

## **SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD      MINUTES      January 22, 2015**

Members Present: William Limbacher, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Richard Taylor, Clerk; Robert Vogel, Robert Greene and Ann Burbine, Alternate member.

Members Absent: None.

Others Present: Ms. Laura Harbottle, Town Planner.

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.

Chairman Limbacher called the meeting to order at 7:31 P.M. The meeting was being recorded for airing on local cable television.

### **Documents**

- 1/22/15 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Mr. Taylor moved to accept the agenda. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor.

---

**Discussion of Potential Zoning for Greenbush/Driftway Area subject to MGL Ch 40 R, the Smart Growth Zoning Overlay District Act** with Bill Reyelt, Principal Planner, Smart Growth Programs, Dept. of Housing & Community Development; Matt Smith, Senior Regional Planner, MAPC; Town Officials; Property Owners

### **Documents**

- 1/8/2015 Draft Section 580: Greenbush /Driftway Smart Growth Overlay District (GDRSGOD)
- Questions on 40 R for Bill Reyelt
- Map of Smart Growth Districts in MA 5/6/13
- Chart of 40 R Districts/Activity

Chairman Limbacher introduced Bill Reyelt of DHCD, Matt Smith of MAPC and Elaine Wijnja, the Principal Planner for Land Use of DHCD. Bill Reyelt indicated that 40 R, or Smart Growth Zoning, offers incentives of smart growth, financial and housing production. It is an overlay district that requires a transit oriented location, 20% affordable housing, specific higher density development and development as of right. He said that 20 units/ acre is the minimum for high density multifamily housing. He indicated a town receives incentive payments for adopting the district based on the number of units potentially developable and \$3,000 per unit as the units come on line. He indicated that there is a subsidy under 40 S for increased school costs due to increased school demand due to adoption of a 40 R district.

Mr. Reyelt said that Greenbush is an ideal location for a 40 R district as it is within a half mile of a transit center and there are undeveloped and underutilized sites in the area. He indicated that developments with fewer than 13 units do not need to meet the affordability requirement and all rental unit developments need to have 25% of the units affordable for the units to count on the Town's subsidized inventory list. He said that 20% affordability is required over the entire district so if exemptions are made then the units need to be made up elsewhere in the district. Mr. Reyelt said that the incentive payments are based on developable or underutilized land and payments are

maximized at \$600,000 for 500 + units. He said the process includes a site visit to the Town, an application being submitted to DHCD with a preliminary approval, local adoption of the zoning and its approval by the Attorney General, final approval from DHCD along with the incentive payment then local project approval. He said the zoning is typically done as an overlay district with Massachusetts already having approved 35 districts with over 12,000 units and approximately 2,700 units of housing have been built or are under construction. Belmont, Northhampton, Lynnfield, Reading, Easton and Natick were shown as examples.

Chris McConaughy, Chairman of the Scituate Economic Development Commission (EDC), said that the 40 R district recommendations came out of the EDC's Market Study for Scituate. He said it would be a great economic development opportunity for the Town to provide additional revenue in a manner that provides controlled growth and advantages for developers as well. He indicated that this would make Scituate more welcoming and the EDC supports the zoning.

Mr. Reyelt provided answers to questions that the Town Planner had compiled and sent. In response to the first question asking if the state funds were guaranteed, he said that the incentive money towns receive comes from a trust that is recapitalized. He said every town that has met the requirements for the money has been given it so far, but it is not guaranteed. He said the money in the trust covers the incentive and density bonus payments. He indicated that the 40 S school money is appropriated each year and is not in the trust. He said that most 40 R developments so far have been in urban gateway areas so the formula has not resulted in a net increase to school costs. He said that most of the housing units developed so far have been 2 bedroom units. Mr. Reyelt said that the Town receives the incentive money once, except for the 40 S payments. He said that if a town adopts a district and then amends it and the incentive payment is not maxed out, then the town would be eligible for additional incentive money.

