

HINGHAM PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 27, 2023 @ 7:00 PM
REMOTE MEETING

Planning Board Members Present Remotely: Judith Sneath, Chair, Gordon Carr, Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, and Gary Tondorf-Dick

Also Present: Emily Wentworth, Community Planning Director, and Michael Silveira, Senior Planner

Members Absent: None

Chair Sneath called the Planning Board meeting to order by roll call vote at 7pm and stated the following:

“This meeting is being held remotely as an alternate means of public access pursuant to Chapter 107 of the Acts of 2022 and all other laws, temporarily amending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. You are hereby advised that this meeting and all communications during this meeting will be recorded by the Town of Hingham in accordance with the Open Meeting Law. If any participant wishes to record this meeting, please notify the chair at the start of the meeting in accordance with M.G.L. c. 30A, § 20(f) so that the chair may inform all other participants of said recording.”

Hearing(s)

The Chair then turned the meeting over to Kevin Ellis, Acting Chair on the Accessory Dwelling Unit Zoning Article (AAA) and Residential Occupancy Term Zoning Article (BBB).

Zoning Articles

Article AAA: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and Article BBB: Residential Occupancy Terms

The Acting Chair reopened the hearings and invited members of the public to comment on the current version of the articles.

John Falvey, 18 Martins Cove Road, introduced himself as the Chair of the Affordable Housing Trust. He reviewed the reasons why the Trust supports elimination of the family restriction, including creating a variety of housing options consistent with the goals of the 2021 Housing Plan and 2021 Master Plan. He reviewed the 2018 Pioneer Institute Report that reviewed communities that had already lifted the family restriction. He said those communities had not experienced negative impacts as a result. He reviewed market research on similarly sized rental units in Hingham and rentals of ADUs in other communities. He added the article would help residents age in place. He said that he had not heard any fact based evidence from the Board that supports maintaining the restriction.

Katie Sutton, 245 Leavitt Street, spoke on behalf of the Hingham Unity Council. She expressed support for the ADU Study Committee’s recommendation to lift the family restriction. She said there were adequate controls and the change would be an incremental step. She urged the Board to bring the entire recommendation of the Study Committee to Town Meeting.

Stephanie Gertz, 16 Carlton Road, relayed a story about a relative that has an ADU in California. She said she is in favor of lifting the family restriction based on that experience.

Beth Rouleau, 14 Prospect Street, said she works in gerontology and served on the Council on Aging. She cited to statistics on elderly residents, but offered that the narrative is just as important. She expressed concern about the language in some of the public comment received by the Board about non-family ADUs being commercial or newly introducing rental ADUs, which is not the case since owners can now rent to their family. She described how an ADU might help a senior remain in Town.

Andrew Turner, 172 Wompatuck Road, said he read the Study Committee Report. He noted all the research conducted by the Committee. He supported the Committee's conclusions and asked the Board why it would support creation of the Committee and then cherry pick their recommendations.

Reena Patel, 22 Andrew Isle, introduced herself. She pointed out that 98% of the Town is white, so limiting occupancy to family is like a legacy clause.

Paul Sprecher, 302 Linden Ponds Way, said that lifting the family restriction will advance affordability goals. He also supports the amendment because it reduces carbon footprint.

Olivia Lanna, 107 Halsted Drive, said she operates a medical practice in the community. She interacts with many people with diverse needs. She believes the Study Committee's recommendations are appropriate. She appreciates that the community is evolving in a way that is equitable and kind.

Diane DeNapoli, 16 Gardner Street, said she was a member of the Study Committee. She doesn't believe that the article will support people with disabilities because the units wouldn't be affordable. She is concerned about accessibility to ADUs. She encouraged the Board to consider housing for disabled residents.

Judy Kelly, 19 Harvest Lane, said she has lived in Hingham for almost 40 years. She said she spoke to about 75 seniors and none of them support the amendment. She said if she built an ADU, she would want to get the most amount of income out of it. She doesn't think any would be affordable and doesn't support rental.

