

Approved 04/12/2017



Town of Duxbury Massachusetts Planning Board

TOWN CLERK
2017 APR 18 PM 1:30
DUXBURY, MASS.

Minutes 03/22/2017

The Planning Board met on Wednesday, March 22, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, 878 Tremont Street, Mural Room.

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

Absent: John Bear and Jennifer Turcotte.

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

Mr. Glennon called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

OPEN FORUM

Town Meeting Thank You: Mr. Glennon expressed his gratitude to residents who approved the Planning Board's articles at Town Meeting.

MBTA Commuter Rail Weekend Service: Mr. Glennon acknowledged Mr. Richard Prone, Duxbury's representative to the MBTA Advisory Board, for advocating for weekend commuter rail service. Governor Charlie Baker had considered ending weekend service as a cost-cutting measure, and Mr. Glennon gave Mr. Prone credit for speaking up and providing reasons to maintain weekend service. Now the governor has reconsidered and weekend commuter rail service will continue.

Clear Cutting and Grading: Mr. Robert (Terry) Vose addressed the Planning Board regarding extensive clear cutting and grading at his neighbor's property. Mr. Glennon requested that Mr. Vose save his presentation for the Planning Board's discussion on Grading and Stormwater Containment later in the meeting.

HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN PUBLIC MEETING (MAPC / MARTIN PILLSBURY)

Present for the discussion was Mr. Martin Pillsbury, Environmental Planning Director for the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC). Mr. Pillsbury gave a slideshow presentation of the Hazard Mitigation Plan. A printout of that presentation is on file at the Planning Office. He noted that the plan is in process and is expected to be completed by June 2018. He stated that the plan is a joint effort by the Town of Duxbury's Hazard Mitigation team and local assistance through the MAPC, one of the town's regional planning agencies. The plan provides an orderly planning process in the event of a natural disaster such as a hurricane or flood. He noted that it is a mitigation plan, not an emergency response plan. He stated that an additional benefit of having a Hazard Mitigation Plan is eligibility for hazard mitigation grants. The goal of the Hazard Mitigation Plan is a pre-disaster approach to become more resilient and therefore reduce the cycle of repetitive loss.

Currently a list of mitigation measures is being updated. A draft plan will be presented at a future public meeting. Once the plan is updated to reflect comments, a plan will be submitted to the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) and FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) for their review and comments. The final stage will be for the Board of Selectmen to adopt the plan.

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

Ms. Massard thanked Mr. Pillsbury and the MAPC for its assistance, noting that the process started a couple of years ago under the former Planning Director, Mr. Thomas Broadrick.

Mr. Glennon invited public comment. Mr. Ned Lawson of 34 Sunset Road stated that he hopes that sea level rise / climate change can be added to the Hazard Mitigation Plan. He referenced the Kleinfelder study done in 2013 and stated that sea level appears to be rising even faster than predicted in that plan. He noted that MAPC is already working on a coastal resiliency plan for Scituate and Duxbury and stated that the Hazard Mitigation Plan will allow the town to adopt adaptation strategies. He stated that planning now will save the Town of Duxbury time, money and resources later. He stated that he is a member of the Duxbury Civic Association and offered to help get the issue in front of the public.

Ms. Sara Wilson of 120 Bay Road supported Mr. Lawson's comments. She strongly recommended that the Planning Board consider zoning restrictions to protect coastal areas from stormwater and sea level rise. She stated that she lives above the McGibbons Pond and it appears that sea level is rising faster than anticipated. She expressed concern with the expense of social and economic costs of climate change. She noted that the Town of Chatham adopted a Coastal Conservatory District along the 100-year floodplain, and recommended that the Town of Duxbury move in this direction.

Mr. Frank Holden of 350 Powder Point asked about the prioritization process, noting that there is a lot of uncertainty and there are cost variables involved. Mr. Pillsbury replied that the prioritization will be done by the Development Review Team (DRT) of town land use and public safety departments using a matrix process with qualitative cost/benefit analysis. The public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan once it is completed.