In response to question 2 asking if a developer can begin construction under 40 R without the Town having promulgated design standards, Mr. Reyelt said that a project would be on hold until the standards were developed. He said that the design standards can't be applied to a project that is already approved. He said that the standards need to be transparent to maintain an as of right development and can't be unduly restrictive. Ms. Wijnja said that a town can adopt the zoning and if the standards aren't done when a project is filed the standards later adopted don't apply to the project. Mr. Vogel confirmed that the existing standards in the Village Business Overlay District (VBOD) can't apply to the 40 R unless written in the 40 R zoning. Based on the above, the Board decided they would want the existing standards of the VBOD as the minimum standards in the 40 R bylaw and that these could be modified later with the understanding of the limitations of 40 R on not being too restrictive. The Board said they wanted some standards in place in the event that the developer of the MBTA parcel would choose the 40 R option. Mr. Reyelt said that review of the standards takes about 30 days. Selectman John Danehey asked what other town are doing with design guidelines. Mr. Reyelt said some are incorporating them into the bylaw and some are separating them and doing them later.

Mr. Taylor asked if it would be easier to do design guidelines for a smaller parcel than the entire district. Mr. Reyelt said it depends and that the underutilized land is low hanging fruit. Bob Burwick asked about the minimum density of 25 units/acre as indicated in the letter sent to property owners. Mr. Reyelt said the minimum per state requirements is 20, but the town sets the final density. Ms. Harbottle said the Town said 25 as an incentive to use 40 R over the 20 in the existing VBOD as there have not been many applications under the VBOD. Mr. Taylor asked if there can be

an option to use the 40 R or stay with the VBOD. Ms. Wijnja and Mr. Reyelt said that most towns just pick one option or another, but it is up to the Town.

In response to questions 3, Mr. Reyelt said that if the Town meets its 10% threshold for affordable housing and there is still room to build in the 40 R section, it cannot deny development in the 40 R district. He indicated that the state can deny a 40 B project eligibility application in the wrong location if appropriate 40 R districts are in place. He said that 2 towns had 40 B's denied for reasons including a 40 R district was being implemented in their community. He indicated the towns of Andover, Georgetown, Hingham and Weymouth did not go forward with their 40 R districts in response to the Board's question. He said he can't give any particular reasons why these towns did not proceed except for typical community challenges related to development. Mr. Reyelt indicated that the Board can require performance bonds for the work on a 40 R plan if it is in the regulations. Ms. Wijnja said that the bond needs to be related to public health, safety and welfare as related to the construction of the project. She indicated that peer review can occur as long as it is in the rules and regulations, but it is not under Chapter 53 G. Mr. Reyelt said peer review is in the model state bylaw for 40 R under Sec 11 A. In response to the question if 40 R is more advantageous than the VBOD, Mr. Reyelt said it may not be. He said 40 R is as of right and is more predictable so may be more favorable to a developer and the appeal of 40 R is quite onerous. With regards to the question if there are any grants available, he said the Department's Planning Assistance Toward Housing Grant which the Town recently applied for is the primary source of grants for development of design standards. He suggested town CPC applications may also be possible.

Ms. Harbottle indicated to Mr. Reyelt that sewer and water are big issues in Town and the Town has to indicate it has capacity for the 40 R district which could be a challenge. Mr. Reyelt said that the DPW would need to write a letter saying that the infrastructure supports the potential development that zoning allows. He said there could be conditional approval for the 40 R district, but the incentive payment to the Town would not occur until it is shown that all the infrastructure is in place. He said there could be a plan to show that some infrastructure is available and how the remaining infrastructure will be put in place. Ms. Harbottle indicated the Town must be on the same page to produce the letter. Selectmen John Danehey asked if a project would be allowed to go forward without the sewer capacity. Mr. Reyelt indicated that if the zoning allows the use it would be challenging. Mr. Danehey asked if under the 40 S component, can the bylaw mandate the units are all 2 bedrooms. Ms. Wijnja said that under the 40 S component, the Town has to prove there is a burden to the schools as the Dept. of Revenue implements 40 S. Mr. Reyelt said he would forward a spreadsheet to Chairman Limbacher who would forward it to the Selectmen on calculating 40 S payments. Mr. Reyelt said that any language limiting the number of bedrooms will not be acceptable.

