

## SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES March 10, 2022

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

Ms. Lewis joined the meeting at 7:51pm, she recused herself from the first Public Hearing 81 Norwell Ave.

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 and streamed live on Facebook.

### Documents

- 3/10/22 Planning Board Agenda

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

---

Ms. Burbine read the Commitment Statement to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion for the Town of Scituate.

**Continued - Public Hearing – Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for A Multi-family Building in the Village Center and Neighborhood District Greenbush Gateway District - Greenbush Gateway Business Subdistrict (VCN-GDG- GWB) and Stormwater Permit – 7 New Driftway**  
**Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-05-37F**  
**Owner: Joan Auciello, Tr of Shepard Way Realty Trust**  
**Applicant: Drift-way LLC**

### Documents

- Email dated 3.10.22 from Frank Polack
- Doc DRAFT Motion
- PDF 7 New Driftway Progress Set 2022-03-03

### *Motion:*

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicants request to continue the public hearing for Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for a Multi-family Building in the Village Center and Neighborhood District – Greenbush Gateway District -Greenbush Gateway Business Subdistrict (VCN-GDG-GWB) until March 24, 2022 at 8:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until June 30, 2022.

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

**Continued - Public Hearing – Special Permit Accessory Dwelling – 81 Norwell Ave.  
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot: 34-29-5  
Applicant: Maryanne Lewis  
Owner: John M. McAuliffe, Trustee of the AMMA Realty Trust**

**Documents**

- PDF 81 Abutter Comment- Dymek
- PDF As-Built Accessory Dwelling
- PDF As-Built foundation 11-18-19
- PDF As-Built house w loft
- PDF Clark 78 Norwell
- PDF Comment from 75 Norwell Ave
- PDF Lewisscitate1-model 1
- PDF Lewisscitate1-model 2
- Email dated 3.10.22 Abutter Marie Ahearn

Attendees: Maryanne Lewis, Applicant

Ms. Burbine indicated Ms. Rebecca Lewis was not present for the public hearing.

Ms. Lewis addressed questions from the last meeting.

- As-Built is on file in the Building Department
- Updated floor plan for the primary dwelling has been submitted
  - Allows for what is permissible for the Assessor's
- Site visit completed this morning with Ms. Joseph and Mr. Vogel
  - Confirms there is no lighting on the rear and right side of the accessory dwelling
  - Front and left side lights are downward facing fixtures

Ms. Lewis requests that the Board approve her application.

Ms. Joseph made several comments.

- Latest plan is dated 3.2.22 and has a stamped in date of 3.9.22
- Stairs and decks can project into setbacks
- Building meets the setbacks for a freestanding detached structure
- Inspections indicate there are 2 doors which fulfill egress requirements
- Only one Lot
  - Lots have been merged by the Merger Doctrine as in Common Ownership
  - Lot is 13,300 sq. ft.
- Ceiling height in the loft meets definition of habitable attic
- Porch is enclosed by screen panels, a roof, electricity and lighting

Ms. Burbine said there are also new additional comment letters from abutters that are not happy; the letters are here in the record.

Mr. Pritchard asked if the measurement for the square footage has been confirmed. Ms. Joseph said the plan stamped in on the 9<sup>th</sup> shows the loft area is 191 sq. ft. and the ceiling height has to be greater than 7 1/3 feet which was verified by the Building Inspector on the site visit today. She said with the

attic space and the porch added to the 1,863 sq. ft. the base square footage is 2,310; 40% of that is 924 sq. ft. which is greater than 870 sq. ft. which is the size of the accessory dwelling. She said the calculations have been done the same as always.

Mr. Bornstein asked if a screened porch is usually counted as gross floor area. Ms. Joseph read the definition from the Zoning Bylaw, "gross floor area does not include an unenclosed porch". She said this one is enclosed it has screens, electricity, and a roof. Ms. Joseph said there is one instance in which the Board did not include the porch area, but it is not a situation that the Board has dealt with often.

Mr. Bornstein opined that in terms of being consistent, the habitable attic space opens up a can of worms, does the area above the second story of the accessory space also count as habitable space. Ms. Joseph said the space in the primary has a finished ceiling and walls the Building Inspector verified that today. Mr. Bornstein said it needs to be confirmed that the attic space in the accessory dwelling is uninhabitable. Ms. Joseph said that can be conditioned. Mr. Bornstein said that the massing of the structure is obviously a concern and to be consistent that should be conditioned. He said the size could have been ameliorated in the roof if the ridge height wasn't so high; it is the extra portion of the structure that is throwing a lot of people off.

Ms. Lambert agreed and said it needs to be made right across the board. She opined the Board will need to look at the Accessory Dwelling Bylaw and revisit it next year. She said she knows people are not happy, but it meets all the setbacks, etc. and in the spirit of the Bylaw she will have to say it is okay.

*Public Comment:*

Mr. Christopher Patch resident of 82 Norwell Ave. said the enclosed deck is being included and at the time of the application the enclosed deck did not exist; it was done this week. He said with the inspection done today it appears it is now part of the dwelling, but it wasn't at the time of the application. At what point is it acknowledged that someone fixed it to accommodate their clients accessory permit.

Ms. Burbine opined Ms. Lewis was given a laundry list of things that needed to be done in order to meet the conditions of the accessory dwelling bylaw. At this point in time Ms. Lewis has done what was asked; she was told to come up with more square footage in the primary dwelling and the porch does classify as part of the dwelling; it could be glassed in and used in the winter. According to the Building Inspector the second floor of the primary dwelling is finished.

