

## **SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD    MINUTES    March 9, 2023**

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

Others Present: Karen Joseph, Town Planner; Shari Young, 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 Lambert called the meeting to order at 6:30 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television and streaming live on Facebook with in-person and remote access available.

### **Documents**

- 3/9/23 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Chair Lambert 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 – Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for Mixed-Use Building, Multi-Family Building and Stormwater Permit in the VCN- GDG-GVC and GWB – 33 New Driftway and 7 MacDonald Terrace**  
**Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 53-05-19 and 53-5-20A**  
**Applicant/Owner: Saoirse, LLC**

### **Documents**

- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Architectural Plans
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Photometric Plan
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Planning Board Applications & Narrative 2.8.23
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Responses to comments
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Site Plan – 2.8.2023
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Stormwater Permit Application – 2.8.2023
- PDF 15-436-33 New Driftway – Traffic Impact Study - 2.8.2023
- Jpeg – 33 New Driftway Rendering
- PDF 33 New Driftway-Feb-Updates
- PDF 2292 2<sup>nd</sup> Review Letter 030223
- PDF REV 2
- Doc REV 2
- DOC Draft Motion Continuance
- DOC Summary of Issues 3-9-2023
- PDF A6 – Stepback Section Diagram – received at meeting
- PDF 33 New Driftway – Design Memo- received at meeting

Attendees: Bill Ohrenberger, Attorney; Matt Mitchell, Attorney; Greg Morse, Morse Engineering; John Sullivan, Property Owner; Jamie Kelliher, Architect; Jason Adams; Traffic; John Chessia, Town's Consulting Engineer; Kirsten Braun, Town's Consulting Traffic Engineer  
Ms. Lambert indicated there is along list of items the Board would like to address this evening.

Mr. Ohrenberger introduced the team. He indicated that since the last meeting they have received comments from Mr. Chessia and there has been a meeting with both Traffic Engineers, Mr. Morse and Ms. Joseph in attendance to discuss some of the issues. Mr. Morse and Mr. Adams will address comments from Mr. Chessia's review and the traffic review. He also said the project has gone to Design Review Committee (DRC) and Mr. Kelliher has a letter in response to comments from DRC that he can review regarding the setback/setback.

- Water/Sewer Studies have not yet been provided, what is the ETA
  - Applicant is working on the study and should be able to provide it soon.
  - Mr. Ohrenberger said he thinks the information will be similar to information that was provided for 61 New Driftway, an unrelated project.
- Affordable Units – 4 units are required
  - Board said MetroWest Collaborative Development is the monitoring agent for the 3 other Local Action Unit projects in Town; applicant agreed to use Metro West
    - Ms. Joseph to provide contact information
  - Locations of affordable units
    - 3 units in the larger mixed-use building
      - 1-bedroom on first level
      - 2-bedroom on second floor
      - 2-bedroom on third floor
    - 1 unit is in the back smaller residential building
      - 2-bedroom on second floor
  - Discussion if all units will be 80% AMI or will any be lower
    - Scituate is in the Boston area for determining -AMI there is thought what is deemed affordable is not really affordable.
    - Bylaw allows applicants to go below 80% AMI, MetroWest said it happens all the time, if agreed to suggestion is to use 60% AMI because it is a number that HUD calculates.
    - Mr. Ohrenberger said they will have to look into it, they will need weigh in with the lender regarding the financing, etc.
    - Ms. Lambert suggested the lower AMI could count towards the applicant's density bonus
- Construction sequencing – concerned with the steepness for the access off of New Driftway
  - General sequencing is on the site plan
  - Access would be a crushed stone stabilized entrance
  - Front building built first with associated infrastructure and parking lot
  - After building complete, second building on MacDonald Terrace would be built, Mr. Sullivan would move his office from the existing building to the new building.
  - Construction of the second building in the rear would then start, like a second phase of the project

