



Town of Duxbury Massachusetts Planning Board

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:05
DUXBURY, MASS.

Minutes 07/12/2017

The Planning Board met on Wednesday, July 12, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, 878 Tremont Street, Mural Room.

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

Absent: Brian Glennon and Jennifer Turcotte.

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

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

OPEN FORUM

Economic Advisory Committee: Mr. Bear reported that there are two openings on the Economic Advisory Committee: one for a term that recently expired (Member at Large) and one mid-term (Business Representative). He encouraged interested parties to submit a Talent Bank to the Board of Selectmen.

INITIAL PUBLIC HEARING, DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION: 1065 SUMMER STREET / TEDESCHI

Mr. Casagrande opened the public hearing at 7:05 PM. Present for the discussion was the applicant, Mr. Matthew Tedeschi of Ducks Berry LLC; and his representative, Mr. Rick Grady of Grady Consulting, LLC. Also present was Mr. Patrick Brennan of Amory Engineers, the town's consulting engineer.

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Uitti provided a second, to waive the reading of the public hearing notice and correspondence list, which are on file at the Planning Office.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

Mr. Casagrande asked Ms. Massard for a synopsis of background on this application. Ms. Massard stated that a special permit for 20 units was filed last fall but withdrawn. The property owner also filed another special permit and an Annual Town Meeting landowner petition which were also withdrawn. In addition an ANR plan of land was not endorsed by the Planning Board.

Ms. Massard stated that the property encompasses 23 acres of land on the west side of Duxbury near the town line that has been a horse farm for many years. The land is under Chapter 61 protection status and the Town of Duxbury has the first right of refusal. The land is zoned Residential Compatibility and Planned Development 2. Ms. Massard stated that the applicant is filing a 10-lot by-right subdivision, which is lower density than what might be available for the zoning.

Ms. Massard stated that a waiver is required for the length of the road which is proposed at 1,249 feet instead of the maximum 1,000 feet allowed. The existing dwelling will remain and the existing horse barn and stand-alone garage

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

will be renovated into a dwelling. The applicant is required to file with the Board of Health for perc tests. The new houses will be built on slab foundations with dry well for roof drainage.

Mr. Casagrande invited Mr. Grady, the applicant's representative, to present the application. Mr. Grady stated that Ms. Massard covered most pertinent items. He noted that when Mr. Tedeschi presented the ANR plan the Planning Board suggested that he consider filing a definitive subdivision instead. Seven new houses are proposed (along with three existing) on 22.5 acres of land with 18.5 acres of upland and approximately 1.8 acres per home. All proposed lots are 40,000 to 60,000 square feet. A 50-foot right-of-way is proposed with 18 feet wide pavement and Cape Cod berms. The topography is flat with a couple of wetlands near Summer Street. An Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation was approved by the Conservation Commission. The proposed road does not cross wetlands but it does cross the wetlands buffer, so a Notice of Intent filing is required with the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Grady stated that drainage will go to an upland area, and filling is required for the roadway. Septic systems will be located in the front yards of the lots. Some soils testing has been done with the Board of Health, observed by Mr. Brennan. The roadway path roughly follows the existing driveway although it has been slightly moved further away from neighbors. The Fire Department is satisfied with the proposed roadway although a fire suppression system is required in each home. The applicant is willing to comply with all Fire Department requirements. Plantings are proposed on the landscape plan for plantings along the street and along buffers, entryway, screening, cul de sac and detention basin. Mr. Grady addressed Mr. Brennan's peer review letter dated June 12, 2017 and stated that the applicant is willing to address all of his concerns, including a consideration of rotating the basin by 90 degrees.

Mr. Grady stated that three waivers will be requested:

1. Roadway length – the proposed road exceeds the maximum 1,000 feet required by 249 feet due to shape and configuration of the existing property and in order to provide an adequate buffer to neighbors and retain existing buildings. He stated that the Fire Department has no issues with the proposed roadway length.
2. Sidewalks – Subdivision Rules & Regulations require sidewalks and none are proposed.
3. Roadway width – Subdivision Rules & Regulations require a 50-foot wide right-of-way with an 18-foot road width. The applicants propose a rounding of the 50-foot right of way on the south side of the property in order to keep the road away from wetlands.

