

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES September 14, 2023

Members Present: Patricia Lambert, Chair; Rebecca Lewis, Vice Chair; Ann Burbine, Clerk and. Stephen Pritchard and Bob MacLean and Mr. Patrick Niebauer, 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

- 9/14/23 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Chair Lambert indicated there was a posted agenda. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion for the posted agenda a vote was taken the vote was unanimously in favor. Mr. MacLean joined the meeting remotely.

Ms. Lambert introduced Mr. Patrick Niebauer as the newest member of the Planning Board as the Planning Board Alternate.

**Public Hearing – Major Site Plan Review and Stormwater Permit – Stearns Meadow –
Water Treatment Plant – 453 CJC Hwy
Assessor’s Map/Block/Lot 47-2-26-J
Applicant/Owner: Town of Scituate**

Documents

- PDF 1.0 Cover Letter
- PDF 2.0 Report
- PDF 443-461 c j cushing highway planning list
- PDF 2023.08 Stearns Meadow Water Treatment Plant Stormwater Management Report
- PDF 2023.08.15 GHG Emissions Memorandum
- PDF 2023-0808-21205-Arch Sheet for Planning Board
- PDF 22123 TA080923 – Full Report
- PDF 230906-PeerReview-ScituatePB- WTP
- PDF 0233681.02 Drawings Including Supplemental
- PDF Application for Approval of Major Site Plan – Signed
- PDF Architecture Narrative with Exterior Finishes
- PDF Design Review Application – Full FORPRINT
- PDF Process Description Memo
- PDF Roof Ht Detail Memo
- PDF Stearns Meadow Deed

- PDF Stearns Meadow Tax Bill
- PDF StearnsMeadow – Cutfill – Analysis
- PDF TC filed Legal Posting - Water Treatment Plant
- PDF Transmittal 8-11-23
- PDF Waiver Request
- PDF Wetlands and Environmental Summary
- Doc Motion Form for 1st Continuance

Attendees: Renee Lanza, Woodard & Curran; Steve Robbins, Woodard & Curran; Kevin McCaffery, Woodard & Curran; Kevin Cafferty, Director of DPW, Janet Bernardo, Planning Board Peer Review Engineer, Horsley Witten (HW)

Ms. Burbine read the legal ad into the record.

Mr. Robbins said what they intent to cover tonight is some project background, project objectives, site overview, building overview, site layout and circulation, stormwater and resilience, and allow time for Q&A from the Board and the public.

Mr. Robbins provided a slide show presentation. (Slide show attached to minutes)

- Site layout and renderings
 - Northern part of the building houses the main processing functions
 - Southern face of the building has storage garage and administrative function, below the site are the sand drying beds
 - Stormwater is managed on site, through forebays in infiltration features
 - 2 lines around site
 - Interior line is a secure perimeter around the site – secure fence line, will pull back to that line after construction
 - Interior of fence is typically grass that can be mowed and maintained
 - Limit of work line
 - Needed for grading and installation of stormwater practices
 - Between fence line and outer line would be reforested meadow cover so it has a more natural state
- Renderings shown
 - Looking towards northwest, over southern entrance
 - Right hand side is public parking spaces and walkway to main vestibule entrance of the building
 - Left hand side shows storage garage
 - Overhead/Zoomed out rendering shows sand beds and stormwater features towards the southern part of the site
- Layout Plan
 - Western side of the building has a loading dock with a hammerhead to allow for backing up to the dock
- Grading and Drainage
 - Site slopes from north to south
 - Looked at possibility of using impervious materials, but with heavy truck traffic and slopes involved other stormwater practices were implemented

- Stormwater splits up the flows into smaller quantities to make sure runoff is being controlled
- Site Utilities
 - Piping within the fence line primarily connecting to the raw water and finished water piping through the northern site entrance
 - Natural gas service for heating will come through the northern entrance
 - Electrical will come through the northern entrance
 - Site piping for stormwater
 - Piping from the sand drying beds back the plant
- Landscape Architecture
 - Heavily replanting, especially on the northern side of site closest to abutters
 - Rear of the site will have larger trees, plants and meadow
 - Plantings in front of the building to restore some buffer on 3A
 - Maintaining 50' buffer on 3A
 - Plantings at front the building to soften the look
 - Replacing an appropriate number of trees for the number of parking spaces
- Lighting
 - Within fenced perimeter is focused on security
 - Limited number of fixtures on the building
 - Primarily on the front for public access
 - Shielded lighting fixtures around the perimeter of the roadway

Ms. Lambert asked about the cemetery; Mr. Robbins said they have proposed a public walkway from the parking area to the cemetery.

Ms. Bernardo, Planning Boards Peer Review Engineer, indicated a letter was provided on September 6, 2023. The letter goes through some of the zoning requirements for the project and the stormwater.

- Zoning
 - Potential issue on building height that needs to be addressed
 - Different number calculated from what was presented tonight
 - Tree survey – counting of trees that are over 12”
 - Applicant indicated it is out for contract
 - Drinking wells within 400’
 - Confirmed there are none
 - Is the Fire Department okay with the layout?
 - Ms. Joseph indicated no comments have been received by Planning from the Fire Department
 - Ms. Bernardo said comments need to be received
 - Is Board of Health (BOH) okay with septic design?
 - Ms. Joseph indicated no comments have been received by Planning from the BOH
 - Ms. Bernardo said comments need to be received
 - Cut and fill analysis provided
 - Light Poles
 - Town requirement is 20’ maximum, the applicant is showing 30’ maximum

- The applicant indicated they will address this issue
- Pedestrian or bicycle networks
 - No network within the area
 - Applicant is contemplating a bike rack on the site

Ms. Bernardo said there were a number of zoning requirements the applicant needed to meet to comply with zoning, she noted that pages 1-12 of her letter addressed those requirements.

