

# **Board of Selectmen**

## **Urban Renewal Plan Hearing Meeting Minutes**

### **January 5, 2017**

**In Attendance:** Chairman Ronald Clarke, Vice-Chairman Alan Dunham, Sarah Hewins, Helen Marrone, Dave Robertson, Chairman William Sinclair, Vice-Chairman Brian Abateillo. Treasurer Johanna Leighton, Director of Planning and Community Marlene McCollem & Kari Poudrier

**Chairman Clarke** called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Chair led the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and Marrone read the community prayer.

**Clarke** asked that a motion be made allowing Dunham to chair the meeting. Marrone made the motion to allow Alan Dunham chair the meeting, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Robertson.

**Chair Sinclair** opened the Redevelopment Authority meeting at 7:03pm.

**Chairman Sinclair** and **Marlene McCollem, Planning** read and discussed all the topics in great detail within the “North Carver Urban Renewal Plan” document that had been made available to the public on our website.

**Chairman Sinclair** spoke on the topic “A Draft URP for North Carver” including the 20+ year history of this effort as outlined in the slides.

**Michael Milanoski, TA** discussed the URP Open Public and Transparent Process issues; that is designed to protect the Town with significant Potential Opportunities that has no quantifiable risk to the Town and zero financial obligations from the town. In his closing he noted he recommended the Board to consider looking favorably upon the proposed plan and to approve the Redevelopment Authorities Urban Renewal Plan. He also noted although there are no guarantees he believes beyond a reasonable doubt, if this proposed project is developed as projected it will have a significant long term benefit to the town of Carver as a whole that hopefully outweighs any concerns the board may have.

TA also commended the RDA its open planning process, holding meetings, getting public input and the transparency made getting all the information out to the public

**School Superintendent Scott Knief** – discussed FY17 the 7.8% increase based on the budget shortfall. He noted that the community of Carver needs to find a way to increase revenue sources to be able to appropriate support the schools and the future of the students. 1.75 percent increase in the school budget – he noted we need to find ways to build new revenue to support the schools, students and the community.

**Route 44 Development, LLC**, –George McLaughlin, Manger and Co-owner reviewed his professional history as well as his partner Robert Delhome who is also a Manager Co-owner  
Selectmen-Related Material/Urban Removal Hearing Plan Process

profession history. As developers they acquired/bought the parcel to build upon as an Urban Renewal Process. He commended the town on its communication and thanked the board for their time and consideration.

**Board of Selectmen** expressed concerns and had questions regarding the language “Eminent Domain” being a clause reflected in the Urban Renewal Plan.

**McLaughlin** explained he will make every attempt possible to come to an agreement with the remainder of property owner(s) who have not come to an agreement. It was stressed that every attempt has to be made to resolve the issue before the Eminent Domain (power) inherent is owned by the town but does not have to use it RDA to use this power. RDA put in the design criteria the site plan has certain requirements that will address this potential project. Marlene also explained in the current permit process the parties of interests and/or abutters are made aware and can appeal the permitting process as they are submitted. Marrone wants to make sure all residents can live peacefully in their homes. The 20 year time frame was questioned as to who will be responsible if after 20 years this project has not been complete and/or the current developers walked away. Marlene explained there would be no cost to the town should this actually occur.

**Hewins** – discussed the Sustainable Development/Smart Growth Principles implemented as design controls emphasized in the Urban Renewal Plan going a long way towards satisfying DHCD’s requirement for accepting the plan. Hewins would like to have the URP reflect the fact that the Town has already adopted 43B.

**Marlene** explained that the adoption of 43B is reflected on page 48. She would also like the public to know that hazardous site work are being cleaned up and will no longer be an issue.

**Hewins** – asked why ground-mounted solar arrays were not allowed in this District in the URP when this District is zoned to allow for ground-mounted solar.

**RDA** had a lengthy discussion about the solar arrays, noting growth mounted solar is allowed and is noted on the roof control purposes.