- Parking lot would be complete
    - Ms. Joseph said the construction phasing currently is not geared towards two buildings and needs to be adjusted.
  - Construction entrance
    - Information needs to be provided to the Board on the plans
    - Mr. Morse indicated no retainage is needed for construction of the entrance
      - Grade off Driftway is about 2', the excavation will slope back onto the property.
      - Highest point at the site of excavation is 2' per Mr. Morse
      - Mr. Pritchard opined 2' was not that big, so long as it does not slough off into the roadway
        - Stormwater management is required for the whole project
    - Ms. Burbine said she thought the sequence was backwards; it would be disruptive to build the second building after the front building is finished. Why would the second building not be built first or at the same time.
      - Mr. Ohrenberger said Mr. Sullivan cannot demolish his office while the first building is being constructed
        - It might be possible to sequence the building closer together
        - Financing currently requires that the front building be built in order to do get the advances; it is 70% of the project with the infrastructure
      - Ms. Burbine was concerned about the trucks that would need access once construction of the back building starts
        - Ms. Joseph asked if the earthwork could be done, so the big hauling could be done
          - Mr. Morse said majority of the earthwork will be done when the parking lot is done
            - All the drainage structures are under the parking lot, water services, sewer services, etc.
            - Services will be stubbed off for connections at a later time.
            - Demolition on the existing building is a day's work with a 30 yard dumpster; not a significant haul, no substantial earthwork associated with it.
  - Mr. Pritchard asked if there was any chance the second building is never built or has significant delays
    - Mr. Ohrenberger said it is employment driven because Mr. Sullivan's business is in the building
  - Entrance for construction of the back building will be the main entrance; it will be a fully paved commercial grade parking lot
- Ms. Lambert said there needs to be some assurance that the second building will be built
- Setback/Stepback explanation of where/why/how the building does not comply
  - Ms. Joseph indicated the Board will get DRC recommendations

- DRC did like the building, but wanted answers of how much and why the stepback/setback was not able to meet the standard.
  - DRC meeting Tuesday 3.14.23 to review
- Mr. Kelliher said at the request of the DRC a diagram was created to show the section cut through the main section of the building along with a front elevation that indicates areas that had non-conformity with stepback zone.
  - Front of building vanishing back from the road
  - Architectural elements used to break up the building's vertical articulation
    - Portion of the dormers and gable features are popping through the stepback zone
    - Approximately 6% of total area of the front façade is non-conforming
  - Cross-section shows the actual steps and show how they create a sloped roof building
  - Instead of doing a 4-story building kept building features so it has a 2 ½ story building aesthetic, makes it hard to fit into the stepback
  - Main roof falls within the correct zone and mid-point would be the roof height
  - Section 750 – requires that a building longer than 50' has to include a projected vertical element, one for each 50' of the building
    - The intent is to break up the horizontal effect of building of this size.
    - There is a 1'6" extension from the main front wall of the building to give depth and vertical articulation.
  - This will be presented to DRC
    - DRC will determine if the applicant needs to ask for a waiver
  - Building materials - samples discussed at DRC meeting
    - Siding is brick lower level – consensus on red brick with rough traditional finish and variation in color
    - Upper portions will be fiber cement, hardy clapboard in light beige color
    - Roof neutral grayish brown
  - Landscaping updated on rendering
  - Signage would be minimal on the building face – signs would be smaller on windows or free-standing signs in grass yard
  - Added decorative brackets the balconies for more traditional feel
  - Could not get a view of the 2 buildings together on the rendering
  - Second building will be shingle style more residential feel
    - Same or similar color of clapboard material with white trim detailing
  - The Board opined they wanted to wait to hear from DRC before saying if they would grant a waiver; but they did not think it was that much to ask for.
    - Mr. MacLean opined that losing the architectural features to comply would not be aesthetically good for the building.

- Density Bonus
  - Applicant proposing connection to the MBTA walkway/trail
    - Ms. Joseph indicated permission is needed from the MBTA because it is in a MBTA easement
    - Mr. Morse said there is about 5' of connection from the applicant's walkway that needs to be connected is technically owned halfway through the right-of-way by the MBTA.
  - Applicant is realigning the site at over a cost of half million dollars cost for safety
    - Applicant feels realignment is tremendous benefit to the Town at substantial cost
    - Project could have been done without going on to Mr. Burwick's property, building could have been pushed to the east and there could have been 2 curb cuts.
      - Creates a safer egress and moves things away from the brook
  - Ms. Lambert opined that sidewalks are part of doing business they are not part of a density bonus
    - Can be creative with a density bonus, which is why suggestion was made for 60% AMI for affordable units.
  - Ms. Lambert also opined that the realignment of the driveway with the property next door is not a density bonus, but is the cost of doing business.
    - Mr. Ohrenberger said there is an expense to doing this and they either correct this health and safety issues that exists or do another entrance.
      - Mr. Ohrenberger said other Town officials feel it is important to do this change
      - The applicant could abandon this option and construct their building or come up with some else.

