

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES August 26, 2021

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

Others Present: Karen Joseph, Town Planner; Shari Young, Planning Administrative Assistant.

Members absent:

See Sign-in List for names of others present at this meeting.

Location of meeting: Select Board Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

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

Documents

- 8/26/21 Planning Board Agenda

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

Continued Public Hearing – Stormwater Permit – 16 Mann Hill Road Assessor's Map/Block/Lot Portion of 27-7-9A Applicant/Owner: Susan Stone

Documents

- PDF 21-278 PB Review Report, 16 Mann Hill Road, 8-22-21
- PDF 4273 BOH SWP 7-30-21-SWP DETS SHT 2
- PDF 4273 BOH SWP 7-30-21 SPW EROS DETS SHT 4
- PDF 4273 BOH SWP 7-30-21 – SPW EROS SITE SHT 3
- PDF 4273 BOH SWP 7-30-21 SWP SITE SHT 1
- PDF Om RED
- PDF 4273 pp spec RED
- PDF 4273 SWR 8-6-21 RED
- PDF 4373 WS PLANS 7-30-21 red
- Doc DRAFT Motion form 2nd Continuance

Attendees: Greg Tansey, Ross Engineering

Mr. Tansey presented the plans to the Board.

- House #16 Mann Hill Road
- Perimeter of lot has not changed
- Size of the house same as last meeting
- Proposing paver patio with pool and paver driveway
- Mr. Tansey addressed comments from Peter Palmieri, Town's Consultant, peer review
 - Rip rap – removed along buffer strip, preserving the buffer strip

- Additional test pits have been provided for the area of permeable pavement and paver stones for the patio
- Concern about ground water separation between permeable pavement and seasonal high ground water
 - Shortened the amount of permeable pavement in the driveway to allow for 2' ground water separation
- Permeable pavement proximity to foundation – put in a liner to prevent any seepage
- Use of permeable pavement and the slope at 5%
 - With reduction of permeable pavement slope is now less than 5%
 - Overall average slope of the driveway is less than 4%
- Hydrocad model revised with respect to permeable pavers
- Modeled 2nd design point in the hydrocad calculations
- Erosion control
 - Plan has been revised and new calculations provided
 - Enlarged the capacity of the sediment trap
 - Erosion controls around the perimeter
 - Separate Operation & Maintenance (O&M) plan, standalone document
 - Maintenance documents added for the driveway
- Mr. Tansey addressed comments from the Board from the previous meeting
 - Grading over the property line onto the abutting and protecting the abutter to the rear
 - Proposed landscape buffer finalized after the home is built
 - Contacted the owner of Lot #18
 - Given a grading easement over the property
 - When Lot #18 is built out it will blend into the grading of the existing property line and has been reviewed with the approved septic design plan
 - Separate document prepared for the easement with meets and bounds and can be recorded at the Registry of Deeds
 - Documentation about the effectiveness of the permeable pavement
 - Study done by DEP and MassDEM regarding permeable pavement
 - Testing done on old pavement, 20 years., in location with harsh winters, etc. held up structurally
 - Test studies found it had a very effective treatment level
 - Study conducted in area near Silver Beach
 - Silver Beach had issues with E Coli, phosphorous total suspended solids, there were many beach closings
 - Used many BMP's reconstructing a parking lot, i.e. permeable pavement and cobblestone pavement and closed beach only once after installation due to other circumstances
 - Study also mentions other permeable products
 - Concrete block interlocking system forms a permeable grid – picture provided to the Board
 - Can be set on solid crushed stone or compacted gravel base
 - Can in fill with loam and seed, grass grows in between

- Low impact product, high permeability rate, does same thing as permeable pavement – home owner open to changing to this product
- Mr. Tansey opined the permeable pavement is more advantageous because it has a permeable sand filter and is a highly effective way of filtering TSS.
 - DEP credits it with 80% TSS removal

Ms. Joseph said Mr. Tansey did a good job summarizing Mr. Palmieri's comments from peer review.

