

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES February 14, 2019

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Patricia Lambert, Clerk, William Limbacher and Benjamin Bornstein, alternate 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 6:31 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 2/14/19 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.

Public Hearing – Special Permit – Accessory Dwelling Unit – 21 Cole Parkway (aka 1 Cole Parkway)

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 50-7-23-0

Applicant/Owner: Asneny, LLC (Douglas C. Smith, Manager)

Documents

- PDF Application dated 1.16.19
- PDF Floor Plan dated 1.16.19
- PDF Recorded ZBA Decision 10.19.18
- Doc Transmittal letter dated 1.17.19

Attendees: Jeff De Lisi, Attorney

Mr. De Lisi presented the project to the Board:

- 1,280 sq. ft. will convert the third floor to a one bed room, one bath, living unit
- Building constructed in 1920's
- Property covers almost the entire site
 - 3 Commercial establishments in the building - bowling alley, hardware store, coffee shop, office for bowling alley
- No onsite parking
- ZBA issued permit to allow for pre-existing non-conforming use
 - Change use to an accessory dwelling
 - ZBA found no noticeable or detrimental impact on the neighborhood
- Applicant has owned the property since 1985
- Provided notarized letter the owner will occupy the accessory dwelling
- Unit is a complete separate housekeeping unit
- Exterior will be maintained as much as possible

- Changing a door for egress proposed on the side of the building on the first floor
- Dwelling unit is less than 10% of area of the total building
- Exempt from parking requirements under the bylaw
 - Planning Board can waive requirements with adequate on street parking, under bylaw 530.2 G and section 760.8
- Letter from Fire Chief that fire system may need updating
 - The applicant will comply with all code requirements
- Property is connected to town water and sewer

There was discussion with the Board about the new egress and the where the second egress is located.

It was noted that the Building Department will require more complaint plans, these plans are just conceptual.

Ms. Joseph indicated the DRAFT decision has a condition to address comments from the Fire Department and comments regarding parking.

No public comments.

Motion:

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

1. On January 16, 2019, Asneny, LLC (Douglas C. Smith, Manager) applied for a special permit for an accessory dwelling above a business on the property at 21 Cole Parkway (aka 1 Cole Parkway).
2. The proposed accessory dwelling unit will be on the third floor of a building above the businesses of Satuit Bowlaway, Watson Family Hardware and Coffee Corner. It is located above the first floor or street level. One accessory dwelling unit is proposed.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted by the applicant, the floor area of the proposed accessory dwelling will be approximately 1,280 net sq. ft. This is 9.85 % of the total square footage of the building which is 12,992 sq. ft. according to Town of Scituate Assessor's records. The accessory dwelling is a subordinate part of the business structure and its size is unrestricted under the Zoning Bylaw due to being above a business.
4. The Accessory dwelling unit will be a complete separate housekeeping unit that functions as a separate unit from the primary structure.
5. The accessory dwelling has been designed so the appearance of the building remains unchanged as much as feasibly possible except for an added door on the ground floor southerly side of the building (facing the bank) that is necessitated by the building code for secondary egress from an interior stair.
6. Mr. Smith has owned the building since September 10, 1985, three years prior to the January 1, 1988 adoption of parking requirements set forth in the Scituate Zoning Bylaw. Patrons of the building park in Cole Parkway or Front Street as there are no on-site parking spaces available. The Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) found that the use of the bowling alley's

office on the third floor of the building is pre-existing nonconforming and “structures and land uses in existence on January 1, 1988, are not subject to (off street parking requirements) so long as they are not enlarged or changed in a manner that increases their parking needs.” The ZBA found that “the proposed conversion of the third floor office to a dwelling unit would decrease the net parking demand by three parking spaces, and therefore the Property is pre-existing, non-conforming as to the Zoning Bylaw’s parking requirements.” Thus, even though the Property is exempt from parking requirements due to its grandfathered status, the proposed change would be less nonconforming than the existing parking conditions.