Ms. Lambert explained that the proposal is for one entrance with an improvement in sight lines is a bonus to the Town, but there needs to be something over and above. The Applicant is proposing the reconfigured entrance as their density bonus; the Board needs to decide if that is acceptable. Mr. Ohrenberger said this development is not pushed to the maximum, it is 5 less units than what it could be. He said this is the most visible building coming around the curve on the Driftway. Ms. Lambert said it will change the look of the Driftway and the Board's objective is to make sure it is really nicely done.

Ms. Lambert opined that doing 60% AMI is something that could go towards the density bonus, making affordable units more affordable. The Board opined at least 2 units at 60% AMI would be fair as something to count towards the applicant's density bonus.

Mr. Ohrenberger said it is something they can look at, but if the entrance doesn't mean anything the Board needs to tell them because they have wasted a ton of money. Ms. Lambert explained that sidewalks are not part of the density bonus and the Board has been consistent on that before, money has been given for other projects in the area, but she is suggesting that out of the 4 affordable units at least 2 be offered at the 60% AMI. Mr. Ohrenberger asked if the applicant does that will it satisfy the Board.

Ms. Lambert opined it would satisfy her for the density bonus.

Ms. Burbine said it would, but she was still concerned about the 7 parking spaces Mr. Burwick was getting, because he is not losing parking spaces as it was portrayed to the Board thought at the last meeting.

Ms. Joseph asked for clarification on how many legal parking spaces from the approved site plan from 2011 Mr. Burwick losing. She said she does not think parking was allowed along the brook, there were definitive parking spaces on the approved plan. Mr. Morse said there were definitive parking spaces on that plan, and there was 90-degree space adjacent to the ice house that will be lost with the realignment. He said as it has been pointed out there has been a lot of illegal parking parallel along the driveway which has not been enforced, those spots get eliminated and realigned. Mr. MacLean said it is a net add for parking spaces. Mr. Morse said yes, for legal parking spaces it is a net add, but looking at the illegal spaces it is nothing; it corrects a situation that has not been enforced and is continuously a safety concern.

Mr. Ohrenberger said he was confused about what the Board is asking for; is less space for Mr. Burwick good or is more space good. He said is it bad that there is more parking; the Board did not think it was bad that more parking would be available. Ms. Lambert said they are taking a bad thing and making it right; Mr. Ohrenberger said they are in a unique position they are the only ones that can do anything about it. Mr. Pritchard added that it is the property owner's responsibility to enforce the parking, not the Town's, but he is fine with the parking spaces. Ms. Burbine said the applicant is really doing this to aide Mr. Burwick. Ms. Joseph said he Mr. Burwick should not be able to get more seats with the change in parking.

Ms. Burbine restated what she believes the Board is agreeing to for a density bonus, sidewalks are not included, striping is not included, two affordable units at 60% AMI and the realignment of the driveway are the density bonus proposed.

There was discussion about the driveway and materials proposed. Mr. Morse said there are portions of seashell for the existing driveway of 17 New Driftway, they are proposing pavement from 33 New Driftway onto the 17 New Driftway property. Mr. Morse pointed out on the plan what would be shell and what would be pavement; the seven spots along New Driftway would be crushed shell as well as the parking around the backside of the ice house, pavement will tie into existing pavement. Mr. Morse said with the application before the Conservation Commission they wanted to show there was no increase in impervious surface on Mr. Burwick's property; they are maintaining the square footage of impervious surface versus what is being removed which is a net of zero for impervious surface.

Ms. Burbine asked if there will be some type of barrier to prevent people from scooting over across the shells. Mr. Morse said the landscape plan shows a row of arborvitaes/screening between the parking spaces and the roadway.

