

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES October 10, 2013

Members Present: William Limbacher, Chairman; Stephen Pritchard, Vice Chairman; Richard Taylor, Clerk; Robert Vogel, Eric Mercer and Robert Greene, 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.

Chairman Limbacher called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M. The meeting was being audio recorded. The meeting was being recorded for airing on the local cable television station.

Documents

- 10/10/13 Planning Board Amended Agenda

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

**Continued Public Hearing and Scenic Road Public Hearing – 214 Thomas Clapp Road
Flexible Open Space Special Permit & Definitive Subdivision Plan & Scenic Road
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 18/1/2
Applicants/Owners: Fern Properties, LLC**

Documents

- Comment from DPW dated 9/13/13
- Letter from Mike Breen to Laura Harbottle dated 9/18/13
- Email from Pat Gallivan to Misty-Anne Marold dated 9/24/13
- Revised drawings 5, 7, 17 submitted by McKenzie Engineering Group dated 10/2/13
- Email from Deb Keller to Laura Harbottle on Landscape Architect dated 10/2/13
- Email on habitat protection from Pat Gallivan dated 10/2/13
- Revised Beals and Thomas Engineering Review dated 10/2/13
- Letter from John Niland to the Board dated 10/3/13
- 2 emails with letter/comment from Carol Straight dated 10/7/13
- Landscape plans 8, 9 and 9A dated 10/10/13
- Letter from McKenzie Engineering Group dated 10/10/13 on abutter comments

Matthew Watsky, Deb Keller, Paul Bourque, Dave Iantosca, Joe Iantosca and Sean Papich were present for the applicant. Dave Johnson was present as Planning Board consulting engineer. Mr. Watsky indicated that there were some outstanding issues from the last meeting. They included modifications of the drainage design, submission of a landscape plan and control of the open space.

Ms. Keller indicated that the infiltration rate of the basin was adjusted. She said it did not change the grading, but just slightly changed the outlet control structure to meet peak rate and volume control. She indicated two additional rain gardens were added to meet the request for additional Low Impact Development (LID) drainage. She indicated that the applicant has met with the DPW on the two cross culverts at Clapp Road. She said the DPW concurs with the design and that a new catch basin with a 4 foot sump will replace the existing basin at 218 Clapp Road. Ms. Keller said

that the culverts have been sized so that all of the stormwater will flow through them and be under the road including the 100 year storm. She said there would be no sheet flow across the road. She indicated that the culvert will be rotated to be located entirely within the easement. The large tree located within the easement will be removed by the Highway Department as it has been identified by them as a safety concern. Ms. Keller said that a swale has been added behind lots 8 and 9 to direct water to the cross culvert. She indicated additional grading detail was added at the cul-de-sac to show how water flows to the rain garden. She said a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be based on before and after drainage runoff conditions and will be attached to the Homeowners Association documents.

Ms. Keller indicated that a Landscape Plan was filed earlier today. She said it shows street trees, rain garden plantings, stormwater basin plantings and screening at the stormwater basin berm. She indicated that the plantings in the rain garden in the cul-de-sac are less than 3 feet tall to comply with the Traffic Rules Committee request. She said the added rain gardens are connected by pipe as there is a space issue on the lots due to the trail and septic systems. She indicated there are no snow storage areas shown on the plan as snow will be pushed to one side and they feel an easement is not necessary.

Sean Papich, Registered Landscape Architect, reviewed the landscape plan. He said that indigenous plant species will be used throughout the development. He indicated sight distance at the entry will be maintained with low stone walls and low plantings at the entry. He indicated the basins will have vegetation that can accommodate wet conditions and rain gardens will have plants that can tolerate both wet and dry conditions. He said the street trees are native red maples that tolerate a variety of conditions. Mr. Papich indicated that most of the plantings will provide wildlife value. He said there will be a buffer by the stormwater basin 2 in addition to existing trees to remain. He indicated that the plants will need to be watered a fair amount in the first growing season and that the developer will maintain the plants for a couple of years as the road would not be ready for acceptance until after all of the homes are built and the final coat of bituminous is added. He indicated that most contractors will provide two year warranties for plant materials.

