

**SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD    MINUTES    January 9, 2020**

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Patricia Lambert, Clerk, Benjamin Bornstein, William Limbacher and alternate member Rebecca Lewis.

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 being recorded for airing on local cable television.

**Documents**

- 1/9/20 Planning Board Agenda

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

---

**Continued - Public Hearing – Special Permit – Residential Compound – 0 Country Way, 0 Rear Country Way, 483 Rear Country Way  
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot: 32-7-14, 32-7-15, 32-7-16, 32-7-21 and 32-7-13-A  
Applicant/ Owner: Bradford A. Merritt**

**Documents**

- PDF 1-2-2020 ZBA Decision
- PDF GC Response 2019-11-26 to Chessia Consulting Review 2019-10-02
- Doc DRAFT Motion
- Doc REV 2
- PDF Stormwater report – Residential Compound Development – Country Way-2019-11-25
- PDF Stormwater report- Residential Compound Development – Country Way-2019-12-17
- PDF Subdivision Merritt – Revised 2019-11-26
- PDF Subdivision - Post Development
- PDF Subdivision – Pre-Development
- PDF 81X Plan Book 63 Page 1185
- PDF Attachment Plan Trust Docs and Deeds
- PDF Declaration of Private Access Road and Easements
- Doc GC Response 2020-01-02-Chessia Review 2019-12-31
- PDF Letter to K Joseph Planning Board
- Email from Al Elliot, Fire Department dated 1.7.19
- Email to Karen Joseph from abutter Jennifer Oram dated 1.9.20

Attendees: Jeff DeLisi, Attorney; Michelle Nuzzo, Attorney; Kevin Grady, Grady Consulting; Bradford Merritt, Property Owner

Mr. De Lisi began by recapping the project and the purpose of the bylaw that allows for a Residential Compound Development (RCD).

- 5 house lots on the property
- Purpose of Residential Compound Development
  - Encourages large lot development –does not maximize density
  - Reduce construction costs
  - Reduce impact on abutting properties
  - Eliminate town responsibilities and costs
  - Preserve semi-rural nature of the town
- 5 lots on a track of land that is more than 4 times the size of the required lot area
  - Land is now under a single owner
- Access provide by access road off Country Way
- Grady Consulting responded to comments from Peer Review and recently provided additional comments
- Provided Draft to Board of legal document
- 

Ms. Joseph indicated that the Town's Consulting Engineer, Mr. Chessia, was not able to attend the meeting tonight. She discussed some of the points that were made in the peer review comment letter for the project.

- Filed 81X Plan - one tract, one owner
  - Board requested a new application just the application pages so the correct information for owner is used for the written decision
    - Applicant to provide an amended application
- Applicant is working to have 50' buffer around the property, most notably along the back of Aberdeen Way and behind 483 Country Way
- No screening on the west side of the access road - peer review comment the Board should offer feedback
  - Mr. Grady pointed out the area in question on the plan
    - Owners are not overly concerned about screening
      - Mr. Todd Merritt, abutter, agreed he was okay with not having any screening added.
    - Permanent grading easement has been added
    - There is existing tree line that will not be coming down
  - Board agreed screening did not need to be provided on west side of access drive and there was existing vegetation to remain on the east side
- Stone wall is on the property not in the right of way of Country Way

Ms. Joseph suggested after tonight's meeting there should be a meeting with planning, conservation, Mr. Grady and the Town's Consulting engineer and any other members that the applicant would like, to get everyone on the same page so that the next plan set can address issues from all departments, etc.

Mr. De Lisi indicated there is not much work being done that is under the jurisdiction of Conservation. He indicated there might be some specific plantings named, there could be some revision to the basin, but the meeting would be to make sure everyone is on the same page and all plans are the same, i.e. conservation, planning, etc. Mr. Grady pointed out where Conservation is calling for plantings. He indicated the applicant is happy to do plantings that can be mowed and maintained.

