

Approved 11/09/2016



Town of Duxbury Massachusetts Planning Board

TOWN CLERK
2016 NOV 15 AM 9:38
DUXBURY, MASS.

Minutes 10/26/16

The Planning Board met on Wednesday, October 26, 2016 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, Mural Room.

Present: Brian Glennon, Chairman; Scott Casagrande, Vice Chairman; Cynthia Ladd Fiorini, Clerk; John Bear, Jennifer Turcotte, David Uitti, and George Wadsworth.

Absent: No one was absent.

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

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

OPEN FORUM

Community Preservation Committee (CPC): Ms. Ladd Fiorini reported from the CPC that six proposals have been submitted for potential projects for Annual Town Meeting 2017.

Economic Advisory Committee (EAC): Mr. Bear reported that yesterday the EAC attended a Downtown Revitalization workshop in Rockland organized by Ms. Massard. He stated that it was a very good program led by the South Shore Coalition of the Metropolitan Area Planning Council.

Zoning Bylaw Review Committee (ZBRC): Mr. Casagrande reported that he and the ZBRC chair, Ms. Judith Barrett, had spoken today and decided to put a hold on proposing any articles for this year's Annual Town Meeting. Instead they prefer to come back to a future Town Meeting with all of their recommended amendments.

Old Colony Planning Council (OCPC): Mr. Glennon announced that one of the town's regional planning agencies, the OCPC, is hosting two educational programs. There is a program tonight called, "Introduction to Subdivision Control," and on November 15 there is a workshop on "How to Read a Subdivision Plan." More information and registration instructions are available through the Planning Office.

DISCUSSION WITH TOWN COUNSEL (ANDERSON & KREIGER) REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENTS FOR ONE DWELLING PER LOT

Present for the discussion was Atty. Arthur Kreiger of Anderson & Kreiger, Town Counsel for the Town of Duxbury. Mr. Glennon invited Atty. Kreiger to present his opinion. Atty. Kreiger stated that he had been asked whether the Town of Duxbury Zoning Bylaws allow more than one single-family dwelling on a lot. On September 14, 2016 he submitted a memorandum with his opinion to Mr. René Read, Town Manager; Mr. Scott Lambiase, Director of Municipal Services; and Ms. Valerie Massard, Planning Director. In that memorandum Atty. Kreiger stated his opinion that the Zoning Bylaws do allow more than one dwelling per lot as long as there is sufficient area and other criteria are met, based on a number of provisions. He stated that his

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

The mission of the Town of Duxbury is to deliver excellent services to the community in the most fiscally responsible and innovative manner while endeavoring to broaden our sense of community and preserve the unique character of our town.

opinion met with disagreement from current and former board members with knowledge and expertise in the area. He noted that the Zoning Bylaws are not easy to interpret. Atty. Kreiger stated that at this point he has been asked to draft language for the upcoming Annual Town Meeting to amend the Zoning Bylaws so that they clearly state that only one single-family dwelling per lot is allowed unless through a special permit or other process as stated elsewhere in the bylaw.

Atty. Kreiger stated that his draft proposal may not be the only way to fix it. The proposed new language would add to ZBL Article 400 (Use, Intensity, Dimensional and Coverage Regulations for All Districts), Section 401.4 (Permitted Uses) by adding to the list of permitted uses a #4 that "Notwithstanding any other provision in this Bylaw, no more than one (1) single-family dwelling may be erected by right on any lot in any district." Atty. Kreiger noted that #1-3 in that section make it clear that anything not specifically permitted shall be prohibited. He also noted that the proposed language would supercede any other section of the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Turcotte asked if "...in any district" should be removed, and Atty. Kreiger replied that including this language would make it clear that it applies to all zoning districts. However, he agreed that the amendment would still work without that language.

Mr. Bear asked if the language should be amended in Section 410 (Residential Compatibility District) rather than 401.4 (Permitted Uses), and Atty. Kreiger responded that it could be done but he believes it is clearer to put it up front.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if "dwelling" should be defined to make clear that it is a dwelling house. He noted that recent interpretations have been that if there is no stove it is not a dwelling. Atty. Kreiger replied that single-family dwellings are allowed according to ZBL Section 410.1.1 (Permitted Uses). Mr. Wadsworth asked if a property owner could construct a two-family dwelling, and Atty. Kreiger replied that according to Zoning Bylaws one single-family dwelling could be built in the Residential Compatibility (RC) District, and any additional single-family dwellings would be prohibited.