Mr. Grady stated that revised plans could be available within a week.

Mr. Casagrande asked for Mr. Brennan's comments. Mr. Brennan highlighted issues raised in his letter dated June 12, 2017:

- The proposed roadway would be constructed almost entirely in fill, requiring three to four feet of fill, which is excessive especially when considering that Subdivision Rules & Regulations encourage reducing the volume of cut and fill. He recommended that the Planning Board request a report on the mass balance of project cut and fills, including roadway and lot development.
- No test pits have been performed in the proposed vicinity of the drainage basin. He noted that the groundwater is very high. A four-foot deep drainage basin is allowed and the proposed drainage basin is six to seven feet deep; test pits and an evaluation of the design of the basin are needed.
- The primary drainage basin on the south side of the property as shown would require clearing of existing vegetation between the basin and the Town-owned property to the east. He recommended that if the drainage basin is turned 90 degrees it would provide the required 50-foot buffer to the Conservation land.
- Drainage calculations should be revised in order to include roofs because the drywells will eventually fail and it should be ensured that the street drainage is capable of mitigating runoff from all proposed impervious surfaces.
- Documentation should be provided to demonstrate that the sprinkler systems or other provisions will adequately provide for fire safety and the private wells on each lot are able to provide a sustained yield of at least five gallons per minute. In addition the past land use as a horse farm may contribute to higher than normal nitrate levels.

2017 SEP 15 AM 10:25
 DUXBURY, MASS.
 TOWN CLERK

Mr. Brennan summarized that the main issues are the amount of fill proposed and the high groundwater making it difficult for drainage.

Mr. Grady responded that pre-and post-development drainage calculations are provided, and noted that Board of Health regulations are more intensive than Subdivision Rules & Regulations with respect to potable water. Mr. Casagrande asked how changing the amount of fill and the drainage basin depths to no more than four feet would affect drainage calculations. He requested that the applicants provide pre- and post- information on cut and fill. Mr. Grady stated that with a lower depth the drainage basin would need to be widened in order to drain a similar volume.

Mr. Casagrande asked about the possibility of turning one of the drainage basins 90 degrees as Mr. Brennan recommended. Mr. Grady responded that the applicant is agreeable to removing the existing pool house that is proposed to be retained in order to reconfigure the drainage basin. He noted that the basin will be more irregularly shaped than a rectangle. Mr. Casagrande asked if there is space to make the drainage lot larger, and Mr. Grady replied, "Yes."

Mr. Casagrande noted that more filling is required than cutting grades. Mr. Grady responded that he would look into the matter of reducing the amount of fill needed. He drew an elevation to show how it would look with less fill, stating that it would look somewhat natural.

Mr. Bear asked about the nearest drinking water supply, and Mr. Grady replied that it is located on Keene Street, approximately 2,000 feet away. Mr. Grady stated that when they proposed 20 units they obtained an estimate at \$200,000.00 to run a water main for twenty units, so have concluded that it is too costly to run a water main for ten lots proposed now. Mr. Bear asked if the water demand could be supplied, and Mr. Grady stated that they are looking into the matter and with the efficient systems in place today it should not be a problem. Mr. Bear asked what would be the fallback measure if the water is not potable, and Mr. Grady responded that Mr. Tedeschi, the owner, has lived on the property for a number of years and has had no problems to date.

Mr. Bear asked for more information on the roadway length waiver, and Mr. Grady responded that the issue is that fire hose comes in increments of 500 feet so for the extra 250 feet or so a supplemental fire suppression method is required. In addition, alternate egress is often required in other communities although it is not included in Subdivision Rules & Regulations. Mr. Brennan added that it is also a life safety issue because of the concern that residents on a long road might get blocked in a fire or a tree could fall across the road limiting access temporarily. He noted that in some towns a secondary egress is required for that reason.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if water quality sampling has been done, and Mr. Grady replied that it has not been done yet. Private wells are proposed. Mr. Tedeschi added that he has done water quality tests in the past with no problems. Mr. Grady offered to provide water quality test results.