- Stormwater Management
 - Applicant is required to meet the 10th Massachusetts Stormwater Management Handbook.
 - Standard 1 – not allowed to have any erosion in wetlands or waters of the Commonwealth
 - Applicant is more than 200’ away from Tack Factory Pond, some wetlands on the site
 - Applicant needs to go to Conservation Commission for approval of protection measures for those wetlands
 - Discharging to one wetland area, will need to explain any impacts - make sure Conservation understands
 - Applicant needs to go to MassDOT for a curb cut permit
 - Standard 2 – not allowed to increase the flow anywhere off site
 - Evaluated the existing flow and show they have enough stormwater management that they are not increasing it under post-development
 - Some technical comments regarding inverts
 - Comments regarding what is being modeled and what they are showing on the plan
 - Comment on why the largest detention basin is not being infiltrated
 - Applicant said at this point it was just a conservative idea
 - HW recommends that if it can be infiltrated maybe it should be
 - Scituate Stormwater Regulations say there cannot be an increase in volume off the site and there appears to be some increase
 - Applicant needs to come up with a way to not increase the volume per the Scituate Regulations
 - Standard 3 – recharge, applicant needs to show they are recharging any additional impervious cover, existing site is wooded
 - Applicant is able to do
 - 4 rain garden bio-retention areas
 - Low impact development, green infrastructure
 - One is lined – to separate from ground water
 - There is swale for conveyance to direct water to these areas or the detention basin
 - Detention basin in the back is the largest structure
 - Will hold water for the longest
 - Needs to empty within 72 hours
 - Infiltration is not currently included for this, but applicant may decide to infiltrate

- HW wants to confirm there is separation to ground water on the bio-retention areas
- Standard 4 - water quality, applicant needs to show a certain type of water quality for the stormwater practices used
 - Roof runoff considered clean
 - Directed right to the detention basin
 - Road runoff and parking lot runoff
 - Directed to one of the bio-retention areas/rain gardens to provide treatment
 - Underground structures also provided to collect more sediment if needed before it goes to the catch basin
 - Many chances for the water to be treated before it gets to the pond; they do not want to pollute the water
- Standard 5 - land use with regards to higher pollutant loads, i.e. gas stations
 - Nothing required
- Standard 6 – critical area
 - Located in a critical area, Water Resource Protection District
 - More requirements for water quality
 - Applicant has met the requirements
- Standard 7 – redevelopment
 - Project is not considered to be redevelopment
- Standard 8 - erosion control
 - Need to ensure during construction there is no erosion that goes off the site
 - Entire perimeter will have silt socks, etc.
 - Construction entrance so no mud goes into the street
 - NPDES permit will be required and SWPPP
 - Planning Board may want to condition the SWPPP is submitted as a condition of approval
- Standard 9 - Operation and Maintenance
 - O&M plan has been submitted – ensures the system is functioning as designed
 - Planning Board may condition the O&M Plan as a condition of approval
- Standard 10 – illicit discharge statement, facilitator of the building signs off that no part of the building water is going into the stormwater that is not supposed to.

Ms. Bernardo said the applicant did a nice job and there is not much for them to respond to.

Ms. Joseph commented

- The SWPPP will need to be prepared and provided to the Planning Board
- Because of the amount of disturbance sedimentation sumps will be needed and the Board would like to see that plan.
- A waiver will need to be submitted for the volume requirement for stormwater
 - Board will need to decide if they will grant a waiver for the Stormwater
 - Seems they are close and could make the volume requirement work

- Seems like the applicant will try to go back and make it work, but if not, the Board will need to decide if they will grant a waiver
- Landscape plan still being reviewed by Ms. Joseph, but she will be asking for changes
 - Some plants suggested are not readily available in the industry
 - Difficult to read the plan and see what things are
 - Will be looking for more evergreens for screening all year round
- Parking memo received today
 - Board will need to make a finding the parking is adequate because it is not a use that appears in the table in the Zoning Bylaw
- Comments
 - Building Commissioner commented on the height of the building
 - Applicant is working to address the issue
 - No other comments from Town Departments have been received
- Trip generation very high
 - Peak hours seemed very high
 - 39-41 trips during peak hours
 - Based on land use code for utility – closest code
 - Applicant has indicated it will be less trips based on the use of the site

Ms. Lambert said her first impression is this is much more secure than our current plant and that is a good thing.

Ms. Lewis asked about the security gate surrounding the facility; only town employees will be able to access through the gate with the standard key card access now. She also asked about the access to the cemetery; Mr. Robbins said access is via a sidewalk along the side of the building.

There was discussion about who will be moving to the new site from the current location; all those currently working in the plant will be moving to the new plant.

Mr. Pritchard asked about the plant being equipped to address PFAS treatment; Mr. Robbins said the existing/proposed filters are granular activated carbon filters with more than 10 minutes empty bed contact time which is the design standard for PFAS treatment for non-detect levels. There is limited space in the plant where future treatment process could be added down the line if other water quality standards were added. There is room for expansion in the current footprint being proposed.

Mr. Pritchard said he wants to know how the Fire Department plans to fight a fire if needed since the Board has not received any comments. Mr. Robbins said they have reviewed the plans with the Fire Department both the interior of the building and the exterior circulation with regards to what vehicle they would bring to the site and where hydrants would be placed and where the hydrants would be fed from. He said the plans presented here are in response to the Fire Department comments. Ms. Joseph indicated the plans have been sent to all Town departments and responses have been slow to be received back to the Planning Board office.

