

# Town of Duxbury Massachusetts Planning Board

#### Minutes 01/25/16

The Planning Board met on Monday, January 25, 2016 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, Small Conference Room.

Present:

George Wadsworth, Chairman; Brian Glennon, Vice Chairman; Cynthia Ladd Fiorini, Clerk;

John Bear, Scott Casagrande, and Jennifer Turcotte.

Absent:

David Uitti.

Staff:

Valerie Massard, Planning Director; and Diane Grant, Administrative Assistant.

Mr. Wadsworth called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

#### **OPEN FORUM**

No items were brought forward for Open Forum.

#### AS-BUILT REVIEW: SHANTUM LANE DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION / PONTIFF

Present for the discussion was the applicant, Mr. Eric Pontiff. Planning Board members reviewed As-Built plans submitted to the Planning Office on January 12, 2016. Mr. Wadsworth asked if the issues with property abutters had been resolved, and Mr. Pontiff responded that it had been resolved and it had been a misunderstanding about property lines.

**MOTION**: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to approve an As-Built plan for Shantum Lane Definitive Subdivision dated November 2, 2015.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

#### PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLES

Mr. Wadsworth opened the public hearing at 7:07 PM for three of six zoning articles for Annual Town Meeting 2016. The three articles addressed tonight are sponsored by the Zoning Bylaw Review Committee (ZBRC). Mr. Wadsworth and Mr. Casagrande serve as Planning Board representatives to the ZBRC. Present for the discussion was the ZBRC's consultant, Atty. George Hall from Anderson & Kreiger. Ms. Ladd Fiorini read the public hearing notice.

**MOTION**: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Glennon provided a second, to waive the reading of the correspondence lists for tonight's public hearings on Annual Town Meeting zoning articles.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

878 Tremont Street, Duxbury, MA 02332; Telephone: 781-934-1100 x 5476; www.town.duxbury.ma.us/planning

WN CLERK

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 2 of 9

### PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS REGARDING NONCONFORMING USES AND STRUCTURES (ZBRC)

Atty. George Hall presented the proposed amendments, noting that the intent is to make the existing bylaw easier to administer. He noted that there is a distinction between nonconforming structures and nonconforming uses. On building permit applications for residential structures, case law suggests that if there is no change in the nature of the extent of a nonconforming structure, then a permit can be granted.

Mr. Wadsworth noted that if the Building Inspector considers the proposed work to be more detrimental to the neighborhood, then it opens the door to review under a special permit with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). Atty. Hall stated that the language is intended to be generous to a property owner. However, he noted that case law clarifies that a new nonconformity cannot be created without a special permit. Mr. Wadsworth stated that if the neighbors support a special permit application then the ZBA would grant a special permit. Mr. Glennon stated that the decision should be made based on the merits of the application.

Mr. Casagrande stated that the ZBRC's intent is to clarify this section of the Zoning Bylaws. The proposed language clearly lays out the process for applicants. He noted that there is no difference in what the Building Inspector can or cannot do. The idea is to stop a new nonconformity from being created and line up the bylaw with current case law. Mr. Bear asked if coverage is in a separate section of the Zoning Bylaws, and Mr. Casagrande responded that it is.

Atty. Hall stated that this proposed language would allow an intensity of an existing nonconformity but would not allow a new nonconformity to be created, in order to align with the Diedrich case. He stated that previously the language was unclear. Mr. Bear asked about a situation where, for example, a structure is located within the front setback and the proposal was to place an addition in the rear setback. Atty. Hall stated that it would be considered a new nonconformity and a special permit or variance would be required. Mr. Bear asked about another example, such as an increase in height of a structure in a nonconforming setback, and Atty. Hall stated that it would be up to the discretion of the ZBA through a special permit.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini stated that there appears to be some remaining issues with clarity of the proposed language. Mr. Bear asked if the ZBRC had concluded its discussion of the article language, and Mr. Wadsworth stated that it had closed out the discussion.

Mr. Glennon asked about the proposed section 401.2.3.b.ii, that currently states, "Should the Board of Appeals conclude that the proposed change will not increase the nonconforming nature of the structure, the Board shall issue a special permit." He asked if the language should be changed from "shall" to "may." Atty. Hall stated that he would check into the matter. Mr. Glennon asked how the language in 401.2.3.b differs from 401.2.3.a, and Atty. Hall replied that the intent is to minimize cases being referred under 401.2.3.b.ii, although he agreed that the universe of possibilities would be covered under the proposed language. He stated that the intent is to bring the bylaw into conformity with state law.