- Grading on south side of the permeable pavement driveway
- 1:1 rip rap slope is removed
- Temporary grading easement on the abutting property
- Soil testing
 - One trench along the front of the property will be less than the required 2' of separation from the seasonal high ground water
- Impervious barrier along the foundation wall
- Questions remain on some of the hydrocad calculations
- 80% TSS removal is only if the permeable paver driveway is maintained
- Calculation for the sediment trap is acceptable
- Still questions the use of permeable pavement for residential use, driveway with 5% slope

Ms. Joseph indicated new plans were received today, but they are not being discussed and they have not yet been peer reviewed. She indicated tonight's discussion is on the second set of plans submitted and the peer review comments associated with those plans.

Mr. Pritchard asked for clarification on the change made that would change the depth to ground water. Mr. Tansey explained that at the front property line a test pit showed the separation was insufficient for the permeable pavement; the pavement has been moved back from the front of the property line and a small section of standard pavement has been inserted. He said the driveway is sloping up and there is fill that creates more separation between ground water as one moves up closer to the house. Where the line is drawn there is at least 2'3" of separation. The Board will await comment from Mr. Palmieri.

Mr. Pritchard referenced the comment made on how to clean the surface by vacuuming and sweeping machines on a monthly basis. Mr. Tansey said it is mentioned in the BMP maintenance, but it does not specify for a driveway, there are other options, i.e. blowing, power washing. He said a driveway is one of the best uses for permeable pavement, minimal traffic, slow speeds, and the homeowner will keep the grounds clean and want to preserve the value.

Mr. Pritchard suggested Mr. Palmieri opine if there are mitigating circumstances because it is a driveway; are blowing, power washing acceptable for maintenance. Mr. Pritchard opined that given the slope of the driveway Mr. Palmieri does not seem to think the use of the material is acceptable. Mr. Tansey said the slope of the driveway is less than 5%, at maximum it is about 4.9% and at the top it is 4.3.9%; they did not regrade the driveway the permeable pavement was pulled back from the property line where it is the steepest, as you enter into the garage it gets flatter, there is a slope of approximately 3.9% so there is no water getting into the garage.

There was discussion about the alternate option presented for the driveway; it requires less maintenance just mowing and seeding. Mr. Tansey opines it is not as environmentally beneficial as the permeable pavement because the permeable pavement has a sand filter made with bank run gravel; it is very clean well sorted material that perks very well and is structurally sound. He noted bank run gravel could be put under the alternative option, there will be some filtration, but not the same as the permeable pavement.

Mr. Pritchard asked why the easement is temporary. Mr. Tansey said it won't be needed once the abutting lot is built out; the adjacent lot would be filled right against the embankment, it will level out and be smooth and uniform. It will drop down because the grade of the road drops down as you go North. Mr. Tansey said the intent is that the owner would regrade and it will not impact the stormwater calculations on this property; the runoff has been mitigated along the property.

Mr. Bornstein requested more clarification around the design of the infiltration trench drain that goes across the yard. Mr. Tansey said Mr. Palmieri had concerns about water going to the street, originally the front lawn was graded with a slight slope over the septic system and the water would go forward and at the toe of the slope it would follow the natural grade and be sent out back instead of to the street; as a safe guard it is now proposed to a 1' wide infiltration drain at the toe of the slope to a 4" pipe in the trench drain and a 4" pipe in the pavement that gets sent out back. He indicated the flow going to the pipe in the 100-years storm is very small, .018 cfs and it is clean, it is lawn and roof top. He referenced a detail image in the plan.

Mr. Bornstein asked what proportion of water is being infiltrated in the trench versus to the rear of the property. Mr. Tansey said it would depend on the storm; the 100 year storm was modeled as if there was no infiltration occurring. He said he did that because of comments from Mr. Palmieri regarding ground water separation, so to be conservative it was modeled so the entirety would be sent back to the buffer strip. He said he would not be surprised if it was less than 15%; there is no credit being received for it.

Mr. Bornstein opined it is more of a drain and asked for more explanation on what happens to the water that is draining from the front to the rear; what is the pre-existing condition of the area and how does the water that outfalls in the area behave. Mr. Tansey explained it will go the natural course, the modeled peak flow and volume is less than what was there in the beginning. He provided some numbers for the design point 1 to the Board of pre and post conditions; there is noticeable reduction, but the flows are not that great now. He provided pre and post numbers for the volume as well and said that everything has been mitigated and the performance standard has been met.

