

**COHASSET PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**DATE:** MONDAY, JUNE 30, 2008  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** COHASSET TOWN HALL – SELECTMEN’S OFFICE  
41 HIGHLAND AVENUE, COHASSET, MA 02025

**Board Members Present:** Stuart W. Ivimey, Vice-Chair  
Charles A. Samuelson, Clerk  
Clark H. Brewer

**Board Members Absent:** Alfred S. Moore, Jr., Chairman  
Michael R. Westcott

**Recording Secretary Present:** Jo-Ann M. Pilczak

---

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT: 7:05 P.M.**

**7:00 P.M. 16/22 DEPOT COURT – COMMONWEALTH OF MASS. EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION REQUESTED “RESPONSE SHEET” RE: 16/22 DEPOT COURT BUILDING PERMIT (not on agenda – request delivered to Planning Board Office 06/30/08)**

(Member Brewer wanted it noted that he has been doing code analysis on this project). Letter from Exec. Office of Transportation relates to the 2833 SF parcel at Depot Ct. which has small encroachment by the existing porch and proposed handicapped ramp. This smaller lot was railroad property which was sold and abandoned on 11/29/50. Request is for Planning Board to indicated that they do or do not object to the issuance of a building permit for this parcel.

**MOTION:** by Member Samuelson to sign the response sheet indicating that the Planning Board does not object to the issuance of a building permit for this smaller parcel.

**SECOND:** Member Brewer

**VOTE:** 3 - 0 MOTION CARRIES

Member Ivimey signed response sheet as Vice Chair. Administrator to mail.

**7:10 P.M. FORM A APPLICATIONS**

• **22 SPRING ST./129 SO. MAIN ST. – FORM A APPLICATION – ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON - filed on 06/25/08.** John Cavanaro in attendance to represent this application. Currently, there is one structure at 129 No. Main St. (St. Antony’s Rectory) and one structure at 22 Spring St. This application combines lots 82, 83 and 84 into Lots 1, 2. Desire is to move lot lines so as to convey 22 Spring Street with less land so St. Anthony’s Church retains more of the land. 22 Spring St. will meet minimum requirements and be conforming lot.

**MOTION:** by Member Brewer to endorse this ANR application

**SECOND:** Member Samuelson

**VOTE:** 3 - 0 MOTION CARRIES

• **16 RIDGE TOP ROAD – FORM A APPLICATION – KATHLEEN BAILEY - filed on 06/25/08** John Cavanaro in attendance to represent this application. This property is at the corner of Bailey Rd. and Ridge Top Rd. Was originally 3 lots which were merged into one 1.6 acre lot with one dwelling. Has municipal sewer stub and an existing septic system. Petitioned Sewer Commission to keep septic system and not connect to sewer. Owner’s sister would now like to build house on the land - Sewer Commission was petitioned to allow the connection to the municipal stub – this was granted contingent on BOH signing off on the functioning septic system – BOH signed off on use of existing septic system. Plan is to subdivide this 1.6 acres to create a new lot with adequate frontage and area. Both Bailey Rd. and Ridge Top Rd. are private ways with full utilities with 40’ layout widths and were both constructed in 1953 (pre zoning) as a single subdivision of land. Member Ivimey noted that the frontage is not on a public way and contends that Planning Board policy has been not to grant ANR’s on parcels that do not have 50’ of frontage on a public way and that the statute allows granting under 3 circumstances:

1. A public way or a way which the Town Clerk certifies is maintained and used as a public way or,
2. A way shown on a plan theretofore approved and endorsed in accordance with subdivision control law or,
3. A way in existence when the subdivision control law became effective, having, in the opinion of the Planning Board, sufficient width, suitable grades and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land abutting thereon or served thereby for the installation of municipal services to serve such land and the building to be erected thereon.

