

**TOWN OF WEYMOUTH**

**PLANNING BOARD**

**MINUTES**

RECEIVED  
AUG 14 3 33 PM '97  
OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
WEYMOUTH, MA

There was a Planning Board meeting held on August 11, 1997 at 7:30 P.M. at the Town Hall.

Members present: Paul F. Lynch, Sr., Chairman  
Paul Hurley, Sr, Vice-Chairman  
Susan Abbott, Clerk  
Paul M. Dillon  
Patrick Leary  
Mary S. McElroy  
Mary Sue Ryan

Staff present: James Clarke, Director of Planning & Community Development  
Roderick M. Fuqua, Principal Planner

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Lynch.

1. CDBG - proposed reallocation schedule

Mr. Clarke stated that the Board received a memo from Amintha regarding the proposed reallocation funds and schedule. He is looking for approval from the Board for the schedule.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mrs. Ryan, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the schedule for the reallocation of funds.

2. Otis Street - proposed abandonment

Mr. Clarke stated that the Board received a copy of a map of the Otis Street area. There is a proposal to eliminate a portion of Otis Street from French Street to Van Dyke Street. Attorney Rocco DiFazio is here as well as the Solominis who are one of the abutters. They originally submitted a request asking for all of Otis Street. Mr. Clarke stated that he did have a concern because there is a 16' road that goes through there that really doesn't follow the paper street but it does go in the general area. There is an abutter who raised some questions. He thinks that what the Solominis are interested in can still be accomplished by eliminating Otis Street from French Street to Van Dyke Street. Mr. Clarke stated that part of the process to eliminate a private way requires a sign off by the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board.

Mrs. Ryan asked Mr. Clarke if he was saying that we may still want access. Mr. Clarke replied that we need access only on a portion of the road. A road comes in across from Campbell Street. It crosses lot 6 and then crosses over a portion of Otis Street, and then comes up Van Dyke Street. There are a couple of homes and it also goes to the screening plant.

Mr. Lynch asked if this has anything to do with the proposed golf course. Mr. Clarke replied that this does not directly have anything to do with the proposed golf course. The proposed golf course will have access off French Street.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Dillon, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to eliminate Otis Street from French Street to Van Dyke Street.

### 3. Form A Plans

- a. SNUP/Libbey Parkway. Mr. Fuqua stated that this is a re-endorsement of a plan that was approved some time ago, but never recorded.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to re-endorse the Form A Plan for the SNUP/Libbey Parkway.

- b. Meredith Way. Mr. Fuqua stated that this plan is for the end of Meredith Way which is currently a dead end way. The plan does away with the paper streets and consolidates all the lots into one lot. At some time this will be a definitive plan with a completely different layout. He stated that Ken Ryder is the applicant.

Upon motion made by Mr. Hurley and seconded by Mrs. McElroy, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to endorse the Form A Plan for Meredith Way.

- c. Victoria Avenue/Pine Grove. Mr. Fuqua explained the Form A Plan which is to subdivide three lots into two lots. Lot one is 25,000 square feet and it will be coming back to the Board for roadway conditions. Lot two has a note on the plan that it is not a buildable lot.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mrs. Ryan, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to endorse the Form A Plan for Victoria Avenue.

Mr. Clarke stated that four Board members signatures are needed to endorse the Pine Grove plan so that the plan may be recorded.

4. Public Hearing - 7:45 P.M.

Petr: Donald Rafferty  
Locus: 150 Pearl Street  
Sheet 10, Block 123, Lot 7  
Zoning: R-1

Request for special permit for single family dwelling within the 100 year floodplain

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to open the public hearing at 7:50 P.M.

Mr. Donald Rafferty stated that he is the applicant and agent for the owner, Ron Rizzo. Mr. Scott Arnold did the engineering for the lot, but he is on vacation and unable to be here this evening. This property has been before Conservation and approved. The reason it is before the Planning Board is to insure that the house is one foot above the floodplain. For each square foot of foundation area, he has one square inch of louvered area. This is the third house he has built in this area.

Mr. Rafferty stated that he spoke to Mr. Clarke regarding Mr. Arnold being on vacation and unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Clarke suggested to him that he present his case to the Board.