Ms. Joseph indicated that Mr. Chessia recommends the Board should opine if the height of the berm is sufficient for maintenance; the top of the berm is 6'. Ms. Joseph opined that it seems a 6' wide top would be sufficient for maintenance; there is a 4:1 slope, a gentle slope. Mr. Grady indicated that he reached out to DEP and found that there is no minimum or maximum width required for the top of the berm. He said a mini excavator could easily get to the area. The Board opined they were fine with the berm.

Ms. Joseph indicated that peer review comments recommend the Board should opine if they require a traffic engineer/study to determine if there is safe access to the site and how vegetation affects the site lines.

Ms. Burbine indicated that the Board received a letter from an abutter, Jennifer Oram, about the intersection at Curtis and Country Way.

Mr. Grady indicated a sight distance analysis of the roadway was provided, they have also created a clearing easement across 489, a small triangle approximately a 5' easement; currently there is nothing blocking the sight in either direction. He indicated there is currently 640' plus going south and 600' plus going north; enough for a 60mph roadway. Mr. Grady also added that single family house lots are low trip generators; peak hour they estimate about 10 trips out with a few more in the morning and then same thing in the evening.

Mr. Pritchard opined with the sight distances it does not seem to be a problem; it is just a matter of making sure to preserve the no grow zone; that is what the easement is for.

Ms. Burbine asked if the applicant was thinking of putting in a crosswalk to get across to the other side of the street where there is a sidewalk. Mr. De Lisi said they would be happy to do that.

The Board opined it is not necessary to have the opinion of a traffic engineer.

Ms. Joseph indicated that the peer review engineer feels the applicant is making good progress on the drainage calculations and will be doing additional soil testing. He recommends the Draft SWPPP plan be submitted and Ms. Joseph concurred. Mr. Grady indicated the applicant would submit the plan.

Ms. Joseph said the goal is to get the best project for the applicant and the town and they are working towards that. She commented there may be some additional screening that is needed for abutting properties.

Ms. Burbine indicated that comments from the Fire Department need to be addressed; Mr. De Lisi indicated they will have further discussion with the Fire Department.

Ms. Joseph indicated that the Fire Department wants to review the signage for house numbers; a sign has to be visible for 911 emergencies, the homes will have Country Way addresses and the access drive in will not be a named street. Ms. Burbine commented that once inside the development the homes need to be clearly marked at the entrance of the driveway, not just on the house; it is a matter of public safety.

Ms. Joseph asked the applicant to consider planting something more diverse than green giant arborvitae to help deter the deer.

Mr. Pritchard asked about the road connection to Country Way; there will not be a puddle created there or change the water flow? Mr. Grady indicated there will be no puddling or change in the flow, there is a berm along the edge of the road that will maintain the drainage in the road; on the project side of the road they have prepared a Mass Highway type of connection. He said there is a negative grade going from Country Way onto the site and it then grades up and there is a catch basin at that location, Country Way is the high point and then the water goes into infiltration basins. Mr. Grady pointed out the catch basins and infiltrators. Mr. Grady indicated they are not creating anything more than what is already going to the basins.

Mr. Limbacher asked if Mr. Chessia had concern over the driveway slope at 6% slope; is it too steep. Mr. Grady said it is not uncommon to have driveways or roadways at 6% slope; it is not steep and there is only a short section about 50' that is at a 6% slope. Ms. Burbine asked if anyone would have trouble getting on to Country Way in the winter. Mr. Grady said no; the low area goes from 6% to 1.5%. He said the driveway at 489 Country Way is actually steeper than what is being proposed.

Mr. Bornstein asked the applicant to delineate where the extent of clearing would be. Mr. Grady pointed out where the clearing would be; there was discussion if there were any trees that could be saved. Mr. Grady indicated that because of the elevation of the ground water they need to raise the foundations, road and septic systems and would not be able to save any trees in the development area. He did say there may be some opportunity to save some trees where they are not grading. The Board asked how much fill will be brought into the site. Mr. Grady said they are balancing the site between cut and fill, but there will be fill brought in. He did not provide a specific number.

There was additional discussion about soil testing that still needs to be addressed for both the Peer Review comments and the Board of Health. Mr. Grady said they still need to permit the septic systems; they did a general coverage of the property to get a feel of what the soils are. He indicated that the property is mostly well-drained coarse sand.

