

SCITUATE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES September 22, 2016

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

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, Scituate.

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

Documents

- 9/22/16 Planning Board Agenda

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA: Mr. Limbacher moved to accept the agenda. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous in favor.

**Mixed Use Special Permit, 50 Country Way – Review Approve Alternative Design for Replacement of Wetherbee House
Assessor's Map/Block/Lot
Applicant/Owner: James Sandell, Greenbush Station, LLC – Peter Genta**

Documents

- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/15/16 with 9/14/16 Building A progress drawing set, email from Wendy Fronteiro to Carr Lynch Sandell dated 9/14/16, letter from Carr Lynch Sandell dated 9/14/16 on house materials and email from Jim Sandell to Wendy Fronteiro dated 9/15/16
- Emails from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/20/16 with Wendy Fronteiro's Wetherbee House Replacement Analysis and resume
- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/20/16 with Historical Commission's comments

Jim Sandell and Peter Genta were present for the applicant. Wendy Fronteiro was present as the Planning Board's architectural and preservation consultant. Ms. Fronteiro said she was asked by Ms. Harbottle to review the proposed Wetherbee House replacement building based on the Planning Board decision of 5/21/15. She indicated the design is similar to the Wetherbee House and said she reviewed the structure based on the appropriateness of the façade relative to "size, design character and historic period of the building it was intended to replace." She said she had three areas of concern including massing, architectural form and articulation and lack of historic materials.

Ms. Fronteiro said that existing building is a traditional one with a house and attached barn reading as separate structures. She said the proposed replacement building is located much closer to the street and does not retain the existing berm on which the present house exists. She indicated that in historic New England architecture, attached structures are typically subsidiary to the main house in terms of size, scale and /or articulation. She said the proposed replacement building has longer and

wider middle and rear sections with a very long porch. She said the extension is not subsidiary to the main structure which is part of the historic character of the existing historic complex. As relates to form and articulation, Ms. Fronteiro said the roof replacement is steeper and higher with a higher foundation. She said Greek revival structures typically had low pitch sloped roofs. She said the dormers are larger scale than a 19th century home and the porch roof is shown as pitched where the original is flat. She indicated that the windows on the original structure are much taller on the first floor and this is not so in the replacement structure. She indicated the trim is similar to the existing, but there is not enough information available to make a complete analysis. Ms. Fronteiro said that the replacement structure has no natural materials proposed where the existing structure is mostly made of natural materials. She indicated that in historic preservation, all details matter and that based on the incongruous features, the replacement is inappropriate to the character of the historic building.

Mr. Taylor pointed out that the Board previously approved the massing so that issue should be moot for either the existing or replacement structure. Ms. Fronteiro said that if just the massing of the existing main building is viewed, the height is different due to the roof and the planes are different too. Chairman Pritchard asked what changes can be made to be closer to a historic recreation without the mass being considered. Ms. Fronteiro said it is tough for the architects. She said a lower roof would make the building more Greek revival in style as would be a flat top porch with just a porch in front of the building which would help the front part read on its own. She said the dormers would need to be smaller and the windows on the first floor would need to be two feet taller. She said it is all the degree of differences that add up. Mr. Taylor suggested that the trim may be able to be saved and reused. Ms. Fronteiro said that would be great as they are distinctive on the existing house. She suggested that the clapboards should be the same (at least the spacing) and the sill height. She said historic buildings are smaller in scale than building built today. She indicated there is a big difference in the sill height than what is proposed. She likened it to “an old building on steroids”. Mr. Taylor questioned the column spacing. Ms. Fronteiro suggested that research is needed into the original column spacing as it is unusual that the front door would not be centered. She indicated the Wetherbee House is a distinguished Greek revival building and the fact that it sits on a berm suggests something about the status of the owner. Ms. Harbottle said that she echoed Ms. Fronteiro’s sentiments and suggested that although perfection would not be achieved; including some of the historic features recommended by Ms. Fronteiro might come close to what the Board is looking for.