7. The owner has submitted a signed, notarized statement that he and his wife will be occupying the accessory dwelling on the property as their primary residence.
8. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water and sewer. Any new connections will comply with the DPW requirements.
9. The applicant has received a finding from the ZBA under MGL Ch. 40A, Section 6 and Sections 820 and 950.2D of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw that the “proposed conversion on the nonconforming bowling alley’s office into a dwelling unit to be used by the proprietor of the bowling alley will not be substantially more detrimental or injurious to the neighborhood than the existing nonconforming use.”
10. 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. Lambert moved to approve the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling above a business at 21 Cole Parkway (aka 1 Cole Parkway) with the following conditions in addition to the modified 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 or the State Building Code, any construction shall substantially conform to floorplan submitted with the application on 1/16/2019 and incorporated as part of this decision.
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 of the Planning Board.
4. The accessory dwelling shall conform to all applicable standards in the building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, fire and health codes and bylaws.
5. Any lighting installed shall be down lighting to not shed light on abutting properties.
6. The Planning Board agrees to a waiver of the parking requirement for the accessory dwelling as there is a decrease in demand from the pre-existing nonconforming use and there is parking in Cole Parkway
7. 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/federal holidays. Construction includes idling of vehicles, delivery of materials to the site and all other construction activities.

8. The standard conditions for accessory dwellings approved by the Planning Board on 12/17/15 shall be conditions of this decision and shall be included for recording at the Registry of Deeds.
 - A. The applicant shall meet all requirements of the Building Department, Board of Health, Department of Public Works, Fire Department, Water Department, Conservation Commission and other town agencies.
 - B. The property shall contain a maximum of one dwelling unit above a business as proposed. No further expansion is allowed without prior approval of the Planning Board.
 - C. An owner of the property or proprietor of any business operating out of the property shall reside on the property as long as it contains an accessory dwelling unit.
 - D. The Planning Board may require an on-site inspection for conformance to the approved plans and these conditions prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the accessory dwelling.
 - E. An Accessory Dwelling Special Permit Certification of Ownership and Occupancy signed by any new owner shall be provided to the Planning Board within seven days of the closing of the sale of the Property. It is recommended that this be signed at the closing.
 - F. At any time, at the request of the Planning Board the owner shall provide a notarized affidavit indicating that the accessory unit is owner occupied.
 - G. Construction vehicles/equipment shall not idle, be parked, stored, loaded or unloaded in the street.
 - H. This Special Permit shall be void if it is not recorded at the Registry of Deeds within 90 days of the date of filing with the Town Clerk. The owner shall provide proof of this recording to the Planning Board.
 - I. This Special Permit shall lapse within two years from the date of its issuance unless substantial use or construction has commenced prior to that time in accordance with MGL Chapter 40A, Section 9.
 - J. The Planning Board reserves the right to review compliance with this special permit at any time. This Special Permit shall terminate if the use is not in accordance with this decision and its conditions.

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

Minutes

Documents

- Meeting minutes 2.7.19

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the meeting minutes for February 7, 2019.

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

Accounting

Documents

PO #1907966 (\$116.58), PO #1907965 (\$9,736.64), PO #1907967 (\$108.54), PO #1907904 (\$884.00), PO #1907905 (\$312.50), PO #1908023 (\$1,275.00) PO #1908024 (\$1,800.00)

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the requisition of \$116.58 to Gatehouse Media for legal ad for 27 Hood Road, for \$9,736.64 to Horsley Witten for peer review for Seaside at Scituate, for \$108.54 to Gatehouse Media for legal ad for 185 First Parish Road, for \$884.00 to Chessia Consulting Services, Inc. for peer review of The Glen, for \$312.50 to Chessia Consulting Services, Inc. for peer review for 50 Country Way, for \$1,275.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review of Curtis Estates, for \$1,800.00 to Merrill Corporation for stormwater peer review for 269 First Parish Road.