The Board was concerned about the sequence of activities and damage to plant materials. Ms. Keller indicated that the homeowner's contractors will be responsible for damage to subdivision plantings if they go beyond the limit of work. She said the erosion control plan shows the sequence of construction and the road and infrastructure are done first. She indicated a silt sock is shown at the limit of work as it conforms to the land contours and installs easily. She indicated that there are diversion dikes added to direct water to temporary sumps during construction. She said there are two temporary sumps in the pocket wetland that will be used during construction. Ms. Keller indicated that water can flow into the stormwater basin once the road is fully stabilized so timing and weather is very critical during construction. Mr. Vogel confirmed that the rain gardens contain engineered soil and they will be constructed and maintained to avoid sedimentation while the lots are being developed.

Mr. Watsky indicated that the applicant intends to build the road and its mitigation features first and the house lots will be built as quickly as they can be absorbed into the market place. He said the lots will not be clear cut at the beginning of the project. Each lot will be designed for a particular buyer. Joe Iantosca confirmed that the infrastructure, drainage, road to binder and plantings except street trees would be the initial phase. He said he would like the binder to overwinter a year and that final planting and finish seeding would occur after the top coat of bituminous is added.

Dave Johnson of Beals and Thomas indicated that the revised plans adequately address the comments he provided and that he believes his review is complete. Ms. Harbottle said that the Conservation Commission is hiring an expert to review the habitat/rare species protection issues. She indicated the consultant will be looking at the buffer to the vernal pool and if development can occur in the 125 to 250 foot buffer to the pool. She indicated it would be difficult to approve a final plan or the conventional density plan until the Conservation issues are resolved. Pat Gallivan, Scituate Conservation Agent, indicated that the expert's report will be discussed at the Conservation Commission meeting on October 28 along with some additional concerns on erosion control and stormwater. He said the report may be done for the Planning Board meeting on October 24.

Ms. Harbottle asked about the water balance on site with regards to the vernal pool. Mr. Johnson indicated that he asked the design engineer for the water balance impacts to the vernal pool. He said that a balance is needed so that the vernal pool doesn't receive too much or too little water. He said that the amount of interrupted overland flow to the vernal pools is minimal and they are not discharging stormwater to the vernal pool. He said there is a balance between the existing and proposed conditions.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the applicant has been responsive to the Board's comments in adding additional rain gardens for the drainage. She said DPW approved the drainage under Clapp Road with the addition of a catch basin with a four foot sump and a hydraulic analysis of the pipes to be provided. She said the water department asked for more gate valves which have been shown and a landscape plan has been received. She indicated she was concerned that only one variety of street trees was being used. Additional trees for the Scenic Road hearing will be discussed on October 24. Ms. Keller indicated that the work in Clapp Road will be integrated into the project sequence in response to Mr. Pritchard's concern.

Mr. Taylor thanked the applicant for being responsive and asked which existing trees were to be saved on the lots. Mr. Watsky said the stormwater calculations assume that all vegetation is cleared to the tree line shown, but additional trees will remain. He said that individual homeowners will have some additional trees saved after they choose a house design. Mr. Taylor said he liked the sycamore in the rain garden, but is concerned about Fire Department access and the root system of the tree. Mr. Papich said the tree can be limbed up to about 6 to 8 feet in height for access and visibility and a variety of vegetation is good for a rain garden. Mr. Taylor asked if the path around the basin would be gravel. Ms. Keller indicated it could be grass. Mr. Vogel inquired if there is still freeboard in the 100 year storm in the big basin. Ms. Keller said there was and only the outlet control structure was revised.

Mr. Watsky and Ms. Keller discussed the open space land and the trail location. They indicated that the path around the detention basin will connect to a path in the open space that will connect to other trails in town. He said they have had several meetings with the Maxwell Trust and have come up with a trail to be provided. The path will be subject to field adjustment as it will be 3 feet wide and will blend into the existing topography. Only brush, briars and fallen trees will be removed in locating the path. It will be consistent with the smaller trails and part of the Litchfield trail. The trail will be built during the road construction phase. The trail around the detention basin will be private and maintained by the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Pritchard indicated that the public trail in the open space is the real project benefit.

Mr. Watsky told the Board the applicant has gone as far as it could with the Natural Heritage permitting without the open space ownership issue being determined. He asked the Board how it

prefers the ownership of the open space be held. He said it could be held by the Homeowner's Association with a conservation restriction or conveyed to the Conservation Commission or held by the privately owned Maxwell Trust. Ms. Harbottle indicated most open space is donated to the Town or a trust or that a deed restriction is placed on the property by the state which is hard to receive if the land is privately held. Mr. Watsky said he thought that the Secretary of Environmental Affairs would sign a restriction for this property without a problem due to its proximity to other open space and Heritage Program permitting. Ms. Harbottle indicated a letter from the Secretary is needed per the bylaw. Mr. Taylor questioned if the Maxwell Trust would like the land.