The Acting Chair then asked staff to review the most recent version of the amendment that maintains the family restriction. Judy Sneath said she will not vote for this version. She also asked the Board to consider if there is a motion on the floor of Town Meeting to lift the family restriction, would all other requirements remain the same. She also noted that the referenced goal of the Master Plan related to population diversity and aging would not be accurate if the family restriction remains in place. Gordon Carr said he is surprised by the level of interest in the issue and exhausted by the discussion. He said it is likely that there will be a substitute motion at Town Meeting and more discussion. He then said that his goal is not to keep Hingham for Hinghamites. He pointed to other affordable housing goals in the Master Plan. Gary Tondorf-Dick raised his concerns with both demographics and about the appearance of ADUs. He supports more multigenerational housing.

The Board discussed the purposes of the By-Law. Members agreed to remove the Introductory reference to the Master Plan and Purpose. Mr. Silveira made the edits discussed live. Emily Wentworth confirmed that no change other than those related to reinserting the family restriction were reflected in the redline.

Discussion followed about the minimum occupancy or rental term of 6 months. Staff mentioned that the intent was to encourage housing and limit use of an ADU for temporary guests. The Board then reviewed the definition of family in Section V-K and that in Section VI. The definition for residential uses other than ADUs is broader. The ADU By-Law excludes foster children, a long-term domestic partner or their children, an ex-spouse. Members agreed to update the definition applicable for ADUs to mirror that for other residential uses. Mr. Silveira made the edits to the redline.

Andy McElaney, 26 Meyers Farm Road, asked what a recognized family relationship means. Kevin Ellis said ultimately it would be for courts to decide. He added that it would be the same for domestic help and caregivers unless the Board wanted to itemize different relationships.

Judy Sneath suggested that the Board continue the hearing so the definition of family could be refined and reviewed by Counsel. The Acting Chair suggested that the Board first review Article BBB. Gary Tondorf-Dick asked if the term should be increased to be consistent with the ADU article. Kevin Ellis said that there are many month to month rentals already in Hingham.

The Acting Chair then made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to CONTINUE the hearing on Article AAA to Monday, March 6, 2023 at 7pm. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Gary Tondorf-Dick
In Favor: Kevin Ellis, Judy Sneath, Rita DaSilva, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr
Opposed: None

The Acting Chair then made a motion, seconded by Rita DaSilva, to recommend adoption of Article BBB: "Minimum Occupancy Term for Residential Uses". The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Rita DaSilva
In Favor: Kevin Ellis, Judy Sneath, Rita DaSilva, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr
Opposed: None

Judy Sneath resumed the Chair.

55 South Street SPA3 Modification and Site Plan Review Waiver

The Chair reopened the hearing on an application from Charlene and Reuven Levi to modify a Special Permit A3 Parking Determination originally issued September 21, 2016 under §§ III-G, 7.a(iv) and V-A of the Zoning By-Law to fulfill parking requirements for the dwelling units in an existing Commercial/Residential Building in the Business A District and Downtown Hingham Overlay District through off-site spaces designated in the resident parking permit program. She noted that prior to the hearing, the Applicant's representative submitted a request to withdraw the application without prejudice.

Gordon Carr made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis, to GRANT the request to withdraw without prejudice the application of Charlene and Reuven Levi to modify a Special Permit A3 Parking Determination originally issued September 21, 2016 under §§ III-G, 7.a(iv) and V-A of the Zoning By-Law to fulfill parking requirements for the dwelling units in an existing Commercial/Residential Building in the Business A District and Downtown Hingham Overlay District through off-site spaces designated in the resident parking permit program. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Kevin Ellis
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

154 Otis Street Site Plan Review

The Chair opened the hearing on an application from Errol Fagone for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary to raze and rebuild a single-family dwelling and make other improvements including grading, landscaping, and hardscaping in Residence District A. She noted that the Applicant requested a continuance of the hearing to the March 13th meeting.