The Board did not have a copy of the plan so Mr. Clarke suggested that the hearing be tabled for five minutes so that Mr. Fuqua could make copies of the plan for the Board.

Upon motion made by Mr. Leary and seconded by Mrs. McElroy, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to table the public hearing for Pearl Street for five minutes

5. Board of Zoning Appeals - review of cases

The Board received a copy of the hearing notice for the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting scheduled for August 21<sup>st</sup>.

55 Revere Road. The Board reviewed the plan for a 4300 square foot lot at the end of Revere Road with a 26' by 23' proposed house foundation.

Upon motion made by Mrs. Ryan and seconded by Mrs. Abbott, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to send a letter in opposition to the application based on the size of the lot and the vicinity of Whitmans Pond.

Mrs. Ryan requested that the Board be informed of the decisions of BZA cases.

Humphrey/Charles Street. The Board reviewed the application for a variance of the lot size for the vacant lot at the corner of Humphrey/Charles Streets. The lot is approximately 15,000 square feet and lots in the surrounding area approximately 10,000 to 12,000 square feet.

The Board was concerned that this lot is located in the Watershed Protection District and felt the 25,000 square foot lot size requirement should not be reduced.

Upon motion made by Mrs. Ryan and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to send a letter to the Board of Zoning Appeals in opposition to the variance for a 15,000 square foot lot in the Watershed Protection District.

6. Public Hearing - 7:45 P.M.  
Petr: Donald Rafferty  
Locus: 150 Pearl Street  
Sheet 10, Block 123, Lot 7  
Zoning: R-1

Request for special permit for single family dwelling within the 100 year floodplain

Upon motion made by Mr. Dillon and seconded by Mrs. Ryan, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to resume the public hearing for Pearl Street.

Mr. Rafferty stated that the plan shows some compensatory storage with some fill on the front for the driveway. If you fill in the floodplain, you must provide compensatory storage. The first floor elevation at least 1' above the 100 year floodplain.

Mr. Hurley asked if it was correct that the Conservation Commission has approved this plan. Mr. Rafferty replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Lynch asked for comments from the staff.

Mr. Fuqua stated that this is an application in the floodplain. The criteria is that the first floor elevation be 1' above the floodplain which the applicant has

shown. This is a tidal area and normally you would not see compensation. In this particular case they have provided compensation because down stream there is a control structure where it goes to a culvert under the road. Since the culvert is a limiting factor, that's where you have the compensation where the volume of fill that will displace the wetland area has an equal area. They have provided the compensation on site so that there will be no change in the flood waters in this particular area between the two culverts.

Mrs. Abbott asked about the compensatory storage that was being provided. Mr. Rafferty replied that the compensatory storage will be a little depression to catch the ground water.

Mr. Lynch opened the floor for comments/questions from the public.

There was no one who wished to speak on the floodplain application.

Upon motion made by Mr. Dillon and seconded by Mrs. McElroy, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to close the public hearing at 8:05 P.M.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mrs. Ryan, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve the special permit for construction of a single family dwelling within a Special Flood Hazard Zone A4 as per plans entitled: Site Plan of Land, Pearl Street, Weymouth, Mass." dated December 24, 1996, revised February 19, 1997, and drawn by C. F. Arnold Associates, Inc.

7. Petr: Richard Burns  
Locus: between 38-46 Durant Road  
Sheet 50, Block 561, Lots 2, 4  
Zoning: R-1

Decision on definitive plan for nine (9) lot subdivision

Mr. Clarke stated that the Board received comments from Rod at the end of July regarding this subdivision. There were questions raised at the June 23<sup>rd</sup> hearing on the detention basin and water pressure. The hearing was continued to July 14<sup>th</sup> and there was continued discussion on the detention basin, water pressure, runoff and grading. In particular the item that had the most significant review was the detention basin. Based on some further analysis of locations where the basin could go, the staff is suggesting that the Board set a condition that the basin be set back at least forty feet from the property line. Originally it was about 10 feet from the property line. We had made some suggestions about slopes as far as the side slopes around the basin. In further discussions with the applicant, his concern is about being able to meet all of those conditions and still design a basin that holds the amount of water

required. Mr. Clarke stated that the staff is suggesting that we hold to the 40' requirement, and allow some flexibility on the side slopes. He suggested that the Board require a 40' setback for the basin, and ask that the final design be reviewed by the Planning Office and DPW prior to final approval. Mr. Clarke stated that he is assuming that the slopes will not be greater than 3 to 1, but in some cases we recommend 4 to 1 or 5 to 1 and he does not know that the applicant will be able to do that.