Penny Scott-Pipes from the Conservation Commission said that the Conservation Commission controls most of the Town property in the area and the Maxwell Trust only controls a piece on the other side of Bates Lane. She indicated conservation restrictions go on all Conservation Commission land purchased with CPC money. She said and that most of the trails in that area are maintained by town volunteers. She said the Conway School did a study of the trails out in the west end, but the Commission has not decided where the future trails will go. She said there will be parking on Bates Lane and parking will be important. Ms. Scott-Pipes prefers the Conservation Commission to control this new open space piece. Shan Morrisey said she is a director with the Maxwell Trust and their role is to bring projects with open space to the CPC and help the Conservation Commission obtain control over them with a conservation restriction. Chairman Limbacher indicated the project had gone beyond its allotted time and a continuance would be needed.

Mr. Taylor moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearings for the Definitive Subdivision Plan, Flexible Open Space Special Permit and Scenic Road/Public Shade Tree Hearing for Benjamin Studley Farm at 214 Clapp Road until October 24, 2013 at 8:45 pm. Mr. Mercer seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

**Continued Public Hearing and Scenic Road Public Hearing – 305 Country Way
Flexible Open Space Special Permit & Definitive Subdivision Plan & Scenic Road
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 37-2-2 & 37-8-13R
Applicants/Owners: Douglas Sheerin/Kristen DeGaravilla**

Documents

- 8-22-13 emails from Morse Engineering to DEP
- 9/19/13 email from Lisa Bertola
- Email from Horsley Witten to Laura Harbottle dated 10/1/13
- Email from Horsley Witten to Laura Harbottle dated 10/3/13
- Email from Mike Hayes to Laura Harbottle dated 10/3/13
- Email from Greg Morse to Laura Harbottle dated 10/3/13
- Comment from Van Lenten dated 10/3/13
- Petition/Comment delivered by W. Krusell received 10/8/13
- ECR – Brad Holmes Resume
- Landscape Plan Sheet 6 of 11 dated 9/25/13

Chairman Limbacher asked Greg Morse for an update since the last meeting when the Board asked for the missing segment of the stream bank to be located and soil testing of the 25% slope area to determine if it was natural or disturbed. Mr. Morse indicated that a Landscape Plan and revised existing conditions plan with respect to the tributary were submitted. Mr. Morse said the applicant

did not feel the proposal that the Board sought on locating the tributary was reasonable at a cost of initially \$6,500. He said the applicant hired Brad Holmes, a professional wetland scientist who delineated the wetlands on site and Peter Dillon, a hydrogeologist and Water Commissioner in Norwell. Mr. Morse indicated that Steve Ivas was hired by the Conservation Commission to review resource areas on the site. He is a wetland scientist and walked the site with DEP during the wetlands review process.

Mr. Morse said that when the site was reviewed by the Conservation Commission, the one segment in question was reviewed as an intermittent stream and no bank was observed. Peter Dillon has now reviewed the site and delineated the top of bank in the area in question area so now there is a bank connecting the upper area to the lower area for one tributary with a 150 foot buffer was measured from its bank. Mr. Morse said that this was the area where the Board was looking for the independent consultant to examine. He said the applicant has had it reviewed and feels additional review is not necessary. He said they have received comments on the Landscape Plan and Mr. Chessia's additional site comments and would like to bring the tributary issue and other issues to a close. Mr. Taylor asked if anything changed with the new information with respect to the buffer. Mr. Morse said it did not as the buffer was initially shown conservatively and thus the limit of work was not affected.

Chairman Limbacher asked for the experts to help the Board determine why this channel and its banks have been so difficult to determine. Mr. Dillon said it was not. He indicated that the channel was a scour channel. He said it joins the other segments and meets the definition of a tributary found at 310 CMR 22. He indicated he saw the same thing as Bruce Bouck of DEP based on the definition in the regulations. He said he flagged the top edge and then the flags were surveyed in response to Board members questions. Mr. Dillon also indicated that it did not matter if there was a storm event. He said the area where the stream is located is a natural area. He said the area stays dry most of the time unless it is raining or shortly thereafter. He said when Country Way was built, a trench was dug and it flowed to the segment area in question which developed afterwards then it flowed to the former stream. He said if the stream was altered it was done in the past a long time ago.