Mr. Patch said he is questioning at the time of the application she did not meet the requirement and now she is being advised by the Building Department what to do so she can get the permit. The Board and Ms. Joseph disagreed.

Mr. Patch said that is exactly what happened, she was given a laundry list of things that needed to be done in order to meet the square footage requirement; therefore, she was advised by the Town on what to do. The Board said that is done for everyone. Ms. Joseph said Ms. Lewis was not told what to do; Ms. Lewis provided several options to the Town at which point comments were made as to what would qualify as habitable space and what would not.

Mr. Patch said he is not saying the Town told here what to do, he takes that back. He said it could be argued that mini/tiny homes could be put up, up to 750 ft. and be within the requirements; he said it has already been challenged in Upstate and the inhabitants won. He said at this point we are looking at situation where the argument that Ms. Lewis did something after the fact it wrong; he said he watched the same thing happen on Garden Rd. with Greg Morse, on Hood Rd. and Kenneth Rd. where accessory dwellings were built before the fact and then given accessory dwelling special permits. He said if we are going to stick to the letter of the law there should not be variables; the interpretation of the law is there is nothing preventing Ms. Lewis from doing what she did. He said to Ms. Lamberts point the Bylaw needs to be revisited. Ms. Burbine said it will be on next years Annual Town Meeting.

Ms. Holly Clark resident of 78 Norwell Ave. said one member mentioned calculating square footage space that is above the main living space in the accessory dwelling and asked what is to prevent the applicant or future owners from developing it by putting dormers at the top of the accessory dwelling and increasing the square footage even more; why would that not be included in the square footage now if it is habitable space.

Ms. Joseph said the project would have to come back before the Planning Board because it is conditioned that no changes can be made beyond what is already approved without the approval of the Planning Board; more square footage would be required in the primary dwelling for that to happen.

Ms. Clark said that from the 1.27. 22 meeting it was indicated there are stairs in the accessory dwelling up to a level that may or not be habitable space; she said it should be counted in the square footage of the accessory dwelling. Ms. Joseph said the Board is going to condition that it cannot be habitable space. Ms. Burbine said the Board has made an applicant put in trusses so that the area could not be finished and was therefore uninhabitable.

Ms. Lewis said all this will be contingent on inspections, the Building Department will come out and see if a space is finished or not, but it remains unfinished. She said there are things in the primary that are unfinished and have not been included and there are things in the accessory that are unfinished and will be excluded as well. She is happy to accept the condition and in the event that in the future she decides to finish the basement of the house and anything anywhere else she is going to come to the Board or any other department to get the appropriate permits.

Mr. Patch asked if Occupancy Permits have been issued. Ms. Joseph indicated not for the accessory dwelling and she did not know for the primary. Mr. Patch said based on a conversation with Mr. Vogel it had not been issued for the primary. He said in order to give an accessory dwelling permit there would have to be a Certified Occupancy Permit for the primary dwelling and that does not exist. He said if there is not an As-built with signoffs for the primary, how can a permit be issued for the accessory dwelling because the square footage hasn't been certified for what would be allowed for the square footage of the accessory. He said this has nothing to do with the applicant, but are "we" as a Town going to conform to what is required under the Bylaw. Ms. Burbine said she would hope so.

Ms. Burbine said the Board is picking this up after the fact and it is unfortunate.

Ms. Lambert opined forgiveness is being asked for instead of permission. Ms. Lewis came in, she was given a list of things that the Board would like to see done and she has done them, the Board is

not in charge of Occupancy Permits that is the Building Department. Ms. Joseph reiterated the Accessory Dwelling does not have an Occupancy Permit.

Mr. Patch said he is asking about the legality of it; if someone does not certify for the Occupancy Permit which includes a certified stamped plan of the primary dwelling anyone could come in and ask for an accessory dwelling and base it on something that hasn't been stamped or certified.

Ms. Burbine said often times someone builds a new house at the same time there is an accessory apartment with it so they happen together. Unfortunately, this did not happen together. This is a situation where that did not happen and no one is happy; the Board is trying to right a wrong and be consistent, but the Board cannot ask the applicant to rip it down.

There was continued discussion by Mr. Patch with regards to occupancy permits and certifications required to be able to base the square footage of an accessory dwelling off the primary dwelling that does not have an occupancy permit.

Ms. Joseph indicated there is certified as-built foundation plan in the Building Department for both the primary dwelling and the accessory dwelling. Mr. Patch asked why the Occupancy Permit has not been issued yet. The Board said he will have to ask the Building Department.

Mr. Patch said the Board really needs to look at the Accessory Dwelling Bylaw for the future. The Board will work on this for the future.

Ms. Clark commented that because of the size of the building the downward focused lighting is going right into the neighbor's yards; because the structure is so high it still impacts abutters. Ms. Joseph said there is no lighting in the rear or the side of the accessory dwelling. Ms. Clark said there is another side where the stairs are, the stairs are lit and the front of the garage has a deck that is lit and because of the size of the building has the same effect as shining into someone's window. Ms. Joseph said she observed down lights, there are gooseneck lights at the garage that shine down. She said it is typically conditioned that all the lighting has to be down lighting. Ms. Clark said because of the size of the building down lighting has a different impact on the abutters. Mr. Bornstein suggested maybe there is alternative source of lighting that could be used. Ms. Joseph said the condition is that down lighting shall be used to not shed light on abutting properties. Ms. Clark said that is not happening and the Board should come at night.

