

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES September 10, 2020

Members Present: Ann Burbine, Chairman; Benjamin Bornstein, Vice Chairman; Patricia Lambert, Clerk; Stephen Pritchard, Rebecca Lewis and the alternate seat was vacant.

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

Members absent:

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

Location of meeting: Selectmen's Hearing Room, Town Hall, 600 C J Cushing Highway, Scituate.

Chairman Burbine called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was conducted in compliance with the Governor's executive order modifying the Open Meeting Law regulations for remote participation during the COVID-19 health pandemic. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

Documents

- 9/10/20 Planning Board Agenda

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

Roll Call to call the meeting to order:

A roll call vote was taken to open the meeting.

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

Continued - Public Hearing – Site Plan Special Permit for Mixed Use Development in the Village Business Overlay District – 14-16 Old Country Way

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 48-2-56 and 57

Applicant/Owner: 14-16 Old Country Way LLC, Robert Proctor, Manager

Documents

- PDF 2020.08.14 14-16 Old Country Way Planning Board revision w/cars
- PDF 2020.09.03 Planning Board Revision_FINAL
- PDF 3711 8-28-20 Alternatives Analysis Letter
- PDD 3711 LTPPP 8-14-20
- PDF 3711 O&M REV 8-14-20
- PDF 3711 Site Plan 8-27-20
- PDF 200826_3rd_PeerReview_Letter_Scituate_PB_14-16 Old Country Way_Special Permit
- PDF 200902_4th_PeerReview_Letter_Scituate_PB_14-16 Old Country Way_Special Permit

- PDF PB Minutes 7.9.20
- PDF Soil Specification
- PDF ZBA Clarification Letter 8.13.20
- Email to Karen Joseph date 8.6.20 from Horsley Witten, Janet Bernardo
- Email to Ann Burbine date 9.3.20 from Paul Mirabito
- DOC DRC Recommendations dated 9.3.20

Attendees: Jeff De Lisi, Attorney; Paul Mirabito, Ross Engineering; Robert Proctor, Property Manager/Owner; Kelly Connellan, Architect

Ms. Burbine read the comments from the Design Review Committee (DRC) for the record.

The DRC consensus is that the scale of the buildings is appropriate. The window spacing and proportion seems appropriate. DRC expressed approval for the dormers and barn doors with transom expressed on the north building.

DRC recommends approval of the proposed development, with the following notes:

- *Include site lighting strategy in the next public presentation.*
- *The DRC suggests taking advantage of the Old Country Way façade of the southwest building (which is actually the side of the building) by creating a focal point. DRC identified the kitchen window location as a potential site for a bay window or figural composition.*
- *The DRC recommends that the design team consider trees on the east side of the driveway to balance the trees in front of the south west building and to frame the development from the street and screen the neighboring property.*

Mr. Stokes, Chair of DRC did not have any further comments.

The applicant is working on a response to the lighting comments from DRC; it will be presented at the next meeting.

Mr. De Lisi gave a brief recap/update of the project.

- First hearing was July 9, 2020
- Three rounds of comments and responses to Peer Review
- Attended DRC
- August 14th applicant submitted revised Site Plans, revised O& M Plans, revised Long-term Pollution Prevention Plan, etc.
- ZBA letter submitted to the Planning Board to clarify the question on the amount of impervious coverage
 - ZBA decision allows for no more than 42.5% impervious coverage
 - Confirmed that there would be no use of permeable pavement
 - Current plans show impervious calculation of 42.3%
 - Reduced size of the building
 - Moved some parking spaces
- Label on the plan regarding concrete strip to Jenkins Place has been corrected – will be grass
- Provided responses to Fire Department comments
- Provided Alternative Analysis as requested

- Clarified issues on architectural plans
 - Spaces labeled above the center garage bay
 - Storage of materials for the use below
 - 300 sq. ft. space administrative space
 - Not proposed to be living space

Mr. Mirabito reviewed changes to the site plan.