Mr. Bornstein said he is concerned that water is now being channelized and it must not create a problem towards Christopher Lane.

There was discussion about the high point of the pipe; it is at elevation 56.46 and is a gravity flow pipe slopping downhill toward the back. Mr. Tansey agreed to put in a level spreader at the end of the pipe.

Ms. Lambert discussed the enforcement of who and how the maintenance of the permeable pavement is done; how does the Board know it is being done. The homeowners are supposed have the O&M plan/document that addresses all maintenance, i.e. permeable pavement. Ms. Burbine opined it is very onerous.

Ms. Burbine addressed peer review comments about increasing the stone at the construction entrance; Mr. Tansey said that detail has been revised on the next plan.

The meeting is to be continued until the newly submitted plans are peer reviewed.

Public Comment:

Mr. Alan Wasserman resident at 12 Mann Hill Road said his property borders on this property to the left and asked if the development will impede the flow of water across his property. Mr. Tansey indicated there is now a berm and swale along the property and any water that flows from the Wasserman property will be directed to the buffer strip. Mr. Tansey further explained the grading forms a natural swale it is not a uniform cross-section. There was some confusion where the swale starts and stops along the property lines. Mr. Tansey will make revision to the plan to show the swale better. He sketched out how the swale and the grading will work on the property line with the Wasserman property and showed how the swale is created and showed how the water would then flow around to the back. He said the grades will naturally create the swale and prevent standing water from occurring around the Wasserman property; it is the same flow that is happening currently.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Stormwater Permit for 16 Mann Hill Road until September 16, 2021 at 6:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until October 8, 2021.

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

**Public Hearing - Stormwater & Site Plan Review Common Driveway – 533 Country Way
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 26-2-5
Applicant/Owner: Marvel Homes, LLC**

Documents

- Doc DRAFT Motion 1st Continuance

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to immediately continue the public hearing for the Stormwater Permit and the public meeting for the Site Plan Administrative Review for a Common Driveway at 533 Country Way due to unforeseen circumstances with public notification until September 9, 2021 at 7:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until October 29, 2021.

Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

Discussion/Vote Surety Release - Laurelwood

Documents

- PDF 98-02-27 Decision – Laurelwood
- PDF Return of surety package

- PDF 080321_spllc_scituate_road_bond_corr
- Doc DRAFT Motion Form Surety Release

Attendees: Steve Bjorklund, representing Simeone Properties

Mr. Bjorklund indicated the project was started in 1998 and one of the conditions was to post a \$20,000 bond in case there was damage to First Parish Road during construction of the subdivision; there is still some work to be done to complete the subdivision, but the roadway has been completed and the town has since repaved First Parish. He indicated that DPW provided a letter that there was not damage to First Parish Road. He said there are some issues with money owed to the Town for taxes on the property; the request is to have the Planning Board vote to release the \$20K and transfer it to the Town Treasurer/Collector for partial payment of back taxes owed.

Mr. Bjorklund also indicated that in the original decision \$10K was held for a walking trail to be constructed within the first year of construction and if it was not done the Town was able to take the \$10K to be used at the discretion of the Planning Board. A letter has been received from the developer verifying the Town can take the \$10K.

The Town is still holding \$30K in surety to make sure the clean up work is done and completed.

Ms. Joseph indicated Laurelwood is on old subdivision partly in Norwell and Scituate; the Norwell portion has been completed and Norwell has accepted the lower part of the road, the part of the road where all the residences are located. The Town of Scituate did condition \$20K that was to be released at the completion of the road if there was no damage. She said back taxes have been owed on the property for years, \$55K plus. She said the Board does not have to release it now, they can wait to for the completion of the project, but the \$20K would go to the Town to help pay down back taxes. She recommends the Town get the money now for the back taxes as it is unknown when the subdivision will be complete.

Ms. Joseph indicated there was a modification in the project for a sidewalk/trail to Vernon Road that was never done and surety for \$10K was put up for this with the stipulation if an easement was not obtained in a year the Town would get the money for the Board to use for pedestrian improvements. The Town Treasure and Accountant wanted a paper trail before the \$10K was seized which the Town has been entitled to take for over 20 years; a letter from the developer has been provided.