Mr. Wadsworth asked about the public benefit of allowing a longer roadway length than allowed, and Mr. Grady responded that the longer roadway length allows reasonably shaped lots and also allows the retention of the existing dwelling. In addition it would allow keeping the buffer to wetlands. With a shorter road, there would be irregularly shaped lots closer to wetlands buffers.

Mr. Wadsworth noted that at the time the Subdivision Rules & Regulations were revised to restrict the roadway length the Fire Chief was insistent that roadway lengths not exceed 1,000 feet. Ms. Massard noted that at the Development Review Team meeting the Fire Department staff had no issue with the roadway length proposed. Mr. Casagrande noted that no fire hydrants are required on a 1,000 foot road. Ms. Massard noted that the extra road length of 200 feet basically affects one house lot. Ms. Ladd Fiorini noted that Subdivision Rules & Regulations have a good reason to restrict road length and asked if the proposal was for nine lots, could the roadway be reduced to 1,000 feet as required. Mr. Grady replied that he was not sure. He offered to look into providing an alternative plan showing ten lots with a 1,000 foot roadway. He cautioned that the lots would be more irregularly shaped and would be closer to wetlands buffers.

TOWN CLERK
27 SEP 2017 9:51 AM
DUXBURY, MASS.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if the applicant had considered a cluster design that would require a shorter roadway, and Mr. Grady replied that the cluster design does not work well for the applicants on that property because the roadway has to go in some 800 feet before you can access lots.

Mr. Wadsworth asked what happens to the proposed fire suppression system when the power goes out, and Mr. Grady replied that he would have to find out.

Mr. Wadsworth asked about the purpose of Drainage Lot 1, and Mr. Grady replied that drainage was originally designed to go in that direction but now it is going to Drainage Lot 2. Drainage Lot 1 will become open space which could go under the ownership of either the homeowners' association or the Town of Duxbury, or it could be added to one of the proposed house lots, but it is not proposed as a Drainage Lot. Mr. Wadsworth asked if Drainage Lot 1 is unbuildable, and Mr. Grady replied that it is unbuildable because it is primarily wetlands. Mr. Grady stated that the applicant would agree with a condition that no additional lots can be created other than the 10 lots shown on the plan, and he is willing to reconfigure Drainage Lot 1.

Mr. Wadsworth asked how far away the Pembroke water main is, and Mr. Grady replied that it is approximately 700 feet from the property. Mr. Wadsworth asked if the applicant had approached the Town of Pembroke to supply water service, and Mr. Grady stated that they did ask and the Town of Pembroke would not entertain the possibility.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked who prepared the Environmental Impact Statement, and Mr. Grady replied that his office had created it.

Mr. Casagrande invited public comment. Mr. Thomas Borg of 941 Congress Street submitted an envelope with photographs and data and a flash drive and requested to show Planning Board members a video on his device. He stated that on April 1, 2017 he took a video of standing water on approximately three to four acres of land on Mr. Tedeschi's property. The flash drive contains the video. Mr. Borg noted that there is a potential vernal pool on the property that is under the purview of the Conservation Commission, and Ms. Massard noted that potential vernal pools are not regulated. Mr. Borg stated that a significant part of the lot at the back of the property is standing water from March to May, including the entirety of proposed Lots F and G. He stated that even in an under average year there is standing water.

Mr. Borg stated that he has a registered private well on his property and a 150-foot setback is required from a well to a septic system. Mr. Wadsworth asked if the Board of Health is aware of his private well, and Mr. Borg stated that he would confirm that. Mr. Borg expressed concern with the water quality in his well with the development of a lot so close to his well. Mr. Borg stated that of four homes along Congress Street, two have experienced well failures; all have water filtration systems; and one has a sump pump running constantly. He stated that his property failed Title 5 inspection and another property also failed. He noted that in 2010 a septic engineer had warned him of possible radon contamination due to soils so he has installed a radon detector. He questioned why the property at 1065 Summer Street has two wells on the property now.