Mr. Sandell said that when Mr. Genta became owner, the decision was to restore or replicate depending on the condition of the house. He said the notion of going backwards from what was approved was something they did not imagine. He said they brought back a plan with a round of suggestions that the Board approved. He indicated that modular construction is proposed for the speed of construction as the costs are the same as traditional construction. Mr. Sandell said the elevations reflect that the windows are the same size including the first floor. He said the existing windows are Harvey windows that slide in and that slightly diminishes the size as currently viewed. He said most of Building A will be modular construction. He said they will do the Wetherbee House by “stick” construction. He said that the Wetherbee House does not meet code for live loads of 100 lbs. /sf and the roof framing does not satisfy code for wind and snow loads. Chairman Pritchard asked if they could get closer on the replication. Mr. Sandell indicated if they wanted to redesign all Building A they could do something different. He said they have exactly replicated the Wetherbee House. Chairman Pritchard questioned the roof pitch as he heard it was not the same. Mr. Sandell said it was the same. Ms. Fronteiro said the base roof pitch looks steeper and if she had measured drawings she could be certain.

Mr. Sandell said they started with the Paul Ford drawings and then verified. He said they have not done all the measurements, but the drawings show the intent is to replicate the Wetherbee House. He said that some of the materials on the building are not historically accurate such as the columns as Chris Ford replaced them with artificial materials. He said they did not have the advantage of reading Ms. Fronteiro's report. He said he was not sure where the flat roof on the porch came from, but they are replicating the hip roof. He indicated the wrap around porch was part of the design the Board approved and is partially there now. Mr. Sandell said that they could just do the wrap around at the Wetherbee House, but thought it was an amenity of the development to continue it along the whole side. Chairman Pritchard asked if the first floor windows would be taller and if the pilasters can be reused. Mr. Sandell said the first floor windows would be identical with the sill casing and the pilasters can be replicated exactly as they are not worth trying to save as some have been altered by rain gutters. Ms. Fronteiro said that if it is to be an exact replica, then exact dimensions are needed as what she measured was different. Mr. Sandell indicated they will be using Hardy siding, but keeping the same overlap of the existing structure. He said the only difference will be is that there will not be the need to paint in the future. Chairman Pritchard asked about the dormers. Mr. Sandell said the dormers make the room habitable and they were on the approved plan so they were kept. He referred to sets of plans dated 9/14/16 and 9/22/16. He said he thinks the size of the dormers could change.

Chairman Pritchard said it seems fair to let the applicant read the report and then come back with suggested changes. He suggested looking at old photos would help to determine if the column spacing had changed. Mr. Sandell said his column spacing represents what is there now. Ms. Burbine asked if the dormer roof is the same as it has always been. Mr. Sandell said everything is the same. Ms. Burbine opined that the applicant is doing the best he can and it is not always practical and possible to preserve everything. She said the plans show what was approved. Chairman Pritchard indicated that moving the building is what was approved and a historic replication was the alternative if the building could not be moved. Mr. Taylor said that is why he asked about the massing as the Board already approved that. He said the Board should be looking at the replicated elevation and structure of the Wetherbee House. Chairman Pritchard agreed that the massing is different and the Board is not there to address that. He said the question is does the Board have an accurate replication. Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Sandell that based on Ms. Fronteiro's input, can the dormers be sized down on the front to keep in the Greek revival style. Mr. Sandell said yes. Mr. Genta indicated the dormers were already approved and if they shrink there will be a compromised unit. Chairman Pritchard said that the building is not being moved so there are going to be trade-offs to come closer to what Ms. Fronteiro says is a historically accurate replication without being perfect. Mr. Sandell said they like the Wetherbee House and are not trying to change it.