Mr. Glennon noted that in proposed section 401.2.3.b.iv the determination of "substantially more detrimental" requires the ZBA to make findings of fact. Atty. Hall stated that the existing bylaw language attempts to provide more guidance and the intent with the proposed bylaw is to reduce the guidelines somewhat to provide less detail.

Mr. Bear noted that the proposed bylaw does not appear to address reducing a nonconformity, and Atty Half-stated that he was not sure what it would mean to encourage outcomes.

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 3 of 9

Approved 02/24/2016

Mr. Casagrande noted that language in the commercial section proposes to eliminate nonconformity due to lot size. Atty. Hall stated that in the non-residential section, there is more of a burden on the applicant and does rely more on statutory standards.

Mr. Wadsworth invited public comment. Mr. Mark Casey of South Shore Survey in Kingston stated that he had attended the most recent ZBRC meeting, and asked why an applicant would be required to obtain a special permit for increasing a nonconforming height as long as the height requirement is met. Mr. Casagrande stated that the ZBRC went back and forth on this and in the end the ZBRC decided it would be better for the ZBA to review any case where the height of a nonconformity is to be increased. He noted that the ZBA generally approves special permits like this. Mr. Bear noted that on small lots near the waterfront, adding a second story on a small lot could result in stealing a neighbor's view of the water. Mr. Casagrande noted that in the Gurnet Road area of town, structures are being raised in order to protect against flooding damage.

Ms. Mary Steinke, another member of the ZBRC, stated that the existing bylaw is more clear but the ZBRC cannot change policy. She noted that the ZBA does consider volume. Mr. Casey stated that it seems silly for slight setback nonconformities to require special permits.

Mr. Wadsworth stated that the Planning Board could vote to continue the public hearing or close it. Mr. Glennon asked if the change he referred to in Section 401.2.3.b.ii from "shall" to "may" would be changed on the floor of Annual Town Meeting, and Atty. Hall offered to review and reconstruct that section.

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Mr. Glennon provided a second, to continue the prolic hearing for a proposed Annual Town Meeting amendment regarding nonconforming structures to February 8, 2016 at 7:20 PM.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

### PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION CLUSTERS (ZBRC)

Mr. Wadsworth opened the public hearing for this proposed article at 7:47 PM. Ms. Massard returned to the Planning Board meeting.

Atty. Hall stated that the intent of this amendment is based on recent case law: Wall Street v. Westwood. He stated that the proposed language allows for an applicant to apply under the inclusionary bylaw as another form of development. It removes making the Residential Conservation Cluster mandatory, and instead puts an optional special permit process into effect. Mr. Wadsworth stated that the Residential Conservation Cluster remains but a developer now has an option.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked where specific language "coordinated site" in proposed Section 530.2 comes from, and Atty. Hall agreed that it may not be the best wording. Mr. Wadsworth stated that he does not see this language in the existing bylaw, and Atty. Hall agreed to take another look at that language.

Mr. Wadsworth invited public comment. Mr. Mark Casey of South Shore Survey in Kingston asked why it needs to be stated in proposed Section 530.2 (Applicability) that "No special permit residential development shall be initiated without first obtaining a special permit in accordance with the provisions of this section." Atty. Hall agreed to look into the wording.

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 4 of 9

Mr. Casey also asked why the minimum is set at five acres, stating that he would prefer that the Planning Board consider recommending under five acres to be allowed on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Wadsworth stated that the ZBRC cannot change policy as part of its charge. Atty, Hall stated that the intent here is to bring the bylaw into conformity with recent case law, noting that there were significant problems with the legal structure of the existing bylaw.

MOTION: Mr. Bear made a motion, and Mr. Glennon provided a second, to continue the public hearing for an Annual Town Meeting zoning article regarding Residential Conservation Clusters to February 8, 2016 at 7:25 PM.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

#### PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS REGARDING PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS (ZBRC)

Mr. Wadsworth opened the public hearing for this proposed article at 8:02 PM. Mr. Casagrande explained that the Zoning Bylaw Review Committee (ZBRC) proposes to move Section 560 (Planned Developments) out of Article 500 (Requirements for Certain Land Divisions, Land Developments, and Inclusionary Housing) and into Article 700 (Design Standards for Planned Developments) under a new Section 718 (Inclusionary Housing Requirements). Atty. Hall stated that the language would basically remain the same besides the numbering. He stated that they are currently making sure that section numbers are cross-referenced appropriately. Atty. Hall stated that the standards work best under Article 700 instead of Article 500.