Mr. Smith said that 40 R was a recommendation from the EDC study for the Greenbush area. He said Greenbush has the most opportunity for development as it has undeveloped and underutilized land. He said that the study found that retail is needed as are alternatives to single family housing. He said that Greenbush provides the best opportunity as it can concentrate mixed use development close to the train and there would be access and visibility from Route 3A. He said that environmental considerations would still need to be met with the 400 foot buffer to the reservoir and setbacks to the wetlands, streams and salt marsh. He indicated that south and east of the train provide the best prospects for higher development densities.

Ms. Harbottle said that the 40 R process is different than a zoning article in that a state approval process is also involved. She said the application involves mapping, a letter indicating adequate

sewer capacity exists and analysis of why parcels would likely be developed including rent/ square foot. She also indicated that there is conflict with the timeframe of state approval versus town meeting approval and the state only takes the applications at the end of a month. Mr. Reyelt said that much in the application relates to the zoning incentive payment and that the state can condition any eligibility letter to possibly help with the Town Meeting timeframe. He said the Attorney General timeframe is the same for all the zoning articles. Ms. Wijnja said that adopting an amendment to 40 R would be the same as under 40 A. She said they could review the application in pieces if it is given that way. Mr. Reyelt said the burden is on the Town to say that parcels are underutilized.

Chairman Limbacher asked if there were any questions from the public. Since there were none, he closed the discussion and moved on to the public hearing.

**Public Hearing – Greenbush/Driftway Area Smart Growth Overlay District** as required under MGL Ch 40 R and 760 CMR 59.05

### **Documents**

- Legal ad published in the Patriot Ledger 1/14/15 and 1/19/15

Chairman Limbacher opened the public hearing on 40 R as it relates to Greenbush by indicating the hearing had been duly posted. Ms. Harbottle said the hearing provides an opportunity to hear from the public and Town officials to see if the Town should pursue adoption of 40 R. Chairman Limbacher asked if there were any questions on the bylaw. Bill Dillon asked about the change in the existing zoning and the new 40 R bylaw. Ms. Harbottle indicated that the zoning in place now, the Village Business Overlay District (VBOD), provides a density of 16/40,000 sq. ft. or 17-20/40,000 with a public benefit resulting in 17-21 units/acre. She indicated it is a special permit where a 4/5 vote is required with conditions imposed. She said 40 R has a density of 25 units/ acre and is a by right development requiring a 3/5 vote and an onerous appeal process. She said the development must meet standards spelled out in the bylaw and guidelines. She said the VBOD requires 15% affordability and the 40 R requires 20% affordability. Mr. Taylor added that the Town receives incentive payments under 40 R where there is no compensation in the VBOD.

Paul Donovan of South Shore Auto parts asked if an applicant will be able to choose to go with 40 R or the VBOD. Ms. Harbottle said that the Board needs to decide that. Mr. Donovan said that he would like the choice and the more flexibility the better. Chairman Limbacher asked if there is a need to change the proposed 40 R overlay area. Bob Burwick asked how the area was drawn and how many units are attainable. Ms. Harbottle said that 500 units could be attained and now by right the number is 100. Mr. Taylor indicated that several projects in the VBOD have come before the Board and the Board can condition them so that the mixed use portion of the project is completed first and asked Mr. Reyelt if 40 R can do the same. He said he would need to look into the matter as it has not come up before. Chairman Limbacher said that one downside of having both districts is a mismatch if the design criteria are not the same. Mr. Pritchard said that the criteria from 40 R could be applied to a special permit application if one came in for the VBOD.

Scott Greenbaum of 40 Damon Road indicated that the resource areas are not shown on the map which could alter the number of units and he doesn't like that Scituate Concrete Pipe is in the district as it gives them motivation to move their operations and convert their site to housing. He asked why the two existing office buildings are included in the district when they are likely not going to change. Ms. Harbottle said that the state requires the Town to look at the natural resources and the Zone A is

mapped. She said that no build buffer areas are not included in the developable area. She indicated that the Board has to look at which parcels will be developed and while the Jacob Hatch building will not likely be redeveloped, the other building may be redeveloped to be more compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Taylor added that the Board is setting up a framework to give options to property owners. Mr. Grrenbaum said more motivation is being given for some people to leave. Ms. Burbine said that change is inevitable and this 40 R zoning is about expanding Scituate's tax base for the better. Bob Burwick asked about the incentive payments and if they are based on the number of units created and if the current parking would pertain. Chairman Limbacher said the incentive payment is based on capacity and the residual payments come when units are occupied. Ms. Harbottle said the parking requirements for the VBOD which are already reduced would be the same for the 40 R.