Ms. Fronteiro said that the 8/24/16 drawings are different than those shown now. She said the dormers are shorter and the roof pitch is shallower. She said with the historic character, the windows would have been wood. She said the muntins are different causing the divided light to be different. Mr. Sandell said they have simulated the divided light with muntins that are industry standard. Mr. Limbacher said that it was somewhat unfair of the Board to approve something that they didn't necessarily want when the house was being moved. However, he said that he expects what is replaced to be closer to the original house. He indicated that small things like trim can be modified to make it representative of what it was. Ms. Fronteiro said that the porch is the only part of the house likely to have changed. She said the door is original and the window sash is the same. Mr. Taylor said it looks like they have replicated details and they may not all be original. He said

the column spacing bothers him and he likes the wrap around porch as it is suitable for a retail use. Chairman Pritchard said the house will be closer to the street so the perspective for the columns will be different. Mr. Taylor said there needs to be compromises that get as close to a replica as possible because there will be retail use and not residential use. The Chairman asked the applicant to read Ms. Fronteiro's report and consult with her on the replication. Mr. Genta asked if the project needs to be on hold. Mr. Sandell said the foundations won't change. Ms. Harbottle said it would be up to the Building Department on whether the project can start. Mr. Genta said that perhaps if they can keep the dormers maybe they would use cedar siding. Chairman Pritchard said he hasn't heard anything that would impact the construction process. He asked that Ms. Fronteiro be provided the latest drawings and that the Board receive a report before the next meeting. Ms. Harbottle said she would coordinate with Ms. Fronteiro to get a price for the additional work and then communicate that to Mr. Sandell. Discussion on the Wetherbee House was continued until October 13.

Greenbush Visioning – Ted Brovitz – EDC Consultant

Documents

- Greenbush-Driftway Future Vision Plan – preliminary draft dated 8/16 for Scituate EDC

Ted Brovitz was present to share EDC vision plans for the Greenbush –Driftway area. He said there was a streetscape study was done in 2004 before the arrival of the train and the EDC did a market analysis in 2014 which provided some information for a conceptual economic and community development plan. Mr. Brovitz described Greenbush as a traditional neighborhood with historic assets as well as a small amount of commercial, business and light industry that is framed by the scenic North River and its recreation opportunities. He said the area is approximately 800 acres with 200 property owners of which the Town properties contain the highest assessed value. He said the businesses which include food and drink, medical, repair, fitness and light industry draw consumers from the surrounding area. Mr. Brovitz indicated that the streets are generally narrow with Driftway having a 40 foot right of way. He indicated gas and mass transit are available. He said there are issues with water and sewer and both need to be upgraded prior to new development in the area. Chairman Pritchard said that based on his recent meetings with DPW, there appears to be no additional sewer capacity for Greenbush without reducing inflow and infiltration.

Mr. Brovitz said that since the Village Business Overlay District (VBOD) was created in 2004, the 2014 EDC plan defined subareas for development and encouraged creation of a 40R district. He indicated that based on the survey, a preferred image for the area is that it be mixed use with options for outdoor dining. He said there is need for small retail shops, restaurants, a hotel and professional office space. He indicated the base zoning is Business and Planned Development, but the VBOD will be the tool for revitalization. He indicated that there are seven sub-districts in the area. Some suggestions include making a better gateway at the roundabout, infilling with new residential and mixed use buildings that share parking and enhancing Widow's Walk.

Mr. Brovitz described several strategic actions including creating a base zoning district that creates a pedestrian scale with form based building placement and orientation of parking behind buildings and not in the front. He said there will need to be specific areas where retail and commercial are located. He indicated that active open space must be a component of the village center and recommends drafting new standards. He said that he would provide his presentation to the Board and the next step would be to test the ideas with the community.