Gordon Carr made a motion, seconded by Rita DaSilva, to CONTINUE the application of Errol Fagone for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary, to raze and rebuild a single-family dwelling and make other improvements including grading, landscaping, and hardscaping at 154 Otis Street in Residence District A to March 13, 2023 at 7 PM. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Rita DaSilva
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

**457 Main Street
Site Plan Review**

The Chair reopened the hearing on an application from JJF Investments, LLC for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law and such other relief as necessary to construct a single-family dwelling and make other improvements including a paved driveway, grading, and landscaping at 457 Main Street in Residence District A. She

Gary Tondorf-Dick made a motion, seconded by Kevin Ellis, to CONTINUE the application of JJF Investments, LLC for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary, to construct a single-family dwelling and make other improvements including a paved driveway, grading, and landscaping at 457 Main Street in Residence District A to March 13, 2023 at 7 PM and extend the decision deadline to April 13, 2023. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Kevin Ellis
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

**41 Jarvis Avenue
Site Plan Review Waiver**

The Chair opened the matter of Jeffrey Greenman for a waiver of Site Plan Review under § I-I, 9 of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary to modify plans originally approved June 27, 2022 to revise dimensions of the pool, addition, and driveway, flatten grades in the front yard, eliminate an existing pervious driveway, and add landscaping walls in Residence District A.

Paul Louderback, PE, Merrill Engineers, presented the request to the Board by sharing the plans. The Chair noted that the Board's peer review engineer reviewed the proposed changes with respect to stormwater mitigation and noted that the changes actually improve what was previously approved for this site and that there would be no adverse impacts with respect to stormwater.

The Chair then read the following Finding into the record:

That the proposed modifications do not materially or adversely affect conditions governed by the Site Plan Review Design and Performance Standards set forth in § I-I of the Zoning By-Law; as such, the project constitutes a minor modification of the Site Plan Approval, issued June 27, 2022.

Gary Tondorf-Dick made a motion, seconded by Rita DaSilva, to WAIVE Site Plan Review under § I-I, 9 of the By-Law in connection with the revised dimensions of the pool, addition, and driveway, grading modifications in the front yard, elimination of the existing pervious driveway, and addition of landscaping walls at 41 Jarvis Avenue in Residence District A. The motion passed unanimously by role call vote.

Second: Rita DaSilva
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

**136 Nokomis Road and 15 Condito Road
Site Plan Review**

The Chair reopened the hearing on an application from Shadi Alallam for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary to construct an addition onto the existing single-family dwelling and make other improvements including driveway repaving, grading, and landscaping at 136 Nokomis Road and restore 8,400 SF of disturbed vegetated land

at 15 Conditio Road in Residence District A. She referred to the peer review engineer's report and invited the applicant to present.

Attorney Kathleen Heffferman addressed the Board. She reviewed neighborhood context and the project history. Paul Seaberg, Grady Consulting, LLC, presented the plans to the Board. Members discussed the Conditio abutter's request for greater number of smaller mitigation plantings, agreeing that it would be appropriate. No one appeared for public comment.

The Chair read the following Findings into the record:

- a. The proposed development, as conditioned by the Approval, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the prospective occupants, the occupants of neighboring properties, and users of the adjoining streets or highways, and the welfare of the Town generally.
- b. The proposed development meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards, with the exception of a Standard under § I-I, 6.d(ii) requiring mitigation trees to be at least 3" in caliper. A waiver of this Standard to allow mitigation trees at 15 Conditio Road to be 1-2" in caliper will not adversely impact the interests set forth in subsection a. above.

Gary Tondorf-Dick then made a motion, seconded by Rita DaSilva, to GRANT the application of Shadi Alallam for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, with a waiver of submittal requirements under § I-I, 5.1(ii) and (iii) related to a Site Lighting Plan and a Transportation Impact Analysis, to construct an addition onto the existing single-family dwelling and make other improvements including driveway repaving, grading, and landscaping at 136 Nokomis Road and restore 8,400 SF of disturbed vegetated land at 15 Conditio Road in Residence District A, subject to the following conditions:

1. Recording of Decision. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of this decision in the Registry of Deeds and provide evidence of such recording with the application for a building permit.
2. Pre-Construction Meeting. A preconstruction review meeting with inspection of the erosion control installation and marked limits of clearing shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
3. Limits of Work; Tree Protection Areas. During clearing and/or construction activities, the marked limit of work shall be maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. All vegetation beyond the limit of work shall be retained in an undisturbed state and no stockpiling of topsoil or storage of fill, materials, or equipment may occur within the protected area. Without limiting the foregoing, Protected Trees to be retained shall be surrounded by temporary protective fencing or other appropriate measures before any clearing or grading occurs, and maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. Protective barriers shall be large enough to encompass the Critical Root Zone of all Protected Trees to be preserved. Inspection of the protective barriers shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
4. Parking During Construction. All construction vehicles shall be parked onsite. No construction vehicles shall enter the premises before 7 AM on any given construction day.
5. Inspections. Inspections shall be required during construction, and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, of all elements of the project related to or affecting erosion control, limits of work, and the approved drainage and stormwater system installed for the project. The Planning Board may require, at the applicant's expense, the establishment of a consultant fee account pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44 Section 53G, to fund the cost of such inspections.

6. As-Built Plan Requirement. Upon project completion an as-built plan must be submitted to the Building Commissioner prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, and in no event later than two years after the completion of construction. In addition to such other requirements as are imposed by the Building Commissioner, the as-built plan must demonstrate substantial conformance with the stormwater system design and performance standards of the approved project plans.
7. Maintenance of Protected and Replacement Trees. Each Protected Tree retained, and all new trees planted to mitigate the removal of Protected Tree(s), shall be maintained in good health for a period of no less than twenty-four (24) months from the date of final inspection, or issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, if applicable. Should such tree(s) die or be removed within such twenty-four (24) month period, the owner of the property shall be required to replace such tree with a tree consistent with the requirements within nine (9) months from the death or removal of such Protected Tree or new tree.

The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Rita DaSilva
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

158-160 Hersey Street Site Plan Review

The Chair opened the hearing on an application from 158-160 Hersey Street, LLC for Site Plan Review under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, and such other relief as necessary to construct an addition onto the rear of an existing two-family dwelling and make other improvements including driveway repaving, grading, and landscaping in Residence District A.

Jeffrey Couture, SITEC, presented the plan to the Board. He said that the Applicant sought and attained permits from the Zoning Board of Appeals in 2019 to reestablish the prior two-family use of the dwelling that had been unoccupied for approximately 14 years. In connection with a Special Permit A2 application under Section III-I, 1.D.(iii)b., the Planning Board then voted to waive Site Plan Review. The project plans have since been further developed. A total land disturbance of 6,847 SF of land disturbance – 2,660 SF of which is in areas with slopes greater than 10% - triggers a Minor Site Plan Review separate from the Special Permit A2 allowing reestablishment of the use.

The Chair invited public comment. Ryan Connors, 157 Hersey Street, expressed support for the project.

The Chair read the following Findings into the record:

- a. The proposed development, as conditioned by the Approval, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the prospective occupants, the occupants of neighboring properties, and users of the adjoining streets or highways, and the welfare of the Town generally.
- b. The proposed development meets all applicable Design and Performance Standards.

Gary Tondorf-Dick then made a motion, seconded by Rita DaSilva, to GRANT the application of 158-160 Hersey Street, LLC for Site Plan Approval under § I-I of the Zoning By-Law, to construct an addition onto the rear of a two-family dwelling and make other improvements including driveway repaving, grading, and landscaping at 158-160 Hersey Street in Residence District A, subject to the following conditions:

1. Recording of Decision. The Applicant shall file a certified copy of this decision in the Registry of Deeds and provide evidence of such recording with the application for a building permit.
2. Sight Lighting. Proposed outdoor lighting shall be consistent with that of a single-family home and shall not project onto abutting properties greater than the 0.25 foot-candle limit.
3. Pre-Construction Meeting. A preconstruction review meeting with inspection of the erosion control installation and marked limits of clearing shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
4. Limits of Work; Tree Protection Areas. During clearing and/or construction activities, the marked limit of work shall be maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. All vegetation beyond the limit of work shall be retained in an undisturbed state and no stockpiling of topsoil or storage of fill, materials, or equipment may occur within the protected area. Without limiting the foregoing, Protected Trees to be retained shall be surrounded by temporary protective fencing or other appropriate measures before any clearing or grading occurs, and maintained until all construction work is completed and the site is cleaned up. Protective barriers shall be large enough to encompass the Critical Root Zone of all Protected Trees to be preserved. Inspection of the protective barriers shall be required before issuance of a Building Permit.
5. Parking During Construction. All construction vehicles shall be parked onsite. No construction vehicles shall enter the premises before 7 AM on any given construction day.
6. Inspections. Inspections shall be required during construction, and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, of all elements of the project related to or affecting erosion control, limits of work, and the approved drainage and stormwater system installed for the project. The Planning Board may require, at the applicant's expense, the establishment of a consultant fee account pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 44 Section 53G, to fund the cost of such inspections.
7. As-Built Plan Requirement. Upon project completion an as-built plan must be submitted to the Building Commissioner prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, and in no event later than two years after the completion of construction. In addition to such other requirements as are imposed by the Building Commissioner, the as-built plan must demonstrate substantial conformance with the stormwater system design and performance standards of the approved project plans.
8. Maintenance of Protected Trees. Each Protected Tree retained shall be maintained in good health for a period of no less than twenty-four (24) months from the date of final inspection, or issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, if applicable. Should such tree(s) die or be removed within such twenty-four (24) month period, the owner of the property shall be required to replace such tree with a tree consistent with the requirements within nine (9) months from the death or removal of such Protected Tree.

The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second: Rita DaSilva
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

Zoning Articles

Article GGG: Citizen's Petition to Amend Dimensional Requirements for Residence District A

The Chair reopened the hearing on a zoning article that would amend the Zoning By-Law to provide that all buildable lots created in Residence District A after adoption would require a

minimum of 30,000 square feet of area, a minimum of 150' of frontage, and have at least 80% contiguous upland area – i.e., non-wetlands with slopes less than 25%. She invited Special Real Estate Counsel to review her memorandum submitted earlier in the evening. She outlined the differences between the Hingham Zoning By-Law and Pembroke Zoning By-Law, which the article is based upon. She said that lots that do not meet the proposed standard would be considered nonconforming. She reviewed case law related to uniformity and reverse spot zoning.

Gordon Carr asked if the Town had done sufficient research for the article to sustain a challenge? Discussion followed about the difficulty of creating two different standards in one district.

Priya Howell, 26 Del Prete, addressed the Board as the lead proponent of the article. The Chair asked if the intent was to stop development. Ms. Howell said that the pattern of development in Residence A was smaller houses on smaller lots, but redevelopment is resulting in larger houses on small lots. A member asked if FAR or coverage requirements might better address that concern. Ms. Howell said that they didn't have to be exclusive, but she didn't want an economic incentive for larger properties in Residence A to be subdivided. She showed a zoning map with red dots identifying properties that might be impacted by the proposed regulations.

The Chair asked the Board if they saw this as a viable zoning article at this time. Members agreed that the Article raised concerns shared by the Board; however, it may not be in the preferred form to be implemented.

Gary Tondorf-Dick made a motion, seconded by Gordon Carr, to not recommend adoption of the "Dimensional Requirements for Residence District A" article in the form presented during the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second:	Gordon Carr
In Favor:	Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed:	None

Article FFF: Electric Vehicle Charging Parking Requirements

The Chair reopened the hearing on Article FFF which is intended to update provisions of Section V-A Off-Street Parking Requirements to create a standard for the installation of electric vehicle charging stations or infrastructure for future charging stations for all moderate or large parking lots. Additionally, the article would allow parking spaces reserved for electric vehicle charging to qualify toward the minimum parking requirement for the use of the property.

The Community Planning Director reviewed revised text that was suggested during the hearing process to specify in Item 2 that EV charging requirements would only apply prospectively to new or reconstructed parking lots over 20 spaces. It would not apply to restriping or repaving.