Ms. Lewis said she believes it has already been addressed, but she will revisit it.

Mr. Bornstein said the Board has heard a lot of public displeasure with this, but even if the permit was denied the building is still going to exist as it could exist as a barn, or an accessory use structure; there is no way it is getting torn down and whether the permit is approved or denied it is sort of immaterial on the overall impacts to abutters since the building is going to remain. He encouraged the audience to voice their concerns about conditions at this time, so there can maybe be an amicable resolution to some of the concerns.

Mr. MacLean gave the example of privacy screening on the porch. Ms. Clark said she thought that was part of the mitigation; it had been discussed about fencing, screening and plantings to improve privacy.

Ms. Lambert said Ms. Lewis is not required to do that; it was talked about. Ms. Burbine said it is very hard to mitigate something that is already there. Ms. Clark continued to discuss that the applicant was supposed come back with mitigation, fencing, screening and landscaping.

Ms. Joseph reminded the Board that the building does meet the setbacks and under the Zoning Bylaw a deck can extend all the way to the property line. If the Board wants that to change in the future the Zoning Bylaw has to be changed.

Mr. MacLean said this becomes an issue for neighbors to work it out versus there being anything the Town can enforce.

Ms. Clark said those three things were mentioned as something the applicant could do and if the Board or the Town could not enforce them they should not have been mentioned as something the applicant could do to mitigate. Ms. Lewis said those things were mentioned because there was question about the setbacks because there was no as-built at the time.

Mr. Pritchard said he thinks the issue is that many times before the Board has asked the applicant to go the extra mile to mitigate the impacts. In this case the impact is pretty big and he believes the applicant should do something and the Board has asked others who have Special Permits to do exactly that.

Ms. Lewis said fencing and landscaping was discussed and opined the area is environmentally challenged. The fence that currently exists has been knocked down three times in different storms; she called it a high wind area. She does not think it would be viable screening, a fence would need to be probably 8'-10' and shrubbery would be 6'-8' and will not accomplish what it is trying to, it might be viable for different situation. She said in terms of the lighting the site visit confirmed that there is no lighting on two sides and the lighting is down lighting. She is happy to look at lower wattage, but code requires lights by every egress; there is nothing obnoxious about any of the lighting. She said the place that would make the most sense for screening is probably the right-hand side, she is happy to put a trellis, but she does not know how effective or viable it would be and that it could blow off in the next storm. She is happy to accept that as a condition on the right side of the deck. She also said that the structure is setback about a 100' from the street so lighting is not shining on anyone's property.

Ms. Marie Ahearn resident of 334 Tilden Road said she is not clear why a landscape plan was not submitted when the Board asked for it and she does not see any reason why there can't be any mitigation in the back of the garage; she gave an example of a corner lot on Tilden and Irving as an example of mitigation that has very tall evergreens. She opined there are things that can be done and requested the Board make a condition on the mitigation of landscaping and lighting. She said the lighting is visible on the adjoining property including her property in the back and it is high intensity lighting. Ms. Lewis will change the lightbulb. Ms. Ahearn continued to asked about the mitigation, landscaping.

Ms. Burbine said Ms. Lewis has agreed to put up lattice along the right side of the accessory dwelling to mitigate the view. As far as other landscaping the stairs go right up to the property line. Ms. Ahearn said the back of the garage is where the mitigation needs to be done and there is nothing back there, there is no fence. She referred to her comment letter submitted today. Ms. Lewis said there is a fence and the dog was barking today over the fence while Ms. Joseph was there. Ms.

Joseph said there was a dog barking on the other side of the fence. Ms. Ahearn said there is not a fence and she can send a picture.

Ms. Joseph suggested maybe some potted plants on the deck might help to screen some of the lighting.

Ms. Lewis said she does not think that would be the most effective way to accomplish what they are trying to accomplish. She opined the most effective way is to change the light bulb and she is happy to do that.

There was continued discussion about the lighting, Ms. Joseph provided the Board with some pictures. She indicated the photos had previously been sent to the Board.

Ms. Diane Dymek resident of 75 Norwell Ave. said she is directly next door and would like some kind of landscaping between the properties. She has a beautiful backyard that she can no longer use. She is living underneath this garage; there is nothing stopping it from being a party deck, Airbnb, she said she was told it was going to be an office and it was a different story every time. She said the stairway is right at the property line, less than 3' from her shed. She was told she could move her shed and that her driveway was on the property line, she was told all these things and never spoke up and now it is too late. She said she has a beautiful backyard/patio/firepit and she is on display with people looking down on her; she bought the house because of the yard. She said she can't use the backyard without being looked upon; she can't have a pool, hot tub or outside shower. The place is so big and so high. The applicant says she will take care of her side, but what about the left side it is so big and so high that looks out over every property, her property, the property behind and everyone around is not happy. She said there is no landscaping, there is no greenery, there is nothing and the lights in the main house have shined into her dining room and the lights from the deck were shining into her bedroom, although the applicant has dimmed those a little bit. She said it has been nothing but a problem, it has changed the whole set up she had in her backyard and there is nothing that can fix it, it can't be torn down, but she would like something done between the properties. She said let's decide where the property line is so she can establish her space between the two houses; she planted trees so they would grow up and she would have some privacy in her patio area, but it will take years. She said she sent a letter to the Board with all her concerns and she just had to speak up.