Mr. Vogel asked if they need to go back to Conservation for approval of this new tributary segment. Mr. Morse indicated that the areas delineated down gradient are jurisdictional under the Wetlands Protection Act. He said those areas are different from the regulations applicable to this tributary. Mr. Ivas, consultant for the Conservation Commission on this project, indicated that this tributary is intermittent and under the Planning Board jurisdiction. Mr. Ivas said jurisdiction under the Wetland Protection Act comes where groundwater breaks out at the surface from the tributary. He believes there should be a stilling basin to disconnect the intermittent tributary from the remainder of the tributary as there is a difference in water quality due to pollutants from the road. Mr. Vogel asked whose jurisdiction the Water Resource Protection District was. Ms. Harbottle indicated it was the Planning Board and zoning, not the Conservation Commission. Mr. Ivas indicated he was at the site with Mr. Bouck of DEP and he was speaking on behalf of the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Van Lenten showed his picture of the tributary area in question and indicated the flags are in the flowing stream. Mr. Pritchard indicated there was no way to tell from the picture where the flags were located. Mr. Van Lenten said that neither Mr. Ivas nor Mr. Dillon had confirmed the edge of the bank and that is why a hydrogeologist is needed. Mr. Vogel questioned that if the edge of the bank was not confirmed then it is not a tributary to a public water supply and questioned if the tributary begins where the groundwater breaks out. Mr. Dillon indicated no and re-explained. He indicated that the Conservation Commission regulates wetlands and streams. He said that water

supply regulations have a different tributary definition. He said there is a man-made intermittent channel so the whole area is part of the water supply. Mr. Ivas indicated the Conservation Commission approved the plan and bordering vegetated wetlands which contain hydric soils, hydrology and wetland plants. He said the wetlands are close to the intermittent stream. Mr. Vogel questioned why a sump at the end of the intermittent tributary was needed. Mr. Ivas said it would improve water quality before the groundwater breaks out. Mr. Vogel questioned the location as it is in the 150' buffer. Mr. Dillon said that the DEP in Boston would need to approve that work and they may possibly allow it as it would result in an improvement to water quality. Mr. Morse re-affirmed that all of the flags were hung on the project side of the bank.

Mr. Van Lenten commented that he has been involved in the watershed study and believes the water quality at the road should be addressed as it keeps flowing to the reservoir. He said the water on the site is surface water and seasonal high groundwater. He said a tributary can't be cut up and that is why a hydrogeologist is needed. He said the applicant's consultants are trying to get away from the flow through the area. Mr. Van Lenten believes there is a tributary and the flow should be addressed at the road and not interrupt the tributary. He said he still believes the line is incorrect. Mr. Ivas said that a deep sump catch basin could be put at the road to make the water cleaner. He said he was not suggesting water flow be taken off the site, but just be made cleaner through the sump. Mr. Dillon indicated that he reviewed the test pits and understands the geology of the Town. He said the upper portions of the tributary probably do not receive groundwater where the lower portions do. He said there were some underground springs in the lower portion.

Mr. Holmes agreed that there were underground springs below and said that the upper reaches of the tributary take road runoff. He said there is no groundwater to get in the stream. He indicated that the stream was delineated by the definition of the first observable break in slope. He said the upper reach is the limit of scouring and it is not a stream according to wetland regulations as it is upgradient of a wetland. Mr. Ivas said that there upstream area may be a channel, but it is not a bank under the wetlands regulations and thus there are 2 sets of regulations. Mr. Taylor confirmed that the upper area was signed off by the Conservation Commission as a ditch. Mr. Morse indicated that the wetland line was subject to an appeal, but the neighbors withdrew the appeal one day before a scheduled site walk, thus the line was affirmed. Mr. Ivas said the stream inside the wetland is an intermittent stream and outside the wetlands it is a ditch.

Samantha Woods from the NSRWA asked how you determine in a tributary what part is ditch. Mr. Dillon indicated that scour will indicate the edge in a channel. He said in a superstorm, water will be outside the channel. He said geomorphic features indicate flow such as larger grain size. He said there is no size or frequency of storm requirement. He said the definition talks about channel, man-made or intermittent. Ms. Woods summarized that if there is no clear delineation in the field, then wetland indicators are looked at. Mr. Van Lenten said that is why an independent consultant is needed. He said no evidence has been presented to say the tributary is not defined by DEP. Mr. Ivas said it is not a stream under the Wetland's Protection Act. Mr. Van Lenten said that Mr. Ivas said it was not a tributary in his report, but his opinion is not valid as it is a tributary under zoning. Mr. Vogel said he was not as interested in what it is called, but where it is located and he has heard that where it is located is agreed upon.