- Plan revised 8.27.20
 - Pg. 3
 - Added note that the existing concrete driveway is to be removed(Jenkins Pl)
 - Proposed barn building in the rear reduced to 82.2' long reduced by 5'-6'
 - Setback off Country Way 15' and setback line shown to be 10'(min. set back in the district)
 - Mr. De Lisi indicated there are two ways to calculate the setback and the calculation used ended up on the plan; the building is being setback 15' so the number on the plan is superfluous
 - Pg. 4
 - SRS-1, subsurface recharge area has been pulled away from the pipe, approximately 4' from the closed pipe
 - The pipe is owned by the property owner
 - Provisions will be made that the HOA of the property will have to make any repairs, etc. in the case that anything ever happens to it
 - No one has been able to determine if the Town ever installed the pipe or maintains the pipe – without any documentation it is currently each property owners' responsibility for which the pipe goes under their property
 - The applicant will provide an easement/provision that the Town can access the property with respect to the pipe
 - Mr. De Lisi opined the easement should be for the entire property
 - The Town would have the right to enter the property, documents will be drafted so that the interpretation is for the entire property
 - Recharge area will accept the roof run from the residential units, roof run off considered to be clean water, all downspouts will go to the recharge system to the rear
 - Modifications made to the bio-retention area on the right side of the driveway
 - Plan shows reduced size to the proposed building to the rear of the property

There was additional discussion about the pipe. The pipe discharges water, there are 2 ends; there is a perennial stream that enters from Mr. Monteiro's property and then it runs underneath Old Country Way, spills out onto the law firm's property and then to a channel into a culvert under Country Way and then into the pond. (Sheet 4 of the plan shows the entire pipe). The pipe has been camera'd. The 24" pipe stops at the layout line of Old Country Way, underneath Country Way the town has a 36" concrete pipe that goes to the other side of the layout of Country Way to a head wall and then it is open to the stream and eventually goes under Country Way.

Mr. Mirabito explained how they determined the resource areas and regulations under DEP.

- Plan show the entire property, approximately 29,000 sq. ft. is all upland
- There are no wetland resource areas on the property
- Pipe is closed on the property so it is not regulated under DEP regulations
- Resource areas - they are within the buffer zone
 - Stream into the pipe on the Monteiro Property
 - Inland bank is a resource area
 - Sheet 4 shows the 50' and 100' buffer zones on both sides of the property
 - Because they are within the buffer zones of two offsite areas need to file with Conservation Commission
 - Conservation Commission has yet to open the hearing
 - The applicant opines there are no regulated resource areas on the site
 - The applicant reviewed if they are subject to the Riverfront Regulations under DEP; they are not subject to those regulations because the pipe is over 200' in length
 - Mr. Mirabito referenced an email he sent to the Board with a diagram on how to determine if the area is in the Riverfront.
 - The applicant referenced DEP Regulation 310 CMR 10.58.h.
 - Ms. Bernardo, the Town's Consulting Engineer is in agreement with the determination

Ms. Bernardo, Town's Consulting Engineer, gave a brief overview.

- Provided peer review letter on July 27th
- Provided another letter on August 26th
- Fourth letter dated September 2nd
 - Three comments still outstanding
 - Number of parking spaces in the barn – 7 spaces allocated to the barn, unclear how they were being laid out
 - Revised architectural plan shows the layout - August 31st
 - Defer to the Board if the spaces are usable parking spaces
 - Alternatives Analysis
 - Reasoning for the analysis is because the applicant is discharging into a Zone A, drinking water supply
 - Applicant is infiltrating into the ground which is part of the water supply because it is part of the aquifer
 - DEP allows for the applicant to continue to discharge into the Zone A; it is a redevelopment project, they are improving the existing conditions, they are containing any runoff if a spill were to happen in the parking lot
 - Sand filter with impermeable liner can capture and prevent any discharge so it can then be cleaned up
 - The Alternatives Analysis if for both the Planning Board and the Conservation Commission to include in their findings
 - The project is within a Zone A, they are discharging into a Zone A

- Based on DEP regulations and various other options, i.e. permeable pavement, etc. the applicant is proceeding with the option on the plan as is
 - The analysis provides backup for the Boards if other applicants want to develop in the Zone A
- Horsley Witten was satisfied with the analysis the Board should opine if they are
- Two rooms in the barn that were not labeled
 - Board may want to condition that they cannot be come bedrooms

Ms. Bernardo closed by indicating it is the reviewer's job to review the project against the Zoning Bylaws and the Stormwater system, but the Board should opine if they are satisfied as well with plan as it is presented.

