

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES November 4, 2021

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chair; Patricia Lambert, Vice Chair; Rebecca Lewis, Clerk; Stephen Pritchard, Benjamin Bornstein 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: Select Board Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chair Burbine called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 11/4/21 Planning Board Agenda

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

Public Hearing – Special Permit Accessory Dwelling – 65 Booth Hill Road Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 19-3-2-0 Applicant/Owner: John J. and Linda M. Adams, Trustees

Documents

- PDF Adams Acc Dwelling App.
- PDF Application
- PDF Barn Images for Elevations
- PDF Site Plan with Accessory Floor Plan
- PDF Site Plan and Existing House floor plan
- Email from the Board of Health dated 9.27.21
- Email from the Sewer Department dated 9.27.21
- Email from Water Department dated 10.4.21
- Email from the Water Department dated 10.20.21
- Doc DRAFT Motion

Attendees: Mike Hayes, Attorney; John Adams and Linda Adams, Property Owners

Ms. Burbine read the legal posting for notice into the record.

Mr. Hayes gave a brief overview of the project.

- Barn and the single-family home have been on the property since 1800's
- Property almost 4 acres
- Was a working farm – used to do riding lessons, summer camps
 - Business operation of farm has ceased
- Proposal is to put accessory dwelling on the first floor of the barn
- Accessory dwelling will be for their daughter and her husband
 - Daughter has had several severe horse accidents

- Unit will be outfitted with handicapped accessible fixtures, etc., single floor living
- Children will live in the main house with grandparents
- No structural changes, no changes to the footprint, no expansion of the building
- New windows and siding have been done, window now match the windows in the main house

Ms. Joseph indicated the detached structure meets all the requirements for setbacks, etc.; it is about 1,153sq. ft., 38.3% square footage of the primary dwelling which meets the bylaw; there has been a bathroom on the premises for decades, the Water Division has indicated the applicant does not need a separate water service and the structure is on septic. She recommends that the Board approve the accessory dwelling special permit.

There was discussion about parking; there are 2 dedicated spots to the east of the barn for the accessory dwelling and plenty of parking in the driveway.

All outside lighting will be down lighting.

No public comments.

Motion:

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

1. On September 24, 2021 John J. Adams and Linda M. Adams, Trustees of the J and L Realty Trust applied for a special permit for a detached accessory dwelling on the property at 65 Booth Hill Road.
2. According to the Town of Scituate Assessor's records and the deed, the property at 65 Booth Hill Road is owned by John J. and Linda M. Adams.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted by the applicant, the floor area of the proposed accessory dwelling will be approximately 1,153 sq. ft. The application indicates this is 38.3% of the total square footage of the primary dwelling which is 3,007 sq. ft. according to the Applicant and the Assessor's card. 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 square footage 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-1 Zoning District and Wireless Communications Overlay District. The proposed detached 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 the existing barn on the property. Access will be via a front door and from a mudroom door on the west side of the dwelling.
7. The appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the appearance of the primary dwelling.
8. The Plan of Land for 65 Booth Hill Road, Scituate, MA by Atlantic Coast Engineering, LLC, shows the location of the existing primary dwelling and the proposed accessory dwelling.

The plan shows a gravel circular driveway connecting to an asphalt driveway with 2 new proposed parking spaces for the accessory dwelling. 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 owners have submitted a signed, notarized statement that they will be occupying one of the units at 65 Booth Hill Road.
10. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water. The Water Department has commented that a separate water connection will not be required as the barn has been using utilities from the primary house for decades.
11. The addition of the one-bedroom accessory dwelling is within the current capacity of the existing septic system.
12. The application meets the standards of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit.

Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling at 65 Booth Hill Road 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 architectural plans for the Booth Hill Farm Residence, 65 Booth Hill Road, Scituate, MA consisting of a three plan sheets including: Existing First Floor Plan A1.1; Proposed Floor Plan, A1.2; Existing Second Floor Plan; Plan of Land for 65 Booth Hill Road in Scituate, MA by Atlantic Coast Engineering, LLC dated September 2021.
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.
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 he 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 not requiring a separate water service for the 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.
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.

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

Accounting Documents

PO #2204048 (\$250.00)

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the requisition of \$250.00 to CAI Technologies for Zoning Map updates on GIS Viewer.