Mr. Wadsworth recalled that former governor Michael Dukakis had once suggested that it may be less expensive to purchase key properties rather than rebuilding over and over again. He asked if funding for this is a possibility. Mr. Pillsbury stated that he is not sure but he will look into that option, noting that it may be a last resort.

Mr. Glennon requested that staff make the slideshow available on the town's web site under the Planning Department page.

ANR PLAN OF LAND: 0 NORTH STREET & KEENE STREET / BALDWIN.

Present for the discussion was the applicant, Mr. John Baldwin, and his representative, Mr. Rick Grady of Grady Consulting LLC. Ms. Massard noted that the Planning Board had recently endorsed an earlier ANR Plan of Land showing Lot 1 and Lot 2 on the same property. The current plan shows Lot 1, Lot 3 and Lot 4 for a total of three lots. The new lot, Lot 4, has adequate frontage on Keene Street. She stated that staff recommends endorsement of the ANR plan.

Mr. Glennon invited Mr. Baldwin to present his plan and Mr. Baldwin said that he had nothing more to add.

Mr. Glennon asked about the required lot area for Lot 4 on Keene Street, noting that it appears that a portion of the lot is within the Aquifer Protection Overlay District (APOD). Ms. Massard confirmed that Lot 4 requires 60,000 square feet of upland and the plan shows it contains 62,860 square feet of upland. She noted that although the 150-foot diameter is partially within the APOD, the dwelling could be constructed within the Residential Compatibility (RC) district. Mr. Glennon requested that the 60,000 square foot requirement be added to the ANR plan under "Zoning Data." Mr. Casagrande noted that Lot 4 meets the APOD requirements.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked for clarification on the wetlands/uplands line, noting that there are a lot of wetlands on the property. Ms. Massard clarified the location of the uplands. Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked about access to Lot 3, the large parcel that would remain from carving off Lot 1 and Lot 4. Ms. Massard stated that the Conservation Administrator, Mr. Joseph Grady, had walked the property and told her that he was confident that the proposed plan accurately shows that 50-60 feet of upland are available for access. She stated that Mr. Grady had reviewed the previous ANR

TOWN CLERK
2017 MAR 18 PM 1:30
DUXBURY MASS.

plan for Lot 1. She stated that, per Mr. Grady, a property owner is allowed to construct a driveway within a width of 25 feet of upland according to the Town Wetlands Regulations when in the vicinity of a regulated wetland area.

Mr. Glennon stated that for endorsement purposes an ANR must show access that is more than illusory, and this ANR demonstrates access that is not illusory. Mr. Glennon asked why the "Location Map" on the ANR shows the locus of the ANR plus a property across North Street. Ms. Massard confirmed that there is no activity on this plan for the locus on the other side of the street. Mr. Baldwin stated that he owns the other property on the locus map.

Atty. Dennis Murphy of 290 High Street requested to share remarks on behalf of abutters, whom he represents as legal counsel. Mr. Glennon asked if Mr. Baldwin had a procedural objection, and Mr. Baldwin replied that the abutters have no legal standing because they are approximately 700 feet away from the ANR lot. Mr. Glennon allowed Atty. Murphy to briefly present comments.

Atty. Murphy noted that an appeal building permits on this property was upheld as "circumvention of the Subdivision Control process," quoting the decision by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that the abutters are similarly concerned regarding this ANR. He noted that the plan presented is the second generation of an ANR plan. He stated that the applicant has presented a 40B concept plan before another town board. He summarized that there are three plans in play: the endorsed ANR, a 40B concept plan, and tonight's ANR plan. He stated that there may be another 40B plan. Ms. Massard cautioned that there should be no discussion of future speculative plans.