Ms. Lambert asked for more clarity on the shells; Mr. Morse said it is a conservation issue because the property is within the river front area and they are limited on the amount of impervious that is allowed on the site. He said the Planning Board approved the use of shell for the site in 2010-2011. Ms. Lambert discussed some concerns she has with the tandem parking on the site; she said she is not opposed to it, but there is no room to back out because there is a sidewalk. Mr. Morse said the

back units are 2-bedroom units and would be assigned to those parking spaces and there should not be any issues.

Mr. Morse pointed out that there are 2 electric charging stations on site and 2 ADA spots. There was discussion about where the ADA space was for the second building. Mr. Morse pointed out the closets spot which is also the closets to the ADA ramp, etc. Ms. Burbine asked if there is sufficient parking for building number one; Mr. Morse opined yes, it meets the bylaw and exceeds the bylaw. He said there are also 4 additional spaces inside the garage which would be assigned spaces. Ms. Burbine said parking will be an enforcement issue, but she has a very hard time with the tandem parking spaces even though they are assigned in this type of capacity.

Ms. Joseph asked for some clarification on a note regarding ADA parking spaces by the loading area and the dumpster. Mr. Morse confirmed there are only 2 ADA spaces in the locations he pointed to on the site plan. He also pointed out where the snow storage would be.

There was discussion about the dumpster and if people should/could be required to go to the transfer station. Mr. Morse said it has been done both ways, but he believes it is required to have a dumpster. The building association will contract the dumpster service.

Mr. Ohrenberger said the units will be rental units, there will be no Homeowners Association.

Ms. Lambert asked for clarification on the MBTA; Mr. Morse pointed out the public walking path and showed where the applicant intends to connect to the path in 3 locations with the site sidewalks. He said he does not anticipate any connection issues; they have connected to the sidewalk pathway at the 50 Country Way project and had discussion with Mr. Fords property at the end of Ford Place. He said in the event they could not connect to the MBTA they could continue the pathway on their property and run it directly adjacent to the pathway, it would be redundant and ridiculous and doesn't really make any sense.

Ms. Lambert asked if bollards on the pathway are illuminated and work. Mr. Sullivan said the bollards are illuminated all the way from Country Way; it is unclear who owns them.

#### *Traffic:*

Ms. Braun, Town's Consulting Engineer, indicated most of the comments from the last review were addressed, an updated traffic study was provided with the expanded study area as well as traffic counts. She indicated there were some minor additional comments;

- Landscaping within the sight triangles
  - Applicant to confirm landscaping is 2.5' or less so it does not impede any sight lines
  - Snow should be removed within the sight triangles
- Need confirmation from the Fire Department that there is adequate accessibility to all sides of the buildings
  - Ms. Joseph spoke to Deputy Chief and confirmed there are no issues
  - The buildings are sprinklered
  - A new fire hydrant will be relocated at the entrance

Ms. Braun said the new submittal addresses most everything they had commented on originally.

Mr. Adams indicated they are comfortable with the issues that had been addressed. He spoke to the sight line issues and said landscaping will be kept below 2.5' and he noted there will be significant improvements to sight line with the new driveway configuration. He said the 90-degree angle clears up a lot of issues and the driveway has been pushed to be in as close as possible alignment with the driveway across the way.

Mr. Chessia indicated most of his letter has already been discussed, but he commented about the EV (electric vehicle charging) and asked if they need to be accessible. He said it may depend if the applicant gets funding, which the gas station did, he said there is a supplemental State funding for EV Chargers and if the applicant intends to use that one station may have to be accessible and is something the applicant may have to address. The space does not need to be designated handicapped, but it needs to be accessible so the spacing is a little different and there has to be cross hatch. An additional 4' would be needed to make a spot accessible in the current location. Mr. Morse said he is not aware that it is a requirement, it is only a requirement if the applicant is applying for the grant. He said if they go for the grant, they would have to put in a 5' stripe area adjacent to one of the EV stations to make it accessible or they could move 2 of the EV stations to the parking spaces that are adjacent to the proposed handicapped spaces, i.e. put the station right on the stripe that differentiates the two so either vehicle could be charged and it is an already existing ADA space. The Board agreed and thought that made sense.