Mr. Bornstein said he has thought about the public comments that have been received and about the purpose of a RCD. He discussed the real purpose of an RCD; to promote large lot development, preserve semi-rural character, reduce construction costs, and reduce the impact of the development on abutters and came up with a rubric on how to grade those aspects. He opined RCD lots would provide superior environmental services through increased stormwater management leading to increased ground water infiltration, reduce heating and cooling effect from urban heat island, etc. and improve nutrient cycling and provide superior ecological benefit and habitat and preserve semi-rural character with semi wooded lots. He said the only way rural character is maintained is if the lots remain wooded and the area is not clear-cut. He opined listening to the abutter's comments he is not sure how much it is helping them. His main comment is to think about how the clear cutting and landscape architecture can be redesigned to be more innovative to create something that eliminates the need for whole-sale clear cutting. He asked if the applicant could do an inventory of mature existing trees or design of small pockets of wooded space in strategic areas. Mr. Grady said that he has looked at that, but would look to see if there any areas where they can save some of the trees. He said there were no real mature trees.

Ms. Joseph asked if the applicant would be able to push the limit of clearing to save trees along the border of 489 and move the mound in. Mr. Grady opined they should be able to save some trees in that area.

Mr. Bornstein asked if things could be tightened up with how the site work is done. Mr. Grady indicated that looking from Country Way not a lot is going to change; the only thing visible will be the driveway opening. The general public will not really see a major change. Mr. Grady is not sure they can bring the buildings any closer. He pointed out the screening and preserved woodland areas that are not being disturbed, but will look for more.

*Public comment:*

Ms. Edward Katersky resident at 14 Aberdeen Drive said that the view from his home since they have lived there has been woods; he asked if the 50' buffer will be kept and would like to know where that is. He also asked how the pressure of the new homes will affect the amount of water that is in the pond, drainage, etc. Mr. Grady indicated it is a 50' setback not a 50' buffer; they are proposing a 20' permanent no clear zone and pointed it out on the plan. Ms. Joseph indicated that it is no structures in the 50' set back. Mr. Grady indicated that there is no residential to residential buffer requirements in the zoning bylaw for single lots. Ms. Joseph asked if the applicant will be able to get more than 20' in the area where the driveway and the building need to move up, there would be less grading in the area as well. Mr. Grady indicated they need to have some yard space to maintain the value of the lots; restricting the area could be an issue with the value.

Mr. Brian Power resident at 20 Aberdeen said that a 20' buffer with no restriction doesn't stop someone from taking all the trees down. Ms. Burbine said it needs to be figured out how to ensure the buffer remains, so that a homeowner does not take the trees down. Mr. Grady said they have proposed an easement plan for a 20' selective clearing zone. Mr. De Lisi opined that an easement may not be the correct mechanism; there could be a condition that runs with the special permit for the land. Mr. De Lisi understands the Boards concern about homeowners taking the trees down and will work with Ms. Joseph on language so that homeowners are clear on what can be done in the area. Mr. Grady indicated there will be a split rail fence around the perimeter of the project providing a demarcation of land for the 20' buffer.

Mr. Grady addressed the concern over the pond and water; he indicated there are no foundations in the ground water they are all above it. Mr. Chessia's comments asked the applicant to separate out the stormwater, what is running to the pond now and what will be running to the pond after development; the applicant has provided that information and there is no increase in the rate or volume of water to the area.

Mr. Dana Gillis resident at 10 Aberdeen Drive said he is very concerned about the buffer and the definition of what a buffer, understanding 20' is the plan. He is also concerned about the level of gradation of the homes. He indicated he is maybe 5' above the woods so there is no flooding yet, but a house put in next to buffer zone and raised up 6'-7' he worries about flooding on this property. Mr. Grady indicated that the proposed dwellings and road are down gradient of Aberdeen; there is a low spot in the middle of the property that will be filled, but that is away from Aberdeen and with the fill the project is still down gradient. Water that went to the low spot now goes to the infiltration basin.