Chairman Limbacher suggested voting the entire district to go forward assuming that a letter can be obtained for the infrastructure or a subset of the district if it is needed to be reduced in size due to limited infrastructure for the entire area. Mr. Vogel thought that it would be cleanest to vote the whole area and then if reductions are necessary make them at Town Meeting. The Board agreed. Joe Lynch of Conroy Development said he was trying to understand what the Board meant as he just walked in. Chairman Limbacher said that a letter is needed from DPW for the 40 R application to indicate that there is adequate sewer infrastructure available for the whole 40 R district, and if they cannot do a letter for the whole area then they could do a subset area which would be the MBTA parcel. Bob Vogel asked when the 40 R bylaw would be available for use. Ms. Harbottle said not until after it is approved by the Attorney General's office so likely August. Mr. Lynch said they need to decide which way they are going. He said that they are open to 40 R; however the difficulty is the timeframe from the MBTA. He said they need to purchase the property in July unless they receive an extension. He said with Town Meeting in April, and if they can't get an extension they will use the VBOD bylaw.

The Board decided that the proposed 40 R district would be another overlay district and they will still have the VBOD district available for an option. Mr. Lynch said they would like to receive approval from the Town for their project before they close on the property. Mr. Burwick asked if there have been discussions with the DPW. Chairman Limbacher said that the DPW and Board of Selectmen need to work the issue. The Board said that they wanted to leave the district as is and if needed, it can be amended at Town Meeting. Mr. Taylor moved to proceed with 40 R with the boundary as currently shown on the December 2014 map, to authorize the legal ad for the zoning public hearing and to move forward with the 40 R zoning for the entire district. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

**Presentation for Information and Discussion – Bartlett Fields Development, Booth Hill Road**  
with Jack Livingstone, Stephen Callahan and Attorney Adam Brodsky

Attorney Adam Brodsky said that the presentation would be the same as given to the Conservation Commission last evening. He indicated the project was not before any board in Town yet and they are providing a general informal presentation of what is likely to be proposed as the Selectmen asked them to seek input from the Planning Board and Conservation Commission. Atty. Brodsky said that apartments will be proposed under Chapter 40 B off of Booth Hill Road with a public information session in February. He indicated the conceptual design will be filed in a Project Eligibility Application (PEA) in the next few weeks. He said the Town would be able to comment on the PEA application before Mass Housing issued its letter enabling the 40 B project to be filed with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). He said the public will have ample opportunity to comment in the

ZBA process. He indicated the wetlands have been delineated under an ORAD in 2013 and the project will also go before the Conservation Commission.

Attorney Brodsky said that the 24 acre property is located off of Booth Hill Road. He said the Town Forest was not part of the land that is proposed for the 1.8 acre land swap, but the land is part of the Ellis Estate. He indicated that the project can be built with access off of Booth Hill Road with two wetland crossings. One would be a fill situation with 2,490 sq. ft. of fill and the other would be a open bottom box culvert with 1,800 sq. ft. of fill for a total of less than 5,000 sq. ft. The 900 foot long entrance would be double barreled to provide two means of access for emergency vehicles to the 8 buildings with a maximum of 252 units. He indicated that wastewater treatment would be by a sewer absorption system with a capacity of less than 40,000 gpd.

Attorney Brodsky said the units will all be rental with 25% affordable and 75% market rate, but they would all be able to count toward the Town's housing inventory since they are rental. He said there will be 36 unit and 24 unit 3 story buildings. He said the architectural style will be in keeping with Scituate's character and there would be a clubhouse and a pool as tenant amenities. Attorney Brodsky said there would be 378 parking spaces and 15 garages with a parking count of 1.7 spaces per unit. He indicated that the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards will be met with 4 proposed basins; but will change as the design evolves. He said a vegetated buffer would be kept to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Attorney Brodsky said that a traffic engineer has been consulted and the site distance on Booth Hill Road will be acceptable and the additional traffic will not impact the level of service at Booth Hill Road and Route 3A which is a state highway of which the applicant has no control over. He indicated that a traffic study will be performed by the applicant and he expects to have it peer reviewed. He said that the proposed land swap would provide access to Route 3A in lieu of the Booth Hill access. Attorney Brodsky said that if the land swap is done, it will be a double barrel road and would eliminate the need for the two wetland crossings and the access area at Booth Hill Road would remain untouched. He said the road would be located as far from Merritt Woods as feasible. He indicated that the applicant would provide the Town with a 16 acre piece of property owned by his trust. Additionally, two parcels owned by the applicant through Whitcomb Pines LLC with a conservation restriction on them could be also transferred to the Town for a total of 27 acres. He said there is significant upland on the property and also access to Clapp Road. He suggested the conservation restriction could be removed with an act of the legislature. Attorney Brodsky said the applicants know the project is large and are willing to listen to town and public comments.