Mr. Pritchard asked what heavy equipment will be on site and where will it be stored; Mr. Robbins said there is a storage garage which has five bays, designed to house the water divisions utility trucks and heavy equipment to be protected from the weather.

Mr. Pritchard asked what the life expectancy for the facility is; Mr. Robbins said 50 years+, individual components maybe less.

Mr. Pritchard said that with regards to the volume waiver for stormwater, the applicant is close enough they should figure out how to fix it.

Mr. Pritchard addressed the sand basins and asked if there is a mechanism to deal with excessive water; Mr. Robbins said the way the drying beds are designed is based on MassDEP criteria for backwashing and filters and rate and volume, combined with the source water and the chemicals being added to purify the water it is designed to accommodate rainfall and has freeboard above that. He explained there are 2 ways to get water out of the bed; he said the primary source of water is from the backwash not from rainfall and it is under the operator's control. There is no real concern of over flow.

Mr. Pritchard expressed concern over the flat portion of the roof; Mr. Robbins said they are not concerned the building has been designed to have appropriate weather waterproofing, there is an internal drain, it is an architectural feature to join the 2 main gables.

Mr. Pritchard said when the facility is actually being constructed a good amount of it is below groundwater level, he asked if there a groundwater management plan during construction that has been presented; Mr. Robbins said they are specifications and performance criteria for contractors as part of their construction plans that would need to be submitted along with their methods for control, part of the construction sequencing accounts for dewatering on site. Mr. Robbins said there is a blend of what they specify and what the contractor comes back to the Town with as their approach and methods. He said that they did not receive all of their technical specifications as part of the Planning Board submittal, but if there is some additional supplemental information needed they are happy to provide it. Mr. Pritchard said he is trying to understand the exposure; Mr. Robbins said the expectation is that runoff is being managed.

Ms. Joseph indicated the SWPPP will have to identify where the applicant is dewatering to; the Board is interested in seeing how the site will handle the dewatering. Mr. Robbins said they can provide that information.

Mr. Pritchard asked about floor drains; Mr. Robbins said there are limited floor drains in the building. There is a containment tank for managing the water that comes from the on-site laboratory and safety showers located underground in the front parking lot that has to be pumped out.

Mr. Pritchard asked the applicant to explain the containment plan for the chemicals that will be used on site; Mr. Robbins said the plan is to contain 110% of the volume on site, when a truck comes in with bulk material there is a designated containment area for them to park along the northern wall of facility. The containment area inside is 110% at a minimum of the largest tank.

Ms. Burbine said she is glad to see how secure this is being made. She asked if the hydrant that landscapers, etc. are allowed to use at the current Old Oaken Bucket (OOB) location will continue, since this is a secure facility. Mr. Robbins said that is a policy question the Water Department will need to address.

Ms. Burbine asked why there needed to be so many parking spaces and clarified that the public cannot access behind the building. Mr. Robbins said there are 4 water operators, the distribution staff arrives in their personal vehicles and then leave in a town vehicle.

The Water Department equipment will be parked in the garage, double deep bays, that is the intent. Mr. Niebauer asked where the EV charging stations will be located; Mr. Robbins said they will be exterior and located near the garages. Ms. Burbine suggested that EV charging station also be put inside the garage. Ms. Lanza said the Fire Department commented about a potential fire hazard with interior charging station.

Ms. Burbine said she has a big concern with maintenance, despite the O&M plan, because this Town is historically awful with maintenance; things need to be maintained.

Mr. MacLean asked about the 3.0 mgd (million gallons/day) being processed in 16 hours and asked why that metric was used. Mr. Robbins indicated the firm capacity of the plant is 3.0 mgd/24-hour production period; the Town currently runs one operator/shift during the day. The applicant was asked by the DPW Department to make sure the plant is hydraulically capable of treating the 3.0 million gallons in 2 shifts; that is a peaking capacity for the plant that accounts for the use of reserve or redundant infrastructure, any individual piece of equipment could be taken offline and still maintain the flow capacity. If all components of the plant are in operation they have hydraulic capability to put 3.0 mgd through a shorter period of time; it taps into the redundancy. Mr. Pritchard asked if the inverse is true; Mr. Robbins said that is correct.

Mr. Niebauer commented on the slide regarding the process description, asking if the raw water is coming from the existing OOB pump station and questioned if it is coming from existing pipes along 3A; Mr. Robbins said it is through the existing intake in OOB into the treatment plant; the Town currently has a watermain project along 3A that includes the future water treatment plant.

Public Comment:

Ms. Schlegel, resident at 9 Westgate Lane and member of the Water Resources Committee, said she heard about LED lighting, etc. in the design, but asked about water sense fixtures. Mr. Robbins said certainly they will used, plumbing fixtures too; they want to be responsible water users.

Ms. Szklut, resident at 15 Stearns Road, is a direct abutter and asked how often trucks would be coming in and going around the back of the building. Mr. Robbins said the bulk of the chemical storage tanks are designed to hold 30 days of supply, there are 5 chemicals on site, so there could be at least one delivery per week, the Town trucks have the ability to navigate around the site, but the chemical deliveries are the primary truck traffic. Ms. Szklut asked about the buffer zone on the westside, Mr. Robbins said they have maintained a 30' buffer and in some areas it is more than that, they do have some separation from the final footprint of the building to construct the building and that area is proposed to be landscaped with a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees and meadow ground cover and the Town Planner does have some comments on that. Ms. Szklut asked when they come into cut what the oversight will be to make sure they don't cut more than what is supposed to be; Mr. Robbins said the first step is to have a surveyor come out on site and mark the limit of work line and the contractor set erosion controls interior to that line and the Town will have fulltime inspector on site to monitor.