Mr. Clarke stated that he thinks that the biggest concern that was raised at the hearing was the impact on the existing neighborhood on Durant Road, and by moving the basin back, it helps to address the concerns that were raised.

Mr. Lynch asked if there were any questions from the Board.

Mr. Hurley stated that he agrees with the comments on the basin. He stated that when the applicant came in, he did not ask for any waivers. He asked if that was correct that the applicant has not asked for any waivers. Mr. Fuqua replied in the affirmative. Mr. Hurley stated that the Board would be granting waivers without the applicant asking for them. Mr. Fuqua replied that is correct.

Mr. Hurley stated that he liked the comments prepared by the staff.

Mr. Leary asked about the slopes. Mr. Fuqua replied that the slopes, as laid out, were 3 to 1, 4 to 1, and 5 to 1, and that was just a rough estimate. There were no calculations. If there is any flexibility on the slopes, it would probably be on the 5 to 1 and/or the 4 to 1 area.

Mr. Clarke stated that his comment is that if the Board is going to allow flexibility of the slopes, then he feels we should hold firm on the set back of the basin.

Mrs. Ryan stated that she would definitively want a 40' set back for the basin, but she is also concerned with the slopes.

Mr. Charles Arnold stated that they will do the best they can. Whatever they can fit in with the least slope is what they intend to do.

Mr. Clarke stated that the side slopes along the wetland should be no steeper than a 3 to 1 slope. Along Durant Road, the slope should be as close to a 3 to 1 slope as possible. A 3 to 1 slope is the maximum we would want to see.

Mrs. Abbott asked about a fence around the detention basin. Mr. Clarke replied that the detention basin will be located out in the woods.

Mr. Fuqua stated that the Street Lighting Committee has asked for an

additional street light that is not required under our regulations. He asked if the Board wanted to follow the Street Lighting Committee's recommendation, and if so would there be a need for the individual pole lanterns on the individual lots. The Board must decide if they want more street lights or they want to go with the requirements of the rules and regulations and have one street light at the intersection and pole lanterns on the lots.

Mr. Dillon stated that he feels the Board should go with pole lanterns on the lots but it must be enforced.

Mrs. Abbott stated that the Street Lighting Committee has taken into consideration the pole lanterns on the lots and are still asking for an additional street light.

Mrs. Ryan stated that she feels that the Board should require the pole lanterns on the lots and follow the recommendation of the Street Lighting Committee for the number of street lights.

Mrs. McElroy stated that on page 3 of the comments by the staff, it says the detention basin maintenance should follow the storm water management guidelines. She asked what those guidelines were. Mr. Fuqua replied that the storm water management guidelines have just come out. He reviewed the guidelines. This is a State requirement and must be followed for any basin.

Mr. Hurley stated that the applicant should be required to request a waiver on the entrance curbs. It should be included in the application.

Mr. Fuqua stated that the bounds will be worked out with DPW so it will be as per requirements of DPW.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve a definitive plan entitled: "TAYLA DRIVE, WEYMOUTH, MASS" submitted by: Richard Burns; filed with the Town Clerk on May 14, 1997, concerning property located off 42 Durant Road, shown on the Weymouth Town Atlas Sheet 50, Block 361, Lot 2, with the following conditions:

1. Subdivision approval does not confirm nor grant permission of any regulation, permit, easement or right, (such as DPW "no net gain" water policy, or DPW 2:1 infiltration/abatement policy,) the applicant may be required to obtain from any municipal, state, federal or private agency or individual and are the applicant's responsibility to secure such.
2. Three street light fixtures of 4KLU on non-metallic poles at lots 4&5, 7&8 and 9& the Wittaker house on Durant Rd., as requested by Street Lighting Committee with installation as per Mass. Electric construction

standards.