Cavanaro noted that it certainly has adequate suitability for municipal services as the municipal services are already in the road and that there are not any plans to access any further than shown on the plan or to subdivide further. Capt. Trask commented that this is a very sub-standard road – emergency service vehicles can enter the road but that the width poses problems. Cavanaro replied that there is a hydrant and new water main on the property and that the property has access from both Pond St. and Rt. 3A and that he would argue that the access is more than suitable. Member Ivimey stated that the key question is the adequacy of access to the lot. Member Brewer noted that Ridge Top Rd. is a dead end that narrows to about 24' at the end and is less adequate than Bailey Rd. Cavanaro stated that they were not yet sure if they would access the new house from Bailey Rd. or Ridge Top Rd. – would depend on where they configure the garage. Member Samuelson would like statement from Police Dept. and Fire Dept. regarding adequacy of road for their services. Cavanaro agreed to extend the 21 day deadline to July 31, 2008. He will get statements and reappear at the July 21 meeting.

**7:30 P.M. MIKE BLISS, AEC – DEMONSTRATION LIGHT GRANT (not on agenda)** Bliss explained that the AEC has an opportunity to apply for a grant to receive one demonstration solar powered street light – perhaps for the Village – to see how they work and if the Town likes them. The lights are a “dark skies” approach and seem to compliment the design preferred in the Village

**MOTION: by Member Brewer to encourage and endorse submission of the grant application**

**SECOND: Member Samuelson**

**VOTE: 3 - 0 MOTION CARRIES**

**7:35 P.M. REVIEW OF DRAFT VILLAGE BUSINESS DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES** Angus Jennings, Concord Square in attendance. Member Ivimey explained that the purpose of this meeting is to review the draft guidelines drawn up by Concord Square, not to discuss and review individual properties. Jennings distributed a handout of the key points and explained that the draft is organized:

1. Legal framework for document – to give applicants clear guidance as to the design elements the Board is looking for in the Village and that the applicant’s filing will be viewed against these guidelines. The intent is to create an enforceable regulatory document that can be used in the permitting process for the basis of conditional approval or denial of an application.
2. Guiding principles that are aspirational in nature and vision statements of public policy in terms of what the Town wants to see happen in the Village. Guiding principles are divided into:
  - a) General Public Policy objectives such as sustainability, affordability etc.
  - b) Guideline subsections based on geographical location within the Village recognizing that there are sections of the Village that are not the same and should be treated more specifically
3. Design Guiding principles that are more significant regulatory components:
  - a) Building Design Guidelines
  - b) Site Design Guidelines

These two sections will contain “should” and “shall” statements with the “should” being things the Board would like to see (which are not enforceable) while the “shall” statements which could become the basis for the denial of an application. Current draft is primarily “should” - ***the Board must review and determine which guidelines are so important that they should become “shall” statements.***

Jennings encourages all applicants to meet with the Board for Informal Discussion to review preliminary plans before they are deep in design.

Member Brewer would like to see some specific successful design examples (perhaps from other Towns) for specifics such as façade, projecting signs, fixed awnings as well as examples on larger scale such as 2-3 story façade. Also noted that regarding interior panels (4.2.6), emphasis should be on “should” (“building should not be symmetrical in design”).

**Bill Good, Design Review Committee:** Good continues to work on pulling a diverse group together to sit on this committee and believes the design review process will be an opportunity to offer constructive input. He would like

the DRC to be included in informal discussions with applicants. He cited Newbury Street as being a good example of a common theme (brick) among different building architectures which he believes is less restrictive and, adds interest and diversity to the design mix.

Wayne Sawchuk: had several items he wanted to comment on:

1. p. 8 - 5.2.1: he noted that the materials cited in the last sentence are the only materials NOT found in the village and that these are not materials for Cohasset. Also cited the omission of clapboard and shingles which are Cohasset type materials.
2. p.9 - 5.3.6: he noted that some areas might be better with a >10' setback (might be good for So. Main St. but not other locations outside the core area
3. p. 10 - 5.4.5: when it is said that windows should be recessed a minimum of X", he thought "projected" should also be included – a boxed or bay window is appropriate with what is in the village and is an option that adds interest.
4. p. 10 - 5.6.4: he noted that it is not always possible to align windows vertically – 1<sup>st</sup> floor commercial locations usually have picture windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and smaller windows on the upper level residential floors – so the windows don't align.
5. p. 11 - 5.7.2: he thought "unless spaces are replaced" should be added
6. p. 12 - 6.1.6.1: "poured & bituminous should not be used within the same sidewalk" . . . Sawchuk noted that has already been done with the new sidewalks, handicapped ramps and crosswalks in the Village
7. p. 14 - 6.3.9.5: Cobra Head light fixtures needs to be clarified – Jennings noted that images of allowed and prohibited will be included.
8. P. 16 - 6.4.6.4: Sawchuk noted that most stores rely on some of these types of signs (eg. Vinyl stick-on) to post their hours on the front door, so this might not be practical.