Mr. Casagrande stated that he is fine with the language but asked if it should be included in Section 410 (RC District) as well. Atty. Kreiger responded that adding the language in 401.4 (Permitted Uses) trumps everything else. Mr. Casagrande asked if the language should be changed to reference a "dwelling unit" rather than just a "dwelling." He noted that the definition of Accessory Structure references "dwelling unit." Atty. Kreiger replied that language in ZBL Section 410 (RC District) references "dwelling" rather than "dwelling unit." He stated that a single-family dwelling is a dwelling unit. Mr. Uitti suggested "single-family dwelling and/or dwelling unit," and Atty. Kreiger responded that the "and/or" might increase the ambiguity. Mr. Uitti stated that it could be all inclusive. Atty. Kreiger agreed to consider using the term "dwelling unit" instead of "dwelling."

Ms. Massard stated this will have an impact on the current language of one single-family dwelling per 40,000 square feet. Atty. Kreiger responded that the definition of "lot size" in ZBL Section 410.4 (RC District Intensity, Dimensional and Coverage Regulations) references the 40,000 square feet. Mr. Casagrande observed that changing language in one section may affect other sections of the bylaw unintentionally. Ms. Turcotte agreed that we do not want to solve one problem only to create a number of other new problems.

Mr. Bear asked if the proposed language addresses condominiums. Ms. Massard suggested that language in the definition of "Lot" could address the reference to "in one ownership" in order to avoid any further confusion. Atty. Kreiger stated that condominiums under one ownership are permissible, and condominiums under separate ownership are permissible if otherwise allowed. He noted that the language in ZBL Section 401.4.4 does not address that issue and he was not asked to address this section in his proposed amendment language.

TOWN CLERK
NOV 15 AM 9:33
EXBURG, MA

Mr. Glennon opened the discussion to the public. Mr. James Lampert of 148 Washington Street stated that he is former chairperson of the Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that getting rid of the ownership language might affect people putting multiple dwelling units on a single lot. He cautioned the Planning Board to consider it carefully before removing the "one ownership" language from the definition of "Lot." Mr. Lampert noted that the term "dwelling" can refer to single-family or multi-family, and recommended that the proposed language include the term "dwelling unit."

Mr. Lampert stated that there are districts where residential dwellings are not allowed. Atty. Kreiger stated that he does not believe the proposed language would imply that single-family dwellings are permitted where they are not allowed, and nothing in that section implies that anything is allowed where it is not permitted. Atty. Kreiger added that he believes that "single-family dwelling" is clear and "dwelling unit" is probably not needed. Mr. Lampert urged the Planning Board to fix the issue now.

Ms. Sara Wilson of 120 Bay Road noted that she is a former chairperson on the Planning Board, and stated that she has no objection to the new proposed language of adding a ZBL Section 401.4.4, adding that it would end a "local nightmare." She recommended that the term "dwelling unit" should be used also. She provided history, noting that in the 2003 re-write of Zoning Bylaws "dwelling unit" was changed to "dwelling" and it should be put back. She suggested adding language that "where such use is allowed by right" takes care of the question of whether single-family dwellings would be allowed in the two districts where they are in fact not allowed. She stated that Atty. Kreiger has done a good job of narrowing down the language with these two small additions.

Atty. Kreiger stated that instead of adding "where such use is allowed by right," he would suggest adding another sentence instead. He noted that the final proposed language will be available at the Planning Board public hearing for zoning articles.

Mr. Richard Brennan of 100 Myrtle Street referenced ZBL Section 717 (Planned Developments – Driveways) that states that "No more than two single-family units shall be served by a common driveway." He asked if this would be applicable in zoning districts other than Planned Developments. Ms. Massard noted that this Zoning Bylaw pertains to a certain type of development that is allowed by special permit and allows shared driveways.

Mr. Glennon invited comments from Ms. Massard on Atty. Kreiger's proposed language. Ms. Massard thanked Atty. Kreiger for attending tonight's Planning Board meeting. She noted that the public hearing will be scheduled as soon as language is available.

Mr. Glennon asked Atty. Kreiger if his recent opinion requires the Building Inspector to sign off on building permits for multiple dwellings on one lot. Atty. Kreiger stated that if the Building Inspector denies a building permit and it is appealed, Atty. Kreiger would defend the Building Inspector's decision, or if he issues a building permit, he will also defend that decision, as the bylaw is very hard to interpret.