3. Sidewalk shall be 4.5 feet in width to comply with ADA regulations.
  4. A waiver of Section 5.2.4 of the Rules and Regulations of the Planning Board of Weymouth, Massachusetts Governing the Subdivision of Land, Adopted March 4, 1954, Latest Amendment May 10, 1991, Revised June 13, 1994 regarding entrance curves of Tayla Dr. and Durant Road, to allow the entrance as shown on said plan.
  5. Town bound at Durant Rd. to be protected during construction.
  6. Sewer and water lines shall be encased in concrete where lines cross, construction to follow regulation of the Weymouth Department of Public Works.
  7. Lot 10 shall be noted as "not a buildable lot".
  8. The detention basin shall be relocated and redesigned to incorporate the following
    - i. Set basin back 40 feet from the rear property line of the abutting lots fronting Durant Rd.
    - ii. Set basin back a minimum of 75 feet from the westerly edge of the easement extending beyond Elinor Rd.
    - iii. Set the basin as close to the wetlands as is permissible through Conservation Commission.
    - iv. All side slopes shall be no steeper than a 3:1 slope
    - v. Side slopes along the Durant Road side should be as close to a 4:1 slope as design will allow.
    - vi. Side slopes facing the sewer easement should be as close to a 5:1 slope as design will allow.
    - vii. Detention Basin maintenance shall follow the Storm Water Management Guidelines. The maintenance plan shall be noted on the definitive plan.
  9. All conditions contained herein shall be noted on said definitive plan before the Planning Board endorses their approval on said plan.
8. Petr: Marylou's News  
Locus: 768 Main Street  
Sheet 45, Block 521, Lot 3  
Zoning: B-1

Decision on special permit for a drive through service

Mr. Clarke stated that the Board received comments from the staff regarding



the special permit. One of the items he wanted to point out, the Board really had not gone into detail discussing this. Rod prepared an overlay of the site plan of the queuing area with a number of vehicles shown on the plan for the queue area. Three vehicles is not bad, but getting up to five vehicles starts to create conflicts on the site. They are raising that issue as a concern. By adding the drive through to this site will all the other activity going on, there is a concern.

Mr. Clarke stated that this is a special permit and the Board needs to follow the special permit criteria.

Mr. Dillon stated that his problem with the site is that he feels the site is too small. He is very concerned about the queuing problem and parking that will be at the front of the building. He is concerned with the use of Park Avenue. He knows the intersection has been upgraded and improvements made, but he still feels there is a serious problem, and feels the site is too small for a drive through. He could not vote in favor of this.

Mrs. Ryan stated that she shares Mr. Dillon's concern. She agrees the site is too small. Once there are over three cars in the queue, there is a problem. This is an intersection with two major arteries with cars exiting and entering both on Park Avenue. She feels there will be a negative impact on existing traffic. She thinks there will be more queue than what has been suggested.

Mr. Dillon stated that criteria #4 - adequate and proper facilities will be provided - bothers him. The zoning is correct. He has a problem with criteria #3 - no nuisance or serious hazards to vehicles or pedestrians. He has a problem with both criteria #3 and 4.

Mr. Leary stated that he shares Mr. Dillon and Mrs. Ryan's concerns.

Mrs. McElroy stated that safety is her biggest concern. It is a dangerous street and there is no provision for any future growth. The kind of drive through proposed will not be fast paced - they sell so many items. The window will be stalled all the time. She feels there is a safety issue.

Mr. Hurley stated that the traffic consultant and the applicant have done just about everything they possibly could. The traffic consultant said this was the best possible design for this site. He thinks this site is just limited so the design can't be perfect.

Mrs. Abbott stated that she is concerned with safety issues, queuing, and Park Avenue. She cannot support this application either.

Mr. Lynch stated that he agrees with Board members. They have a nice layout right now the way it is. It is a very small lot and he cannot support the drive

through.

Mr. Dillon made a motion to deny the special permit application for a drive through service based on special permit criteria #3 and 4. There are safety issues, the site is too small to handle a drive through and the application does not meet #3 and 4 of the special permit criteria. Mr. Leary seconded the motion.