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

Old Business, New Business, Correspondence, Administrative Items, Update

Liaison Reports:

CPC – Ms. Burbine noted that she did not attend the last meeting

- Everything that was before the Commission for a vote was passed unanimously
- Athletic fields:
 - CPC still working out details with regards to money
 - Will be a Bond and cash; bond amount still in flux
 - Bond will be over 5 years
 - Rate is under 3%
 - CPC cannot pay for maintenance and turf fields
 - Mr. Hayes indicated there has never been any discussion about the safety of turf fields versus natural grass.
 - Needs to go to Town Meeting, but does not need to be an override

Conservation Commission – reported by Ms. Lambert:

- Fields before Conservation
 - Similar questions asked of the applicant that Planning Board has asked

Planning/Development Report – Ms. Joseph

- Upcoming schedule of projects for the next meeting 2.28.19
 - Multi- family 87 Glades Road
 - Well 17A
 - Greenbush Zoning
 - Athletic Fields
 - 2 ANR's

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-2-8, 53-2-8B, 53-2-9A, 53-2-10, 53-2-10A

Applicant: Drew Company, Inc.

Owner: Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

Document

- PDF Special Permit Application dated 1.18.19
- PDF Application Narrative from Drew Company
- PDF Attachments_01172019
- PDF Greenbush Development Traffic Review dated 2.5.19
- PDF P&S redacted
- PDF Planning Board Application Master Plan Greenbush Station dated 1.18.19
- PDF Scituate Mixed Use Project Tech Memo Revised_01162019
- PDF Scituate Tech Memo Figures 01172019
- PDF Special Permit Application
- Doc Transmittal Drew Co. MUSP dated 1.23.19
- PDF Architectural renderings – Passed out at meeting

Attendees: John P. Drew, President Drew Company; John E. Drew, Chairman Drew Company; Bob Walsh, Drew Consultant; Jon Ford and Joe Henderson, Horsley Witten Engineers; David Black, Traffic Consultant, VHB; Jim Sandell, architect; Jeffrey Dirk, VAI – Town Consulting Engineer for Traffic; Peter Palmieri, Merrill Engineers and Land Surveyors (Town Consulting Engineer)

Ms. Burbine acknowledged that the application submission was incomplete due to the magnitude of the project. She indicated this meeting will be continued and will go through several additional hearings; everyone will have a chance to be heard.

Mr. John P. Drew, president of the Drew Company and Scituate resident of 122 Michael Ave. introduced the team with him and presented the project.

- Drew Company is a real estate development company based in Boston with offices in Washington DC, Atlanta and Dublin, Ireland
- Working on this project for 3 years
- Site:
 - MBTA lot across the street across from the train
 - 4.46 acres, under agreement, P & S signed, closing at the end of the month
 - Will have a permanent perpetual easement with the MBTA
 - 196 parking space are required with the agreement to be maintained for the MBTA
 - Number of spaces was determined by the MBTA prior to the Drew Company involvement
 - Maintenance agreement with MBTA – striping, snow plowing, etc.
 - Located in the Village Business Overlay District, under current version of Scituate Zoning Bylaw
 - 78 units, 4 three story buildings, residential building B, C, D, E,
 - Buildings A and B have retail and commercial space
 - Approximately 10,500 sq. ft. of retail/commercial space
 - Building A is all commercial/retail
 - Building B split commercial and residential
 - Coffee shop is a placeholder – no tenant at this time

- Residential units:
 - 27 one bedroom units
 - 51 two bedroom units
 - Parking is under each residential building
 - Building B and C 17 spaces
 - Building E and D 23 spaces
 - All buildings meet height requirements of the Town
- 47,691 sq. ft. of open space
- Proposing to reconstruct Old Driftway and add 17 public parking spaces
- Working with MBTA to reserve spaces on the lot for retail/commercial
 - Allow parking for off peak hours, will be part of maintenance agreement
- Buildings A and B closest to the train
 - Mix of retail and commercial
 - Store fronts on the street
 - Create a plaza area; active and lively place, mix of uses, bike racks, etc.
- Residents - commuters into the city; people who need to use the train
 - Will have empty nesters as well
- 15% of units affordable
 - 12 units - 4 one bedrooms, 8 two bedrooms