Sawchuk mentioned that he would like the Board to consider allowing some artificial materials such as vinyl siding. Member Brewer noted that he would be against vinyl siding that melts down the side of the building in a fire, but conceded that it can be very useful for detail spots that are hard to maintain.

Discussion about roofs: questions was posed as to whether flat roofs should be discourage. Member Brewer noted that a flat roof can have valuable useable space for equipment, roof decks etc. and that fences, facades etc can be used in the design approach such that one could not tell that the roof was flat. Red Lion Inn is an example of a flat roof that houses a lot of mechanical equipment but is screened by fence on edge. Could include language that flat roofs must have non-flat façade and adequate screening so that it does not appear flat. Jennings cautioned against something that is too prescriptive on design – this is an area of design review that is very subjective and, over-regulation might risk exceeding authority. Jennings suggested that preferences for design could be suggested for different areas of the Village. Regarding being too prescriptive - Jennings noted that if the Board preserves a lot of options they are probably on the right track - in otherwords, they should probably not suggest only one roof line in the Village for example, but probably would be OK in not allowing one type of roof line that they really think will not work in the Village.

Noise Abatement: Jennings noted that it does not have to be covered in the Design Guidelines as it is already covered in the Zoning Bylaws.

Fire Protection: Member Ivimey queried as to whether the Board can ask applicants to exceed code for external sprinkler protection.

Parkingway backside of So. Main St. Lot: Idea is to encourage similar architecture on Parkingway as on So. Main St. for consistent design approach – streetscape like design along the parking lot although individual property owners will have to deal with their own property. Sawchuk noted that he thinks it would be better to see a consistent sidewalk and landscape line from Depot Ct. to the Red Lion Inn for owners to follow. He suggested that the sidewalk be built out all at once rather than waiting for various property owners to build it out over a long period of time on their own. Bill Good agreed that this approach is better than leaving the consistency of the So. Main St. theme along the Parkingway to chance.

Design Charrette: Bill Good felt a future design charrette is not necessary at this point. He felt it will provide much more information and opinion than is needed at this point. Paul Cleary added that the more informational meetings an applicant has with the Planning Board for larger parcels of land Jennings will target the August 4, 2008 Planning Board meeting for review of the next draft.

**9:10 P.M. ADMINISTRATION**

• **166 KING STREET SITE PLAN APPROVAL** – Administrator explained that this Site Plan Review had just been filed and that the July 14 meeting advertising deadline had passed. The next meeting, August 4<sup>th</sup>, is beyond the 30 days within which the Board must open the public hearing for this filing. Board moved the July 14 meeting to July 21 to accommodate this filing and deadline.

• **VOTE TO APPROVE 06/16/08 MINUTES**

**MOTION:** by Member Samuelson to accept the 06/16/08 minutes

**SECOND:** Member Brewer

**VOTE:** 3 - 0 MOTION CARRIES

• **SUBDIVISION RULES & REGULATIONS UPDATE – DISCUSSION** – hold discussion until Member Moore is in attendance.

• **UMASS AMHERST – RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE** – Administrator explained questionnaire – Members Ivimey and Moore to complete questionnaire and return

• **DEP WATERWAYS REGULATION PROGRAM**

- 40 PARKER AVENUE

- BEACH STREET CULVERT

Board members to review applications and comment individually if necessary.

**MOTION:** by Member Brewer to adjourn at 9:30 P.M.

**SECOND:** Member Samuelson

**VOTE:** 3 - 0 MOTION CARRIES

**NEXT MEETING:** MONDAY, JULY 21, 2008 AT 7:00 PM

**MINUTES APPROVED:** CHARLES A. SAMUELSON, CLERK

**DATE:** JULY 21, 2008