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

Liaison Reports:

Traffic Rules and Regulations (TRR) – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- 533 Country Way on agenda for next meeting 11.9.21

CPC – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- Meeting on 11.8.21 several items up for review and some items will be rescinded
- Select Board voted for Border Street and everything has been squared away
- First Cliff, MacDonald Farm property one of the owners has decided not to sell
 - Property is land locked
 - CPC going to move forward with purchasing the remainder of the property around the one lot
- Mordecai Lincoln property status unknown

Ms. Burbine addressed a comment made on social media regarding 7 New Driftway. The information on social media is incorrect and the Planning Board has not approved anything at 7 New Driftway at this time.

Discussion/Vote – Minor Changes - Residential Compound Development – 485 Country Way

Documents

- PDF Analysis of Submitted Plans
- PDF Highland Ests Permit Set – 0 CW Lot #5 0 9-23-21
- PDF Highland Ests Permit Set – 0 CW Lot #1 9-23-21
- PDF Site Plan - Lot 1 – 0 Country Way
- PDF Site Plan – Lot 2 – 0 Country Way

- PDF Site Plan – Lot 3 – 0 Country Way
- PDF Site Plan – Lot 4 – 0 Country Way
- PDF Site Plan – Lot 5 – 0 Country Way
- Doc 11-3-21 Drainage Calculation REV

Attendees: Kevin Grad, Grady Consulting; Andrew Nadar, Developer; Tony Nadar, Developer

Ms. Joseph indicated she requested the applicants come in to discuss condition #10 and #11 of the special permit. Condition #10 references the location and footprint of each building on the plans and any proposed changes need to be reviewed by the Planning Board to determine if the changes are insignificant or require a modification to the special permit. Condition #11 requires that individual site plans are submitted for each lot prior to the application of a building permit with the intent to preserve trees on individual lots; lots shall be reviewed in the field with the site engineer, landscape architect and the Town Planner prior to any clearing.

Ms. Joseph addressed condition #11; she walked the site and determined there are no trees that can be retained because they are in areas that will have to be graded and filled.

Mr. Grady showed a plan with what was approved and what is being proposed for the building locations and size; he opined the general shape is very similar. The widths are very similar; there is now a bump out in the back versus the front, farmers' porch, garages and they have been sighted in the general location of the approved plans.

Mr. Andy Nadar said they provided an analysis that shows a difference between what was originally approved and what is being proposed to be a change of 8-10% in square footage on the first floor; calculations have been run on of the drainage systems to confirm that any changes won't have a detrimental effect on the system.

Ms. Lambert asked the difference in the floor plan. Mr. Nadar said the first-floor plan is 2,197 sq. ft. and they are all around that number versus 2,024 it is an increase of about 100 sq. ft. excluding garages.

There was discussion about the net increase/decrease of impervious surface. Mr. Grady indicated the impervious was a percentage over what was shown on the original plan, but he ran the stormwater analysis for the basins and there was additional capacity in the drainage basin.

Mr. Pritchard reference the Country Way analysis provided by the applicant. Based off that document the driveways appear to be reduced by 1,974 sq. ft. and there is an increase in the homes of 920 sq. ft. Mr. Nadar said yes that is correct; lot 1 driveway decreased 30%, Lot 2 decreased 7%, Lot 3 decreased by 24%, Lot 4 is even, Lot 5 decreased 23% and there is increase of 920 sq. ft. for the homes. Mr. Pritchard said the net is 1,000 sq. ft. reduction.

There was further discussion on the calculations that Mr. Grady did versus what the Town's Consulting Engineer provided. The Board wanted to reconcile the numbers; there was reference to REV letter dated 11.3.21 from Chessia Consulting and the numbers from Mr., Grady. Mr. Nadar tried to explain the numbers provided were just based off the driveways and houses and the engineering review accounts for more impervious area, i.e. porches, that were not included in the floor plan analysis. Mr. Grady said he included the covered porches as impervious in the drainage

calculations, but they are on footings there is no foundation. Mr. Grady said Mr. Chessia's numbers were from his report and the system can handle the water.

There was further discussion about the REV letter dated 11.3.21; Mr. Grady indicated he had a conversation with Mr. Chessia about connecting the roof drains to the overflow outlet by the garage on Lot 3 and then flowing to basin 1. Mr. Pritchard thought it was going to a drywell. Mr. Grady said they are required to have drywells for the first inch of rain, but they were asked to design the system to ignore the drywells because they would not necessarily be maintained by the homeowners. He said the analysis does not use the drywells at all and is all considered runoff. Mr. Grady said Mr. Chessia had some confusion with the roof lines, but after further discussion he was not concerned. Mr. Grady explained the downspouts are interconnected underground and when they surcharge it is outlet in area that guarantees the water will flow to the basin. This is over ground flow to the basin.