Ms. Burbine said the Board has heard the issues and asked Ms. Lewis if there is anything she is willing to do mitigate the concerns of her neighbors; i.e. landscaping, dim down the bulbs, etc. Is there anything Ms. Lewis is willing to do to make it more palatable for those around her. Ms. Lewis said she would change the light bulbs and put up the privacy screening on the right side. She said she would not do any landscaping not because she is unwilling, but her idea of landscaping is different from someone else's; she doesn't like greenery, she likes rocks and gravel and that is how it is landscaped; she opined it is beautiful as it is and appropriate.

There was discussion if Ms. Lewis would do anything in the back of the garage in terms of landscaping. Ms. Lewis said she does not have endless resources and building a fence and putting up a tree is not going to accomplish anything they are trying to accomplish. She has improved the lot and the neighborhood and she was trying to think about her neighbors when the light fixtures, etc. were selected. She is happy to dim them, but she opines it is beautifully landscaped as it is.

Ms. Joseph suggested room darkening shades in the accessory dwelling so that when the lights are on the light doesn't shed out. Ms. Lewis said yes.

Ms. Ahearn said this conversation points out that the Board needs to step up and make a certain condition about mitigation; the issue is not what is in the eye of the beholder on landscaping, the issue is there are real harms that have been described by the neighbors and there needs to be mitigation. She said the Board asked for mitigation plans at the last meeting; she does not see any mitigation plans and she does see a specific condition that would take care of that situation. She opined there needs to be more study done on this by the Board or the Town Planning Office. She again referred to her earlier example on the corner of Irving and Tilden that looks very nice. She also said in terms of screening she has seen trellis and in terms of the fence it is a very flimsy stockade fence so that is why it is falling down. She feels there are options that could be explored in terms of the fencing and to leave it to the applicant without some specific conditions is not really mitigating and really isn't addressing all of the concerns.

Ms. Ahearn asked about the secondary egress stair and where it would be located. Ms. Joseph said the Building Commissioner has indicated the inspector has signed off that the egress is proper. There is no stair to be built in the rear.

*Motion:*

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

1. On December 22, 2021 applicant Maryanne Lewis and owner John M McAuliffe, Trustee of the AMMA Realty Trust applied for a special permit for a detached accessory dwelling on the property at 81 Norwell Avenue.
2. According to the Town of Scituate Assessor's records and the deed, the property at 81 Norwell Avenue is owned by AMMA Realty Trust, John M. McAuliffe, Trustee. The affidavit of the trustee indicates that Maryanne Lewis has the right to make operational decisions and to execute legal forms.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted with the application, the Planning Board finds the floor area of the Accessory Dwelling to be 870 sq. ft. in accordance with the Assessors records. A further as-built provided by the applicant shows a loft area of 191 sq. ft. added to first floor area of 1863 for the primary dwelling gives a total of 2054 sq. ft. Plan A1 dated 3/2/22 received by the Planning Board on 3/9/22 shows a screened porch of 256 sq. ft. for a total area of 2310 sq. ft. 40% of 2310 is 924 sq. ft. The loft area meets the zoning bylaw definition of a habitable attic as the ceiling height meets or exceeds 7 1/3 feet. An unenclosed porch does not meet the definition of gross floor area. The *enclosed* porch is screened with electricity, lighting and a roof thus being enclosed. This does meet 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.

*Comment: added the word "enclosed"*

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-3 Zoning 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 on the second floor of the newly constructed garage on the property. Access will be via a deck with a side door and two additional sliding doors on the front of the dwelling.
7. The appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the appearance of the primary dwelling.
8. The Site Plan for 81 Norwell Ave, Scituate, MA by Warwick & Associates, Inc., dated 3/29/2019 shows the location of the existing primary dwelling and the proposed accessory dwelling. The plan shows a circular driveway connecting to a driveway leading to the garage. 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 owner has submitted a signed, notarized statement that she will be occupying one of the units at 81 Norwell Ave.
10. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water and sewer. The Water Department has commented that a separate water connection will be required and \$14,000 connection fee paid. The Sewer Department has indicated that a sewer connection and corresponding fees have been completed and paid.
11. The application meets the standards of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit.

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

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling at 81 Norwell Avenue 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 submitted with the application consisting of View from the street, Sheet A1 New House for 81 Norwell Ave, G2 New Garage/Apartment Second Floor Plan dated 4/22/2019, G1 First Floor Plan New Garage/Apartment dated 4/22/2019, G3 Front Elevation New Garage/Apartment dated 5/16/2019, G4 Right and Rear Elevation for New Garage/Apartment dated 5/13/2019; AB1 dated 2/14/22 received by Planning Board 2/28/22; AB2 dated 2/7/22 received by Planning Board on 3/1/22 all by Cotuit Bay Design; A1 New Remodeling dated 3/2/2022 received by the Planning Board on 3/3/2022; A1 New Remodeling dated 3/2/2022 received by the Planning Board on 3/9/22; Site Plan for Maryanne Lewis 81 Norwell Avenue, Scituate, MA by Warwick & Associates, Inc. dated March 29, 2019 and Certified Plot Plan by Warwick Associates dated 1/18/2019.
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 she 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. *Existing light bulbs shall be changed to accommodate a reasonable level of light acceptable to the Building Commissioner.*

Language added: existing bulbs shall be changed...

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.
12. The attic of the accessory dwelling shall remain as unfinished/uninhabitable space.