Mr. Borg stated that the applicant proposes to divert water away from wetlands, and he is concerned that disturbing standing water on that property will affect his water quality. He noted that on April 22 he found a spotted salamander which is an obligate species found only around stagnant water, swamps and vernal pools.

Mr. Borg concluded that he is not against development but he is against irresponsible development. He stated that he is not surprised that the property has not been developed already and is concerned with the integrity of the water supply in the rear of the property.

Ms. Massard noted that the property is not in a Natural Heritage Priority Habitat and Estimated Habitat. Mr. Borg asked about how wetlands are defined, and Ms. Massard replied that wetlands are not under the Planning Board's purview. She noted that the Conservation Commission had approved the wetlands line and has hired its own consultant and is reviewing the proposal. She noted that Mr. Brennan of Amory Engineers is also the consulting

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:01
DUXBURY MASS

engineer for the Board of Health. Mr. Casagrande advised Mr. Borg that most of the issues he has raised are relevant to the Conservation Commission and the Board of Health.

Mr. Dino Colucci of 951 Congress Street stated that the water level is close to the surface at his property and he uses a sump pump year round. He stated that it is common to see standing water outside of wetlands. He stated that his property had a failed well and the new well had to be dug down 500 feet, the deepest well the contractor had ever drilled. He stated that he purchased a pressure booster for his home and during the summer at 2:00 AM with the sprinklers on he could not get a drop of water from his faucet. He stated that water pressure is an issue despite his efforts to boost it. He stated a concern that the proposed fire suppression systems for this project may not have enough water pressure to be effective. He stated that there is not a lot of drinkable water in that part of town. He stated that flooding is also a real concern on his property.

Mr. Dan Costanza of 254 Taylor Street in Pembroke stated that he recently inherited property abutting the proposed subdivision and his lot plan shows different lot lines than shown on the plan submitted with this application. Mr. Grady offered to double check the lot lines and stated that the applicant has no intention of claiming any of Mr. Costanza's land.

Ms. Megan Jeffers of 1047 Summer Street stated that she has similar concerns with water and drainage. Mr. Casagrande assured her that the proposed subdivision will not drain onto her property.

Mr. Ron Daigle of 971 Congress Street stated that he has similar water concerns to what others have stated. He stated that his private well is located near the proposed subdivision. He asked if the water service to the proposed lots would be public or private, and Mr. Casagrande replied they will be private. Mr. Daigle asked what the problem is with irregularly shaped lots, and Mr. Wadsworth replied that it is a marketing issue. Mr. Casagrande added that irregular lot lines can create future lot line disputes.

Mr. Daigle asked how long driveways can be, and Mr. Casagrande responded that driveways are not regulated by the Town of Duxbury and are a private matter.

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Uitti provided a second, to continue the public hearing for the 1065 Summer Street Definitive Subdivision / Tedeschi to Wednesday, August 9, 2017 at 7:05 PM.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

2017 SEP 15 AM 10:05
DUXBURY MASS.
TOWN CLERK

DISCUSSION OF CONCEPT PLAN: TEMPLE STREET / SOUTH SHORE SURVEY

Present for the discussion were the developers, Mr. John McSharry and Mr. Mark McSharry of McSharry Bros. Inc. in Abington, and their representative, Mr. Mark Casey of South Shore Survey in Kingston. Ms. Massard provided background on the concept plans submitted to the Planning Board for tonight's discussion. She stated that the property has a long history on land that abuts Route 3. A state taking for the construction of Route 3 eliminated some of the property's access, so a 50-foot easement was created by eminent domain on an abutting property in order to provide access. Ms. Massard noted that in 1996 the Planning Board turned down a Definitive Subdivision plan, a decision that was upheld in Land Court. An issue in that part of Duxbury is the lack of water pressure. And with this particular property there is a sight line issue from traffic approaching from under the Route 3 overpass. A 30-unit Local Initiative Project proposed on the property in 1997 was not supported by the Board of Selectmen due to the sight line issue. Ms. Massard noted that a 2007 ANR plan of land approved by the Planning Board lays out the easement more clearly. In 2008 a Chapter 40B application for 52 units did not proceed.