Ms. Burbine said her concern is the driveways are right on the property lines, there is no room between them. She opined it is a lot of pavement.

Mr. Nadar said the decision opted for a shorter road and narrower lots in order to have the 5 houses, the lots are tighter. He said originally there was not a lot of clearance on lot 2 or lot 3; the house on lot 3 was rotated slightly and pulled away from the wetlands and Aberdeen Road which they think is a benefit. Mr. Grady said they are trying to create larger backyards. Mr. Nadar said it also creates more buffer to the houses on Aberdeen than originally submitted and is a net positive to those abutters that had expressed concerns.

Ms. Joseph said the Board should decide if the changes are insignificant or require a modification.

Mr. Pritchard circled back on the stormwater. Mr. Grady said there are no changes in velocity or volume on any of the property lines and the basins hold the 100 years storm.

Mr. Tony Nadar said they want to do what is right, but they are running into the situation where the weather is changing and said if they could move forward with the next phase it would be great so they can anticipate getting foundations in the ground before the weather really changes; they would be expensive delays. Their opinion is these are minor changes to the plans, moving the houses forward makes it better for the abutters.

There is less driveway, but more house.

Mr. MacLean said he was in favor of cutting down the driveway size and adding to house so long as the stormwater drainage remains within the performance metrics.

Mr. Bornstein said with regards to the building and driveways if the drainage works he is okay. But, he opined he is disappointed in the lots and that more ingenuity wasn't put into the design; if he had seen this plan as the original plan he would not have gone for it. The Board pushed for Condition 10 and 11 to preserve trees and the rural character of the area which they heard is what people wanted from the abutters in the area. He was hoping the look and feel of the wilder area that is being kept was in the look and feel of the lot design.

Mr. Tony Nadar agreed with Mr. Bornstein. He said they did a subdivision in Cohasset and added more trees to the site after the site was built than the town wanted. They agree they would like to see

more green, trees and vegetation on site. They intend to add more landscaping after the project is complete as they did in Cohasset.

Mr. Bornstein made a comment regarding the large yard space and opined a lot of new younger homeowners do not want larger yards to maintain. There is a trend to create well priced marketable homes and shift the paradigm of traditional lot development.

Ms. Lambert said she would like to see more greenery and has been to their development in Cohasset. She agreed with Mr. Bornstein that people don't want such big yards anymore.

Mr. Pritchard said he wants to make sure Mr. Chessia's comment #1 is resolved in final site plans.

Ms. Joseph indicated to the applicants there is potential to go over budget with the Consulting Engineer and the applicant will have to pay for any overages.

There was discussion about the gravel testing for the roadway and issues that is has failed; they are working on resolution. The gravel has to pass before the paving can go down and foundations can be started.

The telephone poll was approved to be moved; Mr. Andy Nadar indicated the phonelines, etc. are being handled by Verizon and National Grid.

Mr. Nadar said one of the conditions is that an as-built be provided before they proceed into Phase 2 and asked if the Board was ready to accept the as-built.

Ms. Joseph indicated the revised as-built was just received and has not been submitted to the Board yet, but Mr. Chessia does believe the 3' ground water separation has been met.

Mr. Grady said they did test holes in May with Mr. Chessia before construction started to confirm groundwater elevations, constructed the basins, there is a monitoring well that has been measured, he believes there is 4' of separation.

The Board opined the changes were minor with conditions.

Motion:

Move to approve changes to the layouts of each building shown on the Lots 1-5 as insignificant changes (condition 10) provided an improved landscape design plan is presented to the Board prior to implementation and comment 1 of the Chessia Consulting Service letter dated November 3, 2021 is addressed and pending Chessia Consulting and the Town Planner review and approval of the as-built per condition 28 and the base course of the road being laid and approved by the Town Planner and consulting engineer, then Phase 2 can proceed.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion as amended; a vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

There was continued discussion about the trees and Ms. Joseph said there were no trees to save.

Discussion/Vote – 6 MacDonald Terrace – Mixed-use Special Permit – Request for Extension of Time

Applicant/Owner: RJB Development, Bob Burwick

Documents

- PDF 10.21.21 Time Extension Request Letter
- Doc DRAFT Motion Form Permit Extension

Attendees: Bob Burwick, RJB Development

Mr. Burwick said that he was previously granted an extension on October 13, 2020 to extend for a year with an option to extend for another year. He is seeking another extension for the project. Several reasons were provided as to why an extension should be granted.