*#12 is added condition*

13. A trellis shall be established on the stairs side of the accessory dwelling on the deck to mitigate the view.

*#13 is added condition*

14. The applicant shall work with the Town Planner to come up with an acceptable landscape plan 45 days after approval.

*#14 is added condition, there was discussion about Ms. Lewis working with the neighbors, but Ms. Lewis was not comfortable with that and it was changed to working with the Town Planner. There was discussion about where there should be screening on the side yard or backyard. Ms. Lewis thought it was unreasonable to have her put a fence on the neighbor's property that is falling down or never existed in the first place. Mr. Pritchard said Ms. Lewis is coming in and asking for forgiveness not permission.*

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

Ms. Burbine reminded Ms. Lewis there is an appeal period.

Ms. Burbine said for the record she is truly sorry Ms. Lewis did not come to the Board; the Board did not miss one meeting during COVID, the Board was here the entire time. She said she feels badly for Ms. Lewis's neighbors and for Ms. Lewis because this should not have happened.

Ms. Joseph said she has fourteen days to file the decision.

Ms. Rebecca Lewis joined the meeting at 7:51pm.

### **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendments to Town Meeting**

Ms. Burbine indicated this is a discussion and vote for the Board to make their recommendations to Town Meeting on April 11, 2022.

### **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendment – Section 440.5 – Business District – Article 17**

#### **Documents**

- Doc PB Report Section 440.5 Business Districts

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted unanimously to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article allow for the listed accessory uses in this section to be included in the Village Center and Neighborhood Districts (VCN). This is a housekeeping article as VCN should have previously been included. The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

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

### **Discussion/Vote - Proposed Zoning Amendment – Section 610.1 – Lot Area and Width Requirements - Article 18**

#### **Documents**

- Doc PB Report Section 610.1 Lot Area- Lot Width

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted unanimously to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article allow for lot width criteria to be added to help prevent rattail lots and where the rattails are not prevented by adding the criteria of a 30' diameter circle to be drawn tangent to the exterior property line, the area that does not meet the requirement cannot be counted toward the buildable lot area. The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

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

#### **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendment – Section 810/830 – Non-conforming Structures and Uses – Article 19**

##### **Documents**

- PB Report Section 800 Nonconforming Structures and Uses

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted unanimously to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article allow for the by-right window of redevelopment of a damaged property from two years to four years providing a more realistic timeframe in which to accomplish a restoration before *any rebuilt* effort *falls would require approval from* ~~to~~ the Zoning Board of Appeals. It also allows for all time periods to be waived with a Special Permit from the *Zoning* Board of Appeals. The new provisions apply only to any lawful structure or lawful use of land or structure existing in whole or substantial part as of the effective date of the bylaw. The *Zoning* Board of Appeals can grant the requested relief only if it finds the repair, alteration, reconstruction, extension or structural change will not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood. The intent is to provide a continuing opportunity for derelict properties to be rehabilitated while preventing inappropriate redevelopment of properties that would result in undesirable conditions or situations. The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

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

Ms. Joseph informed the Board she had a meeting with the Town Moderator, Town Counsel, Town Administrator, and Ms. Lambert. At Town Meeting the Moderator will go through each article to explain what it does, why it is in the order it is in, what happens if something passes and something doesn't pass; for legal and clarity the articles as they are written now will be in the draft Warrant, each thing will be its own article.

Ms. Joseph also informed the Board of a meeting with the Select Board and base on that meeting some revisions were made to the Zoning Bylaw for Marijuana. The Board has a copy of the draft Warrant highlighting the revisions.

- Square footage for a Marijuana Establishment is allowed to be 3,000 sq. ft.
  - Changed from 4,000 sq. ft.
  - Change is for both Medical and Adult Use Establishments
- Language change for measuring of 500' buffer area to a Marijuana Establishment
  - "No Medical Marijuana Treatment Center shall be located within 500' of the nearest point of the property line where the following activities occur...500' distance is measured in a straight line from the nearest point of the property line to the proposed Medical Marijuana Treatment Center."
    - Wording is what is currently in the Registered Marijuana Dispensary (RMD) Bylaw
  - Select Board wanted the measurement to be property line to property line
    - That change was not made; however, it was changed to the current distance measured in the RMD Bylaw.
- Select Board wanted Marijuana taken out of the Business Districts
  - The change was not made
  - Business Districts are where retail is allowed
    - Marijuana is a retail business
- Select Board and Citizen's requested language be taken out on the Waiver
  - Town Counsel advised NOT to remove the language
    - Language protects the town

After discussion about the 500' measurement the language was amended to say, "from the nearest point of the property line to nearest point of the Medical/Adult Use Marijuana Establishment".

## **Discussion /Vote– Proposed Zoning – Marijuana Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers – Article 20**

### **Documents**

- PB Report Section 440.2 Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted unanimously to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article provide for deleting the existing Registered Marijuana Dispensary definition in Section 200 Definitions, Registered Marijuana Dispensary in Section 420 Table of Uses and deleting the existing Section 440.2 Registered Marijuana Dispensaries and replacing them with a new definition Medical Marijuana Treatment Center (MTC) definition in Section 200, a new line for Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers in Section 420 Table of Uses and a new Section 440.2 Medical Marijuana Treatment Center (MTC). This allows for updated terminology that has been established by the Cannabis Control Commission Regulations to be implemented. The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

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

### **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendment – Adult Use Recreational Establishments – Article 21**

#### **Documents**

- 1 PB Report Section 440.3 Marijuana Establishments (Adult Use Marijuana Establishments)
- 2 PB Report Section 440.3 Marijuana Establishments (Adult Use Marijuana Establishments) \_sp
- 3 PB Report Section 440.3 Marijuana Establishments (Adult Use Marijuana Establishments) - Article 21

Ms. Joseph said there are three versions of the report to Town Meeting.