Mr. Green confirmed the Town Forest was not part of the landswap. Ms. Burbine asked if the School Committee owns the Ellis land. Selectman Shawn Harris indicated that the Ellis land is owned by the Town under the care and custody of the Conservation Commission. Ms. Burbine asked if the access to the land from Clapp Road involved a wetland crossing. Selectman Harris said that the entrance off of Clapp Road to these 27 acres involves no wetland and is located between Ted Coyle's and Joan Collins' homes. Mr. Pritchard inquired as to the targeted mix of the units. Attorney Brodsky said it would be one, two and some three bedroom units. He said they would be high end rental similar to Avalon in Cohasset primarily for young adults, small families and older residents who want to downsize and stay in Town. He said the mix is consistent with what the EDC study is recommending. He said the septic would be on-site with care under a Homeowner's Association and would also hook up to town water and gas. Mr. Pritchard asked if there needed to be more than one access. Mr. Brodsky said that a boulevard entrance provides two means of access. He indicated a MassHighway Access permit would be necessary for Route 3A and there is good

sight distance and federal standards can be met. He did say that it is possible that a turning lane may be required and they will coordinate with the public safety complex. Mr. Pritchard asked if the open space land was accessible. Attorney Brodsky said that the land with the conservation restriction on it has trails on it which would connect to the town forest. He said there is no estimated or priority habitat. Mr. Taylor asked if the building locations would change if access came from 3A. Attorney Brodsky suggested possibly. Mr. Taylor asked if the development would be similar to Avalon in Cohasset. Steve Callahan said that Avalon has 240 units so the proposed development would be similar to that in terms of traffic. Mr. Vogel asked about the permitting process. Attorney Brodsky said that the project would not be allowed under current zoning, thus the 40 B avenue. He indicated that it will be designed to comply with the local wetland bylaw and is subject to the stormwater regulations and MEPA. He also said that the 16 acre parcel has 10 acres of upland and 6 acres of wetland.

Ms. Harbottle asked if the applicant had any thought about having the Design Review Committee review the application as it did on Whitcomb Pines and Herring Brook Meadow. Attorney Brodsky said they are open to it; however with the new Mass Housing application and guidelines design is now required. Ms. Harbottle asked if the project was going to be phased. Attorney Brodsky said that all of the infrastructure would be done in the first phase and then the buildings phased in. He emphasized that since Scituate is below the 10% affordable housing requirement then all the rental units will count as 25% of the units are being proposed as affordable. He said this project would not bring Scituate to its 10%. Ms. Harbottle asked if analysis has been done for water service relative to the Town capacity. Chairman Limbacher said that is a concern of his with regards to the water source and pressure. Attorney Brodsky said this will all be in the 40 B application, but the focus has been on access thus far. Mr. Vogel said the building will need to have a sprinkler system. Ms. Burbine said they will need to have a maintenance company versus a Homeowner's Association. Mr. Pritchard asked if the rentals could ever be converted to condominiums. Attorney Brodsky said that it was being applied for as rental. Mr. Taylor asked if there would be transit friendly amenities such as shuttles to the train station and bike racks as there are no sidewalks in the area. Mr. Brodsky said that they will address this in the future.