Mr. Brennan asked if a moratorium would be placed on allowing multiple dwellings on a lot, and Mr. Glennon replied that although the Building Inspector cannot place a moratorium, the Building Inspector is not required to issue building permits based on Anderson & Kreiger's interpretation of the bylaw in its September letter. If an applicant disagrees, the applicant can file an appeal, as can an abutter with standing.

TOWN CLERK
NOV 15 9:38 AM
DUXBURY, MASS

**REQUEST FOR REDUCED MINIMUM PEER REVIEW DEPOSIT,
ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW (PRE-FILING): WINSOR HOUSE INN,
390 WASHINGTON STREET / CASEY**

Ms. Massard explained that the minimum deposit for peer review of Administrative Site Plan Review applications is \$5,000.00. However, in this case the project involves an extension of an existing parking lot of twelve or less parking spaces so the applicant's representative, Mr. Mark Casey of South Shore Survey Consultants, Inc., is requesting that the deposit be reduced to \$2,500.00. If additional funding is required they are willing to replenish the account.

Mr. Wadsworth noted that any unused funds in the escrow account would be returned to the applicant.

Ms. Turcotte suggested that the Planning Board should accept the lower amount in the spirit of cooperation.

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Mr. Casagrande provided a second, to reduce the minimum peer review escrow deposit for Administrative Site Plan Review of Winsor House Inn, 390 Washington Street / Casey from \$5,000.00 to \$2,500.00.

VOTE: The motion carried 6-0-1, with Mr. Bear abstaining.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT
REGARDING STORMWATER CONTAINMENT**

Ms. Massard reported that as a result of her discussion last night with the Finance Committee, she is considering pulling back on the proposed stormwater addendum to Zoning Bylaws due to staffing concerns. She stated that property owners are regrading to mound dwellings during new construction and our zoning does not address this issue. The goal of a proposed bylaw would be for property owners to maintain stormwater on their own lots. Property owners would be asked to follow best management practices, with design guidelines to be included as adopted locally in the future. Ms. Massard stated that although the intention is to bring an article to Annual Town Meeting, limited staff time may not allow it to be ready for this year.

Ms. Massard noted that grant funding for creating design guidelines is not available but the Town of Duxbury may be able to work with other communities to pool costs for savings. When she worked for the Town of Plymouth, Ms. Massard collaborated with the Towns of Kingston and Duxbury on these issues, and in Plymouth they were able to create new stormwater design guidelines which will be used as a starting point in Duxbury.

Mr. Glennon asked if any Planning Board action is required, and Ms. Massard replied that no action is required on behalf of the Planning Board.

Mr. Bear asked if the Department of Public Works could get involved in stormwater containment in the meanwhile. Ms. Massard stated that it is both a public and private issue, and central stormwater design guidelines must be adopted due to EPA permits for local communities. DPW is in charge of municipal stormwater (public).

Mr. Glennon, who had also attended the Finance Committee meeting, noted that the committee had discussed several options that ranged from spreading the work over the next three years to getting it done all at once in three years.

Mr. Wadsworth agreed that stormwater draining onto neighboring properties has been an issue and there has been a longstanding policy in the Town of Duxbury to contain stormwater. In some cases over time the property owners have filled in drainage basins because they have no understanding what they are. Mr. Glennon

TOWN CLERK
NOV 15 AM 9:39
DUXBURY, MASS.

agreed that an absence of a bylaw does not mean it is okay to allow stormwater to drain from your property to a neighbor's.

Ms. Sarah McCormick of the Design Review Board stated that stormwater draining onto abutting properties is an increasing problem. She noted that a number of property owners have brought in soil to lift their houses, which has changed streetscapes and is not consistent with the rural character of the town. She stated that she has even seen mounding in a flood zone. She urged the Planning Board to consider limiting the amount of fill that can be brought in, and to respect the natural topography of the land in order to preserve the streetscape. She stated that something needs to be done.

DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL GROUND-MOUNTED SOLAR ON MUNICIPAL LAND FOR GREEN COMMUNITY STATUS

Ms. Massard noted that originally the Town of Duxbury was not going to pursue Green Community status due to staffing concerns, but the schools have now advised the town that funding for a school project is a priority and is eligible if the town becomes a Green Community in 2018. She reported that the Town of Duxbury has received a META grant through the Metropolitan Area Planning Council toward doing the application and energy plan to file a request to become a Green Community as of 2018, and zoning must be in place soon in order to meet the school's objective.