Andy McElaney, 26 Meyers Farm Road, asked about enforcement of for EV parking. The Planning Director reviewed the charging structure implemented by HMLP to encourage turnover. The Building Commissioner could potentially also issue a violation notice if a property was functioning more as a filling station, as opposed to an accessory parking use that users of the principal use.

Carol Tully, Advisory Committee, asked for the past presentations on the Article.

Kevin Ellis made a motion, seconded by Gary Tondorf-Dick, to recommend adoption of the "Electric Vehicle Charging Parking Requirements" article in the form presented during the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Second:	Gary Tondorf-Dick
In Favor:	Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed:	None

Administrative Reports

The Chair asked for volunteer representatives for each article, resulting in the following:

Articles AAA, BBB, CCC – Gary Tondorf-Dick
Articles DDD and EEE – Kevin Ellis
Article FFF – Rita DaSilva
Article GGG – Judy Sneath
Article AAA Minority – Judy Sneath

Chair Sneath MOVED to adjourn the Planning Board at 10:02 pm.

Second: Gary Tondorf-Dick
In Favor: Rita DaSilva, Kevin Ellis, Gary Tondorf-Dick, Gordon Carr, Judith Sneath
Opposed: None

Meeting Materials:

Articles AAA and BBB

January 9, 2023 Initial Hearing on all Zoning Articles
January 23, 2023 Hearing on Residential Occupancy Terms and Accessory Dwelling Units Articles
January 30, 2023 Zoning Articles Presentation
February 6, 2023 Zoning Articles Presentation
Report of the Accessory Dwelling Units Study Committee (Please visit <https://www.hingham-ma.gov/940/Documents> for additional background information reviewed by the Study Committee)
Full Text of Proposed Amendment
All documents reviewed by the ADU Study Committee continue to be available online at <https://www.hingham-ma.gov/940/Documents>.
Planning Board Questions and Comments for Consideration, dated January 23, 2023
Benchmark Communities Comparison, updated January 23, 2023
Memo from S. Murphy, dated January 27, 2023
NY Times Article, "Senior Housing that Seniors Actually Like," dated January 29, 2023
Memo from J. Gay-Smith, dated January 30, 2023
Response to Questions from Assessor, dated January 30, 2023
Housing Assistance on Cape Cod ADU Article
Suggested Edits from G. Tondorf-Dick, dated February 13, 2023
ADU By-Law Markup, dated February 13, 2023
Draft ADU By Law Amendment with Family Restriction - Red Lined February 17, 2023
Public Comment from D. DeNapoli, received January 25, 2023
Public Comments from C. Bowman, received January 26, 2023
Public Comment from S. Mason, dated January 26, 2023
Public Comment from L. Burns, dated January 26, 2023
Public Comment from D. Steele, dated January 26, 2023
Public Comment from U. Vakil, received January 27, 2023
Public Comment from E. Moulds, dated January 27, 2023
Public Comment from J. Heileman, dated January 27, 2023
Public Comment from K. Sutton, dated January 27, 2023
Public Comment from S. Gertz, dated January 29, 2023
Public Comment from L. Wittman, dated January 30, 2023
Public Comment from B. Rouleau, dated January 30, 2023
PowerPoint Slide from B. Rouleau, dated January 30, 2023
Memo from J. Gay-Smith, dated January 30, 2023
Public Comment from C. Orwig, dated January 30, 2023
Public Comment from L. Freeman, dated January 30, 2023
HAHT Presentation, dated January 30, 2023
Public Comment from A. Molloy Hussey, dated January 31, 2023
Public Comment from K. Blackwell, dated January 31, 2023