Mr. Clarke stated that Mrs. McElroy brought up the queuing as proposed and no room for any future growth at the site. Also the staff raised the issue of items 4.C. and D. which are (C.) four vehicles in queue impacts Park Avenue approach in front of the building by limiting the ability to use the "bailout" lane; and (D.) five vehicles in queue impacts Main Street approach by last vehicle extending into the entrance curb cut.

Mr. Dillon stated that he will include those items as part of his motion to deny the application.

Mrs. Ryan asked if included in the motion to deny was the impact on existing traffic on Park Avenue. Mr. Clarke replied that the motion was made with reasons for denial, but also comments have been made by individual members. He does not feel we need to go back through everything that was said because the Minutes are made a part of the decision.

A motion was made by Mr. Dillon and seconded by Mr. Leary to deny the special permit for a drive through service for Marylou's News, 768 Main Street based on the following reasons:

1. The application does not meet special permit criteria 120-122.D.(3) and (4).
2. Based on safety issues, the site is too small to handle a drive through.
3. There is no room for any future growth at the site.
4. Four vehicles in queue impacts the Park Avenue approach in front of the building by limiting the ability to use the "bailout" lane.
5. Five vehicles in queue impacts the Main Street approach by the last vehicle extending in the entrance curb cut.
6. Impact on existing traffic on Park Avenue.
7. Proposal tries to put too much activity on a small site at a busy intersection.

The Chairman called for a roll call vote on the motion to deny the special permit.

Paul M. Dillon - aye  
Mary Sue Ryan - aye  
Patrick Leary - aye  
Mary S. McElroy - aye  
Paul Hurley - aye

Susan Abbott - aye  
Paul F. Lynch, Sr. - aye

The motion to deny the special permit application was unanimously voted (7-0).

9. Subdivisions

Mr. Clarke stated that he has asked Rod to prepare an update for the Board on the status of subdivisions possibly at the September 8<sup>th</sup> Board meeting. On Heather Estates, he has been in touch with the attorney and are trying to come to an agreement with the bank and the homeowners association. On Holly Estates, the Board will be given a full report, but the sidewalk has been put in. On Burns Way, he thinks they will be paving this week. In the Pine Grove subdivision, there is agreement on the sidewalk, and he has talked to the post office and the post office has agreed to have all of the mail boxes on the same side of the street.

a. Northern Avenue extension - bond release

Mr. Fuqua stated that Northern Avenue is complete. An as built plan has been filed and there is a bond of \$8,150 remaining. He recommends holding \$500 because there is still backfill to put in, along with loam and seed.

Upon motion made by Mr. Hurley and seconded by Mrs. McElroy, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to reduce the bond for Northern Avenue extension to \$500.

b. Lightwood and Bantry - set guarantee, request to modify condition

Mr. Fuqua stated that the developer, Paul Driscoll, is here this evening. Mr. Driscoll has requested for the Board to reconsider granite curbs. There is a granite curb requirement that is shown on the plan going around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Driscoll is requesting to eliminate the granite curb and to put in a stone wall.

Mr. Driscoll stated that at the entrance on the north side he is proposing to construct an approximate 30' long, about 4' behind the curbing. All of the granite curbing will stay, as required. His request is just to eliminate the granite curbing around the cul-de-sac. For beautification purposes, Mr. Driscoll stated that he feels this is a better plan than curbing around the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Fuqua stated that the wall would be on the entranceway. There will be granite curb and then 4' behind that is where the wall would be.

Mr. Driscoll stated that the only place he is looking to eliminate the granite curbing is on the inside of the cul-de-sac. The granite curbing would be replaced with cape cod berm. Where the stone wall is going there is going to be curbing, a 4' loam and seed area, and then the stone wall.

Mr. Dillon asked if it was correct that Mr. Driscoll is proposing to eliminate the curbing around the cul-de-sac on the interior. Mr. Driscoll replied that is correct.

Mrs. Ryan asked what the reason was for this request. Mr. Driscoll replied that he thinks it would make the entrance more attractive. Mrs. Ryan asked if it was correct that if the Board does not allow the cape cod berm on the interior of the cul-de-sac, Mr. Driscoll won't do the wall at the entrance. Mr. Driscoll replied in the affirmative.