One of the requirements is allowing solar facilities by right somewhere in the town. Ms. Massard reported that she has tried to identify municipal land that would fit the requirements, and she has reached out to the Alternative Energy Committee for help. She noted that research facilities are off the table because there is no industrial land in the Town of Duxbury and wind is not desired by Duxbury, and rooftop solar does not count toward Green Community status. The only land she has been able to identify is on the public golf course at North Hill, although she stated that it is not an ideal solution, and land near the existing solar array at the transfer station that is not ideal but could create a by-right solar area. Private property on Keene Street has also been identified but she is not sure the town wants to use private property. She asked for Planning Board input.

Mr. Utti asked how much land is needed, and Ms. Massard replied that approximately one acre is needed. Ms. Turcotte asked if the school can help find a property. Mr. Bear noted that Alden school has a large rooftop, and Ms. Massard replied that rooftop solar is not counted as a by-right solar. We cannot count the already-built solar in this case, either.

Mr. Wadsworth suggested that there are town-owned former bogs near Exit 11 on West Street that are large and flat but there are Conservation Restrictions. Ms. Massard stated that she would need to look into the matter to find out if solar can be placed on land with a Conservation Restriction, and it would require a two-thirds vote of the state legislature. Mr. Wadsworth suggested that there may be land that surrounds other town-owned bogs. He also suggested that the Water Department owns land on Church Street that may be available for a solar facility.

Ms. Massard stated that she could put together a booklet of potential areas, noting that she can model zoning from the five or six local communities that have already been granted Green Community status.

Mr. Glennon cautioned that haste makes waste, noting his concern that although everyone likes potential grant money and wants to support the schools, approximately 155 towns that are Green Communities would be competing for funding. He noted that the Town of Duxbury should consider the potential pitfalls against the rewards. He expressed concern with potential onerous provisions like requiring only fuel-efficient vehicles, and he does not support using conservation land. He stated that he sees a lot of strings attached to the Green

TOWN CLERK
NOV 15 AM 9:00
DUXBURY, MA

Community status. Mr. Glennon stated that he is all for money for the town but asked if this is the right way to go about it. He stated that it may look great initially but there may be unintended consequences.

Ms. Massard offered to bring in Mr. Seth Pickering from the Green Communities program to discuss it in more detail, noting that he has offered to speak where asked, including with the Board of Selectmen, paid for by residents for location of solar arrays. Mr. Glennon agreed that it would be a good idea.

Mr. Jim Goldenberg introduced himself as a member of the Alternative Energy Committee. He reported that his committee has been looking for properties for a while in an attempt to support Ms. Massard's efforts. He stated that while he agrees that haste makes waste, there is a significant amount of funding available through the Green Communities program, and the Alternative Energy Committee has been working on this goal for over a year now. Mr. Goldenberg stated that it turns out that the solar array that the Town of Duxbury constructed over the old landfill actually would have qualified the Town of Duxbury for Green Community status but the process was not done at the time.

Mr. Goldenberg summarized the Alternative Energy Committee's recommendations. They do not believe bogs would be the best place to site a solar array. Instead, they recommend expanding the existing solar array, creating an acre of buffer around it. He stated that they have gone through studies and there is no opposition to solar at that site. The solar array would not need to be built; land would need to be set aside. The engineering has already been done and there is already a connection to the grid without a downside.

Mr. Glennon asked who would own the project, and Ms. Massard replied that it would be a municipal contract with a private owner if built, and the Alternative Energy Committee would be the sponsor of the zoning article. She stated that she would coordinate having Mr. Pickering from the Green Communities program attend the Town Meeting.

Mr. Glennon stated that the Planning Board has laid out its goals for the town and he is sensitive to the Planning Director's limited time. He stated that he does not want to supercede other important priorities. Ms. Massard assured the Planning Board that once the town becomes a Green Community her staff time will be limited, if at all.

REPORT FROM LOW IMPACT DESIGN TOUR AT PINEHILLS (GEORGE WADSWORTH)

Mr. Wadsworth reported on a recent Low-Impact Design Tour he took at the Pinehills development in Plymouth. He reported that he was the only person representing a town or a Planning Board. He stated that he believes the program was aimed at people considering or already an owner in the community.

Mr. Wadsworth reported that there is very complex zoning at Pinehills, with a mixture of housing, open space, and a golf course. In addition there is a lot of Low-Impact Design (LID) drainage. The Pinehills representative (Tony Green) went through the zoning process and it may be useful to invite him to a future Planning Board meeting to learn more as it may apply to the Battelle rezoning.