Mr. Sandell presented architectural renderings to the Board:

- Site plan
- Compliance of parking
 - Shows parking along North Road access to MBTA parking
 - Plan has been worked through with MBTA
- Create density with retail, use building A and B to form a public plaza
- Elevation rendering presented, profile of Old Driftway
 - Podium based buildings, retaining wall on uphill side, columns on front side
 - Parking for residents underneath
- Sketches of public spaces:
 - Building A and ground level of B, both have retail space
 - Ideal to have place to eat, service needs of local residents
 - Connect to the train as much as possible
 - Landscaping creates separation from pedestrians, creates sidewalks
 - Signage not on the plan, safety is primary concern
 - Center Way will have parking for retail and some residential
 - Pedestrian circulation goes to Old Driftway
 - Will have another curb cut onto the Driftway
 - Circulation for the drive thru for the coffee shop
 - Suggest one-way out right turn only, no left turn on the Driftway

Mr. Black indicated that a detailed traffic study was completed for the site and has been peer reviewed by VAI. He said they did a thorough review and they will be addressing comments made by VAI as the plan continues to be engineered. He said each driveway needs to operate from a

capacity point of view, but also from a safety point of view. He indicated they will be in compliance with all rules and regulations.

Mr. Pritchard asked when walking down the sidewalk will the view be into the parking garage. Mr. Sandell indicated there will be a screening detail to hide the parking garage; a steel structure across the opening planted with Boston ivy that will grow all year long; year round green that would provide a shield from seeing into the parking garage.

Mr. Dirk spoke to the peer review of the traffic study provided by the applicant. He indicated that things need to be pulled together; he opined the comments made in the review should be taken as guidance as to what they would expect to see in the next submission.

Mr. Dirk made remarks about the site plan and noted that the plan is still in flux.

- Site plan:
 - Need to make sure vehicles can access and circulate within the site, i.e. loading and deliveries, fire truck access, on street parking, etc.
 - Zoning compliance plan – need to see a chart for compliance with zoning
 - Concept of shared parking is of concern
 - Residential parking ratio seems low
 - Need analysis to show they are meeting required residential ratio of 1.5-1.7
 - Creating additional curb cut on Old Driftway
 - 2 curb cuts that are offset from the exit of the parking lot
 - Creates conflicting turning movements - applicant to provide more detail on safety, etc.
 - Coffee shop area:
 - Applicant to go back and look at queuing
 - Drive-thru/coffee shop may have significant implications in terms of net increase in traffic and how the driveways function
 - Concerned with how the driveway will operate
 - Area needs more thought if going to be coffee shop

Mr. Pritchard asked if the report addressed peak loading congestion with the train. Mr. Dirk indicated that there is a peaking factor that is taken into account when doing the traffic report. As further work is done on the plan there maybe suggestions for improvements with further analysis; it will deal with the traffic signal, pedestrians, bicycles and site lines for crossing the roadways.

Mr. Bornstein asked if the applicant knew the rational on how the MBTA determined the area was excess land/property. He said he is all for Greenbush as a Village, but with population growth to the South Shore it might impact the train at the end of the line and could the future mean parking garages. The applicant indicated they could get that information, but the MBTA did extensive studies and they have vetted what they need for parking. The applicant indicated it has been discussed if the need arises for additional parking in the future they could use a lift system to accommodate more vehicles. There was discussion that in 10-15 yrs. cars may drive themselves and there will be fewer parking spaces and garages.