Atty. Murphy stated that the abutters believe that the access to Lot 3 will be changed to an existing cart path in a different location. He noted that a lot needs real access to the frontage from which it divides. He noted that Lot 1 does not legally exist because it has not been recorded. He stated that tonight's ANR would create Lot 1. He also noted that tonight's ANR plan differs slightly from the earlier ANR plan which was created by a different surveyor. The two plans are inconsistent. He stated that if the Planning Board endorses tonight's plan, it should also revoke the prior ANR plan because the two plans are inconsistent.

Mr. Glennon thanked Atty. Murphy for his input, and noted that Lot 4 has sufficient frontage and access for Planning Board endorsement. He stated that the Planning Board cannot be concerned with whatever may happen in the future. Regarding inconsistent ANR plans, whether the prior ANR plan was recorded or not has no bearing or jurisdiction before the Planning Board. He stated that Mr. Baldwin has a right to present subsequent ANR applications, and it is up to the Building Department to issue building permits. He stated that other than correcting the Zoning Data, he does not see how the Planning Board has authority not to endorse the plan.

Atty. Murphy requested that the Planning Board consider requiring a scrivener's note referencing the previous ANR. Mr. Glennon asked if Note 1 on the Plan References on the current ANR plan would address this concern. Mr. Casagrande stated that it would. Mr. Uitti added that if tonight's ANR plan is recorded it may create Lot 1 since it had not yet been recorded from the previous ANR.

Mr. Wadsworth noted a typographical error on the lot size of Lot 1 on tonight's ANR plan. Mr. Grady agreed to correct the plan to show the lot area as 40, 137 square feet.

Mr. Glennon asked Mr. Baldwin if he had recorded the prior ANR plan, and Mr. Baldwin replied that he is not sure. Mr. Glennon asked if tonight's plan would create Lot 1, and Mr. Baldwin replied that Lot 1 existed already. Mr. Glennon stated that if the prior plan had not been recorded, which plan would create Lot 1, and Mr. Baldwin replied that he is not sure what he would do. Mr. Casagrande noted that the ZBA has upheld the issuance of a building permit for Lot 1. Mr. Baldwin confirmed that he has a building permit for Lot 1.

Ms. Deborah Frangesh of 399 North Street requested to speak, and Mr. Glennon declined because her representative, Atty. Murphy, had already presented on her behalf.

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Casagrande provided a second, to endorse a Plan of Land entitled, "Plan of Land, North Street and Keene Street, Duxbury, Massachusetts," dated March 14, 2017, prepared by Grady Consulting, LLC, 71 Evergreen Street, Suite 1, Kingston, MA 02364, and stamped and signed Douglas Bailey, PLS on March 14, 2017, scale 1" = 50,' one sheet, subject to corrections to zoning data and the lot area of Lot 1.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

Mr. Grady made corrections to the plan and the Planning Board members endorsed the mylar. Mr. Grady left the meeting with the mylar.

PERFORMANCE GUARANTEE AND LOT RELEASE: MCLEAN'S WAY DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION / REINHALTER

Ms. Massard noted that a new format for Duxbury, but common throughout Massachusetts, is being presented as a Performance Guarantee, is being presented for this project to allow for a Tri-Party Agreement so that only upon Planning Board approval the bank would release funds. Mr. Glennon stated that the Planning Board will need to address two issues: 1) whether the estimate prepared by the town's consulting engineer, Mr. Peter Palmieri of Merrill Associates, is adequate; and 2) whether the Tri-Party Agreement is satisfactory for its intended purpose. Mr. Glennon noted that Mr. Palmieri's estimate to complete the project, including a 20 percent contingency, is \$119,400.00. He invited Planning Board input.

Mr. Uitti asked if Mr. Palmieri's estimate of the remaining work is accurate, and Ms. Massard responded that it is, noting that it is important that landscaping was included in the estimate because it usually takes at least one full growing season to make sure that dead plants are replaced. Mr. Glennon asked if that requirement should be included in the Tri-Party Agreement, and Ms. Massard stated that it is not necessary.