Ms. Massard stated that at this time the developers are looking to develop the land into a cluster, Definitive Subdivision, or Chapter 40B project. The property is 14.4 acres in size and is located in the Aquifer Protection Overlay District and a small portion has wetlands and is on the National Heritage Priority Habitat and Estimated Habitat map.

Mr. Casagrande invited Mr. Casey to provide an overview of the proposal. Mr. Casey noted that although sight line issues have been mentioned, the developers' traffic engineers have concluded that there is no sight line issue. Mr. Casey stated that the developers are now considering whether to proceed with a Definitive Subdivision or Residential Conservation Cluster (RCC) project. Although a 40B project may be possible the developers are not interested in that approach at this time. He stated that the property has only 50 feet of frontage on Temple Street. The paved way goes into Temple Street and would need a waiver of the layout radius, but not of the constructed road radius, to construct a roadway. He stated that two plans submitted to the Planning Board show the two alternative configurations.

Mr. Casey stated that the RCC makes the most sense and would be of significant public benefit because it provides a good deal of open space and would provide affordable housing. He stated that the property is basically a giant pre-existing nonconforming lot.

Mr. Casagrande asked about the access and utility easement on the abutting property. Mr. Casey stated that when the Commonwealth of Massachusetts took the frontage, Massachusetts General Law does not allow a property to be left landlocked as a result of a taking, so the state imposed the access easement onto the abutting property. Ms. Massard stated that Town Counsel has reviewed the access more than once and concluded that the access is available for road construction.

Mr. Casagrande asked if the biggest issue now is the sight lines, and Mr. Wadsworth noted that trees may need to be removed along Temple Street, a state road, in order to improve sight lines. Ms. Massard noted that the project has never gone far enough for a traffic engineering study.

Mr. Casagrande asked if town water would be proposed, and Mr. Casey responded, "Yes."

Mr. Uitti asked if there are buildings on the property now, and Mr. Casey replied that there are remnants of an old cellar. Ms. Ladd Fiorini asked if someone lives on the property where the access easement is located, and Mr. Casey replied that the property owner is in attendance at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Casey stated that the grid subdivision plan shows eight lots, plus a fee would be provided in lieu of affordable housing. Ms. Massard stated that the property owners could do an RCC by right if they could show sight lines. She stated that there are no water issues there. Mr. Casey added that a new water main was installed in that area 10 or 11 years ago and the water pressure is very good. Ms. Massard advised the Planning Board that they cannot impose an RCC but a voluntary process is allowed.

Mr. Wadsworth asked if the current Town Counsel has reviewed the easement, and Ms. Massard replied that she is not going to re-test the easement because it has already been reviewed twice before by previous Town Counsels. She stated that the burden is on the property owner to show that sight lines are adequate. She asked for Planning Board input on a potential RCC.

Mr. Casagrande stated that he does not have an objection to an RCC through the special permit process because it saves pavement and provides a greater buffer of land to adjacent properties.

Mr. Casey stated that a road layout is not possible without waivers. He stated that the open space could be deeded to whomever the Planning Board chooses plus a fee would be provided in lieu of affordable housing. He stated that the former property owner died and a realtor contacted the McSharry brothers and they entered a Purchase & Sales agreement on the property. However the title attorney found a flaw in the title because of three beneficiaries only two signed off. Some of the beneficiaries reside in Cape Verde Islands so legal requirements of two countries are involved. He stated that as a result the property has been researched thoroughly.

Mr. Casey asked if, easements and sight lines aside, if the Planning Board would entertain a waiver for a 50-foot wide road layout. He noted that the required 30-foot rounding on the pavement road layout would not be possible.

TOWN CLERK
27 SEP 15 AM 9:06
DUXBURY, MASS.

Mr. Bear stated that he vaguely remembered previous filings on the property and that the visibility for the driver exiting the proposed road was part of the sight line issue. He stated that overall the cluster does appear to make sense. He stated that getting the radius and sight lines may take some engineering. Ms. Massard stated that it needs to be clear that a safe stopping distance can be provided. Mr. Casagrande asked about the speed limit at that location, and Mr. Casey replied that it is 30 MPH.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini stated that it in this location an RCC would be preferable. Mr. Casagrande and Mr. Uitti agreed. Mr. Wadsworth stated that if an RCC is filed, the applicant may need to request a waiver for sight lines. In addition, he stated that existing and proposed grades need to be reviewed.