Mr. Ciruso, resident at 35 Stearns Road, is an abutter and asked for the possibility of a wall of evergreens/arborvitaes for the winter time to screen the building. Mr. Robbins said the landscape plan was done using native species and species to provide bio-diversity on the site in addition to visual screening they were trying to blend back the site into a transitional habitat, but they will take that comment back. Mr. Ciruso said a wall of evergreen would be the best-case scenario in the eyes of the abutters.

Mr. Gibson, resident at 142 Old Forge Road, is an abutter and said that under the stormwater regulations abutters are to be notified and he did not receive notice. He said this is a pattern of sloppiness by that applicant, 142 is clearly marked on the plan as an abutter. He said with regard to the buffer they have continually been told there will be a 50' buffer, why has it changed to 30'. Mr. Robbins said during detail design it was determined that on the southwestern portion of the property the limit of work needed to extend for some of the grading for the stormwater infrastructure; in many cases along the property line it is more, but that is what they are showing. Ms. Lanza pointed out the lines on the plan representing the limit of work and the 30' zoning requirement.

Mr. Gibson also referenced a comment from a Select Board meeting a year ago that the lagoons would not get larger and could get smaller; he said you can all it a "retention pond, whatever" ...he asked why are things being added at this time and why is the stormwater not being funneled to somewhere else, he said it seems to be increasing lagoons from the original concept. Mr. Robbins said there are two main functions of water retention on the site, he said what Mr. Gibson is calling a third lagoon is part of the stormwater infrastructure on the site, water that flows through that is rainfall that runs off the roof and the impervious surfaces, the other which are correctly called drying beds, but may have previously been referred to as lagoons, water that flows through those is rain water and water that comes directly from the plant and does not go into the stormwater system, but is recycled and goes back into the plant, leaving the organic materials that are removed from the water are stored in that area and are eventually removed. Mr. Robbins said they look dimensionally the same, but function differently.

Mr. Pritchard confirmed that the sand drying beds have liners; Mr. Robbins said that is correct.

Ms. Lambert said the third one is going to be seeded.

Mr. Gibson also commented about light pollution into the neighborhood and what does it look like. Mr. Robbins said there is one or two light fixtures on the building itself and there are shielded dark sky compliant light fixtures around the access road, they are designed for safety lighting around the roadway and will be the minimum amount of light for access purposes and safety, it is not an athletic field. He said they have received a comment about the height of the poles, the initial design was to use fewer poles at 30' for a low broad spread, but they will be revised to 20' poles which will increase the number of poles.

Mr. Gibson said a lot of things have changed from what has been presented, the Select Board appears to not want to hold the applicant accountable for why things have changed. He said there has been a lot tonight that has been said "they will look into it", he wants to know who will actually hold Woodward & Curran accountable for all these things and he hopes the Planning Board will do that.

The Board said that is their job. Ms. Burbine said this is the initial meeting, comments have been made, issues have been made and nothing can be solved in one public hearing. The Board will review this and make sure that questions asked are answered; not everyone will be happy, but this in

the best interests of the Town of Scituate. The Planning Board will make sure this process is open and transparent and this project is the best it can be.

Mr. Pritchard asked about lights on the loading dock and asked that the wall mounted lights be structured to so they do not have a direct impact on abutters across the way; Mr. Robbins said they will review that with the electrical engineer.

Mr. Donovan resident at 11 Doctors Hill Drive asked if there will be a buffer between the building and 3A and where are the curb cuts for the property, he said right now when you leave Doctors Hill the view is of woods and looking at a commercial building is not going to enhance the property values. A rendering and the layout plan were shown to show the entrances in relation to Doctors Hill, there will be a 50' buffer.

Mr. Arbonies resident at 23 Gannett Pasture Lane and Chair of the Water Resource Commission asked about the drying beds and if there is any chance they could overflow and run-down hill towards the reservoir. Mr. Robbins said the primary source of water going into the drying beds is backwash from the filters in the building that is controlled by the treatment plant operators, the drying beds are sized for one bed to be used for a long period of time, 1 year, and the other to be empty and drying there is redundant capacity between the two drying beds, but primarily it is designed to have one in service at a time, there is freeboard above the maximum operating water level. He said "no" they would not overflow because the operators of the plant control the amount of backwash. The freeboard is about 2'.

Ms. Kuhn resident at 20 Carrie Litchfield Lane asked if the Board could request some research be done for some sustainable green solar panels or something to conserve energy and electricity. She commented the Recreation Committee has had enormous electric bills from the field lights. Ms. Lambert said the applicant did say that solar panels could at some point be put on the roof; Mr. Robbins also said that with the south facing slope there could also be ground-based panels, but at this time it has been determined to re-vegetate the area.

Mr. Pritchard asked if there was any reason why they couldn't acquire renewable energy and make it zero carbon footprint; Mr. Robbins said that would be a Town purchase and policy question, it has not been addressed in the treatment plant design, but they will certainly bring it up.

Ms. Kuhn said she does have an example of a facility being built in Duxbury for the DPW that is using solar panels on the roof. Ms. Kuhn to forward her information along to the Planning Board.

Mr. Cafferty, Department Head of DPW, said the Town is at 105% for credits for renewable energy with the wind turbine and the solar array.

Mr. Pritchard said residents have been pushed to participate in renewable energy; he is asking if the Town is willing to participate.

Ms. Tuttle resident at 15 Doctors Hill Dr. asked about the entrances, the northern one is going both directions in/out, but are only trucks going around the building using the other one. Mr. Robbins said the southern exit is proposed to be only for truck traffic and water department vehicles.