- Version 1 - original version sent to everyone for comment
- Version 2 - drafted by Mr. Pritchard
- Version 3 – based on Mr. Pritchard’s version 2 with some edits drafted by Ms. Joseph and Ms. Lambert

The Board needs to decide which Version they would like to recommend for Town Meeting

Ms. Lambert spoke about the meeting with Select Board, saying it was one of the longest nights of her life, she described the meeting as being skewered, pilloried and roasted for doing this. She opined at some points they could have just called it in, there was no substantial back and forth, really the meeting was with Mr. Vegnani with some input from other Board members. She said there was a spirited discussion that they would agree to disagree on some points.

Ms. Lambert also spoke about the meeting with the Town Moderator where it was discussed how all this would be presented, why it is being presented and the Moderator will keep a very tight lid on how things will go and what will happen if something happens and something doesn't happen. She said the Moderator is well aware of the complications and complexities of issues before us.

Ms. Joseph indicate a few changes have been made to recreational marijuana as well.

- Same Square footage as Medical Marijuana, 3,000 sq. ft.
- Same change made with the property line
  - All language will be made consistent with Medical and Recreational
  - New language discussed tonight will be included

Ms. Joseph indicated the square footage was changed based on an analysis she did on free-standing liquor stores; 3,000 sq. ft. is in line. She indicated she spoke with Marshfield and the one retail store that is on Rt. 139 is 3,400 sq. ft. of retail space, but they do have additional space for processing. She opined 3,000 sq. ft. is a reasonable number.

There was discussion about what was edited in Version 2 of the report compared to Version 3. Ms. Lambert said the Board is endorsing a land use, they are not endorsing Marijuana Establishments. Mr. Pritchard said he was trying to be clear that the Board is making no opinion about lifting or keeping the Ban; this is only a Bylaw that could be used if people decided to lift the Ban and there would be appropriate zoning in place in order to make their decision. Ms. Lambert opined that is what is being said and she read from Version 3.

Ms. Burbine read Version 3 of the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the public hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted X to X to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The proposed article is the product that resulted from the Town's commitment in response to the indefinite postponement and referral to the Planning Board of a Citizen's Petition at the October 26, 2021 Special Fall Town Meeting, to develop adequate zoning regulations in the event that the Town voted to remove the existing ban and allow for Adult Use Marijuana Establishment in limited areas in Town.

The changes proposed in this zoning article provide for adding a new section to the zoning bylaw Section 440.3 Marijuana Establishments (Adult Use Marijuana Establishments to include definitions in Section 200 Definitions, a Table of Uses for the different types of marijuana establishments found in Section 420 Table of Uses and a new Section 440.3 defining the requirements for Town approval of marijuana establishments

To the extent that the Town votes to allow for marijuana establishments, the zoning bylaw changes as written are recommended to the Town if the Town's existing bans on adult use marijuana establishments are overturned by Town voters.

These changes, if coupled with a vote to remove the existing marijuana bans, provides adequate regulation for a legal land use and controls for marijuana establishments.

The Planning Board is providing proposed zoning bylaw modifications to be used *to inform* voters in conjunction with the Town's vote to *keep or lift* the existing bans.

The Planning Board **does or does not support** this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote

Mr. MacLean said Version 3 is good, it does not explicitly say if the Board is endorsing a lifting of the Ban; a well-informed Town Meeting voter will understand this was the Board working with the original petition.

The Board agreed to use Version 3.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis - yes

## **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendment – Section 491 Temporary Moratoria – Article 22**

### **Documents**

- PB Report Section 491- Temporary Moratoria

Ms. Joseph said this is to remove the temporary moratorium that ended in 2018. She added a bit to the warrant article to make sure the existing definitions are added into Section 200. She added it in the event the preceding article does not pass the existing definitions are not lost.

Mr. Pritchard said point in fact the moratorium is expired.

Ms. Joseph said correct, but the definitions were only put in that section and we don't want to lose them, they just need to be moved to Section 200.

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted unanimously to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article provide for deleting the Temporary Moratorium on the Sale and Distribution of Adult Use/Recreational Marijuana as the time period for it has expired and adding the existing definitions in the section to Section 200 Definitions.

The temporary moratorium time has passed and this section is no longer relevant. The definitions existing in this section are proposed to be moved to Section 200 in the event the changes in Section



440.3 are not passed thus allowing for the existing definitions to be retained. The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor to support the article.

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

### **Discussion/Vote – Proposed Zoning Amendment – Prohibition of Marijuana Establishments – Article 23**

#### **Documents**

- PB Report Section 492 – Prohibition of Marijuana Establishments

Ms. Burbine read the report.

The Planning Board hereby reports that in accordance with MGL Ch. 40 A, a public hearing was held on this article on February 10, 2022 and continued until February 24, 2022 when the hearing was closed. On March 10, 2022, the Board voted X to X to support passage of the Article at the April 11, 2022 Annual Town Meeting.

The changes to this article provide for deleting the Prohibition of Marijuana Establishments. To the extent the Town wants to allow for marijuana establishments, the ban must be lifted and the zoning as proposed passed. This prohibition shall not be construed to affect the medical use of marijuana.