Ms. Joseph questioned that everything is pitching down so swales to intercept the water around the site would not be needed. Mr. Grady said that is correct.

*Motion:*

Ms. Lambert moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Residential Compound Special Permit for 0 Country Way, 0 Rear Country Way and 483 Rear Country Way until February 27, 2020 at 8:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until March 13, 2020.

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

### **Zoning Workshop – North Scituate – MAPC – Christopher Kuschel**

#### **Documents**

- PDF North Scituate E-TOD\_1.9.20\_Landowners Forum
- PP North Scituate\_zoning\_11.20.19\_public meeting
- Doc Scituate\_North Scituate Zoning\_Draft\_01.06.20

Attendees: Christopher Kuschel, MAPC Consultant

Mr. Kuschel indicated they have been working on zoning for the North Scituate area; big issue is lack of sewer, but the Town wants to be ready for when sewer comes; visioning plan done several years ago; town has received a grant from MAPC to develop the zoning in North Scituate.

Mr. Kuschel presented a power point presentation. *See Attachment A*

#### *Board comments:*

Mr. Pritchard asked what drove the Gas Backwards. Mr. Kuschel indicated there is a gas station there today and if the owner wanted to redevelop the use or maintain the use it would provide an option. Mr. Pritchard also asked if there was consideration for a limit on those kinds of facilities; we would not want 3 or 4 of them in the area. There was discussion if that use would be "by right" or "special permit"; need to further review the document and can make it by special permit.

Mr. Bornstein asked if there is a recommendation or analysis to establish a ratio for mixed use development to determine what would be commercial vs. residential. He said he has heard concerns, particularly in the new Greenbush Village Center and Neighborhood District (VCN) district which this zoning is modeled after, that the bylaw seems light on the commercial/retail use compared to the residential use; how can this be analyzed. Mr. Kuschel said there is no commercial being taken away that remains on the ground level. There was discussion about the definitions/standards of a mixed use building covered in the new zoning passed in April 2019; the entire ground floor must be commercial/retail space.

Ms. Burbine opined that by putting this zoning in place, property owners would be able to go up and pull buildings forward; this needs to be in place before sewer comes. It needs to be all business/commercial on the first floor and apartments on the second and third floors.

Mr. Kuschel did find the definition for mixed- use and it says "ground floor commercial". There was further discussion if more analysis should be done; none has been done to date. Mr. Kuschel said that as the ground floor remains commercial having more residential further enhances the commercial. There will be some challenges with parking, etc, but the goal is to take advantage of people using the train. People attracted to mixed use buildings tend to be empty nesters or young

professionals before they have kids that use the train. Ms. Joseph did indicate there could be offices in the upper floors of a mixed-use building, but it does have to be commercial on the ground floor.

Ms. Karen Canfield resident at 39 Surfside and member of the Board of Selectmen said this is visionary. She gave Greenbush as an example and said with the residential there will be more density and opportunity for more small businesses. She opined the framework is solid; putting this in place with the anticipation of sewer is something she would like to see the Board move forward on. Ms. Burbine said the Board is hoping to do that.

There was discussion about the affordable component; there are affordable standards that are part of the framework. Ms. Joseph indicated there is a section on affordability under the VCN part of the bylaw. There was discussion about the amount of paperwork that is needed to get affordable units registered.

Ms. Canfield indicated there a number of parcels that are town owned property and asked how they would be impacted; they fall under the same zoning. If the town chose to sell a parcel to a private developer, a private developer would have to meet zoning.

Ms. Canfield asked if there has been any thought to doing a bike lane within the village; it might encourage people to travel by bike to the train station. Mr. Bornstein commented that if North Scituate is modeled after Greenbush it would be a complete streets community. Mr. Kuschel indicated that yes, but it only works if there are going to be new streets created and it really comes down to DPW. On existing roads it is the town's responsibility to create bike lanes. Ms. Canfield opined when sewer comes and things are re-developed to be mindful of the opportunity to being more complete street friendly and partnering with DPW; it is the town's responsibility.

There was discussion about the use of the public realm standards in the VCN bylaw and how the town can follow the design concepts to redevelop the roads; it could be the road map to creating the overall space that is intended.