- Project was sent back to Design Review Committee
- Project at 18 Ford Place going on simultaneously and the area is very tight
- Tenant is still in the home and is leaving shortly

Ms. Joseph recommends granting the extension.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to accept Bob Burwick of RJB Development Corporation request 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, 2022 in accordance with the letter submitted by Mr. Burwick dated 10-20-21.

Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Form A – 46 Hollett Street

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 13-1-4

Applicant/Owner: Christopher S. and Barbara M. Horne

Documents

- PDF 21-226 ANR
- PDF ANR Application
- PDF ZBA Decision 2021
- Doc Transmittal 46- Hollett Street – ANR
- Jpeg Images

Attendees: Greg Morse, Morse Engineering; Chris Horne, Owner

Mr. Morse reviewed the project.

- Lot is roughly 1.5 acres
- Splitting into 2 lots
- Frontage on Hollett Street
- Lot 1 41,000 sq. ft., 50' frontage
 - ZBA has granted 50' Frontage Special Permit
- Lot 2 remains 20,000 sq. ft. has access on 100' of frontage on Hollett St

- Should endorse because both have vital access and frontage on a Town accept way

Ms. Joseph indicated that she has been discussing this Form A with Town Counsel; while both lots have access and frontage, the plan is creating a non-conformity to an existing lot. Town Counsel has now advised that the Form A and the Common Driveway should be done simultaneously; by doing the Form A the applicant is putting their own lot at risk if a common driveway is not granted as the existing house will be non-conforming and there could be enforcement. It was just suggested that the ANR be conditioned that the plan could not be recorded until a common driveway is approved by the Planning Board.

The applicant agreed to the condition.

Mr. Morse said the issue is with the lot width; when there is a common driveway the width can be measured parallel to the driveway versus the frontage on the roadway. He said Lot 2 would be compliant once a common driveway is issued. He said there is a note on the plan that lot 1 and lot 2 are not buildable lots without a common driveway approved by the Planning Board. He said the non-conformity happens only when there is a conveyance of the lots.

Ms. Burbine indicated the Section 6 Finding from the ZBA was granted with the condition of a common driveway. No building permits can be issued for Lot 1 until a common driveway is put in.

Ms. Joseph said as soon as the plan is recorded it creates a non-conformity; but Town Counsel opined the applicant can apply for a common driveway.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as Approval Not Required a Plan of Land in Scituate, MA, 46 Hollett Street, Assessor's Parcel 13-1-4, stamped by Jason Scott, P.L.S. of Morse Engineering, Co. Inc. for applicant/owner Christopher S. and Barbara M. Horne dated July 15, 2021 as the division of the tract of land shown on the accompanying plan is not a subdivision because every lot shown on the plan has frontage of at least the distance presently required by the Scituate Zoning Bylaw on the public way of Hollett Street. *The ANR cannot be recorded unless and until a common driveway permit is granted by the Planning Board.*

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

Discussion: Water Study Requirements

Documents

- Doc Water Study Scope

Ms. Joseph began by saying when the scope of the sewer study was received for 7 New Driftway it did not include water and DPW specifically said that a water study was required. She has been working with Mr. Cafferty of DPW on the scope for a water study and was provided what has been used previously. She has amended the scope based on recommendations from Mr. Pritchard. Ms. Joseph indicated everything except #11 is included in the typical town water scope study.

Mr. Pritchard opined that the typical scope does not address demand and supply. It addresses the physical capacity and mechanic and hydraulic system to handle a connection. He said with item #11 the capacity issue/demand and supply issue are addressed. He read item #11..." determine the town's ability to meet demand of this project with the town's available supply on both an average day and peak month and peak day basis." Mr. Pritchard suggests that be a standard for all future projects. The Town needs to keep track of what the Board is looking at and how it is impacting supply and demand.

He said he pulled some information from the Water study and it is a broad general view, but there is a lot of detail and "the devil is in the detail" on how this gets done and whether it accounts for drought conditions, etc. He opined looking at information from Tighe & Bond looking at an average day everything seems fine, but Scituate does not have a system that works to an average day and during drought conditions there would be trouble on an average day; it is compounded with the summer demand when we are adding demand, but there is nothing adding to the supply. He opined that is the gap that needs be addressed. He opined this scope document takes into an analysis to include all the pieces; do we address required stream flows, fish ladder flows or are those flows sacrificed for adding another development. He thinks those are the kinds of decisions the Board is facing. The data provided is from 2018 so there are three years of data that is unknown. It needs to start somewhere with all the projects that have been approved and what happens when this project is added and so on. He thinks this provides a methodology of how to look at water and we should start now; it is one of the things that came out of the Master Plan. He thinks if the DPW can't do it or their Consultant can't do it then someone else needs to do it; it should be standard approach in any new development. There is no difference in asking for the capacity in a sewer study to doing this water study. He discussed some of the information in the Water Study dealing with maximum demand versus the current production capability. The key is evaluating that peak condition situation.