Mr. Glennon asked why a Tri-Party Agreement is proposed rather than the Performance Bond that the Planning Board has used previously. Ms. Massard responded that a Tri-Party Agreement is better than a Performance Bond because the Town of Duxbury is limited in its capacity to exercise a bond or access private property to do improvements through a bond. Mr. Glennon confirmed with Ms. Massard that Town Counsel had reviewed and approved the Tri-Party Agreement form.

Mr. Glennon requested that Planning Board members review the document prior to signing it because board members were seeing it for the first time tonight, and tabled further discussion to later in the meeting in order to allow time for board members to review it.

Later during the meeting, Mr. Glennon confirmed that all board members had reviewed the Tri-Party Agreement. Mr. Uitti noted that a Lot Release form is also being presented for endorsement.

Mr. Glennon recommended an amendment to the Tri-Party Agreement under #5, in order to ensure that the notice to the lender to release funds is signed by two people, consisting of either the Planning Board chair, the Planning Board vice-chair, and the Planning Director. Ms. Massard noted that no lots would be released except through a vote of the Planning Board, but she agreed that the bank would not object to this change. Mr. Glennon requested that staff request the modification through the applicant's attorney. Ms. Massard asked if the Planning Board would consider signing the document subject to this modification and the signed forms would be held until the change was made.

MOTION: Mr. Uitti made a motion, and Ms. Ladd Fiorini provided a second, to accept a Tri-Party Agreement for McLean's Way Definitive Subdivision / Reinhalter, subject to a modification of #5 of the document presented regarding the communication of the Planning Board vote to release funds.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

Board members signed the Tri-Party Agreement and the Lot Release documents and Ms. Massard notarized three originals of each document.

2017 APR 18 PM 1:55
DUXBURY
TOWN CLERK

DISCUSSION OF CONCEPT PLAN: 232 SURPLUS STREET / JRM INVESTMENT REALTY 2010, LLC

Mr. Casagrande recused himself from this discussion because one of the applicants/owners is a client of his insurance business. Mr. Glennon noted that a quorum of four exists without Mr. Casagrande's participation, and confirmed with Mr. Casagrande that he expects to recuse himself from a possible future filing for a subdivision.

Ms. Massard stated that the question for Planning Board consideration is the possibility of waivers for a subdivision filing. She stated that at the last board meeting, the property owners submitted a concept plan that reflected waivers. For tonight's meeting the property owners have submitted a by-right concept plan without waivers for comparison. She stated that by discussing the concept plans it may save engineering costs.

Mr. Glennon noted that there is no formal application before the Planning Board, so discussion would be advisory only. He stated that he is uncomfortable weighing in on specific waivers without a subdivision filing. He stated that he does not want a future misconception that the Planning Board is binding itself to a past position.

Mr. Rick Grady of Grady Consulting LLC stated that his firm had created nearly a dozen concept plans prior to the one the Planning Board saw at its last meeting. For tonight's discussion they have submitted a by-right subdivision concept plan showing a 50-foot right-of-way with three proposed lots. The existing dwelling lot area would be 60,000 square feet, with two lots to the rear. He stated that tonight's by-right plan shows that a roadway designed according to Subdivision Rules and Regulations would need to be placed in the center of the lot, which may result in the necessity to raze or relocate the existing antique dwelling. He stated that the cost of relocating is prohibitive, so it probably would be razed. He stated that the applicants' proposal is to construct a local street with a 40-foot right-of-way and a hammerhead turnaround, and their position is that a 150-foot turnaround is better for the design and preservation of this historic structure.

Ms. Massard reported that a letter of support for keeping the existing dwelling was submitted by a resident, Mr. David Corey of 26 Surplus Street, noting that the dwelling is the 26th oldest dwelling in Duxbury.