Ms. Joseph indicated the proposal is basically the VCN framework with specific conditions for North Scituate. Mr. Kuschel noted there are some slight modifications from the Greenbush VCN; reduced open space percentage requirements, parcels are smaller; front setbacks will be consistent regardless of the building type.

### **Zoning Workshop – Sign Bylaw – Section 710 – Karen Joseph**

#### **Documents**

- PDF 13-502-901b
- PDF Scit\_SignDisc01092020
- PDF Zoning –Practice -2019-11

Ms. Joseph indicated a consultant has been hired. The bylaw needs be revised to be legal; the bylaw cannot regulate content. The Consultant has provided a memorandum of some questions for the Board to provide some initial input on.

- The Town needs to address Political signs and Church and Civic signs
- Does the Board want to create a section for temporary signs - yes

- Does the Board want to see a re-organization of the bylaw - yes
- Does the Board want to create a section specifically devoted to exemptions - yes

Board members will email Ms. Joseph with additional comments.

Zoning public hearing for signs will be February 27<sup>th</sup>.

There was discussion about why it got voted down at the last town meeting; the Board opined it was not understood that it was about not regulating the content of a sign.

This bylaw amendment will address the content issue, but also clean up and re-organize the overall bylaw.

Ms. Joseph indicated many towns are dealing with this issue; Norwell is bringing signs to their Spring Town meeting.

**Zoning Workshop – Section 810.1 – Existing Uses and Structures – Bob Vogel**

**Section 830 – Repair and Restoration of Nonconforming Structures and  
And Uses – Bob Vogel**

**Documents**

- Doc 810 2
- PDF Existing Section 810.1
- PDF Existing Section 830
- Excel Matrix
- Doc Memorandum
- Doc Version 2.2-830d

Attendees: Robert Vogel, Building Commissioner/Zoning Enforcement Officer

Mr. Vogel read letter the he sent to the Board explaining why he came up with the proposal.

- First issue – presence of abandon or derelict structures that are a plighting respectable and well-kept neighborhoods
  - Structures are safety hazards, shelter for illicit activities, fire potential, rodent infestation, etc.
  - Section 830 contributing factor in these properties
    - In case of damaged or destroyed structure the owner must apply for building permit within 3 years and complete work within 4 years
    - Once the time period has passed there is no repair or reconstruction allowed under the current bylaw
  - Section 810
    - Wording about structure being “unless or until abandon or not used for a period of 2 years or more applies” to the same situation.
    - Original intent was to incentivize owners to restore their properties, but issues come up, i.e. death, divorce, probate, illness, etc.
  - Once prescribed time has passed properties cannot be restored and become valueless.



- Most cases the nonconformity is lot size or lot frontage

Mr. Vogel's proposal is to remove the time limit for repair or re-construction of a non-conforming damaged or destroyed single or two family dwelling existing as of the date of the adoption of the change and going forward; this would allow some properties to retain their value and become more attractive to either the owner or a potential developer for redevelopment.

Mr. Vogel also proposes to distinguish between residential properties, single and two-family properties and structures with other uses, commercial, multi-family, he opined that in those cases the structure is non-conforming with area regulations, but may also maybe non-conforming in terms of its use within the district it is located. He opined that keeping the present restrictions in place for that category will incentivize and weed out the uses that are incompatible with the surrounding residential zoning district where they are located, i.e. Egypt Garage and Egypt Country Store.

Mr. Vogel said there are not many structures, but there are a few poster children, i.e. 81 Surfside Road.

Ms. Burbine gave an example of a house that was destroyed in the storm of '78 on Humarock Beach, people came in 6 years later and wanted to rebuild and were not allowed. Mr. Vogel said under the present bylaw they still would not be able to rebuild; if proposed changes were accepted it would be allowed; he indicated he would like the wording of the proposal to also read "houses existing as of the adoption of this bylaw or any amendment thereto" which would mean today going forward that the bylaw would apply. Ms. Burbine said so then the house on Humarock Beach could not be rebuilt. Mr. Vogel said unless there was a substantial part of the house remaining; anything that is completely gone could not be rebuilt.