Mr. Pritchard said the analysis could start with current capacity and what is the future capacity. He does not think decisions can be made today with projections of plans for things years out from now. He opined we need to look at he current production capacity, what is near term with high probability of happening. He does not think decisions should be made to sacrifice one thing for another; how do we get from where we are today to a better situation, but without some standard analysis we will never get there.

Ms. Lambert asked if this would then predicate the Board to be able to answer why building continues if there is no water. Mr. Pritchard that is where he thinks it is going; there are 2 answers. One that we have enough water on an average daily basis, but the problem in town is the peak periods especially during drought times and that is what should be used as a benchmark for what the impacts are.

Ms. Joseph said that the town has to provide water to a developer.

Mr. Pritchard believes the developer will have to help mitigate the opportunity to provide the capacity. Ms. Joseph said this is a conversation that should happen with DPW and Water Departments; she has been told in the past that water cannot be denied to a development.

This is jumping off point; the concern is what is it going to look like for the whole town as things continue to be added to the system.

Ms. Lambert opined this is a black n 'white issue; the DPW policy may be that the town has to provide water and sewer. She assumes people think the town only doesn't have water when there are water restrictions and then the question is why is so much building being allowed and the Board cannot answer that question because they are told water has to be provided to every development.

Mr. Pritchard said if the analysis shows that there is not water during peak periods, then the question of how are "you" going to do it, how are "you" going to provide water.

Mr. MacLean spoke about the idea of creating a regional agreement where the towns around the area that work off wells systems or surface water systems got together to do a large-scale infrastructure project to tie into the NWRA substation in Quincy or Weymouth. Then all the water plants that work off the surface water would be able to use it for extreme situations; the town could then stop worrying about drilling wells that either perform or fail or fail when the town does not want them to.

Mr. Pritchard opined that is a great long-term alternative to evaluate, it is not something the Planning Board could do. He said the Board needs to make decisions with some knowledge of level of capacity now and the immediate future.

Ms. Burbine opined this encompasses more than the Planning Board, the Select Board as the Water Commissioners, need to be involved in this. She referenced a study done previously by CEI on the availability and number of units that could be built considering the capacity at that time. She said there was a public meeting, this encompasses more than just the Planning Board. It has to be a plan and approved by everyone; the Select Board are the Water Commissioners.

Mr. Pritchard responded that the Board has been asking for this for years and at the end of the day it is the Boards job to make the decision; this is what is needed to be able to make those decisions.

There was discussion about the scope and how many applicants have done the work, minus item #11.

Mr. Bornstein agreed with Mr. Pritchard and we need to start somewhere; this is a good addition to a true water study to study and evaluate the impact of a development.

Ms. Lambert said perhaps the Select Board needs to be led to what it is that needs to be done; the Board is not trying to take away the Water Commissioners job.

Mr. Pritchard said he does not think we are going to get it any other way then to ask for it on a case-by-case basis. The Master Plan says we are supposed to address water drought issues, in his view this a way to do it.

The Board decided to proceed with the Water Study Scope as written for this new applicant and will continue to ask the same of other applicants going forward. The Board will need to scrutinize the results and learn as they go, but it will get easier every time it is done.

Mr. Pritchard thought the Board could go to the DEP for help and look for grants.

The Board discussed re-arranging the number of items and changed the wording of #11. The language was change to "provide an evaluation of..."

The Board will be sending the proposed Water Study Scope to the applicant for 7 New Driftway.

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- Design Review Committee – November 16th
 - 7 New Driftway
 - 2 members of the Board welcome to attend
- Drew continuing
- Finishing Inly School
- 48-52 moving along
 - Footings for canopies going in next 2 weeks
 - Working on stormwater system
 - Water is in
- Working on Zoning
 - Lot shape
 - Section 830/810 – non-conforming uses
 - Marijuana

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 10.29.21 with meeting agenda for 11.4.21
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph date 10.29.21 with meeting materials for 65 Booth Hill Road, 485 Country Way Residential Compound, 46 Hollett Street and 6 MacDonald Terrace.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 11.2.21 with meeting materials for 46 Hollett Street.
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 11.3.21 with AMENDED agenda 11.4.21

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:21 p.m. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Rebecca Lewis, Clerk

Date Approved: December 9, 2021