Mr. Chessia said there are not a lot of issues with drainage, there are pretty good soils. There is an issue with some calculations, but he recommends if the project gets approved that the excavation be checked, things could be buried and the applicant could find something that was not expected. He said there are pervious paver walkways proposed, but they are not asking for credit with regards to TSS removal, but the detail should specify the joints, etc. based on issues that have happened on other sites, the thickness of the gravel underneath may not be enough and is something for the Board to think about. He said the Board should address the construction phasing because currently there is a big hole in the middle of the site and if it is blasted open the water will go towards Driftway; something will have to be done to take care of it during the process. The other items he commented on in his letter which the Board has not addressed are the amenity space and public realm.

Mr. Morse indicated the amenity space is common yard/garden space, they are required to have 20% amenity space they have over 9,772 sq. ft. of common yard so they comply. Mr. Morse said the area is color hatched out on the landscape plan. The Board opined there was not much more they could do; benches are proposed along the walkways and are depicted on the site plans along with the required bike racks.

Mr. Pritchard asked if building 1 and the parking lot are built out before anything is done with the second building will the applicant be able to manage the stormwater. Mr. Chessia opined the bigger issue maybe managing the stormwater while building the first building and the parking lot. With the second building the applicant will need to keep the dirt out of the system because all the drainage would be in with the exception of the roof. He said most likely once the second building's foundation is poured and there is a slab the runoff from that would likely be picked up by catch basins that are at the low point by the island; silt sacks would be needed and erosion control would be needed around the area. He said he has less of concern with runoff during construction of building 2 than he does with building 1. He did say that if the entire parking lot is going to be paved there has to be a place for the workers to go which will depend on the occupancy for building 1, there could be conflicts if the whole building is occupied. He said there will be a lot of vehicles parked during the building of the second building. Mr. Ohrenberger said until the second building is



finished there is no parking required for the 12 bedrooms and that area could be used for parking of construction vehicles. Mr. Morse said it would be enough space to hold the equipment for construction.

Mr. Pritchard asked if the construction water management has been looked at. Mr. Chessia said that has not yet been done, the applicant still needs to do that; the construction phase water management has not been addressed yet. Mr. Pritchard said the Boards experience is that is where all the major water problems happen. Mr. Chessia said they have the benefit of sandy soil so there should not be much runoff, but it is still a sensitive area and it needs to be considered in the design.

*No public comment.*

*Motion:*

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicants request to continue the public hearing for Site Plan Administrative Review and Special Permit for a Mixed-Use Building and Multi-family Building and Stormwater Permit in the Village Center and Neighborhood District – Greenbush Gateway District – Greenbush Village Center Subdistrict and Gateway Business District (VCN-GDG-GVC and GWB) until May 11, 2023 at 6:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until June 23, 2023.

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

**Form A – ANR Plan – 525 Country Way  
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 26-2-4  
Applicant/Owner: Jonathan and Carley Marsh**

### **Documents**

- PDF Application 525 Country Way
- PDF REC deed
- PDF Scituate, Country Way, 525-Plan of Land 01-30-23 sgnd
- PDF Transmittal
- Doc DRAFT Motion

Ms. Joseph said this is a simple Form A, both lots have access and frontage, it is just moving an internal lot line so one lot has more of a backyard. She recommends endorsement.

*Motion:*

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as approval under the Subdivision Control Law Not Required a Plan of Land 525 Country Way & 4 Arborway Drive Scituate, MA 02066 prepared by Land Mapping, Inc., Patrick Roseingrave, Registered Land Surveyor for applicant/owner Jonathan and Carly Marsh dated January 30, 2023 as the division of the tract of land shown on the accompanying plan is not a subdivision because it shows a proposed conveyance or change in a lot line which does not alter the existing frontage as required under the Scituate Zoning Bylaw. No new buildable lots are proposed.

### **Minutes**

### **Documents**

- Meeting Minutes 2.23.23

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the meeting minutes for February 23, 2023.

Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and was unanimously in favor.  
Mr. Bornstein and Ms. Lewis did not vote as they are not present at the meeting.

### **Accounting Documents**

PO #2317734 (\$367.50), PO #2317679 (\$190.00), PO #2317655 (\$73.99), PO #2317383 (\$1,530.00)

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the requisition of \$1,530.00 to TEC, Inc. for peer review services for Laurelwood Lots 3, 4 and 5, for \$73.99 to Schwaab, Inc. for ink pads, for \$190.00 to Rockland Trust for training seminar, for \$367.50 to Horsley Witten for peer review services for Seaside at Scituate.