There was further discussion on properties that would/would not be affected with the proposed bylaw changes, i.e. Egypt Country Garage and Egypt Country Store. Mr. Vogel indicated that a non-conforming use would still have time limit restrictions, but if it was converted to a conforming use the time period would not be limited. All other zoning would be applicable; if there was a non-conforming lot a ZBA decision would still be required.

Ms. Lewis noted that there had been discussion about a "special permit" being needed. Mr. Vogel indicated if that is what the Board wanted he would be amenable to that. He will be discussing this proposal with the ZBA.

Mr. Vogel reviewed the matrix that was provided to the Board; it distinguishes between what is in place now and what is proposed and differentiates between one and two residential homes and other uses. He discussed the language of the current bylaw is very specific with regard to damaged or destroyed by accidental use; he opined it is too specific and proposes it should be changed to damaged or damaged to a degree that is uninhabitable or unusable. It removes the need to define "accidental" and further defines damage. The time limit is eliminated for one and two family homes. Mr. Pritchard indicated that is what the Board was struggling with the last time; how to do you maintain the incentive and give an avenue to those when the time limit has expired to build, i.e. create a special permit. The Board does not want to remove the incentive to rebuild. Mr. Vogel opined that the incentive may not be needed; it may not work.

Mr. Vogel said there is specific language in the proposed new bylaw that it would not apply to anything prior to the Attorney General's approval.

Ms. Lewis opined it is a great idea, but is worried someone will slip through; there could be unintended consequences.

Mr. Bornstein agreed with Ms. Lewis, but he has concerns about definitions – uninhabitable, derelict, repair, restoration, and reconstruction; he is afraid someone could do a raze and reconstruct and double a house in size. He would like a definition of reconstruction and what the procedure would be, i.e. ZBA Section 6, a special permit from Planning Board.

The Board discussed the scenario of a house being destroyed back in '78 and it shouldn't be re-built. Mr. Vogel indicated the intent is to limit the application of what's existing as of the adoption of the new language.

Mr. Vogel also pointed out a change in wording from "less non-conforming" to "not more non-conforming" which would allow the re-use of an existing foundation.

The process going forward; finalized language by next week, legal ad to the paper by January 24<sup>th</sup> for February 13<sup>th</sup> Public meeting. The wording can change, but the scope cannot change; it cannot be increased. A draft will be needed for the public hearing.

The Board needs to be on board with all the wording before it goes to Town Meeting.

The Board discussed the potential for double dipping and making sure that does not happen; ZBA would have to issue a Variance which rarely happens.

### **Design Review Committee Interviews (DRC)**

#### **Documents**

- PDF 2019 CV – Buckley
- Doc 2020 Questions for Candidates – DRC
- PDF Cover Letter to Scituate - Buckley
- PDF CV.situate.drc – Coogan
- PDF DRC Checklist
- PDF Letter of Intent – Marshall
- PDF Resume – Heather Marshall 2019
- PDF Paulette OConnell Resume

#### **Interview with Mr. John Buckley:**

- New to town, been in Scituate for 3 years, living on Ann Vinal
- Grew up in Hingham
- Been living in New York City
- Residential architect
- Worked with municipalities of New York City, Brooklyn, and the Hamptons
- Familiar with large scale urban building and planning issues
- In private practice in Boston – most work in the Boston area
- Loves Scituate
- Versed in what happens one side of the table, fluent in the language

Ms. Burbine began by saying the DRC is appointed by the Planning Board, but also serves the ZBA; it is advisory more than anything.

Q: How have are you with Historic Preservation?

A: Not a lot of experience here; has done some in Cambridge. He has done lots of presentations to landmarks in NY - very active meetings. A lot of follow-up; a project may span over a year and half.

Q: Have you done much on the commercial side?

A: Has not done much commercial, has done some restaurant work and some gallery work.

Mr. Pritchard said projects run the gambit here, there is some residential, but there is commercial or mixed use – commercial with residential.

A: Mr. Buckley said that is what he is interested in as a resident; making sure larger projects don't go awry is important to him.