Mr. Bornstein asked for the rational for the split between, retail, commercial, etc. Mr. Sandell indicated the town requirements are straight forward as to what is needed for retail, the dimensions,

etc. and they followed that criteria for designing buildings A and B. Mr. J.P. Drew said they had looked to see if building C could have another use, but it did not make sense. He said there is a limit to the amount of retail that could go on the site to make it viable. They have some ideas for retail establishments they would want to go into the space and the sizes work for those uses. Mr. J. E. Drew said this is meant to be complimentary to what have the town already has; it is not the intention to take people away from other merchants. He said from a proforma perspective rental housing is not prevalent in the area, this creates some choice for people. The applicant indicated they have met with local business owners and are mindful of what is around and hope to bring some things that might be missing from the town.

Mr. Pritchard said he appreciates the affordable housing aspect being built into the project.

Mr. J.P. Drew gave an overview of the infrastructure for sewer and water that was worked out with the Selectmen. The applicant did a review on of Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) and other projects for the town; the Selectmen approved a betterment fee of \$229, 000.00. The applicant coordinated with the town on the Massworks Grant for \$2.2M which will support sewer infrastructure upgrades.

Water capacity has not yet been discussed, but they will be working with DPW.

Mr. J.P. Drew indicated they do not plan to phase the project.

Mr. Pritchard mentioned additional things to consider and they will get into as the project moves forward:

- Light pollution, noise pollution for residents around and those that will live there
 - Working with MBTA on additional lighting for the east parking lot
- Potential for the other side of the street – improvement to the connection with the train
- Trail connections
 - Working on landscape plan and working on connections
 - Crossing Driftway safely, currently need to cross down by building C
- Parking along the street – limited parking to the retail component

Ms. Lambert indicated there is another large project around the corner and neither development looks like the other. She hopes this will encompass more than a coffee shop as she opined the area has enough coffee shops. She hopes it would be more like a one stop shopping area so people don't need cars, i.e. a small scale gourmet grocery store. She gave an example of the commuter station in Rockport on the North Shore. The applicant indicated that is the vision, a grab and go, a small shop like Shubie's in Marblehead.

Mr. Limbacher said that the handicapped access will need to be explained. He also indicated he has an issue with Building B and the flow of traffic going in and out. He advised that the applicant to look at that issue.

Public comments:

Mr. Mike Hayes resident at 35 Allen Place and local attorney is in favor of the project and agrees with Mr. Bornstein that it was short sighted of the MBTA to sell the lot. He also said he has concerns that developers are not required to look at the long term effects of traffic in the area especially with new proposed zoning. He opined the first group in will have advantage over everyone else in terms

of development. He also opined that retail tenants will want the public there from 8:30 am – 4:00 pm and he does not feel this is a destination for the residents of Scituate. He indicated there is lots of work to be done for handicapped individuals, i.e. curb cuts, step risers, parking spaces more than 50' from retail/commercial spaces. He feels the long range traffic should be looked at for the area.

Mr. Hayes opined over the acceptance of the incomplete application and that tonight's discussion was more suited to an "informal discussion" versus the opening night of a public hearing.

Ms. Humphrey resident at 8 Ladds Way, James Landing said she has concerns that the plan did not show any different green space than what is already there, which she feels is not enough. She also has concerns with traffic patterns as discussed and the potential of building parking garages in the future; she questioned if there will be electrical components for cars in the garages. She also agreed with Ms. Lambert that we have enough coffee shops; that the traffic from the Dunkin' Donuts is already very difficult to deal with.

Mr. John McLaughlin resident at 160 Turner Road said he agrees with comments already discussed, but his concerns are about levitation; young families moving to the area, raising their children and then retiring here. There needs to be more ADA compliance, how one street bridges to the next street, community or neighborhood. He said things don't bridge together correctly for both the short and long term. He opined there should more stringent laws for ADA compliance.

Mr. Frank Kilduff resident at 125 Chief Justice Cushing Highway asked who will manage the project once it is built. He also asked if the units will have individual meters and will the tenants pay the same as the rest of the residents who can't hook up to sewer. He also asked if there is a limit to the development.