Ms. Joseph recommends the Board vote to release the \$20K, but she opined it is not right that the Town has to act first; the applicant has said for two months they would be making payment and nothing has happened.

There was discussion about how long until the subdivision is complete; Ms. Joseph said she does not know that is why she is recommending the Board release the money now.

Mr. Bjorklund said there is a one-page record about what needs to be done and the Norwell Homeowners Association has been doing some of the punch list items; there are no Scituate residence on the property.

Ms. Joseph said the punch list from 2007 needs to be re-evaluated when the project comes forward for completion. The \$20K was specifically for First Parish Road; DPW has repaved over the road so it is a moot point if there was damage.

The money goes from the Town to the Town, it does no pass into anyone else's hands.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved that the Board release the \$20,000 plus accumulated interest cash surety being held per Condition 21 of the Laurelwood Drive Definitive Subdivision approval to cover the costs of damage to First Parish Road resulting from trucks and heavy equipment as the Town of Scituate DPW has inspected the road and found no damage. The funds released to the Town shall be immediately transferred to the Town to cover outstanding taxes. The Board determines it is more beneficial for the town to receive back taxes of over \$55,000 (this \$20,000 plus an outstanding balance that is unpaid) than to keep this money until completion of the subdivision.

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

No vote was needed for the \$10K, but it will be moved to the Planning Board restricted funds.

Discussion on pool – 5 Cold Brook Circle - Curtis Estates

Applicant/Owner: Errol Fagone

Documents

- Email dated 8.17.21 from Errol Fagone to Karen Joseph
- Email dated 8.18.21 from Karen Joseph to Errol Fagone
- PDF 3739-14 SITE AS BLT 4-20-21
- PDF 3739 O&M Plan&Adendum REV 3-29-21
- Jped Curtis_estates_lot_assignment_sheet

Attendees: Errol and Sarah Fagone, Property Owners

Ms. Fagone said they moved to Scituate a year and half ago to raise their four children when they purchased a home in Curtis Estates. She said they were provided a list of lots from the builder of which lots could accommodate pools; they have worked with multiple companies to line things up for a pool installation. They have had many issues with the builder and did not understand the severity of issues with impervious area on their lot when they purchased the property; they were misled by the builder. She said they would not have purchased the house if they knew putting a pool in would not be an option; they are not the only ones that have issues with the builders. They are asking the Board for some guidance; they are willing to take care of the stormwater and runoff to make a pool work in their backyard.

Mr. Bornstein said the project was pushed to the limits with stormwater and runoff, etc. and that is why there are such conditions with impervious surface, etc. and adding a pool would be adding more impervious area and then affecting the stormwater, etc. He said he was not comfortable agreeing to this, without an engineer's review if the function of the stormwater system would be altered and if the stormwater could be mitigated from the pool.

The Board said without the math it is hard to give answer.

Mr. Pritchard said the condition allows for the homeowner to demonstrate that the stormwater could be mitigated, etc.

Mr. Fagone said they started down that road, but some engineers would not touch the project without the homeowner seeking some guidance from the Board.

Ms. Joseph clarified that it is the O&M Plan that has a condition that would allow for a homeowner to demonstrate and modify the condition of their lot. The Fagone's said they have never seen the O&M until the town provided it to them.

The Board feels for the Fagone's as they were led down a wrong path; but they are open to having the Fagone's demonstrate that a pool could be installed and stormwater/runoff could be mitigated and not cause issue with the function of the approved stormwater and drainage systems on site.

Ms. Joseph said the design plans clearly show the maximum impervious surface on every lot; the homes were built too big and did not account for walkways, driveways, etc. so the Board conceded to pervious pavers on the walkways and that something should be in the O&M Plan so the buyers would be aware. Apparently, the homeowners were not given the O&M Plan at time of purchase.