Mr. Bornstein commented that his biggest issue last time was the issues with the ZBA decision. He understands the clarification to be that the use of permeable pavement was not factored into the ZBA decision; the 42.3% of impervious pavement the ZBA is allowing excluded that in the calculations of impervious surfaces.

Mr. De Lisi indicated that during the ZBA meeting there was question about the use of permeable pavement and the response was no, the applicant was not using it. He further said it was not factored into the ZBA decision of approval. The applicant is not proposing to use permeable pavement; if the Board wants to condition that, no permeable pavement could be used on the site the applicant would agree.

Mr. Bornstein said his concern was more about how the impervious percent was calculated and if any permeable area was factored into that number in the ZBA decision; the answer is no.

The Board expressed concern over the barn building and how the space was laid out for a workshop of a carpenter, electrician, etc. and the parking in the building, where are people going to work. Mr. De Lisi referenced section 760 of the bylaws. He said they take the use of property and match it with a chart in Section 760 that gives the total number of parking spaces for a particular use. He said the bylaw allows for the use in this zone, but when looking at the parking chart does not ascribe required parking for the use. Mr. De Lisi referenced a project on Ford Place in the same district that he opined is similar; based on that project the applicant concluded that only one parking space would be needed for each bay. There are 12 bedrooms with 12 parking spaces and 3 workshops and they are proposing 7 additional parking spaces; there are 19 spaces on the plan. The applicant believes they only need 15 spaces, but they are showing they can accommodate up to 19. Mr. De Lisi said there are two sections in the bylaw that allow the Board to make exceptions in the parking requirements, section 760 and section 560.6.

Ms. Joseph disagreed with Mr. De Lisi. She indicated that the use of shops and parking at 13 Ford Place was 1space/600 sq. ft. using the warehouse calculation. Applying the same to this project would require 7 plus spaces with an additional 300 sq. ft. of office space and 688 sq. ft. of unfinished space that are unaccounted for with regards to parking. She said in the Village Business Overlay District the Board can require only 1.5 spaces/unit for residential parking; the Board needs to determine how many spaces are needed. There are provisions to waive parking. There are, however, other questions that need to be answered, i.e. employees, how are they working.

Mr. Pritchard commented that 6 spaces would be required per 600 sq. ft. He said he would be worried about people parking outside these spaces, Ms. Burbine agreed; where outside of these spaces would people park, there are no parking spaces outside for the craftsman. Mr. Pritchard opined there would need to be at least 2 parking spaces per bay and there is no parking outside for the tradesman. Ms. Burbine was concerned how people would work inside the shop if there were cars parked in it; is this just a place to store stuff, i.e. vehicles and no work is done in the shops. Mr. Proctor said the interest he has had is for storage.

The Board opined the parking was insufficient; the Board thought there should be 2 spaces per shop. Mr. Pritchard referred to the property near the Brewery, Hallin's property; trucks are parked outside all the time. Mr. Proctor said that is exactly what they do not want to happen. The Board does not want to see parking outside; there are not enough spots outside.

Ms. Joseph indicated she had sent the Board an email with a list of outstanding issues that require the Boards input.

- Is the Board seeking any type of mitigation
- Alternatives analysis is it acceptable
 - Board wants the reasons spelled out in the alternatives analysis – not a note that the “Board knows the reasons”.
- No legal documents have been submitted, i.e. draft of Condominium Documents
 - Questions on ownership
 - Residential Building is Ownership
 - Barn Building is rental
 - Applicant confirmed the rental units would be owned by one individual and would be part of the Condominium Association
- Board can condition signs in the shops
- O&M Plan has been provided as a stand-alone document
 - Plan needs some additional work
 - Board needs to decide if it wants to restrict salt for de-icing and fertilizers
- Long-Term Prevention and Pollution Plan has been received
- Landscaping
 - Trees must be 2.5” caliber minimum
 - Proposed Beech very close to the 24” pipe
 - Line of arborvitae to rear for screening is 4’-6’ tall - is Board okay
 - Mixed shrub border is all deciduous - recommends some evergreens
 - Plan is labeled not for construction and is not stamped – need a stamped plan
 - Changes could be done as conditions
- Impervious surface is 42.3%, there is stormwater management which is a benefit
- Bike rack is shown in the middle of the grass area
- Parking per the previous discussion
- Conservation has not heard the project and has not verified the resource areas
- Waste disposal all internal to the units
- Site distance – cannot determine if it is adequate – no information has been provided
- Surety will be required
- Glazing and DRC recommendations