Continued Discussion – Site Plan Waiver – Scituate Dog Park – 167 Driftway

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot

Applicant/Owner: Town of Scituate/Friends of Scituate Dog Park

Documents

- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/19/16 with revised dog park plan dated 9/16/16, summary/questions from 8/25/16 meeting, 9/7/16 Board of Health memorandum, 9/6/16 DPW memo

Adrienne Rowles and Andrew Boyle were present for the applicant, Friends of Scituate Dog Park along with engineer Greg Morse. They indicated that they made revisions with the paths, added fencing and waste receptacles, signage at the Driftway path, a rain garden for stormwater and an ADA compliant gravel parking area. Mr. Boyle indicated that each park has two access points and a maintenance gate. Mr. Taylor inquired as to how the parking was going to be delineated. Mr. Morse said they would have striped parking with demarcation at the perimeter. Chairman Pritchard asked if there is visual access at the entrance/exit. Mr. Morse said it was relatively straight. Ms. Harbottle offered that DPW had concerns on the sight distance and the dip going into the site.

Ms. Harbottle said that the Town's overall approach to CPC projects has recently been clarified so that no engineered plans are needed at this stage in the development cycle. She indicated that there may be requirements that need to be addressed further down the line. She said costs for engineering and how it is being approached is an open question at this point. Chairman Pritchard asked if the Town wants to know that someone has looked at the project. Ms. Harbottle indicated yes.

Ms. Burbine read the DPW memo and said that no curb cut has been issued yet as there are no detailed plans. Ms. Rowles said that they applied for a site plan waiver and hope to obtain the approval tonight so that they can proceed on to the funding agency and obtain funding. Mr. Boyle said they have done their due diligence. They have some in depth planning and have looked at contingencies. Ms. Rowles said that there is a sign off from the Board of Health. Chairman Pritchard said the Board can vote to endorse the concept and still make a list of the items to be addressed. He said the applicant needs to understand that they will come back later with more details. Mr. Limbacher said a conceptual approval. Ms. Burbine asked how the park will be maintained. Ms. Rowles said they are a 501C3 corporation and will have fundraising events. Ms. Burbine said that it needs to be self-funded so that the users have a vested interest. Ms. Rowles said that the people who are not abiding by the rules will be asked to leave and she wants the park to be affordable for the users. Mr. Boyle said that it should be around \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year for maintenance and they will ask DPW to plow. Ms. Rowles said they will manage from the fence inside the park. Mr. Boyle added that there will be a carry in/carry out policy and it won't be a place just for dogs. He said value will be added to the community. He said this will hopefully draw dogs off the beach and other places they shouldn't be. Ms. Rowles said that the park will be accessible for all ages and a sense of community will hopefully be felt.

Ms. Burbine read the following: The proponents of the Dog Park are to be commended for devoting time and energy to a project which will benefit many residents of the Town of Scituate. The new design is graceful and much more attractive than the first design. The connection to the McEachern Trails will increase use of the beautiful natural areas surrounding the park. At the same time, this site will require maintenance, is in a location with high multi-modal traffic volume, within a Zone II to a public well with a number of issues that need to be addressed.

The Board asked that the second sentence be changed to read as follows: The new Schematic Site Plan revised dated 9/19/16 is graceful and attractive.

Ms. Burbine moved the Planning Board make the following recommendations regarding the construction of a Dog Park at 167 Driftway:

1. A Site Plan Review must be approved by the Planning Board prior to the start of construction. This should address the issues and concerns identified below.

The Board asked that the word should in the second sentence be replaced with must.