Ms. Schultz 27 Doctors Hill Dr. asked how large the trucks making deliveries will be; Mr. Robbins said the frequency of deliveries will vary throughout the year, during the summer they make be more frequent during those peak months, but there is adequate storage for more than a month. He said it

could be the size of a water truck that would fill a pool, it is designed for a 55' long truck to circulate. She asked why there has to be another egress because it is a very dangerous road; it has to with security and there is no place to turn around and this is what the Fire Department wants.

Ms. Butler resident at 439 Chief Justice Cushing Highway is the abutter between the plant and the pond, she asked if there is a contingency plan for when all the trees come down. Mr. Robbins indicated there is an area behind her home that is a wetland and they are about 200' from her property line and the wetlands to the limit of work. Mr. Robbins said the wetlands serve as a buffer, the majority the stormwater at the top of the site is sent to the west away from her property, there is an area of the site from the sand drying beds that is directed down to drainage, but so much is being captured uphill and send in a different direction. Ms. Butler asked what happens if the detention basin over flows; he said any stormwater in the drying beds stays in the drying beds, anything uphill from that goes a different direction, so anything below would eventually flow to Tack Factory Pond, but through the back corner of the property. Any stormwater that is not infiltrated on the site follows the path of drainage off the site and is controlled.

Mr. Young resident at 5 Old Forge Rd is an abutter and asked what the box to the north is; there was discussion about the distance from Mr. Youngs property; Mr. Young said the setback line of 35' meets his stone wall. Mr. Robbins explained there is a zoning setback of 15' to the property line where they are not able to build, he said they would look at he grading in the corner to see if it could be tightened up. There is no work happening with in the 15' setback, there was continued discussion about the setback lines shown on the plans and where the limit of work is. Mr. Young asked if the septic system could be moved over; it was explained there is a small retaining wall and grading that was done in a certain way to reduce costs for the Town, instead of looking at a wall it will be more of a hill. The applicant said there be some mowing that is needed in the area, but there is no reason why it couldn't be almost what it is today. The septic system meets all setback requirements for septic system and grading was done so the abutter is not looking at a wall.

Mr. Young questioned the amount of water that will be taken out of the reservoir versus Old Oaken Bucket; Mr. Robbins said the facility is designed to treat water from the existing Old Oaken Bucket source which is permitted for up to 3.0 mgd. Mr. Young asked if there is even 3.0 mgd to pull from OOB, he believes it to only be about 6' deep, he questioned if we are building something that we don't have the capacity of water to pull through. Mr. Robbins said the State has permitted the Town to pull that amount of water from that source per day, so the design capacity of the facility is to maximize that source. He said there are measures the Town can take to increase the capacity, i.e. dredging, etc. that are potential future projects. The project is designed to account for what the Town is permitted to take, it may not be there an on given day. Mr. Young asked what the capacity could be brought down to so the fish are not affected; Mr. Robbins said there is a water management plan that the Town uses to manage that.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to accept the applicants request to continue the public hearing for Site Plan Administrative Review and Stormwater Permit for the Stearns Meadow Water Treatment Plant at 453 Chief Justice Cushing Highway until October 26, 2023 at 6:30 pm and to continue the time for action for filing with the Town Clerk until December 1, 2023.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lewis – yes
Ms. Burbine – yes
Mr. MacLean – yes

The Board took a five-minute break at 8:15; the Board reconvened at 8:20.

**Public Hearing – Special Permit – Accessory Dwelling – 28 Torrey’s Lane
Assessor’s Map/Block/Lot 54-1-11
Applicant/Owner: Stephen S. & Katherine M. Drew**

Documents

- PDF Application 7.31.23
- PDF GIS Map and Assessors Card
- Jpeg Image
- PDF Plans
- PDF TC filed Legal Posting – 28 Torrey’s Lane
- DOC Transmittal
- DOD DRAFT Motion 28 Torrey’s Lane

Attendees: Stephen Drew, Applicant/Owner, joint remotely

Ms. Burbine read the legal ad into the record.

Mr. Drew explained they would like to put a 20’x 16’ in-law apartment on the back side of the house that he and his wife will occupy and his son and family will occupy the main house.

Ms. Joseph indicated that it technically meets the requirements for an accessory dwelling, but part of the parking of the driveway is in the town right-of-way.

Mr. Pritchard asked why the parking is in the town right-of-way; Ms. Joseph explained that a large portion of the driveway is in the right-of-way beyond the property line so cars will be sticking out into the right-to-of way, but it is a dead-end road.

Mr. Drew indicated there are a couple of driveways, they would not leave any cars on the street. The plan is to have 2 cars in each driveway.

Mr. Drew said the 20’x 16’ addition is going to go off a family room in the back of the house that has its own gabled roof, the first means of egress is a sliding glass door that goes into the 20’x 20’ family room and the second means is a door that will go out on the north side of the new 20’x16’ addition down a set of stairs. The locations should be on the plan.

Motion:

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

1. On July 31, 2023 applicants Stephen S. & Katherine M. Drew applied for a special permit for an accessory dwelling in a single-family home at the property at 28 Torrey's Lane.
2. According to the Town of Scituate Assessor's records and the deed, the property at 28 Torrey's Lane is owned by Stephen S. and Katherine M. Drew.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted with the application, the Planning Board finds the floor area of the Accessory Dwelling to be 320 sq. ft. The floor area of the primary dwelling is 2,495 sq. ft. according to the application. The accessory dwelling is 13% of the floor area of the primary dwelling. This meets 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 floor area of the primary dwelling, whichever is greater. The accessory dwelling is subordinate to the existing single-family home.
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-2 Zoning District as well as the Water Resource Protection District. The proposed 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 in a new addition to the single-family home. Access will be via a door at the rear of the accessory dwelling as well as through the primary dwelling.
7. The appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the appearance of the primary dwelling.
8. The Building Permit Plan for 28 Torrey's Lane in Scituate, MA by McKenzie Engineering Group, Inc. dated May 31, 2023 shows the location of the existing primary dwelling and the proposed accessory dwelling. The plan shows two existing driveways extending into the right-of-way of Torrey's Lane which appear capable of supporting two cars each. 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 applicant/owner has submitted a signed, notarized statement that he will occupy one of the dwellings upon completion of the project.
10. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water and a private septic system. The Water Department has commented that as long as the accessory dwelling does not have separate utilities, then there does not need to be any changes to the water service. The Board of Health commented that one of the bedrooms existing in the primary dwelling can be made into an office with a wider opening and no closets.
11. The application meets the standards of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling at 28 Torrey's Lane 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 plans submitted with the application by Rockwood Design, Inc. dated 7/25/2023 for Drew Residence, 28 Torrey's Lane consisting of 18 sheets including Cover, A1 Notes and Legend; A2 Existing Elevations; A2.1 Elevations; A2.2 Elevations; A2.3 Elevations; A2.4 Elevations; A3 Existing First Floor Plan; A3.1 Proposed First Floor Plan; A3.2 Proposed First Floor Plan; A4 Existing Second Floor Plan; A4.1 Proposed Second Floor Plan; A6 Existing Roof Plan; A6.1 Proposed Roof Plan; A7 Building Section "A-A"; A8 Building Section "B-B"; S1 First Floor Framing Plan; S1.1 Proposed Foundation Plan; Building Permit Plan for 28 Torrey's Lane dated May 31, 2023 by McKenzie Engineering Group, Inc.
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 an owner 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.
8. Any lighting installed shall be down lighting to not shed light on abutting properties.
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. As the property is in the Water Resource Protection District, rooftop runoff must be designed to recharge the first inch of rainfall. Recharge shall be attained through site design, infiltration basins or swales constructed with a three-foot minimum separation between the bottom of the structure and maximum groundwater elevation so that nitrogen is removed. An artificial system of recharge may be required which does not degrade the groundwater if there is more than 15% impervious area for the site. A plan for attaining runoff requirements must be provided to the Building Commissioner as part of the building permit application.

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 appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the primary dwelling unless otherwise required by the Massachusetts Building Code and new exterior stairs needed to provide primary or secondary means of egress for the accessory dwelling shall be located on the side or rear of the building.
13. At least two private off-street parking spaces shall be available for use by the occupants of the accessory dwelling in addition to those parking spaces required for the primary dwelling.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

Discussion - Stormwater Permit – 12 Carriage House Way - Pool

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 21-15-5-0

Applicant/Owner: Douglas & Kristen Lane

Documents

- PDF 12 Carriage House Way 7.24.23 Signed
- PDF 23-361 PB Report, 12 Carriage House Way, 8-07-23
- PDF 23-361 PB Report, 12 Carriage House Way, 9-08-23
- PDF Stormwater Report 12 Carriage House 7-24-23 STAMPED
- PDF Stormwater-permit-application- 6-12-23
- DOC 12 Carriage House Way Cover Letter
- PDF 12 Carriage House Way V2010 8.27.23 – PLAN
- PDF Peer Review Response Letter 9.5.23
- PDF Stormwater Report 12 Carriage House 8.27.23
- PDF Stormwater Permit Application 9-5-23

Attendees: Jed Hannon, Engineer

Ms. Lewis recused herself from the discussion and left the room.

Mr. Hannon indicated there is a proposed pool at this residence and Homeowners Association covenants at this subdivision did not allow pools, but there was a provision that if there was stormwater mitigation the Town would entertain allowing pools. He noted there are 2 other properties in the subdivision that have been approved with permits; one pool is under construction the second is to be done at a later date. He said the site plan was reviewed along with the stormwater report by Merrill Engineers and there were 2 rounds of comments and a minor 3rd round of comments. They have addressed all the comments.

- Proposed pool is 15'x 25', with surrounding patio

- Installing 3 Cultec systems to mitigate the water
- Net increase in impervious area is 962 sq. ft.
- Proposing to capture 2,282 sq. ft.
- Proposing catch basin in the rear
- Stairs to be rotated 90 degrees from their current location
- System is really roof drains and down spouts to Cultec systems

Ms. Lambert commented it is not that much different from the other two; Mr. Hannon said no and it is probably smaller.

Ms. Joseph said as the Board has done in the past for the other pools this has been prepared for issuing a stormwater permit, which is why there was peer review. Does the Board want Ms. Joseph to issue a stormwater permit for this pool; that is consistent with what has been done in the past.

The Board directed Ms. Joseph to issue the stormwater permit.

Ms. Joseph indicated that it will take her 1-2 weeks to issue the permit. Mr. Hannon confirmed his understanding.

Ms. Lewis rejoined the meeting.

**Continued Public Hearing – Special Permit Accessory Dwelling – 9 Ocean Ave.
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 8-3-13
Applicant/Owner: Jennifer Foley**

Documents

- PDF 20-306-9 Ocean Ave., Scituate FAB 5.04.2021
- PDF First Floor for Architectural for BP
- PDF Second Floor Architectural for BP
- PDF Site Plan for Building Permit
- DOC DRAFT Motion 9 Ocean Ave

Attendees: Jennifer Foley, Applicant/Owner, attended remotely

Ms. Joseph said after the last meeting the Board had asked for some additional information; she indicated a building permit was received for a living area on the first floor, with no kitchenette and storage was proposed on the second floor. She said an abutter complaint resulted in a violation to from the Building Commissioner, the applicant applied for any accessory dwelling, the setbacks meet all the requirements because it is a corner lot. There is no occupancy permit because it is not a legal dwelling unit yet, once it is approved as a dwelling Ms. Foley can then apply for an occupancy permit.