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

### **Liaison Reports:**

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

- Deal with sewer with Cohasset is not going to happen
- Approved money for more I&I on Oceanside and other streets
  - When Cedar Point was done it was discovered many of the laterals were broken
  - With next phase everything will be camera'd
  - If there are laterals that need to be replaced it will need to be replaced
    - Unknown who will have to pay for it at this time

#### **Pier 44 – reported by Ms. Lambert:**

- Attended 2 meetings on Pier 44
  - Morning session had about 25-30 people all neighbors of the area
    - Expressed concerns about water, wind, no concerns about parking
    - Said they want to have somewhere to sit on the way from Cole Parkway to the Light house. They just want a park
  - Evening session attendees wanted a pavilion
- She opined it is over engineered, but a great idea
- No idea on the costs
- Coming to Town Meeting asking for \$300K from CPC
- Chapter 91 needed, FEMA, etc. because it is on the waterfront
  - Would like to put out a walkout pier, but land is privately owned to the low water mark
  - Pier would require permission of the Governor
  - Takes years and costs a lot of money
- Taking the building down is over \$700K

- Proposed pavilion structure for 100 people, potential for concerts
  - Area is in a residential zone
  - Not enough parking
- 1,400 people responded to the survey
  - 3 options for the pavilion roof shape

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

- Old Oaken Bucket 40B hearing
  - Ready to write a decision in April
  - Having a breakout meeting and will be back before ZBA April 24<sup>th</sup>
  - People very concerned about traffic and development going on in Norwell
  - Will be 24 units, owner occupied
  - 6 units will be affordable, 25% is required

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

- Met with State Representatives on Monday regarding MBTA Communities
  - Good meeting
  - Understand Scituate's concerns about mixed-use not being counted
  - Understand Scituate is an old community with constraints from wetlands, salt marsh, flood plains, Zone A, Zone II
  - Understand Scituate has infrastructure issues
  - Will be writing letters to DHCH on behalf of Scituate
  - Town applying for Mass Works grants
    - State Reps going to write joint letter in support of Scituate's Application
    - Also getting letters from 7 New Driftway and 33 New Driftway/7 MacDonald Terrace for additional leverage
      - Previous Mass Works grant for Cedar Point leveraged Toll Brothers Seaside at Scituate, and the Drew project at the MBTA station
  - Action Plan is still under review from MBTA Compliance
    - Communities with Inclusionary Zoning do not seem to have their action plans approved
    - We are currently in a wait and see pattern at the moment, do not need to make decision on how to proceed at this point
  - Feeling was the law may not need to be changed, but needs clarification on multi-family, because mixed-use is a form of multi-family housing
  - Scituate has a pedestrian frontage zone that requires commercial on the first floor; reason why MAPC says it cannot be counted
    - Scituate requiring mixed-use to create vibrant development which is smart growth
    - Need to push back against the guidelines
  - Scituate is not their only constituents having issues
  - Sense is there may be changes in time with the new Governor once the Housing Czar position is put in place
  - Made point that Scituate is a unique community and one-size does not fit all
- Meeting with Toll Brothers tomorrow
  - Toll has indicated they plan to be out by May

- Ms. Joseph does not think that is realistic
  - Many issues that still need addressing and clean up
  - Nature trail is an issue; it has never been stabilized
- Discussion with Town Counsel on Laurelwood
  - Town Counsel opined the water line installation does not need a modification
  - Any complaints/questions will be directed to the owner, Mr. Simeone or the Norwell water department
  - Letter will be sent to Mr. Simeone regarding completion of the Laurelwood project from Town Counsel

Mr. MacLean said there will be a community outreach meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> at the Senior Center for the non-profit that is proposing the Veterans Memorial sculpture on the common; sculptor and the Connors will be at the meeting.

### **Documents**

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 3.3.23 with agenda for 3.9.23.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 3.3.23 with meeting materials for 33 New Driftway/7 MacDonald Terrace and 525 Country Way.
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 3.7.23 with DRAFT minutes from 2.23.23.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 3.7.23 with meeting materials for 33 New Driftway/7 MacDonald Terrace and 525 Country Way.

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:14 p.m. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion; a vote was taken, and unanimously in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young  
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Ann Burbine, Clerk  
Date Approved: March 23, 2023