2. Engineered plans should be provided including design of a stormwater system or low impact development techniques based on the volume and rate of stormwater from the parking lot calculated under storm conditions typical of those normally considered by the Board. In order to review stormwater management on the property, existing and proposed grades must be provided.
3. In order to establish safe conditions for traffic on the Driftway and exiting the site, sight distances must be provided. The sharp turn and grade change at the entrance need further review. Sight line documentation in accordance with AASHTO requirements and a curb cut permit must be provided prior to the start of construction.
4. Signage should be installed on the Driftway Trail to alert walkers and bikers to crossing traffic, and to indicate a full stop at the entrance.
5. Due to the location within a Zone II to a public well, the proponents of the dog park must meet with the Water Resources Committee prior to Town Meeting.
6. The entity responsible for maintenance and repair of the dog park and its parking facilities should be identified.
7. The entity responsible for the water bill, turning off the water in times of drought and controlling water use must be identified. Water lines and spigots and lighting and lighting fixtures shall be included on the construction plans identified in condition 1. The need for water and the dog wash station may need more consideration.
8. The dog park, parking, accessible route and required signage must meet all requirements of the ADA and the Scituate Commission on Disabilities.
9. The Applicant shall determine specific hours of operation and establish how the dog park shall be closed at night and who will be responsible for locking the facility. No lighting should be allowed beyond the operating hours.
10. Approval from the Traffic Rules Committee must be provided to the Planning Board prior to submission of the construction documents indicated in condition 1.
11. It is recommended there be no fewer than seven (7) covered waste receptacle and bag dispenser locations for animal waste. Specifications for the waste receptacles should be included on the construction plans identified in condition 1. Waste should be disposed of by a private hauler employed by the Friends of Scituate Dog Park and disposed of once weekly at a minimum.

The Board asked that the Friends of Scituate Dog Park be changed to Applicant.

12. There should be no fewer than three (3) covered trash receptacles provided for use of patrons of the park. Specifications for the trash receptacles should be included on the construction plans. Trash should be disposed of by a private hauler, recommended to be employed by the Friends of Scituate Dog Park and disposed of once weekly at a minimum.

The Board asked that the Friends of Scituate Dog Park be changed to Applicant.

13. The Applicant should provide an Operation and Maintenance Agreement for the dog park, parking area, stormwater system and other private infrastructure to the Planning Board to address maintenance of the stormwater system, walks, parking, driveway, landscaping, dog waste receptacles, trash receptacles and fencing. This should include provisions for snow removal and maintenance of safe conditions through the winter of all vehicle and walkways, and a description of annual maintenance of the driveway, parking area, lawn and landscaping.
14. The sign design should be approved by the Planning Board.
15. Black vinyl coated chain link fence should be used wherever chain link fence is called for on the plans. Double gates shall be as shown on the plan.
16. Existing shade trees should remain wherever possible to provide shade and aesthetics for the dog park.
17. The following rules are suggested:
 - Dog owners are required to remove all waste.
 - Dog owners are required to have voice control over their dog(s).
 - Dog owners are required to always keep their dog(s) in sight.
 - Dog owners are required to be present at all times.
 - No smoking, alcohol, or food is allowed in the dog park.
 - No pet grooming is allowed.
 - A minimum age for dog handlers is required.
 - Full immunizations of dogs are required.
 - Dogs in heat are not allowed.
 - A maximum number of dogs per owner/handler is established.
 - Dogs must be healthy.
 - Dogs must be spayed/neutered.
 - Dogs must display a current license.
 - Dogs showing any signs of aggression must leave the park.
 - Dogs must be on a leash to and from the park access points.

Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion as amended. Motion was unanimously approved.

Informal Discussion – New Roach Field Parking

Documents

- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/19/16 with new Roach Field plan and parking email
- Email to Board from Laura Harbottle dated 9/21/16 with email forwarded from Seth Malamut showing a revised existing parking lot layout

Dan Fennelly of Scituate Little League was present and handed out an updated plan. He said he was before the Board to ask for advice on a project for the community to take cars off the street and put them in a parking lot at Roach Field. He said there has been a problem for at least six years with cars parking on the road and the police and neighbors complaining. He said the Little League has had an abutter's meeting on the project and got some feedback there. Mr. Fennelly said that the Little League has over 600 members and when there are back to back games at the field they can have 48 to 60 players thus cars park along Beaver Dam Road. He said they have a zero dollar operating budget and spend what they raise with fees being equal to what is spent. He indicated over

the past five years they have spent \$160,000 on maintenance and \$500,000 in field improvements all over town. He said the health and safety of the players is a major concern and the league fears there will be a serious accident. He said it is the first time Little League has asked for money for the fields.