Mr. Glennon opened the discussion for Planning Board input. Mr. Wadsworth asked if the cul-de-sac design would result in a loss of square footage to Lot 4, and Mr. Grady confirmed that it would lose 25,000-26,000 square feet of area. Mr. Glennon asked about a dashed section on the northeast corner of the lot, and Mr. Grady explained that it shows an existing restriction where no structure is allowed. He offered to submit a copy of the deed showing the restriction. Mr. Glennon asked if the restricted land must remain in a vegetated state, and Mr. Grady replied, "No."

Ms. Massard stated that she had encouraged the property owners to present the concept plan to the Planning Board to address the possibility of waivers in the public interest. Mr. Uitti asked Mr. Grady if he had a sense of the complete list of waivers, and Mr. Grady listed the anticipated waivers:

1. Reduced width of right of way from 50 to 40 feet, with a conforming 14-foot roadway within the layout.
2. Waiver of the 75 foot diameter at the end of the right-of-way, noting that the Planning Board has previously approved a hammerhead for another subdivision.

Ms. Massard explained that the reason for granting a waiver would be in the interest of public good. Granting these waivers would provide a way to preserve one of the oldest homes in town and maintain the rural character of the town from the public way. Also, more trees would be preserved with the layout that includes waivers.

Mr. Glennon invited public comment. Ms. Carol Merry of 226 Surplus Street, an abutter to the property, stated that this particular antique home is priceless to the town, and it is very important to keep antiquities in order to preserve the town's character.

Ms. Sara Wilson of 120 Bay Road stated that she knew the previous owners and she believes that they would agree that it is in the best interest of the Town of Duxbury to preserve the existing antique dwelling.

Mr. Uitti thanked the property owners for coming up with a plan to save an historic home. Ms. Massard thanked the property owners for bringing the idea to the board and for working with her to show alternatives with the development community and the Planning Board, stating that she hopes to keep this approach.

DISCUSSION OF ANNUAL TOWN MEETING 2017 / 2018

Ground Mounted Solar Regulations: Ms. Massard distributed copies of a solar zoning bylaw from Mendon, Massachusetts, noting that the Attorney General had provided comments in its approval. She stated that currently in Duxbury, all ground-mounted solar arrays are connected to the grid. Unless the Town of Duxbury adopts a solar zoning district, they can be sited anywhere in the community, and in some cases, at the discretion of the Building Inspector, ground-mounted solar structures would be reviewed by the Planning Board under the Administrative Site Plan Review process. She stated that the Mendon bylaw is a good example because it addresses solar structures on roofs and on the ground, whether it is commercial or residential, and whether it is an accessory structure or a non-accessory structure. She noted that the Building Inspector, Mr. Scott Lambiase, agrees that it provides a good starting point for Duxbury.

Ms. Massard stated that she would like to review the Mendon bylaw with the Alternative Energy Committee and get input from them on where ground-mounted solar structures should and should not be sited. She stated that she would like to address this issue right away while the Comprehensive Plan Update is getting underway.

Mr. Glennon stated that the purpose of a zoning bylaw would be to guard against the town looking like solar satellites dropped into town. He stated that there are issues with panels on the ground and he is looking forward to reviewing the Mendon example.

Mr. Wadsworth stated that there are issues with the disposal of solar equipment, and some may be hazardous waste. Ms. Massard noted that materials in the Planning Board packet address that issue. She added that there may also be clean-up costs. She stated that the Attorney General is generally amenable to ground-mounted solar zoning bylaws, but the Attorney General's office is concerned about what kinds of regulations are adopted and what does and does not work because of the solar siting statute. Overall, she stated that it is a complicated issue. Mr. Glennon noted that while the state-generated review materials provided for tonight's discussion are helpful, they are not exactly balanced and lean pro-solar.

Access Standards: Ms. Massard reported that she is backing off on addressing this issue at this time for a number of reasons, and instead would prefer to address lot coverage in the Neighborhood Business Districts. Mr. Glennon noted that the coverage issue goes back a number of years.