- Glazing is 18% and 19% requirement is 50% on first floor and 30% on second floor
 - Board has waived this before – Board needs to opine
- DRC recommended window change on the side of the residential building on Old Country Way
- Site lighting

Ms. Connellan, Architect, spoke to the DRC comments regarding the windows on the side of the building. They decided to flare the shingles around the entire building and enclose the back decks to add interest to the building. They did not feel a bay window was appropriate since there were no others on the site. The detail is shown on the September 8th drawings on page AH200 and 201. The applicant did add a window to the side elevation to eliminate some of the shingling.

Lighting will be discussed at the next meeting.

There was discussion about mitigation and what the Board would like to see as mitigation. Ms. Burbine indicated there is possibility of a sidewalk fund that could be used for the extension of the side walk from Huey Road to Greenbush. She said the Board is asking different developers to provide something for the public good, a benefit for Greenbush. There was discussion about a town vote to appropriate CPC funds for sidewalks in Greenbush. Ms. Burbine said it was adjudicated and it cannot be done with CPC funds after a lawsuit in Norwell. Ms. Burbine said that is just one idea, but if the applicant wants to propose something else the Board is open.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Burbine opined that the applicant should receive a copy of the comments Mr. Pritchard provided this afternoon regarding the O&M Plan so that they can respond.

Mr. Bornstein asked about the architectural elevations showing a third floor in the residential building, but there are no floor plans for a third floor. Ms. Connellan said it is just storage space, a pull down attic space and is not meant to be living space; all the middle units will be dark and the end units have one window. Ms. Burbine asked what prevents someone from putting a dormer above the second floor; the Condo Association would need to grant approval. Ms. Joseph said there would not be sewer capacity for any additional living space.

Mr. De Lisi recapped the expectation for parking; the Board is requiring 2 parking spaces for each of the three commercial units. Should the applicant revise the parking from the seven spaces they currently show on the plan to two spaces for each unit; the Board opined there should be two spaces/shop with no outside parking for the shops. There was discussion about where people will park if they come to see someone working in the shops; there is nowhere to park. Ms. Connellan gave her husband as an example; he is a Tile Contractor he parks his truck, etc. in a bay and does not typically have people coming to his place of work. The applicant anticipates these would work much the same way, people would not be coming to the shops.

Mr. De Lisi acknowledged the project is in a Water Resource Area the applicant is trying to have a site that does not have a big parking area on it; that is the challenge. The site is maxed out with what can be done, they are trying to have the least amount of impervious area as possible. They are proposing something that has less impervious area and more treatment than what exists now, more impervious area and no treatment.

There are solar panels on these buildings.

Motion:

Ms. Lambert moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearing for the Mixed Use Special Permit in the Village Business Overlay District for property located at 14-16 Old Country Way until November 12, 2020 at 7:00 pm and continue the time for action until December 30, 2020.

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

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

Interviews for Planning Board Alternate Seat

Documents

- PDF Cover Letter and Resume – Paulette O'Connell
- PDF Cover Letter and Resume – Lars Holmquist
- PDF Cover Letter and Resume – Robert MacLean
- PDF Cover Letter and Resume – Christian Putnam

Attendees: Paulette O'Connell, Lars Holmquist, Robert MacLean, Christian Putnam

Interview with Paulette O'Connell

Ms. O'Connell told the Board about herself.

- Resident of Scituate for almost 20 years
- Two children who attend Scituate Public Schools
- Self-employed architect – started her own business 10 years - office on Front St.
- Worked in Boston
- Has presented to many Boards like this - wants to be on the other side of things
- Wants to participate more in the town
 - Retain the things she moved to Scituate for while continuing to see the town grow

Question: What issue do you see the Planning Board facing in Scituate?