Mr. Fennelly said their first idea was to add a gravel parking lot in back of right field, but this would offer no visibility to the police. He said they thought there would be minimal tree cutting and the batting cage would move to the right field grass. He said the abutters had issues with trees being cut. He said the original idea was to move the batting cage and redo the front parking. He indicated the abutters prefer to redo the front parking lot. He said he has been working with Seth Malamut and Greg Morse to redesign the front parking lot. This option, now option 2, will have 40 parking spaces with two handicap accessible ones. He said the parking lot has adequate visibility and would be closed in the winter. Mr. Fennelly said the problem with Option 2 is that the parking lot is too close to the field so there is inadequate room for warm up and the closeness also impacts the Thomas Road abutters. He said there would be an evergreen screen in front of the stream and stone wall. He outlined the costs associated with the project which includes a survey, tree removal, landscaping and a contingency. Mr. Limbacher asked how traffic flows in option 2. Mr. Fennelly suggested it be one way in/out.

Seth Malamut of 195 Beaver Dam Road says he sees overflow all the time and option 2 would be less impactful. He said he regularly sees five to seven cars parked along Beaver Dam. He said he thinks the existing lot can accommodate most of the cars. He said there is a lot of unused space and he realized that more cars could be added to make the existing lot better. He said the plan would shift away from the stream more after measurements are taken. He opined that engineering money would be minimized. Mr. Fennelly said the field needs more parking as there are more than just five to seven cars along Beaver Dam and Clifton Roads blocking driveways and engineering would be needed for either option. He said that at least parking for 40 cars is needed. He said the Greenbush Little League field also has a parking problem and some of the people park in the Water Department area. He said he understands the abutters' desire to minimize tree cutting, but he wants a safe area. He said they would have a traffic study done if needed and is concerned for the Clifton Ave area as there is only one way in/out of the development.

Ms. Harbottle said this project should be treated similar to the dog park and the Board should make recommendations when they are ready. She suggested that more details are needed and perhaps a traffic engineer should review the proposal. Mr. Limbacher said that his grandson plays baseball and all the fields everywhere need more parking. He asked how many parking spaces are there now. Mr. Fennelly said about 15 to 17. Mr. Malamut said that no one has counted the cars and they extend on Clifton Ave. He suggests there could be 25 cars in the existing lot. Mr. Wynne asked what the abutters' objection to right field proposal was. Mr. Malamut said that the additional tree clearing, putting a large parking area to accommodate few cars, another curb cut and it would take away from the picturesque view. He said that thoughtful planning is needed and no one has done a survey to analyze existing conditions. Mr. Fennelly said the goal is to receive funding first and then do a study to determine exactly what is needed and the feasibility of it. He said the budget of \$72,000 includes money for this. He said they are not asking the Little League Board to spend money that they don't have. He said the greater good of the community and the safety of the children are his goals.

Chairman Pritchard said that the Board agrees that additional parking is needed and this involves looking at alternatives and determining amount of parking needed. He said the alternative study

should be in the next iteration. Tom Keefe of 8 Clifton Ave said he understands the need for additional parking, but is concerned about the traffic flow and kids just darting into the parking lot. Pat Devine of 8 Thomas Road concurred with Mr. Keefe. He said from what Mr. Malamut sees there are 5-7 cars parked along Beaver Dam; however, there are 15 along Clifton and cars cannot always get into the neighborhood in the summer. Mr. Malamut said he would be less impacted by option 1, but others will be impacted on Clifton Ave. He would like aesthetics with the well-being of people on Clifton considered. Ms. Devine said she would like the island to remain as it is the gateway to their neighborhood and thinks the parking should be split. Barbara Keefe of 8 Clifton Ave said there is one way in and out of the Clifton Ave road and the parking needs to be addressed. She suggested there may need to be a compromise between the two options. Audrey Mellanson said the field is used for 8 – 10 year old. She said they bolt and don't look. She said there are often younger kids who tag along with the older ones. She said practice space and space for the younger kids to play is important and applauds the efforts to have more parking.