There was discussion about what the residential zoning which allows 25% of the lot. Ms. Fagone said her lot has 20.7% and some have 28% and asked how that is reconciled. Ms. Joseph explained the development was built under a Flexible Open Space Subdivision which accounts for the all the permeable pavement in the entire drainage design and the number of basins they have; that is why the lot sizes are a little smaller and unique to zoning, all the land on the outside is part of open space that is now managed by the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Joseph explained the homeowners are tied to the maximum number on the plan which is on the as-built plan.

Ms. Fagone said none of this was disclosed to the potential homeowners at the time of purchase.

The Board opined they are willing to look at the numbers. This is an unfortunate situation and the Board is willing to listen and work with the homeowners.

Public Hearing – Accessory Dwelling Special Permit – 137 Gilson Road
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 64-1-7
Applicant/Owner: Linda Barnhart LE and Bruce Barnhart

Documents

- Doc DRAFT Motion 1st Continuance

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to continue the public hearing for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit at 137 Gilson Road due to unforeseen circumstances in public notification until September 9, 2021 at 6:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until September 28, 2021.

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

Vote on use of Restricted Greenbush Traffic/Pedestrian Planning Board funds to be Used for Sidewalk on Old Country Way

Documents

- PDF Complete streets payment
- PDF Spreadsheet – Greenbush Funds
- Email dated 8.18.21 from Director of Planning & Development, Kyle Boyd
- Email dated 8.18.21 from Director of DPW, Kevin Cafferty
- Doc DRAFT motion

Ms. Joseph indicated the Board has collected \$60K from the Drew project for the sidewalk on Old Country Way. She said all parties have agreed and recommends to use the money for the completion of the sidewalk. There was a \$400K Complete Street grant, but some additional money was needed.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved that the Board release up to \$46,000 being held in a restricted account for the completion of the sidewalk at Country Way/Old Country Way. The funds were collected per Condition 43 of the Special Permit for the Residences at Driftway Place to be used for traffic/pedestrian improvements in Greenbush.

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

Discussion – 6 MacDonald Terrace – Building Architectural Plan Changes

Documents

- PDF 181126_MacDonald Terrace Planning Board 11.27.18
- PDF Architectural Plans
- PDF TC Filed Decision Special Permit Modification Shared Driveway
- PDF TC filed Special Permit 6 MacDonald Terrace 12.12.18
- Email from Karen Joseph dated 8.18.21
- PDF MultiPDF0387-01

Attendees: Bob Burwick, RJB Development

Mr. Burwick explained he is here to review some plans changes made to the original plans approved by the Board and incorporated into the final architectural stamped plans on 4/14/2020 and submitted to the Board on 10/20/20 that relocated the commercial office space to middle of the building. He said a public hearing was held on 12/10/20 and the plans were approved and the modification was filed on 12/14/20. He indicated there were other design changes on those plans that were not discussed at that time. In preparing for the pre-construction meeting the Town Planner expressed concern over changes made to the plans that had not been previously addressed. He noted four items of concern.

- Southwest elevation
 - Cornice does not go entirely across the front of the building

- Shed dormer moved forward with face of the building to increase the interior floor space.
 - Well defined cornice still runs between the dormers giving good definition and cleaner frontal look
- Northwest elevation
 - Balconies removed
 - Buyers still looking for more interior open space and primary bedrooms with walk-in-closets and large bathrooms
 - Decided 3rd floor balcony was a flawed design
 - Too remote
 - No significant vistas
 - Not appropriate for the neighborhood
 - Not used for grilling because of code
 - Only seen from several backyards
 - Space better served to be incorporated into the interior and staying within the original foot print
 - Façade has less windows
 - 80 windows versus 82 windows
 - More fenestration
 - Windows on third floor slightly larger and now match second floor
- Bathrooms moved internally
- Question if stairs are up to code
 - Obtained a stairway code compliant design detail from the registered architect and will be forwarding that to the Building Commissioner for review

Ms. Joseph indicated she requested Mr. Burwick to come to the Board per Condition #18 of the Special Permit; does the Board feel these changes are a field changes or modifications. The stairway issue does not impact the Planning Board, it does not change the exterior of the interior of the structure.

Ms. Joseph indicated this project did go to Design Review.

The Board reviewed the plan changes with Mr. Burwick pointing out the changes from the original plan to the new proposed plan. The Board did not think they were big changes, but opined they should have the Design Review Committee opine.