Mr. Wadsworth invited public comment and there was none.

dsworth invited public comment and there was none.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to close the public comments.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Therefore the public hearing closed at 8:10 PM. Mr. Wadsworth announced that no public comment could be provided since the hearing has closed.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Ladd Fiorini provided a second, to recommend approval of an Annual Town Meeting 2016 zoning article regarding Planned Developments.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

#### CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING BYLAW (DUXBURY AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST)

Mr. Wadsworth opened the continued public hearing for this proposed article at 8:12 PM.

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Glennon provided a second, to waive reading the correspondence list for this continued public hearing.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 5 of 9

Ms. Massard reported that the Duxbury Affordable Housing Trust (DAHT) has changed its recommended minimum lot size from 5,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet. She also stated that the DAHT had removed the requirement for a rectangular-shaped lot, and provides flexibility for the Planning Board to provide dimensional waivers. She stated that the Floor-to-Area ratio has been removed, and the existing diagram has been eliminated.

Mr. Wadsworth, who serves on the DAHT, stated that the purpose of the new bylaw is to make it more user-friendly to those who might want to consider developing a lot for affordable housing. He asked Ms. Massard how many lots would fall under the 10,000 square foot category, and Ms. Massard replied that a preliminary estimate is 3,000 lots at 10,000 square feet; however, there has been no screening of wetlands or other zoning issues.

Mr. Shawn Dahlen of the Board of Selectmen, who also serves on the DAHT, arrived at the meeting. He apologized on behalf of Ms. Diane Bartlett, DAHT chair, who is ill and not able to attend tonight's meeting.

Mr. Bear asked if setbacks had been changed, and Mr. Dahlen stated that the proposed language removes the existing 30-foot setback requirement.

Mr. Glennon noted the effective date of the bylaw is currently March 8, 2008, and Ms. Massard stated that the effective date would remain. Mr. Wadsworth noted that location of the language with the bylaw effective date should be moved, and Ms. Massard offered to consult with Town Counsel for their opinion on where the bylaw effective date should be referenced.

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Ms. Ladd Fiorini provided a second, to continue the public hearing for a proposed Annual Town Meeting 2016 article regarding a replacement of the Affordable Housing Bylaw to Monday, February 8, 2016 at 7:30 PM.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

### CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF DEMOLITION DELAY BYLAW (HISTORICAL COMMISSION)

Mr. Wadsworth opened the continued public hearing for this proposed article at 8:12 PM. Present for the discussion from the Historical Commission were Mr. Mark Barry, Mr. Tag Carpenter and Mr. Terry Vose. Board members reviewed proposed changes submitted to the Planning Office on January 21, 2016.

**MOTION**: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to waive reading the correspondence list for this continued public hearing.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Ms. Massard reported that the question of non-transferability of a demolition delay certificate has been referred to Town Counsel because of potential issues with enforceability. She also noted that new correspondence had been received from a resident, Mr. David Corey of 26 Surplus Street, in support of the proposed 12-month demolition delay and recommending changes to the certification process.

Mr. Casagrande asked when the clock starts on demolition delay, and Mr. Wadsworth replied that it begins when the Historical Commission makes the decision. Mr. Barry stated that the Historical Commission acts expeditiously on complete applications. Mr. Casagrande asked if the Historical Commission has given any

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 6 of 9

thought to stating when the demolition delay becomes effective within the bylaw. Ms. Turcotte stated that it may change based on Town Counsel's opinion.

Mr. Wadsworth invited public comment. Mr. Mark Casey of South Shore Survey in Kingston noted that proposed Section 609.3 (Review Standards and Procedures) references "demolition of any building that is in whole or in part more than 75 years old" and asked if, for example, if a 4'x4' section of a 75 year old structure would require demolition delay review, and Mr. Carpenter stated that only the 4'x 4' section would apply. Ms. Massard noted that the language is not clear, and reported that the Building Inspector also believes that the language is not clear. She stated that she and the Building Inspector believe that there are a lot of gray areas that would place the burden on the Building Inspector to make policy decisions on a case-by-case pasis.

Ms. Turcotte asked if there were any other items of concern to Mr. Lambiase, the Building Inspector, and Ms. Massard responded that Mr. Lambiase is concerned with the timing. According to the proposed language, the Historical Commission's site inspection cannot take place until ten days after the building permit application, and Mr. Lambiase would like to see a speedier review. Mr. Carpenter stated that the proposed timing is standard practice. Ms. Turcotte noted that in a later paragraph an earlier site visit is allowed at the discretion of the applicant, and suggested that the process needs to be clarified. Mr. Dahlen recommended that the Historical Commission consider viewing the property in advance of the initial hearing so that the commission can act at the hearing.