Mr. Pritchard said that is what the DRC does primarily.

Ms. Burbine said Scituate is changing it is important to be involved.

Mr. Buckley said he read the bylaws of all the towns he was thinking of moving to; Scituate bylaws and zoning related to his experience in the Hamptons. He felt the bylaws were not as restrictive as some other municipalities; we are the “watchful eye” and what the town decides to do over the long hall is important and the language is important. He is interested in that.

Q: Have you had a chance to look at what was done in Greenbush?

A: Has not had a chance.

Mr. Limbacher said we are building on that and wondered if Mr. Buckley had any thoughts on it.

Mr. Buckley did not offer any thoughts.

Ms. Lambert said that she struggles with the “less restrictive” that Mr. Buckley spoke of. She opined we lose our integrity when there is not a watchful eye. She said the language is very important when you take a historic structure and try to maintain what is there.

Q: Can you give an example of how have you worked in situations with people that want something different than you in a positive way?

A: With two different parties there has to be some give and take between the two parties; some back and forth.

Mr. Pritchard indicated that the Board will send a developer to DRC to work with them on questions that have come from the Planning Board and help to come up with a better project.

Q: Presently and in the future what would you think are the biggest issues facing a DRC member and what their charge is?

A: Not being part of the process is difficult to answer; not supposed to be pushing for content and need to be respectful of as of right for a property. He gave the example of Toll Brothers and how that property could be developed in many different ways. He was surprised to see what happened; he would hope that if something like that were to come up again he might be able to provide more impact on what it might become.

**Interview with Ms. Heather Marshall:**

- Resident at 17 Nelson for last 12 years

- Started her own practice 5 years ago out of her house
- Been a practicing architect since 2008
- Worked for firms in Boston worked on municipal/government projects, all public bid work
- Now doing residential work
- Ran for Planning Board alternate

Q: Why do you want to be on the DRC?

A: Wants to be involved with the Town and how it is being developed, why she ran for Planning Board alternate, learn what the Board is doing and be immersed into the process. Thought this would be an opportunity to learn what is going on, get her feet wet and have some input.

Q: What DRC larger scale projects in town do you admire and think came out well and which do you think could have been better?

A: Library beautiful job; Toll Brothers – would have selected different materials, i.e. asphalt roofs black could have done grey and could have been more sustainable without any added extra cost; the DRC could have made the suggestion; the Greenbush apartments – scale feels good, different roof lines, etc. She is intrigued on scale, density and sustainability.

Q: What is your take on how we are striving to keep our historic perspective?

A: Has done some historical homes in Hingham on main street and Osterville and they are very particular on certain aspects. She said there is reasoning to keep it because once you start changing it the scale and charm start to go away. She has been looking at the historical committee to know what is historical in town without seeing the little plaques. Scituate feels like a fisher village and is not overly built; the scale feels good; historical keeps that in line.

Q: How would you work with proponents on the other side of the table?

A: This happens a lot with just a husband and wife that don't agree. She had clients that had gotten divorced and then came back to her separately. She opined she created a neutral territory, listened while educating, there is give and take.

Q: Do you do work in Scituate?

A: Yes, mostly residential a few commercial; 50% projects are in Scituate, mostly on the South Shore.

Ms. Joseph asked what methodology Ms. Marshall would have used to convince Toll Brothers about the grey roofs? Ms. Marshall indicated she would have pulled information about heat gain, how mechanical systems have to work harder and showing them examples of what the effects are of the darker color; it is about education.

**Interview with Ms. Paulette O'Connell:**

- Lives at 2 Curtis Ave. since 2001
- 10 years ago started her own practice located 4 Brook Street
- Time in life to be able to devote time to the town
- Seen how much Scituate has changed in the last 20 years.
  - Left Boston to work to keep the seaside vernacular of the Scituate community as the town grows
- Works mostly residential

- Previous work experience in Boston was multi discipline firm
  - Worked on recreational office buildings, historic, pre-schools
  - Worked with non-profits, developers and towns
  - Been in front of the Planning Board as the architect
  - Has done work in Marshfield and North Andover
  - Worked on projects to mesh and meddle with the town
    - North Andover did a gym which resembled a barn instead of a big box, was the town's community center on the town green

Ms. O'Connell said she would like to see more things like her example of North Andover that fits the vernacular of the town as the town keeps growing.

