wetlands, etc.

Ms. Burbine said there really should be a sidewalk from the Cohasset line to the train station. Ms. Lambert said that is on the list. A lot of the study centered around the schools and much has been done and much has changed. She said she will report back to the Board.

Ms. Joseph discussed the Complete Streets; MASSDOT submitted 19-20 prioritizations for complete streets, Country Way was the first one and that is completed. DPW outlined certain projects they would seek money for periodically.

Ms. Lambert said there is no sidewalk that goes up 3A to the Old Forge neighborhood and is something they have to look at.

Ms. Burbine said that there will be a sidewalk from Beechwood down to Henry Turner Bailey Road when 3A is redone.

**Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:**

- Old Driftway was paved and will be striped on Monday
- Curtis Estates was paved
- Gas Station has temporary Certificates of Occupancy

**Documents**

- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 11.7.22 with meeting agenda for 11.10.22 and materials for 14-16 Old Country Way, 6 MacDonald Terrace, 52 Pin Oak Drive, Parking Requirements.
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 11.7.22 with materials for 14-16 Old Country Way and DRAFT Meeting minutes from 10.27.22
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 11.10.22 with AMENDED Agenda 11.10.22

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Ms. Burbine moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:54 p.m. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken, and unanimously in favor.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Ann Burbine, Clerk  
Date Approved: November 17, 2022