Ms. Joseph advised that what was inspected is what is currently existing now; the inspections occurred for the finished product. She opined it meets the requirements for an accessory dwelling, even though it was not done in the proper way it should be approved for an accessory dwelling special permit.

No public comment.

Motion:

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

1. On June 26, 2023 applicant Jennifer Foley applied for a special permit for an accessory dwelling in a single-family home at the property at 9 Ocean Avenue.
2. According to the Town of Scituate Assessor's records and the deed, the property at 9 Ocean Avenue is owned by Jennifer Foley.
3. Based on a floor plan submitted with the application, the Planning Board finds the floor area of the Accessory Dwelling to be 679 sq. ft. The floor area of the primary dwelling is 2,174 sq. ft. according to the application. The accessory dwelling is 31.23% of the floor area of the primary dwelling. This meets 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 floor area of the primary dwelling, whichever is greater. The Assessor's Office indicates the primary dwelling is 2,367 sq. ft. and the accessory dwelling is 872 sq. ft. which is 36.7% of the primary dwelling and still allowed as it is less than 40%. The accessory dwelling is subordinate to the existing single-family home.
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 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 in a recent garage addition to the single-family home. Access will be via a door at the side of the house and a second door through the garage.
7. The appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the appearance of the primary dwelling.
8. The Septic System Design Plan for 9 Ocean Avenue in Scituate, MA by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. dated 10/16/20 with revisions through 12/9/20 shows the location of the existing primary dwelling and the existing garage addition. The plan shows an existing bituminous driveway which appears to fit four parking spaces and the garage is able to house two cars. 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 applicant/owner have submitted a signed, notarized statement that she will occupy one of the dwellings upon completion of the project.
10. The accessory dwelling will be serviced by Town water and sewer. The Water Department has commented that they have no comments. The Sewer Department has no comments as there is no sewer for the house; *there is private septic.*
11. The application meets the standards of the Scituate Zoning Bylaw for an Accessory Dwelling Special Permit.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lewis – yes
Ms. Burbine – yes
Mr. MacLean – yes

Ms. Burbine move to approve the Special Permit for an accessory dwelling at 9 Ocean 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 plans submitted with the application by Custom Home Designs dated 11/29/2020 consisting of Foundation Layout, Front and Rear Elevations, Left and Right-Side Elevations, 2nd Floor Plan, Foundation, Foley Garage, 9 Ocean Ave., Scituate, MA 02066; Septic System Design Plan for 9 Ocean Ave. in Scituate, MA by Morse Engineering Co., Inc. dated 10/16/20 with revisions 10/19/20.
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 an owner 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.
8. Any lighting installed shall be down lighting to not shed light on abutting properties.
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 appearance of the accessory dwelling will be in keeping with the primary dwelling unless otherwise required by the Massachusetts Building Code and new exterior stairs needed to provide primary or secondary means of egress for the accessory dwelling shall be located on the side or rear of the building.
13. At least two private off-street parking spaces shall be available for use by the occupants of the accessory dwelling in addition to those parking spaces required for the primary dwelling.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

Form A- ANR Plan – 62R Booth Hill Road
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 12-01-001R
Applicant/Owner: Peter and Maryann Fryling

Documents

- PDF 62R Booth Hill Road Deed
- PDF doc0511820230824104244
- PDF mlc-62r booth hill road, scituate-fryling 081423
- PDF Scan-20230822-112658
- DOC Transmittal
- DOC Motion Form 62 R Booth Hill Road

Attendees: Walter Sullivan, Attorney; Peter Fryling, Owner

Mr. Sullivan gave a brief overview of the application.

- Property has been in the family for 3 generations
- Lot A
 - 60,000 sq. ft.
 - 40,647 sq. of upland
 - 200' of frontage on Chief Justice Cushing Highway
- Property located in both R1 and R2

There was discussion about the opening of the guardrail on 3A for access to the property. Ms. Lambert commented that it was difficult to find.

Ms. Joseph commented that the wetlands should have been approved prior to the Form A; if there is an issue with the lot area it is not the Board's problem. She recommends endorsement because it has access and frontage.

Motion:

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as approval under the Subdivision Control Law Not Required a Plan of Land in Scituate, Massachusetts for 62 R Booth Hill Road (Assessor's Parcel: 12-1-1-R), Scituate, MA by Jason Scott, Professional Land Surveyor of Morse Engineering Co., Inc., dated May 30, 2023 for applicant/owner Peter and Maryann Fryling as the division of land is not a subdivision because every lot shown on the plan has frontage of at least the distance presently required by the Scituate Zoning Bylaw on the public way of Chief Justice Cushing Highway.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

MBTA Communities Discussion:

Ms. Joseph indicated some revisions have been made to Section 3A; working with our consultant to take advantage of having a mixed-use district. The consultant ran the numbers for North Scituate Village Center and the NDTV District in Greenbush which results in capacity of 209 units; using the 209-unit capacity it allows us to have to zone for unit capacity of 1,030 units of multi-family. This means we can reduce the number of units per acre by-right to 15 across the board except for where we already allow for 16 units/acre by-right in the North Scituate Outer Village. Ms. Joseph said the numbers are still being finalized, but it seems that the Town will be able to stay much closer to the existing zoning bylaw. However, by utilizing the mixed-use district, parking for commercial uses cannot be required for a by-right project. She explained what the exposure would be; in the NDTV District most of the parcels have already been developed or are in the process of being permitted, in North Scituate there is a Town parking lot. Developers would still have to provide parking for the residential units, the mixed-use would have to be on the ground floor and a variety of uses, it has to be approved by EOHLC a maximum of 90 days prior Town meeting. EOHLC approves the mixed-use district.