The Planning Board supports this article. This article requires a 2/3 vote.

A roll call vote was taken; the vote was four to one in favor to support the article with.

Ms. Burbine – yes  
Mr. Pritchard – no  
Ms. Lambert – yes  
Mr. Bornstein – yes  
Ms. Lewis - yes

Ms. Joseph said she will make the changes to the reports and the Board will sign them at the next meeting. She will be sending the report to the Select Board and the Advisory Committee so they know where the Board stands on the issues.

There was discussion about the General Bylaw and who deals with that. Ms. Joseph said the Board is sponsoring the article, but it does not require a report to Town Meeting. The Board will have to present it. At the next meeting the Board can discuss how they want to present the articles to Town Meeting, etc.

## **Discussion - MBTA Communities**

### **Documents**

- PDF Draft Compliance for Multi-family
- PDF MBTA Communities – How to comply in 2022
- Doc Presentation MBTA Communities

Ms. Joseph indicated she is appearing before the Select Board on Tuesday night as part of the requirement for the One-Stop for Growth Grants; there needs to be a presentation to the Select Board by May 2, 2022 along with an online form to be completed for MBTA Communities.

Ms. Joseph has provided the Board with a facts sheet, the draft Compliance document and how to comply in 2022. Ms. Joseph reviewed the facts sheet.

- Acts of 2020 put a new Section 3A to the Zoning Act (Ch 40A) requiring MBTA communities to have a zoning district in which multifamily zoning is permitted by right and meets other requirements. If do not comply, not eligible for Housing Choice Initiative, Local Capital Projects Fund or Mass Works Infrastructure Program grants
- How to comply in 2022
  1. Draft guidelines are out for review
  2. Must include a presentation of the draft guidelines to the Select Board by 5/2/2022
  3. Complete and Submit Community Information Form
  4. Submit GIS parcel maps if notified
- What does this mean for Scituate?
  1. Zoning Act requires MBTA communities to have 1 district of reasonable size in which multifamily (MF) housing is permitted by right and meets other criteria
    - a) Minimum gross density 15 units/acre
    - b) Not more than ½ mile from commuter rail station
    - c) No age restrictions
    - d) Suitable for families
  2. Scituate has 2 MBTA Commuter Rail Stations
  3. Scituate has 8,260 Housing Units per 2020 Census so determined need of 1,239 housing units needed in multifamily districts that are of a scale, density, character consistent with community goals

There was discussion about how the numbers were calculated and how close Scituate is to the numbers now. Ms. Joseph said that calculation has not been done yet, that will be the next step. She said we will have to determine how close the Town is to meeting the number, how close does the State think the Town is and will there need to be an increase in Zoning areas to accommodate this. She said the units do not have to built they have to be zoned for.

Mr. MacLean said we only have to comply if we want to do this. Ms. Joseph said she is told the Town does want to apply for MassWorks Grants and One-Step for Growth Grants.

4. Reasonable Size not less than 50 contiguous acres (or 1/10 of land area within 1/2 mi of a MBTA station) with a unit capacity of 15% for a commuter rail community. Unit capacity must take into account developable land as well as height limits, setbacks, parking, inadequate water or wastewater, wetlands, waterbodies. **UNIT CAPACITY IS NOT HOUSING PRODUCTION TARGET.** If estimate of number of multi-family units that can be constructed is less than the minimum unit capacity, boundaries of district must be changed or dimensional regulations changed

There was discussion about wastewater and that North Scituate would be out based on that. Ms. Joseph said that the State does not see anything wrong with developments having to build a wastewater treatment facility for the site; the infrastructure does not have to be available and built right now. There was discussion about getting money to sewer the area, Ms. Joseph said that is why we want to be eligible to apply for MassWorks Grants.

5. As of right means construction and occupancy of multifamily housing allowed without need to obtain discretionary permit or approval. Site Plan Review is allowed. Can review vehicular access, circulation, architectural design of buildings, screening of adjacent properties
6. Minimum gross density can be district wide of 15 units/acre subject to further limits under wetlands protection act and Title 5.
7. Compliant multifamily district cannot be age restricted and must be suitable for families with children. Zoning cannot include age restrictions, size of the units, the number of bedrooms, size of bedrooms or number of occupants.
8. DHCD will make determinations on compliance by request of the community following criteria and a schedule. Need maps, reasonable size metrics, district gross density, attestation housing is suitable for families and the application is accurate.
9. Must provide plans and action plan for commuter rail communities no later than July 1, 2023. Any zoning amendments must be adopted by December 31, 2024 for commuter rail communities.

Ms. Joseph explained that Scituate presently has the NDTV District in the Greenbush VCN with a density of 16 units by right/36 by special permit. This district is approximately 9.5 acres. The North Scituate VCN has the outer village with a density of 15 units by right/24 by special permit. This is approximately 20 acres. Two other VCN districts (GWB and GVC in Greenbush) allow for 12 units by right/24 units by special permit for multifamily housing. North Scituate Village Center does not allow for multifamily but mixed use instead.

Ms. Joseph indicate the GVC is about 30 acres; the Town is very close to 50 acres if the GVC was changed.