Public Comment from L. Parsons, dated January 31, 2023
Public Comment from R. Patel, dated January 31, 2023
Public Comment from M. Ayer, dated January 31, 2023
Public Comment from A. Turner, dated January 31, 2023
Public Comment from C. Daley, dated February 2, 2023
Public Comment from O. Lanna, dated February 2, 2023
Public Comment from E. Kitchin, dated February 2, 2023
Public Comment from B. Rouleau, dated February 3, 2023
Public Comment from M. Cullings, dated February 3, 2023
Public Comment from S. Wetzel, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from M. Costello, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from R. Jaromin, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from C. Sturtevant, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from E. Boylan, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from W. English, received February 6, 2023
Public Comment from E. Claypoole, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from A. and D. Calnan, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from J. Kelley, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from A. Anderson, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from P. Gannon, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from E. Ioanilli, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from L. Marwill, dated February 6, 2023
Public Comment from C. and H. Hidell, received February 7, 2023
Public Comment from J. Weymouth, received February 7, 2023
Public Comment from E. Emerson, received February 7, 2023
Public Comment from D. DeNapoli, dated February 8, 2023
Public Comment from HAHT, received February 10, 2023
Public Comment from G. DiLoreto, dated February 10, 2023
GTD ADU Warrant Article-Familial Occupancy Memo, dated February 20, 2023
Public Comment from HAHT, received February 22, 2023
 HAHT Presentation
 Scituate and Weston Rental Listings
 Lexington and Westwood Rental Listings
 Wellesley ADU Article, dated April 13, 2022
 Wellesley ADU Article, dated February 10, 2023
Public Comment from P Sprecher, received February 27, 2023
Public Comment from J. Giesbrecht, received February 27, 2023
Public Comment from D. DeNapoli, dated February 27, 2023
Public Comment from Unity Council, dated February 27, 2023
Public Comment from K. and E. Healey, dated February 27, 2023
Public Comment from E. Boylan, dated February 27, 2023
Public Comment from B. McAlvin, dated February 27, 2023
Public Comment from J. Kelley, dated February 27, 2023

55 South Street

Application Package, dated November 14, 2022
Special Permit A3 Decision, dated September 21, 2016
Site Plan Review Decision, dated September 21, 2016
Request to Withdraw Application, dated February 22, 2023

154 Otis Street

Site Plan Review Application, received January 23, 2023
Site Plan, dated January 17, 2023
Architectural Plans, dated January 12, 2023
Stormwater Report, dated January 17, 2023
Continuance Request, dated February 24, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated February 9, 2023

457 Main Street

Application Package, dated December 22, 2022
Zoning Analysis Letter
Stormwater Report, revised October 28, 2022
Landscape Plan, revised December 5, 2022
Plan Set, revised December 22, 2022
Architectural Plans, dated December 22, 2022
Landscape Plan, revised January 16, 2023
Response to Peer Review Comments, dated February 3, 2023
Plan Set, revised February 3, 2023
Soil Suitability Form, dated February 2, 2023
HydroCAD Report, dated February 2, 2023
Continuance Request, dated February 8, 2023
Continuance and Extension Request, dated February 23, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated January 24, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated February 3, 2023

41 Jarvis Avenue

Application Cover Sheet
Waiver Request, received February 2, 2023
Site Plan, revised January 30, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Note, dated February 15, 2023
Waiver Request, revised February 21, 2023
Site Plan, revised February 24, 2023

136 Nokomis Road and 15 Conditto Road

Site Plan Review Application, received January 13, 2023
Site Plans, dated January 10, 2023
Architectural Plans, dated November 30, 2021
Framing Plans, dated April 14, 2021
Stormwater Report, dated January 10, 2023
Landscape Plan, revised January 25, 2023
Application Cover Sheet, revised February 1, 2023
Response to Staff and Peer Review Comments, received February 22, 2023
Revised Site Plans, received February 22, 2023
Waiver Request, dated February 23, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated February 10, 2023

158-160 Hersey Street

Application Package, received January 12, 2023
Grading, Utility, and Landscape Plan, revised January 27, 2023
Response to Staff Comments, dated January 30, 2023
Response to Peer Review Comments, dated February 10, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated February 8, 2023
P. Brennan Peer Review Report, dated February 10, 2023

Article GGG: Citizens Petition

Full Text of Proposed Amendment
February 6, 2022 Presentation
Memorandum from S. Murphy, dated March 27, 2023

Article EEE: EV Charging Parking Requirements

Full Text of Proposed Amendment