Ms. Massard advised Mr. Casey to meet with her to discuss the concept plan further prior to filing.

ZBA REFERRAL, SPECIAL PERMIT: 278 WASHINGTON STREET / CORDEIRO

Planning Board members reviewed materials from the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) packet for a special permit to use an existing single-family residence as a bed and breakfast on an occasional basis. According to a staff report prepared by the Planning Director for tonight’s discussion, the filing is in response to complaints filed and subsequent enforcement requests by the Municipal Services Department regarding the operation of an Airbnb at the property. The Zoning Enforcement Officer directed the applicant that a special permit is required. No renovations, alterations or additional parking or exterior amenities are proposed.

Mr. Casagrande stated that there appear to be two major issues: If the house is rented out there is no Zoning Bylaw (ZBL) purview. However, if it is a Bed & Breakfast the owner has to reside at the premises according to the ZBL definition of “Bed & Breakfast.” Ms. Massard stated that the applicant appears to be renting portions or the entire house but if operated as a Bed & Breakfast the Bylaw would not require that they be present. She noted that other examples of Airbnb homes for rent in Duxbury submitted with the ZBA materials. The property is located in the Residential Compatibility District and has 1.5 acres. The dwelling contains 12 rooms: five bedrooms and 3.5 baths. The residence is on a private septic system upgraded in the late 2000s. She noted that there appear to be ample amenities and plenty of parking with a wide turnaround.

Mr. Uitti asked what criteria the ZBA would be reviewing for compliance, and Ms. Massard replied that they would look at ZBL Section 906.2 (Special Permits), notably the impact to the neighborhood.

Ms. Ladd Fiorini and Mr. Bear both noted that in order to operate a Bed & Breakfast the owner must reside at the premises. Ms. Ladd Fiorini stated that the only other issue might be parking.

MOTION: Ms. Ladd Fiorini made a motion, and Mr. Bear provided a second, to defer judgment to the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding Special Permit #2017-06 for 278 Washington Street / Cordeiro, noting that it appears that sufficient parking is provided with the proposal and recommending that the applicants must adhere to the definition of “Bed and Breakfast” in ZBL Section 302, especially that the operator must reside at the property.

VOTE: The motion carried unanimously, 5-0.

DISCUSSION: SUBDIVISION MODIFICATIONS / UPDATES

Ms. Massard proposed that fees be removed from Subdivision Rules & Regulations and instead a fee schedule be proposed for all Planning Board applications with updated fees. Board members reviewed a spreadsheet of proposed fees. She reported that the Board of Selectmen had approved all of the proposed fees for applications under the Zoning Bylaws.

TOWN CLERK
SEP 15 AM 10:06
DUXBURY, MASS

In addition, Ms. Massard noted that current Subdivision Rules & Regulations require nutrient testing that is also required by the Board of Health. Mr. Casagrande stated that Board of Health requirements go beyond Subdivision Rules & Regulations so it may be a waste of time for the applicant’s engineer to provide information that is under the Board of Health’s purview.

Ms. Massard reported that Mr. Peter Buttkus, Director of the Department of Public Works, will organize the search for a consultant to create stormwater design guidelines.

PLANNING DIRECTOR REPORT

Comprehensive Plan Update: Ms. Massard reported that the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) is testing a website that will be up and running in a couple of days. A draft survey also will be available soon. Materials have been provided by MAPC for the Ambassadors to use. Ms. Massard stated that she has reached out to various photography and arts groups to gather photographs of Duxbury. She noted that the MAPC staff is working hard to get all the components ready.