Ms. Joseph said the first step is to make compliance for 2022, so the Town can go after some grants. The next step will be to determine where the numbers stand and how the Town might want to comply. The easiest thing to do might be to change the GVC district to 15 units by right from 12

units by right. It would still be a Town Meeting vote; the Board said that seems like the path of least resistance. There was discussion about the contiguous acres and Scituate cannot meet that, but the Town would be very close with the area in North Scituate at 20 acres, Greenbush and potentially by adding the GVC. Ms. Joseph said the State will look at each situation on its own merits.

Mr. Pritchard said he wouldn't say the Town is going to change anything and just state what we have now and this is how the Town complies; there is 9.5 here and 20 here is that good enough. Ms. Joseph said we can try, but we could not get the number of housing units in that too little area. Mr. Pritchard said if they are going to recognize every community as different, then we should tell them to recognize this. He said go in and tell them this is what we can do, if they can't live with that tell us what they can live with.

There was discussion about Grants the Town would want to go after and the dollars. Ms. Joseph did not know, but said the Town is in dire need of sewer and water improvements and MassWorks is the program for infrastructure.

Mr. MacLean questioned if "we" are willing to take the first step and have the Town Zoning be dictated by the City of Boston, he opined that is where this is going. There was debate between Mr. MacLean and Mr. Pritchard. Mr. MacLean thought the Town would be losing control.

All adjacent communities' area also MBTA Communities; Norwell, Cohasset.

Ms. Burbine read the definition of how the Zoning Act defines "gross density as a units per acre density measurement that includes being occupied by the public rights of way any recreational, civic, commercial and other non-residential uses"; would that add to the acreage. Ms. Joseph said maybe, but we need to look at more closely.

Ms. Joseph said we can submit what we already have and let the State tell us if it is not good enough.

Ms. Lambert agreed with Mr. Pritchard; we are ahead of the curve we should tell the State what we have and let them tell us if it is not good enough; we are not a Reading and Weston - we are tiny little Town.

There was discussion about affordable housing; this is not dictating affordable housing. The Town already has Inclusionary Zoning so anything over 6 units requires affordable housing. This is about the lack of housing production in the State not about affordable housing.

Mr. Pritchard said we should let them know that we have Inclusionary Zoning, to address affordable housing.

Mr. Bornstein said it should be pointed out the Town is doing all the right things with Smart Growth and the reality is we don't have 50 acres.

Ms. Joseph said the regulations are still in draft form, but we need to complete this one part by May 2<sup>nd</sup> and then start working on the information to show what the Town has; she does believe this will impact the Master Plan as well. Mr. Pritchard thinks the Master Plan should be an attachment.

Ms. Joseph said this will be a hot topic in the coming weeks.

Mr. Pritchard said the case should be made that the State is discriminating against smaller communities by setting absolute targets; there is one standard for all communities. Ms. Joseph indicated they say communities will be looked at individually; Mr. Pritchard said we should call them on that.

Ms. Joseph will have the Board review all the information that we have; there will be a lot more on this in the next 6 months – 1 year.

The Board will not look at changing zoning until there is feedback from the State.

**Minutes**  
**Documents**

- Meeting Minutes 2.10.22

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the meeting minutes for February 10, 2022.

Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine – yes  
Mr. Pritchard – no  
Ms. Lambert – yes  
Mr. Bornstein – yes  
Ms. Lewis - yes

**Accounting**  
**Documents**

PO #2207705 (\$665.00), PO #2207703 (\$30.33), PO #2207501 (\$46.50), PO #2207508 (\$450.00)

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the requisition of \$450.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review services at 247 Driftway – DREW/MBTA, for \$46.60 to GateHouse media for annual subscription for the Scituate Mariner, for \$30.33 to WB Mason for office supplies, for \$665.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review services at Seaside and Scituate.

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

Ms. Burbine – yes  
Mr. Pritchard – no  
Ms. Lambert – yes  
Mr. Bornstein – yes  
Ms. Lewis - yes

**Liaison Reports:**

**No Liaison reports.**

Ms. Lambert reported that Conservation and ZBA are dragging their feet on a proposal for a pool in the west end on Arrowwood; each is waiting for the other to make a determination. She said this has been going on for a year.

Ms. Lambert also said there will be complaints coming about the heavy trucks on Clapp Road.

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

- Expecting As-built for 18 Ford next week
  - Anticipating getting first unit by April 1
  - Condenser unit is not in a very nice place; developer said only place it could go
  - Walkway has been removed
- Work being done on Dunkin Donuts park
  - Putting in more dense grade
  - Resetting the bollard
- Next Meeting
  - Accessory Dwelling
  - Common Driveway
  - 2 Lots from Curtis Estates coming to discuss pools
  - Stormwater Permit discussion
    - Not sure it is functioning correctly
  - ANR
  - 7 New Driftway coming in with a concept
    - Working on new concept
    - Site plan given to the Board
    - Elevation was not ready for tonight – thus the reason for continuance
    - Reiterated the building needs to look more like it belongs in Scituate
  - Mr. Pritchard will not be at the next meeting
- Traffic study for Senior Center still being worked on
  - Awaiting report before scheduling a discussion with the Board

**Documents**

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 3.4.22 with agenda for 3.10.22
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 3.4.22 with materials for 7 New Driftway, Zoning Amendments for Town Meeting, 81 Norwell Ave., MBTA Communities
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 3.10.22 with materials for 81 Norwell Ave.
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 3.10.22 with materials for 81 Norwell Ave., DRAFT Meeting Minutes 2.10.22 and AMENDED Agenda 3.10.22

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. Pritchard – no

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis - yes

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Rebecca Lewis, Clerk

Date Approved: March 24, 2022