The Board would like a report from Design Review and then Mr. Burwick should come back to the Board.

Mr. Bornstein said that with the changes to the shed dormers the downspouts and gutter design should be reviewed to make sure they get tied into the stormwater as designed. Mr. Burwick to provide that information for the next meeting.

Discussion – Future Meeting Dates

- September 23rd – changes to September 16th
- October 14th - regular schedule
- October 26th – Town Meeting

- October 28th - regular meeting, trying not to schedule
- November 4th and November 18th - meeting on the 1st and 3rd Thursday
- December 9th and December 23rd – hoping not have the 23rd meeting
- First meeting in January is 1/13 and 1/27

Minutes Documents

- Meeting minutes 8.12.21

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the meeting minutes for August 12, 2021.

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

Accounting Documents

PO #22201708 (\$342.00), PO #2201602 (\$68.00), PO #2201600(\$458.00), PO #2201601(\$529.00), PO #2201456(\$3,015.45), PO #2201467 (\$450.00)

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the requisition of \$342.00 to Weston Graphics for printing of zoning maps, for \$68.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services at 18 Ford Place, for \$458.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services at 48-52 New Driftway/Gasbackwards, for \$529.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services for 485 Country Way/Residential Compound, for \$3,015.45 to Great Quality General Contracting, LLC for return of stormwater bond for 52 Otis Place, for \$450.00 to Merrill Corporation for peer review at Curtis Estates/90 Ann Vinal.

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

Liaison Reports:

Select Board – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- Board voted 4-0 to NOT allow for the connection to Sewer for the property at 626 CJC Hwy

Discussion with Ms. Curran (Select Board/AHT Member) – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- 7 New Driftway went to Affordable Housing Trust (AHT)– want to build affordable units offsite
 - Looking to use AHT property at Stockbridge Road
 - Want to put in 4 units, 2 duplexes – property is not viable for 4 units
 - Thought that maybe the old Senior Center at Brook Street could be used for some units
 - Sale of old Senior Center is supposed to pay for new Senior Center
 - Applicant says not economically feasible for affordable units to be in the property at 7 New Driftway
 - AHT may allow the land to be sold \$1.00 and the developer would construct the affordable duplex units

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- 7 New Driftway – anticipate the application coming
 - Back taxes also due, owe \$70K they have paid \$40K
 - Will stamp in the application and send out for peer review
 - Public hearing will not be opened until taxes are paid
 - Affordable units are required last time calculated was 4 units, but need to confirm
- Minot Fire House being auctioned off
- Sidewalk on Ann Vinal started -sidewalk is a condition of the Special Permit
 - Stones falling out of the wall, needs to be addressed prior to final coat of the sidewalk
 - May ask for a modification because there is a tree pushing out the stones
- September 9th Meeting
 - Accessory Dwelling
 - Citizens Petition of Marijuana
 - Town Counsel will be present at the hearing
 - Town Counsel to provide a memo on implications of the petition
 - 533 Country Way
- Items on the Capital Plan something more the \$25K and last more than 5 years, due September 24th
 - Consultants not covered under capital cost
 - Implementation of the Master Plan
- No policy changes on looped water lines
 - Any changes need to be discussed during the permitting process
- Senior Center
 - Traffic counts being done
 - Still working on lighting
 - Lights in parking lot do not have dimming capability looking into
 - Police want lighting for security
 - Dimming of porch lights under the portico will maybe sufficient and cameras will still work
 - Parking lot lights on until 9pm
 - Still working on a solution
 - Town putting in the sidewalk on First Parish Road
 - People still making a left hand turn out of the Senior Center

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 8.20.21 with agenda for 8.26.21 and DRAFT meeting minutes 8.12.2.1
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 8.20.21 with meeting materials for 16 Mann Hill Road, Laurelwood, 5 Coldbrook Circle, Greenbush Restricted Funds, 6 MacDonald Terrace, 533 Country Way, 137 Gilson Road'
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 8.25.21 with meeting materials for 6 MacDonald Terrace

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Pritchard moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 p.m. Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Rebecca Lewis, Clerk

Date Approved: September 9, 2021