Grading / Stormwater Containment: Ms. Massard stated that there are issues on Powder Point and elsewhere, and the Building Inspector agrees with her that something needs to be done. She stated that standards could be created so that if a certain percentage grading is requested (to elevate a property for a basement, for example), stormwater review would be required. Language could be provided as a zoning bylaw or within the Zoning Bylaw definitions, with the ultimate goal of keeping stormwater drainage on one's own property. Mr. Glennon agreed that it is not merely a hypothetical issue, noting that it also relates to clear cutting and moving significant volumes of earth.

Mr. Casagrande stated that currently a property owner is not allowed to shed water from their property. Ms. Massard noted that pre-existing conditions like topography may historically result in water channeling downstream to abutting properties; however, the issue is significant changes to those existing conditions. Mr. Casagrande agreed that sometimes there is no room to hold stormwater within setbacks. He recommended that the Planning Board focus on significant grading changes rather than insignificant ones.

Mr. Wadsworth stated that Weston Farms is an example of a failed stormwater design because property owners unwittingly filled in swales. Mr. Casagrande stated that a restriction could be placed in a deed. Mr. Glennon noted that it would be difficult to enforce.

Mr. Terry Vose and Ms. Judi Vose of 233 Powder Point Avenue gave a presentation on the grading, clear cutting, and stormwater drainage issues on a neighbor's property that have created multiple issues for them. Ms. Vose stated that although the property owners next door may not have broken any laws, they have drastically changed the property and those changes have created expensive issues for the Voses. For example, the Voses have been forced to remove two large trees that have started leaning since the neighbor's property was clear cut and the trees are now exposed to high winds where formerly they were protected.

Mr. Glennon noted that Ms. Lorrie Hall of the Open Space Committee, on which Mr. Glennon serves, tried to promote a tree bylaw that would prohibit clearing vegetation within the structural setbacks, but the bylaw did not move forward. Ms. Vose asked for advice on where to go, and Mr. Glennon suggested that they contact the Building Inspector to make sure that the neighbor had complied with all regulations. Mr. Uitti recommended that the Voses consider consulting with an attorney.

Annual Town Meeting 2017 General Discussion: Mr. Glennon thanked Ms. Massard for her phenomenal work at Annual Town Meeting on a number of planning and zoning issues. He stated that Ms. Massard's presentations were terrific, answering questions respectfully, clearly and completely. Mr. Wadsworth agreed with Mr. Glennon's comments on Ms. Massard's work.

PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Comprehensive Plan Update: Ms. Massard reported that the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) has a starting date of April for work on this plan. She will meet with MAPC staff next week to determine what the outreach process will look like and what the order of process will be.

Mr. Glennon asked about a timeline. Ms. Massard stated that she hopes to have a vision statement by next year. Mr. Glennon stated that it is important that everyone is on the same page. He agreed with Ms. Massard's approach to determine the scope of the plan and then act on it, resisting the urge to rush through to get it done. Mr. Wadsworth stated that it will be good to get a sense of what the community wants. Ms. Massard agreed, noting that the more the community participates, the better the plan will be. She stated that she is having discussions with the Civic Association and various historical groups, and is also interested in addressing water quality as it relates to the viability of the oyster industry. She stated that she would like to channel the energy of various interest groups by bringing them together and making the process fun. She stated that MAPC staff are experts on public engagement, and that is a critical aspect of the plan. Mr. Glennon noted that PAC-TV, WATD Radio, and the Duxbury Clipper are already bringing the public into the process by broadcasting or reporting on every Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Uitti suggested that the Planning Board consider "real world" ways of communicating with the public such as Facebook or Twitter. He stated that this may be a way to solve some of the misunderstandings that he has seen due to lack of information. Mr. Glennon agreed, noting that the Planning Board may be limited in what can be done because every communication is subject to the Public Records Law, so it may be challenging. Ms. Ladd Fiorini noted that although many people use Facebook, she would recommend going no further than posting agendas. Ms. Massard stated that the Planning Department will have a page on the town's web site dedicated to getting input for the Comprehensive Plan. Announcements could be made on Twitter or on the Town News feed that public can subscribe to. Ms. Massard stated that it is important to not get engaged in social media dialogue because dialogue should be saved for Planning Board meetings.