Mr. Glennon asked if Pinehills had utilized anything different than what is done in Duxbury for low-impact design, such as new practices or technologies, and Mr. Wadsworth responded that there was nothing new. Pinehills utilized LID practices with natural swales using the rolling hills topography as set aside. The roads are all privately maintained, and a homeowners' association does the snowplowing.

Ms. Sara Wilson of 120 Bay Road stated that one does not need to leave Duxbury to find good examples of LID drainage. During the 1970s and 1980s six Planned Developments and twelve clusters were permitted

TOWN CLERK
2016 NOV 15 AM 9:39
DUXBURY MASS.

using LID practices, using Trout Farm as an example where natural slopes were used that required no moving of earth and no erosion. She noted that the LID drainage has worked there despite the fact that crushed stone driveways have been replaced over time with pavement.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – DRAFT PUBLIC OUTREACH / VISIONING SCOPE

Planning Board members reviewed a draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for Phase I of the Master Plan, along with a draft Public Engagement overview, both provided by Ms. Massard. She noted that both documents are rough drafts. The baseline will be done in-house to assist with public engagement if staff time allows. It will be a thorough process with at least two public forums that will inform the Town of Duxbury about which parts of the Comprehensive Plan need to be updated. An important outcome will be a community vision statement. Ms. Massard stated that there are many creative ways of getting public input, ideas like pop-ups at popular events such as football games or Christmas tree decorating contests where surveys are filled out to participate, for example.

Mr. Glennon confirmed that the consultant for public engagement was funded through a vote at Annual Town Meeting 2016.

Ms. Massard added that through the Community Compact program, the state will help fund the top three priorities identified by the Town of Duxbury, and the town will work with its regional planning agencies, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council and the Old Colony Planning Council. She noted that they will be looking to leverage the Hall’s Corner Studies done by both regional planning agencies.

Ms. Massard noted that the RFP was borrowed and edited down from another community, and she hopes to get it issued in the next few weeks. Ms. Turcotte stated that the documents are very thorough for what is considered a rough draft.

Mr. Bear asked what might carry over to the second phase of the project. Ms. Massard provided an outline of the process:

- I. Baseline assessment (done in-house)
- II. Outreach (vision statements and goals)
- III. Land use / zoning
- IV. Technical assistance / implementation planning for reaching the goals.

Mr. Glennon thanked Ms. Massard for an excellent draft. He noted that all Ms. Massard needs now is a vote to move forward by the Planning Board. Ms. Massard noted that the project is not large enough to require a formal bidding process but it can go through the procurement process in the event that the town ops to continue with the same consultant for future phases.

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Mr. Wadsworth provided a second, to authorize the Planning Director to move forward with the Request for Proposals for Master Plan Phase I.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 7-0.

PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Hall’s Corner: Ms. Massard reported that the Town of Duxbury is leveraging Town Meeting’s funds with funding provided through technical assistance grants from the town’s two regional planning agencies. The Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) will assist with the vision for the business district, and hosted the recent Revitalizing Downtowns workshop that the Economic Advisory Committee attended this week. This

TOWN CLERK
2016 NOV 15 AM 9:39
DUXBURY, MASS

visioning will allow the town to speak with one voice and move forward in a positive way. She noted that the Town of Duxbury will be applying for a technical grant on streetscapes through the Department of Housing and Community Development Technical Assistance Massachusetts Downtown Initiative program. Ms. Massard noted that the Old Colony Planning Council will also be approached for technical assistance.

Mr. Wadsworth asked about the Hall's Corner land survey that was funded at Annual Town Meeting 2016, and Ms. Massard responded that the survey work started in August and she is cautiously optimistic that a layout plan will be ready by the end of the year. Once the layout plan is ready the Town of Duxbury will meet with property owners to come up with a boundary settlement plan. Once it is all finalized, all will know where the public property lies.

Zoning Articles for Annual Town Meeting 2017: Mr. Wadsworth asked where the zoning articles stand now that the Zoning Bylaw Review Committee has taken its amendments off the docket. Ms. Massard listed several potential zoning articles:

- Battelle – She has heard that they will be submitting a completely revised zoning article from the draft that the Planning Board reviewed earlier.
- Demolition Delay Bylaw
- Odd Lot Bylaw – She noted that this bylaw amendment appears to be going forward
- Green Communities.

Ms. Massard noted that it is news to her that the ZBRC is pulling its articles. The number of articles has decreased from 15 to 11 to about 8 now and dwindling. Ms. Massard noted that the most pressing issues will be addressed, including Battelle and One Dwelling per Lot.