Ms. Burbine suggested they may need to use both areas and drive over the grass to park. Mr. Limbacher said the recommendation needs to come in two parts. The first being to clean up the original parking area and then see what other space is needed although he is not thrilled with a new curb cut on Beaver Dam. He said design for more cars than needed and maybe it all does not get built. Chairman Pritchard agreed and said that an engineering analysis needs to be done to evaluate alternatives and this needs to be considered in the CPC request. Mr. Taylor and Mr. Wynne both concurred. Chairman Pritchard suggested that the area could be designed for a larger use and only build some if that meets the need. He said the Board is in favor of additional parking. Mr. Malamut suggested that the existing lot could be optimized and there is a lot of the grass area that is not graded and can be used. Chairman Pritchard asked for a careful evaluation as the way the lot is laid out now could be problematic for 8 to 10 year olds.

Scope of Work to Complete Kimberly Estates

Documents

- Email from Laura Harbottle to the Board dated 9/16/16 on scope of work and estimates for completion of Kimberly Estates
- Email from Laura Harbottle to Board dated 9/21/16 with letter from Kevin Kenney requesting Board proceed without cul-de-sac work

Ms. Burbine moved to amend the Planning Board's motion of 6/23/16 to remove repair of the drainage problem in the cul-de-sac turnaround of Kimberly Drive from the work that is currently being undertaken to complete the Kimberly Estates subdivision. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Kevin Kenny asked that the surety not be given back until all the work is complete. Ms. Harbottle said he would discuss this with the finance director. Chairman Pritchard said it cannot be held in perpetuity. Mr. Kenney said keeping the project as all one unit is keeping the walkway from being completed and maybe the surety can be held until the road goes up for street acceptance.

Form A – 196 Tilden Road

Assessor's Map/Block/Lot

Applicant: Town of Scituate DPW

Owner: Massachusetts Electric Company

Documents

- Application and Approval Not Required Plan 196 Tilden Road, Scituate MA prepared for Town of Scituate DPW by Horsley Witten Group dated 3/9/2016
- Email to the Board from Laura Harbottle dated 9/20/16 with above materials including transmittal to departments and draft purchase and sales agreement

Ms. Burbine moved to endorse as Approval Not Required a Plan of Land at 196 Tilden Road, Scituate, MA prepared by Horsley Witten Group for applicant Town of Scituate DPW dated 3-9-2016 as the division of land is not a subdivision because the remainder of the lot at 196 Tilden Road has access and frontage on Tilden Road, a public way, as required by the zoning bylaw. A portion of the lot is being added to the Tilden Road right of way. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Accounting

Documents

- PO # 1702792(\$33.68), PO # 1702986 (\$1,560.00)

Ms. Burbine moved to approve the requisition of \$33.68 to WB Mason for office supplies and for \$1,560.00 to Merrill Corporation for engineering peer review for 1 Boardman Ave. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Minutes

Ms. Burbine voted to approve the meeting minutes of 8/25/16 and 9/8/16. Mr. Limbacher seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved with Chairman Pritchard abstaining from the vote on the 9/8/16 meeting minutes.

Old Business and New Business

Documents

- Email to Board dated 9/16/16 from Karen Joseph with agenda, meeting minutes and Board of Selectmen Liaison List

These items were distributed to the Board electronically.

Mr. Limbacher moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:08 p.m. Ms. Burbine seconded the motion. Motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Joseph
Planning Board Secretary

Ann Burbine, Clerk
10-13-16
Date Approved