Answer: COVID may change things, but making sure that there is not such an influx of “cookie cutter” homes taking over the beautiful vernacular of the town trying to bring in bigger businesses, while keeping the small business, i.e. Riva closing, downtown and North Scituate and keep the commercial industry growing rather than losing it. Maybe COVID is an opportunity for that, maybe not, but the population could grow with people coming from the city and maybe we could retain and attract some of that. Try to keep a balance, not make it so “cookie cutter” and bring in some more businesses.

Question: What is your take on the Town's infrastructure, sewer, water, those kinds of limited resources and how you would see balancing development against that.

Answer: Sewer being a huge issue, the brown water...have the developers coming in work within their own lots of land and see what we can do to make new infrastructure self-sufficient rather than trying to use the resources already in town, but continue to work on improvements around town, i.e. millions of dollars approved for replacing pipes and still have some of the same challenges as before; coming up with creative solutions for what is already going on, but any new infrastructure coming in potentially have them give to a fund or create themselves to be self-sufficient on their own lots of land could help us build within in the town without drawing on the resources we have already tapped out.

Question: Do you understand zoning bylaws and how we use them and change them. How do you feel about the zoning in North Scituate and Greenbush in particular with the new zoning bylaw?

Answer: Yes, I understand zoning. I think it is definitely going to be an improvement especially in North Scituate where it can feel more like a community, now you drive through and see cars and small little buildings. I deal with zoning on a daily basis as an architect and have been before Boards in other town, I do feel there is a benefit to them and the back and forth is part of the town process with the builder/developer/architect. I think Greenbush is coming along. I really like the idea of trying to connect everything through a greenway that would bring a lot more foot traffic to the area, which is lacking at both ends of the world. I think if we can get more people living in the area and the paths and greenway space to those spaces are great. I can see how vibrant those two spaces could really be.

Question: Do you have any questions for the Planning Board?

Answer: What are the daily aspects of working together like; I know there will be a learning curve, but I have a good start since I deal with zoning codes almost every day. How do you work behind the scenes and how do you implement community interest, i.e. Scituate 2040. How do you draw that support from the community at large?

Question: In your opinion what would be some bylaw additions or changes or long-term planning initiatives that you think should be going forward to preserve the character of the Town and allow for growth.

Answer: Scituate does not really have a historic preservation community that is as strong as some other communities on the South Shore; implementing more of the historical character piece that people would have to be retain so an older historic home could not just be just be knocked down. It is an important piece to keep the character of the homes and businesses, some oversight is something we could work on to work within and continue growth at the same time.

Ms. O'Connell would be interested in another committee if she were not selected for this position.

Interview with Lars Holmquist

Mr. Holmquist introduced himself to the Board.

- Has lived in Scituate for 3 years
- Wants to get more involved in the town

Question: What do you think you could bring to the Planning Board?

Answer: Has had a very successful business career, is comfortable in many different environments with lots of different rules, has worked in a lot of different states and countries, which gives me a

different perspective about process, detail and getting things done and thinks that might suit this particular role.

Question: Have you been to any of the Planning Board meetings?

Answer: I have watched them on YouTube, but have not been to any of the meetings. I am aware of the proceedings and order of business and how it transpires.

Question: Being a newcomer to Scituate what do you see as the biggest challenges for the long-term development and sustainability of the town of Scituate as it is; what has impressed you in the town.

Answer: Two things – one is the citizen involvement, i.e. town meetings and my wife and I have gotten involved with an adopt a lot downtown and have gotten a feeling there is very good town participation. He said what is clear is it is an old town with old infrastructure and there is a lot to be done, things that weren't taken care of over the years or broke down over time; there are some big issues facing the town that require bond issues to fund, i.e. the Senior Center which was a long time coming and approved at town meeting, things along those lines made him realize a lot needs to be done, but there does seem to be a good level of citizen involvement and that is attractive.

Question: We deal a lot with trying to rationalize and protect our watershed, how would you rationalize not supporting what fit into our bylaw?