Ms. Joseph also explained that there can only be 10% affordable units required for by-right projects; the proposal is to go to 10% for by-right in the VCN only, currently it is 15% for by-right and 20% for special permit. The special permit requirement of 20% affordable would not change. To not accept the 10% affordable component the Town would have to do an economic feasibility study, get a grant to hire a consultant and there are not many consultants that do this kind of work. Ms. Joseph said that the town has to get this approved by Town meeting in the spring, because the Town needs to comply by 2024. She opined it is not worth holding on to 5% affordability to risk not getting approval.

Ms. Joseph said the zoning changes for Spring will require changes to density, parking and affordability, table uses and the removal of Section 430.3 Multi-family Dwellings it does not apply to anything, nothing was ever zoned for it.

Ms. Joseph said that next Tuesday the MBTA working group will be meeting with the chairs of the Select Board and Advisory Board to review where we are right now. On September 26th we will be going to the Select Board meeting to provide a status update. She indicated there is a small chance that the Board may be able to extend when the final wording is due for Town Meeting beyond the

current due date of January 10, 2024 pushing the Board to have public hearings in December, so hoping for an extension. She also said some type of graphics will be needed for Town Meeting and permission will be needed.

Ms. Joseph said it is very good news, but final numbers will probably not be available until the first October Planning Board meeting. She opined we can make the numbers work; this is a “shall” and a major implication if the Town does not comply. There now about 13+ grants that the Town would not be eligible for if we do not comply.

Ms. Joseph also indicated that zoning for Small Cell Attachments will likely be part of Town Meeting; New York Attorney Andrew Campanelli is working with some residents to re-write the bylaw for wireless communications. A draft will be provided in October.

Bicycle Committee Liaison:

Documents

- PDF Scituate Bicycle Committee Charge
- Bicycle Committee Agenda 9.18.23

Mr. Niebauer agreed to the liaison for the Bicycle committee.

Minutes

Documents

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the meeting minutes from August 10, 2023 and August 24, 2023.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

Accounting

Documents

PO #2402242 (\$1,077.10), PO #2402204 (\$560.00), PO #2402205 (\$560.00), PO #2402206 (\$140.00), PO #2402207 (\$1,540.00), PO #2402208 (\$210.00), PO #2402098 (\$3,210.00), PO #2402099 (\$1,320.00), PO #2400728 (\$3,180.00), PO #2402363 (\$3,700.00), PO #2402369 (\$1,900.00), PO #2402371 (\$1,650.00), PO #2402383 (\$2,500.00), PO #2402391 (\$159.99), PO # 2402392 (\$252.20)

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the requisition of \$1,320.00 to TEC, Inc. for peer review services for 817 Country Way, for \$3,210.00 to TEC, Inc. for peer review services for Laurelwood #7 – Lot 4, for \$210.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services for 48-52 New Driftway/Gas Backwards, for \$1,540.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services for 19 Ford Place, for \$140.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services for 533 Country Way, for \$560.00 to Chessia

Consulting for peer review services for 61 New Driftway, for \$560.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review services for 33 New Driftway/7 MacDonald Terrace, for \$1,077.10 to Horsley Witten Group for peer review services at Seaside at Scituate, for \$3,180.00 to TEC, Inc. for peer review services for 817 Country Way, for \$3,700.00 to Merrill Corp. for peer review services for SkySail(Drew), for \$1,900.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review services for 93 Elm Street Lots 5 & 6, for \$1,650.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review services at 334 CJC Highway Lot 2, for \$2,500.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review services for 334 CJC Highway Lot 3, for \$159.99 to Amazon for office supplies, for \$122.20 to GateHouse Media for legal Ad for 9 Ocean Ave., for \$130.00 to GateHouse Media for legal ad for Stormwater Regulations.

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

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Ms. Burbine – yes

Mr. MacLean – yes

Liaison Reports:

Traffic Rules and Regulations Committee – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- Bicycle Committee was discussed

Conservation Commission – reported by Ms. Lambert:

- Edward Foster Road and 817 Country Way were both continued, there was no testimony

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- Next meeting Seaside at Scituate will be in for surety reduction request
 - Horsley Witten is working on an estimate
- 48-52 New Driftway/Gas Station
 - 95% complete, having trouble getting the meadow and grass established
 - Bond was due to be renewed
 - Ms. Joseph asked for \$5,000 cash surety
 - Board agreed to accept the cash surety
- Many Stormwater permits being submitted
- Next meeting will be hearing 19 Ford Place – Cottage Court
 - Assume the Board will refer it go to Design Review Committee (DRC)
 - Next DRC meeting is October 3rd
 - 817 Country Way was supposed to be on October 3rd, but they are not ready

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 9.8.23 with 9.14.23 agenda and DRAFT meeting minutes from 8.10.23
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 9.8.23 with meeting materials for Stearns Meadow Water Treatment Plant, 28 Torrey's Lane, 9 Ocean Ave., 12 Carriage House Way, 62R Booth Hill Road.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 9.11.23 with meeting materials for 12 Carriage House Way.

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 9.11.23 with DRAFT meeting minutes from 8.24.23.
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 9.12.23 with meeting materials for Stearns Meadow Water Treatment Plant.

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Ms. Burbine moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken, and unanimously in favor.

Ms. Lambert – yes
Mr. Pritchard – yes
Ms. Lewis – yes
Ms. Burbine – yes
Mr. MacLean – yes

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Ann Burbine, Clerk
Date Approved: October 12, 2023