Ms. Burbine agreed and said we do need to look at traffic overall, we need to be proactive. She indicated a list was being made of comments and concerns and it will be submitted to the applicants. She said they will make sure traffic is spread out further than this development, understanding the MBTA rational; we will make this work, we need apartments, we need affordability, we will make this the best project it can be. The economy drives the development, if projects met the rules and regulations and there is some give to get, projects move forward.

Ms. Heather Clark resident at 60 Brockton Ave. asked what kind of design arrangements are being made/required for water conservation, including the irrigation systems; she is very concerned about water usage. She also asked about what kind of design arrangements have been made around solar and energy conservation, will the area have any of those features, i.e. a green building, net zero. The applicant said yes, the building will have some of those features and it will be presented.

Mr. Tom Kilduff resident at 108 Tilden Road made two suggestions for future meetings 1.) That a representative from the MBTA be present 2.) The presentation shown tonight be made available for viewing.

Mr. John Tedeschi, direct abutter as owner of Celtic Paws property, said he is in support of the project, but has concerns over the engineering of the project, water, utilities, water runoff. He said presently all the drainage structures are on his property, the parking lot is on a half-acre of his property. He said 90% of the drainage and lighting is on his property; he does support the project and thinks that the Drew Company and he can work together to design something that works for both parcels and for the Town of Scituate.

Ms. Clark asked if there will be any jobs set aside for Scituate residents and will the applicant pay prevailing wage. The applicant indicated they have not yet picked the construction company and currently they do not have jobs set aside for Scituate residents. Mr. John E. Drew said the project will be built as a non-union project and believes anyone doing construction in the area is and will be compensated appropriately.

Mr. Charles Tevo resident at 60 New Driftway asked if there are parking spots calculated for the 8,000 sq. ft. office space; yes there are parking spaces calculated for that space.

Mr. Jerry MacDonald resident at 60 New Driftway asked for clarification on the roads, "Old Driftway" versus "New Driftway". He also said he has concerns about handicapped access and parking spaces on the Driftway. Mr. Tedeschi clarified that "Old Driftway" is the road between the two parking lots that currently exist.

Mr. Greg Morse resident at 167 Tack Factory Pond Drive indicated that the town is looking at changing the zoning in Greenbush and asked how that will affect this project. Ms. Burbine indicated that it would not really affect this project; the project falls in line with the new overlay. Ms. Joseph also indicated that there is an applicability portion under Section 580 in the proposed Bylaw.

There was further discussion on the completeness of the application. Mr. Hayes argued that the acceptance of an incomplete application could be construed as a means of putting an automatic freeze on future zoning for this project. Mr. Limbacher disagreed; saying whether the application is complete or incomplete it is looked at from both sides, what is the time frame of the applicant to put a presentation together and secondly given the amount of time and amount of projects before the Planning Board time needs to be managed so as not to hinder any projects. Mr. Pritchard also did not agree with Mr. Hayes characterization of the process and said the applicant will be required to address all the issues and concerns.

Mr. Richard Murphy resident at 60 New Driftway expressed concern over where the MBTA lot will enter and exit at the far end of the property. He feels the traffic in the area will become a nightmare.

The Board requested the project be sent to Design Review Committee.

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Mixed Use Special Permit in the Village Business Overlay District for Drew Company, Inc. at 247 Driftway until April 25, 2019 at 7:00 pm and continue the time for the Planning Board to take final action until May 31, 2019.

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

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 2.8.19 with agenda
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 2.8.19 with meeting materials for 21 Cole Parkway (aka 1 Cole Parkway)

- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 2.8.19 with meeting materials for Drew Company/MBTA.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 2.8.19 with additional materials for Drew Company/MBTA.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 2.12.19 with meeting materials for 21 Cole Parkway (aka 1 Cole Parkway)
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 2.13.19 with meeting minutes from 2.7.19.

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Limbacher moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:22 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: February 28, 2019