Mr. Wadsworth noted that he was interested in the complex zoning process that the Pinehills went through in considering what Battelle might do. Ms. Massard noted that there was a great deal of engagement in Plymouth for Pinehills and she was involved in reviewing some of the permitting. She stated that the Town of Duxbury is not as pro-active in rezoning Battelle and Snug Harbor, noting that the Comprehensive Plan may provide some level of direction. Mr. Wadsworth noted that Battelle would be a significant rezoning and the town needs time to review and understand it. He stated that Battelle may be running out of time. Ms. Massard stated that if Battelle submits a zoning article by citizen petition, then the Planning Board will hold the public hearing. Mr. Glennon emphasized that Ms. Massard has a lot of other things to do and she is not actively working on the Battelle zoning article.

Logan Airport Terminal E: Ms. Massard announced that Massport has issued a Notice of Availability of Final Environmental Assessment / Environmental Impact Report for the Terminal E Modernization Project at Logan Airport. She noted that comments are due by November 4, 2016.

Zoning Reform: Ms. Massard reported that at a recent Southeastern New England American Planning Association meeting she learned that zoning reform will again be presented. It reached Senate approval with several modifications but never got House approval last year.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE

Ms. Massard proposed that the Planning Board consider meeting on November 9, November 16, and November 30. She noted that now that there are fewer articles, the public hearings for zoning articles will be spread out into December and January because we have not received committee language yet. After discussion the Planning Board opted not to meet on November 30 and instead decided to meet on the following dates through the end of the calendar year: November 9, November 16, and December 14.

TOWN CLERK
 NOV 15 AM 9:39
 DUXBURY, MASS.

OTHER BUSINESS

Meeting Minutes:

MOTION: Ms. Turcotte made a motion, and Mr. Casagrande provided a second, to approve the Planning Board minutes of October 12, 2016 as written.

VOTE: The motion carried, 5-0-2, with Ms. Ladd Fiorini and Mr. Bear abstaining.

Planning Board Photograph: Planning Board members agreed to have their photo taken after the meeting for the Annual Town Report 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 9:08 PM. The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, November 9, 2016 at 7:00 PM at Duxbury Town Hall, Mural Room, 878 Tremont Street.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- Planning Board agenda for 10/12/16
- Email from A. Kreiger to V. Massard et. al dated 10/19/16 re: October 26th Planning Board
- ZBL Section 401.4
- Memorandum from A. Kreiger to R. Read et. al dated 09/14/16 re: Zoning Bylaw – RCCs, Special Permits and Inclusionary Housing
- Staff report dated 10/26/16 re: ASPR escrow account deposit amount recommendation
- GIS Map on NPDES Phase II Stormwater Program, Automatically Designated MS4 Areas in Duxbury
- Power Point print-out on Local Stormwater Design Guidelines: Plymouth’s Experience dated 06/23/08, prepared by V. Massard and R. Balke
- “Stormwater in Massachusetts” Fact Sheet Issued 2016
- MassDEP print-out on Stormwater Phase II: Frequently Asked Questions
- MassDOER Green Communities Designation & Grant Program Criterion 1 Overview
- MassDOER Green Communities Designation & Grant Program Criterion 2 Overview
- Map entitled, “Figure 5. Aerial Image of Site 3 (Duxbury Transfer Station, North Hill Golf Course, and Duxbury Town Hall / DPW Facility
- MassDOER Green Communities Designation and Grant Program , Program Guidance dated August 2016
- MAPC Technical Assistance Green Community application for Town of Duxbury
- Flyer entitled “Workshop and Tour of Pinehills: A Case Study in Low Impact Design” program on October 17, 2016
- “Draft Public Engagement” worksheet
- Draft Request for Proposals Town of Duxbury Master Plan (Phase I)
- “Working Draft Compiled by Planning Office of Duxbury, October 13, 2016” spreadsheet dated 10/19/16
- “Policy for Citizen Petitioned or Committee-Introduced Zoning Amendments” voted by PB on 05/11/16
- MassPort “Boston-Logan International Airport, Terminal E Modernization Project” EIR comment request dated 09/30/16
- Massachusetts Municipal Association article, “Governor Signs Economic Development Package” dated 08/25/16
- Massachusetts Municipal Association article, “Executive Order Outlines Climate Change Strategy” dated 10/03/16
- Massachusetts Municipal Association article, “DPS Updates Stretch and Energy Efficiency Building Codes” dated 08/31/16
- Draft PB minutes of 10/12/16

TOWN CLERK
 2016 NOV 15 AM 9:39
 DUXBURY, MASS.