Chairman Limbacher asked the Board for their thoughts. Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Van Lenten which area he had a problem with. Mr. Van Lenten said he agrees with Mr. Clarkeson that the whole area is a tributary and it is not established as by an independent consultant. Mr. Morse indicated the area has been reviewed and it is approved for 3 years under the Conservation Commission. Mr. Holmes

said that the DEP walked the site during the NRAD process and agreed with the flags in the field. He said that the abutter appeal was dropped and the wetlands and waterways people agreed. Mr. Sheerin indicated that the lower area is locked in. He said the area in question should be the only area that Mr. Van Lenten could discuss. Ms. Woods summarized the issue saying that the area in question is a tributary under zoning and the wetlands are locked in under DEP. She said the tributary definition under zoning is different than wetlands and that is what Mr. Dillon delineated and that is the issue for the Board to decide. She indicated Mr. Dillon reviewed the entire tributary. She said she understood the site is difficult as it is an altered system and Bruce Bouck could be an independent opinion.

Mr. Dillon said he copied Mr. Bouck and will copy Ms. Harbottle on his email, but Mr. Bouck was in agreement. Ms. Woods said that she was glad to see that she was glad to see the Town seriously protecting its drinking water and wants to make sure that the same amount of water gets to the reservoir.

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the Board needs to decide if they want an independent consultant. The consultant was to evaluate the ditch and determine its limits. She indicated the Board can ask for this under the subdivision regulations and determine if the information is complete for their needs. Mr. Mercer asked if the 150' buffer is invaded, is there some type of harm that an insurance policy would cover versus a study. Mr. Morse indicated the grading goes up to the 150' buffer. Mr. Pritchard said he was in favor of protection. Mr. Bjorklund said the applicant is using best management practices and correcting the issue of dirty water off the Town's streets could be done with the applicant's help.

Mr. Pritchard indicated that it was up to the Board to figure out where the tributary is located. Mr. Dillon said he walked the entire tributary. He said there was no doubt that there was a top of bank and is a tributary as whether it is a man-made or natural channel, intermittent or free flowing, it enters a Class A water. Mr. Ivas said that is clearly how it was flagged and the top of the bank located. Mr. Holmes said the top of inland bank and bordering vegetated wetlands were flagged in two different colors. Mr. Dillon said the flags are on the east side of the scour line. Mr. Morse indicated overland flow is not a tributary. Mr. Van Lenten said the bylaw says the edge of the tributary and not the edge of scour. Mr. Morse distributed Mr. Dillon's resume as a published hydrogeologist and the appropriate professional to determine the tributary location. Mr. Dillon said the scour was 2 feet wide. Chairman Limbacher said that if the tributary line was off, it would only be by 2 feet at most.

Mr. Pritchard said that it seems the line was flagged conservatively and it doesn't make sense to him to spend more time on the issue if it could be only a foot or two off and DEP could confirm that. Chairman Limbacher indicated that is where he was headed. He agreed that he likes the peer review process, but experts are here tonight. Mr. Pritchard indicated that the line was set by the Conservation Commission as top of bank which is conservative and meets the definition of a tributary. He said this has been determined by another Board. Mr. Vogel concurred with Mr. Pritchard and Limbacher. He didn't see the purpose in obtaining another consultant when the difference could be 1 or 2 feet and not discernible in the future. Mr. Mercer said he has confidence in another Town agency. Mr. Taylor said he agreed with the hydrologist here and would like the finding confirmed by the DEP email. It was agreed that something could be put in the decision findings of fact.

Mr. Morse moved on to the slope issue. He said as a soil evaluator, he believes the area of 25% slope is man-made and not natural. He said Mr. Dillon concurs. Mr. Morse said the area is small at the edge of the lawn where it slopes down and is no larger than 200 sq. ft. He said it is just inside the tree line where the terraced lawn comes down with contours in excess of 3:1. He said there are rocks and cobbles in there so it is not natural. He said the rest of the site has topsoil. Mr. Dillon concurred he saw the same thing as Mr. Morse. He said a glacier depositing till wouldn't lead to the type of slope. The site has a flattened terrace with surficial geology suggesting it is man-made. Mr. Van Lenten said the area seems like it is further into the woods and not at the edge of the lawn. He said there is no overwhelming evidence to say it is not natural. Mr. Pritchard said Ms. Harbottle went to the site and the area was adjacent to the lawn. Ms. Harbottle concurred. Chairman Limbacher asked if the Board had an issue with the 25% slope. Mr. Vogel said he did not. Mr. Pritchard said the evidence says it was created by lawn terracing and he did not.