Answer: The whole point of Planning Board is to adjudicate the zoning bylaws as they are written, however it is also to uphold the idea of what Scituate wants to be. The Master Plan is part of that, the Village District work and visioning and even the coastal is all part of that; the reason you have a Board is you pass some judgement and judgement sometimes requires you to look at things based on their merits not always as it is written in the zoning bylaws or potentially suggest bylaw revisions.

Question: From a planning perspective, what do you see as being a major issue for our town in the future and what do you think we are doing wrong?

Answer: Starting with what we are doing right, re-zoning in the village districts is a really good idea and enforcing standards around what makes a livable village, I think is super important and is a step in the right direction; however I wonder if we are taking full advantage of all the resources available for watershed protection, coastal protection, etc. are we tapping into all right sort of resources; I do not know and am not in a position to know, but that it is an open question to me, the source of our drinking water and protection of our coastline are big concerns and there overlapping jurisdictions and it is complicated and I wonder if we have optimized that yet.

Question: Do you have any questions for the Board?

Answer: What are some of the expectations and what does the Board think the alternate position would add to this body, what are some of things you were thinking of that would enhance the functioning of the Board.

Ms. Burbine responded that the Alternate is an important position, the Board needs that sixth person, the alternate speaks, gives their opinion, but if all members are present they do not have a vote. Whatever thoughts the Alternate has are taken under advisement and are worth mentioning. Mr. Pritchard added the input from an Alternate is just as important as that of a Board member; it is about the process of getting to the final vote that everyone can support. Having six people evaluating and providing input is a sixth better than having five people. The expectation of an Alternate Board member is full participation, to act just as a full Board member. All the current members have at one time been an alternate member. It is a way to learn the process.

Mr. Holmquist said it is brand new and would be a learning process is there a sort of suggested learning path that the Board would suggest to be prepared. Ms. Burbine said the bylaws are the bible and there is a learning curve, but input is necessary and the alternate needs to be here. Do your homework.

Mr. Holmquist said he would be interested in another committee if this did not workout.

Interview with Bob (Robert) MacLean

Mr. MacLean give a brief history of himself and why he is applying for this position.

- Resident at 155 CJC Hwy
- Grew up in Lexington, attended WestPoint graduated in 2002
- Served on active duty from 2002 to 2008
 - 173rd Airborne out of Italy for invasion of Iraq
 - Deployed to Iraq two more times and Afghanistan with the Army's Ranger Regiment
- Engineering job with heavy equipment/piping electrical equipment for oil and gas companies
- Lived in Bahrain, worked mostly in Saudi Arabia and other places in the middle east
- Moved back to the States and worked in Finance for about 7 years
- Repaired boats for Boston Harbor Cruises
- Currently working as a Hydraulic Engineer for FEMA – makes the FEMA flood maps

Question: Why do you want to be on the Planning Board?

Answer: My wife and I are newcomers to the town and moved down here because they like what the town has to offer and want to start and raise their family here. I want to get involved so I can give my kids the best possible town to grow up in.

Question: What do you see are the biggest challenges or needs in town with respect to planning and what do you see as the biggest strengths of the town.

Answer: Starting out with the biggest needs for planning there are certain issues related to water, sewer, the electrical grid that need improvement, but the challenge with that is moving from the planning and research phase to developing and executing a plan and taking advantage of the structures and facilities that we already have at the base level to generate more tax revenue and to do more things with the town that we want to do, i.e. schools, etc. I think the physical challenges are utility issues, but we are getting over the hump to planning and need to start executing. As far as the strengths go, Scituate has a great small town community feel to it, it is very welcoming, but beyond that there is a lot of area that is ready and ripe for development. We don't need to take undeveloped land and add new growth, but use what is existing to grow wisely and improve the town long-term.

Question: How do you feel about the amount of growth in Scituate, it seems like you have a positive attitude about it.

Answer: I do have a positive view of it; it has been done smartly and given the kind of upheaval that we have seen in peoples work life balance and people working closer to home has created new challenges and they are being addressed. I am still bullish.

Question: What are some strategies you think could be used to balance the economic growth and development with preserving the town's character and providing the public services to the community without over taxing the system.