Dr. Price of 48 Mann Lot Rd. said he hoped the developer would be sensitive to the environment as there are nice tall trees present and he does not want to see it clear cut like Whitcomb Pines. Attorney Brodsky said that there will be green space. Dr. Price asked why it was going to be tenant rental versus owner occupied. Attorney Brodsky said that is what the market is calling for. Mike Corcoran of 5 Trudy's Lane asked where on Booth Hill Road would the access be located. Attorney Brodsky said between 127 and 133 and there was no guardrail. Joe Sugar of 127 Booth Hill Road asked about the development potential of the 16 acres that is to be part of the land swap piece. Mr. Livingstone said that if it was developed under Chapter 40 B, the perc tests indicate the potential for 90 bedrooms. John L of Merritt Woods asked if approval for a driveway is not given off of Route 3A how close is the access from Booth Hill to Merritt Woods. Mr. Callahan said it was 320 feet. He also asked if there was a possibility of having a light at 3A and Booth Hill as it takes a while to get out of Merritt Woods now. Mr. Callahan said it is under Mass Highway control and doubts the intersection meets the signal justification. Selectmen Harris said that Al Bangert is working with Mass Highway for appropriate signalization for the public safety complex. Ryan Earley of 120 Booth Hill Road said it already takes a long time to get out onto 3A from Booth Hill. Cindy Runey of 75 Booth Hill asked how many accidents have occurred there now and how many people have died. She said adding an additional 300 cars to the area is unsafe and crazy. Chairman Limbacher said that data would be in a traffic study.

Mike Kostek of 108 Booth Hill Road expressed concern about the sight lines on the road. He said there is a lot of traffic on the winding road and expressed concern about new traffic entering /exiting. Attorney Brodsky said the traffic issues will be addressed in the future when design plans are filed with the Town. Mr. Kostek expressed concern about a request for a land swap prior to full design being complete. Selectman Harris said that they don't need the land swap to construct the project. He said it is in the best interest of the Town to do the land swap. Mr. Kostek asked how the Town benefits from the swap. Mr. Sugar said that if the town doesn't do the swap then 90 more units can be obtained in the future. Scott Greenbaum of 40 Damon Road said two entrances may be required for fire access and asked if they are going to meet all of the Town bylaws. Mike Kostek asked about an influx of kids and how would it affect the school system. Chairman Limbacher said that many questions will be answered when the project has its public hearing. Cindy Runey expressed concern that 2 access points may be required. Attorney Brodsky said they have not met with the Fire Chief. He said he would advocate strongly for one access off of Route 3A and indicated that similar 40 B projects have been approved in the past. Rick Verzone of 118 Booth Hill Road said access on Booth Hill is not acceptable. He said he hopes all the residents are being informed on the project.

## **Minutes**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the meeting minutes of 1/8/15. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

## **Accounting**

### **Documents**

- PO # 1504887 (\$225.47), PO # 1504884 (\$382.28), PO # 1504885 (\$487.23), PO # 1504886 (\$482.75), PO # 1504890 (\$202.62), PO # 1504891 (\$326.50), PO # 1504888 (\$545.12), PO # 1504889 (\$257.28)

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the requisition of \$225.47 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Ingrid Lane, \$382.28 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Studley Farm, for \$487.23 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Studley Farm, for \$482.75 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Blanchard Farm, for \$202.62 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for White Ash Farm, for \$386.50 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for White Ash Farm, for \$545.12 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Tilden Estates and for \$ 257.28 to Amory Engineers for construction inspections for Tilden Estates. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

## **Town Planner Report**

Ms. Harbottle summarized the changes to 40 R that she needs to accomplish including taking the design guidelines from the VBOD and adding them into the 40 R bylaw, having the VBOD District option remain for the 40 R zoning district area, adding a provision in for a performance bond and adding a provision for peer review. She indicated she would do a Request for Proposal for the 40 R Design Guidelines if the Town received a grant from the state. She said that the Board has received a referral from the Board of Selectmen on the Planned Development District citizen petition so it will be advertised for the zoning public hearing.

## **Old Business and New Business**

**Documents**

- Staff report for 1/22/15
- Email chain between L. Harbottle and Niland dated 1/16/15
- Email chain between L. Harbottle and J. Iantosca dated 1/16/15
- Email chain between L. Harbottle and S. Morrissey dated 1/16/15

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Vogel moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:48 p.m. Mr. Pritchard seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph  
Planning Board Secretary

Richard Taylor, Clerk  
2-26-15  
Date Approved