FEMA: Ms. Massard reported that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has issued a draft inland study with a preliminary draft map based on a flyover using Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) with two foot contours. She stated that she had attended a meeting at Kingston Town Hall the previous day. She stated that the preliminary maps appear to have addressed the Town of Duxbury’s concerns with better data, but as expected no established Base Flood Elevations are established due to limited budgets at FEMA. She noted that some cranberry bogs appear to have been eliminated from the flood zone. Ms. Massard stated that while the Planning Board members are welcome to provide input, the maps are not available to the public at this time. She noted that a 2019 adoption is anticipated and the public will be provided an opportunity for review and comment before then. Mr. Casagrande, who owns an insurance business, noted that inland waterways produce most flood issues.

Hazard Mitigation Plan: Ms. Massard reported that she is working with Mr. Martin Pillsbury, Environmental Planning Director for the Metropolitan Area Planning Council, on a draft Hazard Mitigation Plan and a second public hearing is anticipated in September or October.

Zoning Recodification: Ms. Massard reported that the Zoning Recodification project will get underway this fall. The project will take time and is proposed to start with a reorganization of the content and clarifications. Larger policy matters will be a latter phase.

OTHER BUSINESS

There were no items, including minutes or engineering invoices, brought forward under Open Business.

ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Board meeting adjourned at 9:32 PM. The next Planning Board meeting will take place on Wednesday, July 26, 2017 at 7:00 PM at the Duxbury Town Hall, Mural Room.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- PB agenda for 07/12/17
- Public hearing notice for Definitive Subdivision, 1065 Summer Street / Tedeschi
- Staff Report – July 12, 2017 Agenda, prepared by V. Massard for 1065 Summer Street – Definitive Plan 10-lot subdivision
- GIS map for 1065 Summer Street dated 06/26/17 prepared by Duxbury Planning Department
- Assessors property card for 1065 Summer Street
- Letter dated 06/12/17 submitted by P. Brennan of Amory Engineers re: 1065 Summer Street – Definitive Subdivision
- Cover letter dated 05/30/17 from D. Grady of Grady Consulting LLC re: Definitive Subdivision Plan – 1065 Summer Street

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

TOWN CLERK
2017 SEP 15 AM 10:06
DUXBURY, MASS.

- Application for Approval of a Definitive Subdivision Plan for 1065 Summer Street / Tedeschi
- Definitive Subdivision Plans for 1065 Summer Street dated May 30, 2017
- Public hearing notice for 1065 Summer Street Definitive Subdivision
- Staff report – July 12, 2017 Agenda, prepared by Planning Director for 1065 Summer Street Definitive Subdivision
- Letter from P. Brennan of Amory Engineers dated 06/12/17 re: 1065 Summer Street – Definitive Subdivision
- Environmental Impact Assessment and Evaluation Statement, 1065 Summer Street submitted by Grady Consulting
- Staff Report – July 12, 2017 Agenda, prepared by Planning Director for Temple Street at West of Route 3
- Memorandum from R.S. Troy dated 08/21/2008 re: Town Counsel Opinion on Route 3 Order of Taking – Temple Street
- Plan titled “Temple Street, Plan of Land in Duxbury, Massachusetts, Approval Not Required Subdivision Plan, recorded in Plymouth County Registry of Deeds Plan Book 52, Page 1075
- Memorandum from C. Stickney to R.S. Troy dated 07/01/2008 re: Route 3 Order of Taking – Temple Street (request for Town Counsel opinion)
- Order of Taking recorded in Plymouth County Registry of Deeds Book 2874, Page 79
- Letter from T. Broadrick to M. Dacey of Champion Builders dated 11/14/1997 re: Summer of 09/17/1997 DRT meeting
- Letter from T. Broadrick to R. Perry dated 07/01/1996 re: Certificate of Notification for denial of Belnap Way
- Two GIS maps dated 07/06/17 for Temple Street property, prepared by Duxbury Planning Director
- ZBA referral special permit application and materials for 278 Washington Street / Cordeiro
- Staff Report – July 12, 2017 Agenda, Prepared by Planning Director for ZBA referral, 278 Washington Street
- Google Earth map for 278 Washington Street
- Assessors property card for 278 Washington Street

Distributed at Meeting:

- Memorandum from T. Mayo to PB dated 07/12/17 re: Definitive Subdivision Plan, 1065 Summer Street

TOWN CLERK
 2017 SEP 15 AM 10:06
 DUXBURY, MASS.