Answer: It goes back to the change in dynamic of people working closer to where they live, that is creating a movement in home values and people need to have their businesses outside of dense areas, so with the amount of commercial infrastructure that is already built and being able to utilize that infrastructure is very important, but to also take advantage for the desire of more inflow of people to Scituate; that is the unseen portions of the utilities, strengthening the electrical grid or figuring out how to, figuring out our drinking water and sewer water and having the capacity to handle how people are working and spending more time at home. It also raises the issue of some of our roadways and with more people working closer to home there will a flatter curve of traffic during the day instead of a morning spike and after work spike, there is going to be more traffic during the day when previously the roads may have been safer to travel on now they are not; using the existing roadways and figuring out ways to incorporate safety measures, i.e. speed limits, wider roads with bike lanes on the outside, sidewalks. The town does not need to change its face very much to accommodate the growth and the different ways we are living now, with the existing things that we have improvements on won't change the look of the town, but will strengthen what we have already.

Question: How do you feel about retreat from the ocean?

Answer: A managed retreat; was looking at one working group report that said the ocean is an asset; the ocean is a "crude mistress". My own point view, I do not know if a retreat is necessary, but we do have to accept the fact that we live in a town with a sandy coastline and we will have to deal with it or yes, you can retreat from the ocean. I do not necessarily believe in the expansion of it, but the sands of time the will come in and out. He spoke about the spit trying to get back to Humarock; it is something that we have to be aware of and accept; for some of the houses that are on more sandy ground and more susceptible to larger storms, south of the lighthouse, if there is a wash over on that barrier the harbor could be in trouble. I have seen that happen in Chatham, Nauset Beach, Monomoy where a storm wash in 1987 took 60' feet of the Chatham harbor houses in. I do not encourage more building in those areas, but acceptance and mitigation of what the real possibilities are.

Ms. Burbine said that all of them sitting on the Board have been Alternates; it is and important position the Board needs all the input we can get and all the help we can get; we listen to everyone and anyone, we can all agree to disagree to come to some type of consensus to move forward.

Mr. MacLean has watched the Planning Board meetings; he would still be interested in participating in another committee.

Interview with Christian Putnam

Mr. Putnam introduced himself and said why he was interested in being on the Board.

- Loves Scituate has lived here since 1994
- Believes the town is a very special resource
 - Unique properties to it – the water, the fishing fleet, beautiful trails and a character that is quintessential New England
 - Giving back to the community is helping to preserve what the history is, but at the same time have smart development and economic development and movement forward

Question: What do you see are the biggest challenges for the town going forward and what do you see our biggest weaknesses are.

Answer: In terms of challenges many are self-evident, in terms of planning as a community we have not always been as forward looking as we should be we see that through the fresh water supply and the challenges there, through sewage – 2004 Master Plan said (not sure of the exact numbers) 75-85% of the town does not have soils appropriate for septic systems and only 30% of the town has sewer, that is a challenge and a weakness for the town and something that needs to be dealt with. Another challenge is maintaining the character of the town; it would be very easy for Scituate to turn into a town that does not have the character it has today. In terms of weaknesses, we live in a world of limited resources and have to make decisions about how resources are spent and be smart about it.

Follow up question: In terms of maintain the character of the town how would you manifest that, do you see it as changes to zoning bylaws, as design criteria, how would you go about doing that?

Answer: I think there is an element of zoning bylaws and an element of certain restrictions around the way development is carried out, but it is also important to have access to a working waterfront, i.e. fishing boats, making sure there is access and the ability for making sure small business people can run their businesses; as far as getting away from the water or different parts of the water there has to be open space and access for people to get to it, i.e. the purchase of the property on the Cohasset line, that type of action by the town. The town has to be active in that.

Question: What do you think are some of the most positive qualities of the town and what are some negative or things that you think need improvement, slant it towards zoning and planning.

Answer: The interesting thing about the town is the population has been around 18,000 for decades, but we continue to get bigger and bigger houses with fewer people in them; that could end up being a challenge with McMansions that are outside the character of the town and very different things going in; I think that you need to be smart about how you are doing that so that you know you are in Scituate as opposed to West Palm Beach. Ensuring that even with development that characteristics of a New England 300 year old town are being maintained. In terms of the positive, it is nice that the town is not growing, particularly since we have an infrastructure that cannot really handle a lot more people in my opinion. In term with what we have with the Harbor District, Greenbush and eventually North Scituate those village clusters are very special; I remember the little store that used to be in Minot and it had that feel about it, the residents miss that little store, but there is more to the town than just anyone area, there is a collection of areas that offer so much to not only the residents but to those that visit as well.