Mr. Eric Pontiff of 125 Bow Street stated that he is a recent applicant under the current bylaw. He stated that it would have been better if the Historical Commission had been able to vote before the ten day requirement in order to expedite the application. He stated that by the time the applicant has filed for a building permit, the applicant has already explored alternatives with the architect and builder. He stated that in his case, the Historical Commission hearings took six months and with the demolition delay it will be sixteen months.

Mr. Shawn Dahlen of the Board of Selectmen agreed that the process needed more clarity and that the timing should be changed in order to speed up the process. He noted that he and Mr. Uitti (who was not present due to illness) had submitted suggested edits to the Historical Commission that would have addressed these concerns. Mr. Bear asked if Mr. Carpenter had seen those suggested edits, and Mr. Carpenter stated that the Historical Commission had seen them and acted according to what they thought would work best. Mr. Carpenter stated that the Historical Commission has no administrative support at Town Hall and is not in favor of a timing change. He stated that it would be unworkable to place greater time restraints on the Historical Commission for this reason. Mr. Dahlen suggested that Mr. Carpenter speak with the Town Manager about obtaining administrative support from Town Hall staff. Mr. Dahlen stated that the Historical Commission should be able to act on a decision within 21 days of the application.

Ms. Massard stated that with the revised language only being submitted on January 21, the Building Inspector has not had adequate time to thoroughly review the changes. Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked if town staff would have time to review the language for a continued public hearing on February 8, and Ms. Massard stated that it would. Ms. Massard stated that there are a tremendous number of policy and administrative matters that need to be addressed, and the Annual Town Meeting warrant will close soon.

**MOTION**: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to continue the public hearing to Monday, February 8, 2016 at 7:05 PM for an Annual Town Meeting zoning article public hearing regarding a proposed replacement of the Demolition Delay Bylaw put forth by the Historical Commission.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 7 of 9

## CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FOR ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2016 ZONING ARTICLE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS REGARDING FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP REFERENCES AND FLOOD HAZARD AREAS OVERLAY DISTRICT LANGUAGE (TOWN MANAGER / BOARD OF SELECTMEN)

Mr. Wadsworth opened the continued public hearing at 9:01 PM and asked Ms. Massard for any update. Ms. Massard stated that she has not heard anything on a response to the Town of Duxbury's appeal of proposed Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM maps). She noted that the article is proposed while the Town of Duxbury is waiting to hear from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) so that residents would not jeopardize their flood insurance status. She stated that if FEMA works with the Town of Duxbury to revise the FIRM maps, then the article will be withdrawn. If FEMA does not wish to revise the FIRM maps, then changes would need to be made by individual property owners through a Letter of Map Amendment.

Mr. Casagrande, who works in the insurance field, stated that flood insurance rates are skyrocketing due to FIRM maps that show salt marsh as a velocity zone.

Mr. Wadsworth invited public comment and there was none.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to close the public hearing for an Annual Town Meeting 2016 zoning article regarding Flood Insurance Rate Map references and Flood Hazards Overlay District language put forth by the Town Manager and Board of Selectmen.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Therefore the public hearing closed at 9:08 PM.

MOTION: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to recommend approvation of an Annual Town Meeting zoning article regarding Flood Insurance Rate Map references and Flood Hazards Overlay District language put forth by the Town Manager and Board of Selectment.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

### RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ANNUAL TOWN MEETING ARTICLE: FOUR NEW PROPOSED LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICTS (LOCAL HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION)

Planning Board members reviewed a Preliminary Report from the Local Historic District Commission (LHDC) dated January 2016. Mr. Wadsworth asked Ms. Massard to present the proposal. Ms. Massard stated that the LHDC is proposing historic districts on four individual house lots. Four property owners have volunteered their properties as local historic districts. She stated that the Planning Board and Planning Director must make recommendations to report to the LHDC, then the LHDC would submit a final report at Annual Town Meeting. The Board of Selectmen has scheduled a public hearing for March 10, 2016.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if the regulations for each district are unique, or are the regulations the same across all districts. Mr. Terry Vose of 233 Powder Point, property owner of one of the proposed historic districts and LHDC alternate, responded that the regulations are the same; however, a property owner could place further restrictions through a deed.

Date: January 25, 2016

Page 8 of 9

Mr. Bear stated that he has heard that some property owners on Surplus Street might be interested in becoming a local historic district. Mr. Vose stated that five or six property owners are awaiting the result of this proposal before proposing a new historic district on Surplus Street.

Mr. Wadsworth stated that he was present at a Finance Committee meeting where this Annual Town Meeting article was discussed and the Finance Committee members appeared to be supportive. He stated that he believes the vote will be positive because property owners are volunteering rather than being mandated.

Ms. Massard stated that the Planning Board could make a recommendation on all four proposed historic districts under one motion.