In response to a question regarding the cost, Mr. Driscoll stated that the wall would be a little cheaper. The cost would be approximately \$7,500 for the curbing on the two cul-de-sacs, and approximately \$5,000 for the wall.

Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Driscoll if he was planning anything else for the wall, such as a sign. Mr. Driscoll replied that he was not.

Mr. Dillon asked Mr. Driscoll if he could put up a sign with the name of the development.

Mr. Clarke suggested that Mr. Driscoll consider upgrading the street sign to something similar as the signs at Alewife Lane and Granite Post Lane.

Mr. Driscoll stated that he would not be opposed to putting a decorative sign on the wall.

Upon motion made by Mr. Dillon and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to amend the construction requirements for the Lightwood and Bantry Subdivision by:

1. Allowing "Cape Cod" berms in place of granite curbs on the inside radius around the turnarounds.
2. In lieu of the granite curbing as noted above, a stone wall, 30 foot long set 4' back off the pavement to the rear of the ROW and arced to match the entry radius shall be installed on the westerly side of Lightwood Way with a street sign attached.

Mr. Fuqua stated that he has prepared a bond amount for the roadway work for Lightwood and Bantry in the amount of \$71,800. A vote is needed to approve the bond amount and to release the covenant.

Upon motion made by Mrs. McElroy and seconded by Mr. Hurley, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to approve a bond amount of \$71,800 for Lightwood and Bantry and to release the covenant pending posting of a suitable bond.

10. Other Business

- a. Day Care Centers. Mrs. McElroy stated that at the previous meeting she made a motion that we contact our Representatives/Senator about group day care to see if State law can be changed. Mr. Clarke replied that he will check on that. He thought that if we were going to send a letter, we were going to provide a little more detail.

Mrs. Ryan stated that the Selectmen did not take any action that night with regards to what can be done to address concerns with group day cares. She suggested that a letter be drafted to the Selectmen explaining our concerns and ask that they forward our concerns to our Representatives/Senator. In talking with the Office for Children, they said they would be interested in hearing our concerns. She suggested that we forward our concerns to the Office for Children also stating our concerns over safety and traffic. Police and Fire are not notified if there are day care centers in residential areas.

Mrs. McElroy stated that she thinks group day cares should be registered because they are a business, and they should pay taxes as a business.

Mr. Clarke stated that he will draft something on group day cares.

- b. Greenbush. There is a Greenbush meeting this Thursday evening at Lombardos in Randolph.
- c. Heath n' Kettle. Mr. Clarke stated that the Hearth n' Kettle, which is under construction, has filed an Environmental Notification Form. There was an on site meeting on August 1<sup>st</sup>. We had staff there and gave them information on the special permit, and Conservation Commission Order of Conditions. This was basically for the curb cut.
- d. Planning Board meetings. Mr. Clarke stated that he has not scheduled another meeting in August. The September meetings will be on the 8<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, plus the CDBG public hearing on September 10<sup>th</sup>. There are three public hearings scheduled for September 8<sup>th</sup>: Lucas Circle amendment, cell tower in Libbey, and Dunkin Donuts at Park/Main

Street.

- e. Moratorium - Wireless Communications. Mr. Clarke stated that the Board of Selectmen are going to call a Special Town Meeting in November. We have a moratorium drafted for cell towers. Rod has set up a meeting next week with George Lane, Jeff Coates and Paul Dillon to review a draft bylaw for cell towers.
- f. Meeting with Pond Plain Improvement Association. Mr. Clarke stated that he and Paul Lynch will be at a meeting of the Pond Plain Improvement Association on Wednesday at 7:30 P.M. to discuss the streets around the commuter rail station. It is a working session to identify those streets that they think might need special types of signage.


Mrs. Abbott stated that the whole Pond Plain area might want to think about resident parking stickers.

- g. South Shore Hospital. Mr. Hurley stated that next to the new building to the rear where the doctors parking used to be, they have constructed a 4' wall. He does not know what it is , but he questioned whether it should have come before the Planning Board. He stated that it looks like an outside generator.

Upon motion made by Mr. Hurley and seconded by Mrs. McElroy, it was:

UNANIMOUSLY VOTED: to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 P.M.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and complete statement of all actions and votes taken at this meeting on August 11, 1997.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul F. Lynch, Sr., Chairman