Question: what background experience do you have that would help the Planning Board.

Answer: I am not an architect, a civil engineer, I am none of those things I have a finance background and basically a sales guy, but in that role I have over 30 years of helping organizations and people with complex challenges and coming up with innovative solutions. It is that same type of innovative thinking that I think I can bring and an appreciation for history. I am a lifetime member of the Wellfleet Historical Society and the Orleans Historical Society, I do not think Scituate has a lifetime membership, but it is an appreciation for history. My family has been here since the 1600's on the cape/New England area and it is that sense of where we came from is important when we think about where we are going.

Question: Would you be open to supporting changes, such as our new zoning bylaws and what do you think are important validations as to why we have zoning bylaws.

Answer: We have to change in order to continue to be vibrant and grow, so absolutely I would be supportive of those. We cannot live our lives thinking things will never change within the town, they should and they will and should be positive because we are not going to stop it.

Ms. Burbine said they have all been alternates at some time; the Board expects full participation, if the five members are all present you cannot vote, but your input is valued.

Question: any questions for the Board.

Answer: Yes, I was not sure what being an alternate means, but sounds like it is a little bit of a training ground for becoming a full Board member. What is the time commitment on average?

Ms. Joseph indicated that usually the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of the month there are meetings and then members are liaisons to other committees; it is whatever you need to do to preparation for the meeting. There is a lot of reading, the Board wants you to comment and participate.

Mr. Putnam said he would consider other committees if not selected.

Ms. Joseph indicated this would go on the next agenda for the Board to make a decision.

Minutes

Documents

- Meeting minutes 8.27.20

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the meeting minutes for August 27, 2020.

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

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein - yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Accounting

Documents

PO #2101899 (\$3,020.00), PO #2101943 (\$176.40), PO #2101946 (\$510.00)

Ms. Lambert moved to approve the requisition of \$3,020.00 to Chessia Consulting for peer review of 48-52 New Driftway/Gas Backwards, for \$176.40 to Gatehouse Media for legal ad for 48-52 New Driftway, for \$510.00 to Horsley Witten for peer review services for 14-16 Old Country Way
Mr. Bornstein seconded the motion; a roll call vote was taken and was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Burbine - yes

Mr. Pritchard – yes

Ms. Lambert – yes

Mr. Bornstein – yes

Ms. Lewis – yes

Discussion of meeting schedule: Holiday

- Board is scheduled to meet November 12th and technically do not have another meeting scheduled
- Available dates are November 19th, 24th - Tuesday before Thanksgiving
- December meetings December 12th – second meeting is not scheduled due to the Holidays
- Could add extra meetings on November 5th and December 3rd
- November 16th is Town Meeting
- October 6th Joint meeting with BOS for Alternate Seat appointment

The Board decided to meet on November 5th and November 12th and December 3rd and December 10th.

Liaison Reports:

CPC – reported by Ms. Burbine:

- Annual meeting Monday night

Planning and Development – reported by Ms. Joseph:

- Responses needed on Senior Center
 - Propose not to do the parking monitoring plan due to cost
 - A condition cannot be changed without coming back to the Board
- Three special permits before the Board now
- Working on DRAFT decision for 14-16 Old Country Way – will need feedback on first DRAFT

Documents

- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 9.3.20 with meeting agenda for 9.10.20 and materials for Alternate Member Seat Interviews
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 9.4.20 with meeting materials for 14-16 Old Country Way
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 9.8.20 with Dropbox for 14-16 Old Country Way
- Email to the Board from Shari Young dated 9.8.20 with meeting minutes from 8.27.20
- Email to the Board from Karen Joseph dated 9.8.20 with DRC Recommendations for 14-16 Old Country Way.

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Ms. Burbine moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. Ms. Lambert seconded the motion; the vote was unanimously in favor.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Shari Young
Planning Board Administrative Assistant

Patricia A. Lambert, Clerk

Date Approved: September 24, 2020