Q: What are your thoughts on Greenbush?

A: Gunther Tooties parking is a mess, but beyond that great to see the development moving forward; more walkability which is nice, nice to see more coming into that area; great to see commercial development coming into the space; scale of most of the buildings is great, the apartment complex, but getting into the development is difficult. Great if on foot, but more presence on the street may have been helpful, i.e. looking for the dog groomer.

Q: Design Review looks at a project not just for the design of the buildings but also how it integrates with the site design holistically and a little bit of landscape architecture. Can you talk about your approach or opinions on projects going on in town or your personal practice that would marry overall site design planning, building and landscape; what are the important elements of getting those to work right.

A: It is definitely important; I think about the Shipyard, not in our town, but could have had some great buildings with walkways and archways and it is all these big boxes; need to start with a master plan and how people are using the site, talk with the site designer, the landscape architect and civil and work together; get a dialogue of what the overall movement of the site should be and how the architecture would meld it all together. Important to have outdoor spaces that work with buildings, i.e. cafés, people sitting outside, enhances the public activity.

Q: Have you dealt with any historical preservation, renovation type projects?

A: On both sides, has been in front of numerous historical boards; sees both sides of working with historical and what is trying to be achieved. With previous work worked with Boston Parks; did work with Plymouth Rock Covering and Coast Guard Stations.

The Board said the fourth candidate should be scheduled for the next meeting.

## **Minutes**

## **Documents**

- Meeting minutes 12.12.19
- Meeting minutes 12.19.19

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the meeting minutes for December 12, 2019 and December 19, 2019.

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

**Accounting**  
**Documents**

PO #2006075 (\$47.78), PO #2006047 (\$433.44), PO #2006048 (\$134.40), PO #2005932 (\$94.05), PO #2005769 (\$66,864.96), PO #2005768 (\$1,650.00), PO #2005766 (\$2,175.00)

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the requisition of \$47.78 to WB Mason for office supplies, for \$433.44 to Gate House Media for Legal Ads for First Buckeye Corporation, 14-16 Old Country Way and 7 MacDonald Terrace, for \$134.40 to GateHouse Media for legal ad for 115 Grove Street, for \$94.05 to Karen Joseph for mileage reimbursement, for \$66,864.96 to Deer Common II LLC for partial surety release, for \$1,650.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review services for 115 Grove Street, for \$2,175.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review services for Deer Common.

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

**Liaison Reports:**

**Shellfish Advisory Committee – reported by Mr. Bornstein:**

- Been requested that he no longer serve as the liaison – potential conflict of interest

**Conservation – reported by Ms. Lambert:**

- 115 Grove Street
  - Conservation on top of them for undergrowth and cutting of trees

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

- Approved insignificant change for Seaside
  - Permeable paver patios has been peer reviewed
- First occupancy projected for later this month
  - Have not seen all requirements that Planning Board needs to see first
- All binder down for front part of phase 2
  - Moving to other part of phase 2
- Still doing building pads
- Lot of loaming this week, front of Hatherly looking refined
- Will need an evaluation in spring of plantings – anything dead will have to be replaced

**Documents**

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 1.3.20 with meeting agenda 1.9.20 and meeting minutes 12.12.19
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 1.3.20 with meeting materials for Residential Compound Country Way and DRC Candidates.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 1.6.20 with meeting materials for North Scituate Zoning and 810.1 and 830 Zoning.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 1.7.20 with meeting materials for Residential Compound Country Way and North Scituate Zoning
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 1.7.20 with meeting minutes from 12.19.19
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 1.8.20 with meeting materials for Residential Compound Country Way

- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 1.9.20 with meeting materials for Sign Bylaw
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 1.9.20 with meeting materials for Residential Compound Country Way

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Limbacher moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:46 p.m. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Patricia A. Lambert, Clerk

Date Approved: January 23, 2020