MOTION: Mr. Bear made a motion, and Mr. Casagrande provided a second, to inform the Board of Selectmen that the Planning Board supports the proposed creation of four new historic districts as proposed in the Local Historic District Commission's preliminary report dated January 2016.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

#### PLANNING DIRECTOR UPDATE

Street Acceptance Proposal for Saw Mill Road: Ms. Massard reported that the residents on Saw Mill Road have filed a citizen petition for street acceptance, and the Planning Board will see the proposal at its meeting on February 8, 2016. She stated that because it is a citizen petition it is required to go on the Annual Town Meeting warrant. The private way was negotiated to remain private when it was constructed as part of a Chapter 40B project, through waivers of construction standards.

Ms. Massard stated that the first step in acceptance is laying out the street, and at its meeting tonight the Board of Selectmen referred the layout to the Planning Board for its recommendation. If the layout is accepted, the matter will go to a vote at Annual Town Meeting. If the layout is not accepted by the Board of Selectmen, then the street acceptance will not go forward.

#### DISCUSSION OF GIFT TO PLANNING BOARD

Mr. Wadsworth stated that a gift had been given to the Planning Board by Merrill Associates, an engineering firm that has provided consulting services to the Planning Board on a recent Definitive Subdivision. Mr. Wadsworth asked if the Planning Board members wish to accept the gift or not.

Ms. Turcotte recommended that while the Planning Board does appreciate the gesture, the gift must be returned. Ms. Massard stated that town boards are allowed to accept a gift that can be shared with the public, or a gift of less than \$50.00 in value. In this case, the gift cannot be shared and over time the gifts may add up to over \$50.00 in value.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

**Engineering Invoice:** 

**MOTION**: Mr. Glennon made a motion, and Mr. Bear provided a second, to approve Amory Engineers invoice #14475 dated January 7, 2016 in the amount of \$195.00 for services related to Gudrun Way.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

Date: January 25, 2016 Page 9 of 9

Meeting Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Ms. Turcotte provided a second, to approve meeting minutes of December 14, 2015 as amended.

**VOTE**: The motion carried unanimously, 6-0.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Planning Board meeting adjourned at 9:43 PM. The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Monday. February 8, 2016 at 7:00 PM at Duxbury Town Hall, Small Conference Room, 878 Tremont Street.

#### MATERIALS REVIEWED

#### As-Built Review: Shantum Lane Definitive Subdivision / Pontiff

- Emails between staff, consulting engineer and applicant's engineer dated 11/23/15 01/06/16
- Email from V. Massard to PB dated 12/16/15 re: Follow up from PB meeting on 12/14/15

#### Public Hearings for Annual Town Meeting 2016 Zoning Articles:

#### Proposed Amendments Regarding Nonconforming Uses and Structures

- Public hearing notice stamped with Town Clerk on 01/05/16
- ZBL Section 401.2 existing language
- Proposed article with amendments
- Explanation of article

#### **Proposed Amendments Regarding Residential Conservation Clusters**

- Proposed article with amendments
- Explanation of article

#### Proposed Amendments Regarding Planned Developments (Zoning Bylaw Review Committee)

- Proposed article with amendments
- Explanation of article

#### Continued Public Hearing for Annual Town Meeting 2016 Zoning Article: Proposed Replacement of Affordable Housing Bylaw

- Existing ZBL 570 (Affordable Housing Bylaw)
- Proposed article submitted by DAHT on 01/13/16

#### Continued Public Hearing, Annual Town Meeting 2016 Zoning Article: Proposed Replacement of Demolition Delay Bylaw

- Existing ZBL 609 (Demolition Delay Bylaw)
- Proposed language approved by Historical Commission on 01/13/16 and submitted to PB on 01/21/16

#### Continued Public Hearing, Annual Town Meeting 2016 Zoning Article: Proposed Amendments Regarding Flood Insurance Rate Map References and Flood Hazard Areas Overlay District Language

- Existing ZBL Section 402 "Flood Hazard Areas Overlay District"
- Explanation and proposed amendments to ZBL Sections 202.1 and 202.2 with new FIRM map dates; and proposed ZBL Section 402 incorporating suggested FEMA language

#### Recommendation Regarding Annual Town Meeting Article: Four New Proposed Local Historic Districts

- Maps of proposed historic districts proposed by LHD
- Letter from C. Skelly / Mass. Historical Commission dated

#### Other Business

- Amory Engineers invoice re: Gudrun Way
- PB minutes of 12/14/15
- Planning Board meeting schedule for February December 2016
- PB members "In the News"

#### Distributed at Meeting

Letter from D. Corey dated 01/24/16