Recodification and Zoning Maps: Ms. Massard stated that she is thrilled that funding was voted at Town Meeting for the recodification of Zoning Bylaws and for updated zoning maps. She stated that it will improve day-to-day business for the Planning Department and will be better for the Planning Board also. Mr. Wadsworth noted that the Zoning Bylaw Review Committee (ZBRC) had done a lot of work and he hopes that the vendor will start with that work. Ms. Massard stated that the vendor will most likely start with some of the "cross pollination" before addressing more complex issues, but will start with the ZBRC findings.

TOWN CLERK
2017 APR 18 PM 1:20
DUXBURY MASS

DISCUSSION OF PROCESS / PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE AND ZONING BYLAW RECODIFICATION

Ms. Massard recommended that no subcommittees be formed. She stated that at the next Planning Board meeting she will have a general plan and schedule for this work. She reported that she is gathering a list of stakeholders and there are a lot of experts in town. Mr. Glennon agreed that no subcommittees should be formed because subcommittees would need to post their own agendas and minutes. Instead, Planning Board members will represent various areas of interest.

OTHER BUSINESS

South Shore Coalition Legislative Breakfast: Ms. Massard announced this meeting on Friday, April 7, 2017 in Hull regarding the effect of potential federal cuts on local efforts, as well as legislative priorities for Massachusetts planning-related issues.

Town Elections: Mr. Glennon reminded residents to vote in Town Elections on Saturday, March 25, 2017. Mr. Casagrande is running for Planning Board re-election unopposed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 10:02 PM. The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, April 12, 2017 at 7:00 PM at Town Hall, 878 Tremont Street, Mural Room.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- PB agenda for 03/22/17
- MAPC announcement on Hazard Mitigation Plan Public Meeting
- ANR application and plan for 0 North Street
- Assessor's property card for 0 North Street
- Email from V. Massard to P. Palmieri dated 02/27/17 re: Request for estimate of remaining work
- Letter from P. Palmieri to V. Massard dated 02/28/17 re: Performance security estimate
- Staff report "232 Surplus Street – Conceptual Review"
- Concept plan, 232 Surplus Street dated 03/14/17
- Concept plan, 232 Surplus Street dated 02/17/17
- Assessor's property card and GIS map for 232 Surplus Street
- PB Articles of Interest, Annual Town Meeting 2017 spreadsheet dated 03/16/17
- Mass DOER/DEP Clean Energy Results Q&A: Ground-Mounted Solar Photovoltaic Systems dated June 2015
- Model Zoning for Regulation of Solar Energy Systems dated December 2014 prepared by Mass DOER
- MGL Chapter 40A, Section 9B, "Solar Access" dated 03/16/17
- Letter from Attorney General's office to Town Clerk of Ipswich dated 02/01/16 re: Ipswich Special Town Meeting zoning article
- Draft Duxbury zoning article marked, "Draft – pulled from ATM 2016 Warrant due to regulatory changes and timing" which includes Town Counsel edits through 12/31/14
- ZBA decision on 0 North Street dated 03/06/17
- South Shore Coalition Legislative Breakfast announcement

DISTRIBUTED AT MEETING

- Mendon Solar Bylaw dated 02/18/16
- Tri-Party Agreement for McLean's Way Definitive Subdivision (endorsed by PB)
- Release of Lots Under Covenant form endorsed by PB

TOWN CLERK
 APR 18 PM 1:30
 DUXBURY, MASS.