Chairman Limbacher indicated they were beyond the time allotment. Mr. Taylor moved to accept the applicant's request to continue the public hearings for the Definitive Subdivision Plan, Flexible Open Space Special Permit and Scenic Road/Public Shade Tree Hearing for White Ash Farm Lane at 305 Country Way until November 14, 2013 at 7:30 pm. Mr. Vogel seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Form A – 7-9 Surfside Road

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot 15/1/6-0-R and 6-A-R

Applicant: Matthew Murmes and Arnold Friedfertig

Documents

- Form A Application and Plan of Land 7 & 9 Surfside Road prepared by Neil Murphy Associates
- ZBA Decision dated 9/4/12 for 7-9 Surfside Road
- Authorization from co-owner to pursue ANR

Jeff DeLisi was present for the applicant. He indicated they would like to divide the property into two lots as each lot has access and frontage with the 50 foot Frontage Special Permit approved by the ZBA. Ms. Harbottle indicated there was a 50 foot Frontage Special Permit received and it was verified that the house on Lot 1 – 7 Surfside was not a duplex. Ms. Harbottle indicated an access easement was added to the plan.

Mr. Taylor moved to endorse, as approval under the Subdivision Control Law not required a plan of land 7 & 9 Surfside Road, Scituate, MA prepared by Neil J. Murphy for applicant Matthew Murmes and Arnold Friedfertig dated 8-21-12 as the division of land is not a subdivision because every lot shown on the plan has access and frontage as required by the zoning bylaw on Surfside Road with the Special Permit approved by the Scituate Zoning Board of Appeals on September 4, 2012. Motion was seconded by Mr. Vogel. Motion was unanimously approved.

Vote to hold public hearing on proposed zoning article for Fall Special Town meeting to expand Village Business Overlay District

Ms. Harbottle indicated that the owner of South Shore Auto Parts is the proponent of the change. She indicated there are several properties in the proposed change including the Dunkin Donuts, the Bob Drew property, Herring Brook Mall, the Rousseau property and the Harbor Medical Building. Ms. Harbottle indicated that the project proponent made a presentation to the Economic

Development Commission on 10/9 and they had a nice rendering of a mixed use proposal similar to the condominiums at the Mill Wharf. She indicated this type of development makes sense at this intersection to try to attract business to town. She indicated the EDC market study won't be done before Town Meeting, but the applicant wants to proceed with the petition. Ms. Harbottle indicated the zoning change does not include the MBTA parking lot nor the medical building in the residential zone on the north side of Driftway. The Board asked about expanding the district to include these and other parcels that already have special permits. Ms. Harbottle indicated that it is a citizen petition and can't be changed now; however it could be done in the spring.

Mr. Taylor moved to vote to hold a public hearing to expand the Village Business Overlay District. Chairman Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Accounting

Documents

- PO # 1402246 (\$205.02), PR # 1402600(\$917.38), PR # 1402601(\$190.00)

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the requisition of \$205.02 to Gatehouse Media MA for the legal ad for 214 Clapp Road, for \$917.38 to Beals and Thomas for construction observation for Deer Common for September 2013 and for \$190.00 to Laura Harbottle to attend the Southern NE APA Conference. Mr. Vogel seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Minutes – There were no meeting minutes to approve.

Liaison Reports

Mr. Taylor indicated he went to the MAPC South Shore Coalition meeting. He said the 3A Corridor Study and the EDC market study were discussed. He indicated Hull has recently approved an overlay district to provide greater building density. He said the 3A study is on the fence about the rotary in Hingham. It has been suggested a signal may be needed or it may need to be striped as 2 lanes. The Board was in favor of striping.

Old Business and New Business

Documents

- Revised zoning timeframe memo dated 9/23/13
- Map proposed VBOD zoning change

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Vogel moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:28 p.m. Mr. Mercer seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph
Planning Board Secretary

Richard Taylor, Clerk

1/9/14

Date Approved