**Hewins** suggested the plan de-emphasize or remove discussion of Principles 6 & 7; # 6 “Expanding Housing Opportunities” - #7 “Provide Transportation Choices because the URP doesn’t address these things or do these things.

**Hewins & Dunham** expressed the concern around the language noted on pages 56, 57 & 58 around “Sources of Funding & Project Budget” aspects of the plan, possible costs to the town. A proposed amendment to the Carver RDA Urban Renewal Plan was offered to make a motion to amend the plan.

**Dunham** made a motion to amend the Urban Renewal Plan to reflect the following, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Marrone:

The town of carver shall not be required to pay any of the plan costs.

This amendment will be added to page 56 immediately following “as well as private sources, to effectuate the North Carver URP”.

This amendment is to be placed at the bottom of the “Project Budget” found on page 57.

This amendment is to be added to page 57 at the end of the last paragraph on that page.

**Vote: 5 – 0**

**Clarke** suggested the Board of Selectmen to review the process. Dunham identified who should speak at the public hearing and noted how it should be held in an orderly fashion as noted below:

1. RDA (Redevelopment Authority)
2. Planning Board (for consistency with master plan) (already voted on the 12/27<sup>th</sup>)
3. Carver Residents that own land/property within the proposed urban area, with first priority to residents in the URP.
4. Non-Carver residents with property within the URP
5. Carver residents outside the URP
6. Plympton residents
7. Anyone other person(s) who would like to speak

5 minutes per person not counting any questions BOS may have.

No shouting or outburst from the audience (must follow Carver Code of Conduct)

No name calling or insults

Anyone who violates will be asked to leave by the Chairman

**OPEN PUBLIC SPEAKERS:** 17 people signed up to speak

**Carver residents within the UPR:**

**David Barofski** – owner of 8 acres of commercial land expressed he does not think there is a figure offered to him that will satisfy him to sell his land after paying taxes all these years.

**Bruce Tusher** – expressed his feelings a choice to sell or be taken by eminent domain from the town and is concerned for the people of the town who are put in this position by town government. He noted the residents should have faith in this government.

**Karen Tusher** – questioned if the building(s) and/or businesses will have to go through all the permitting processes that are currently in place.

**Dunham** – answered they will go through all the same processes and Marlene also explained the State will also be involved.

**Dunham** – the land in South Carver possibly being in this same process in the future there are bog owners, wetlands, there is a very small area that could be potentially affected.

**Carver residents:**

**John Bonasari** –noted he is not opposed to this project or development, he is opposed to the eminent domain power being given to a private developer.

**Benjamin Dexter** – he also noted he is not opposed to development, his concern is the potential to take land for the development itself and believes it is morally wrong. Is angry the affected owners could have land taken.

**Bill Duggan** – expressed that taking land from a private citizen to give to another for profit is wrong. Remove “eminent domain” out of the plan and he believes the project can still go forth.

**Robert Belbin** – noted he was disappointed and he did not see a plan nor was there one available to him and the Urban Renewal Plan itself is not available to the public.

**Dunham** – noted that it is and has been on the website for a while with months of detailed discussion in public meetings and reported in the Carver Reporter.

**Belbin** – concerned with the size of a million square foot business is a very big building. The traffic, the trucks, in the area. It may be a safety issue. 1100 employees, 1100 cars coming into town, going through that interchange. He hopes the board will vote against this and feels the residents are more against it than for it.

**Hewins** – questioned if the language “eminent domain” could be taken out of the plan.

**Marlene** - The term “eminent domain” cannot be removed if working under 121B project.

**Savery Moore** – expressed understanding the concerns the people speaking before him with their concern eminent domain is frightening and could affect there residents lives in the future. He noted by voting yes potential to see tax benefits to the residents of carver.

**Plympton residents: (Heathers Path or abutters to the project or Montello St.**

**Kristin Kirkland** – she had an issue with Mr. McLaughlin, the Developer, saying that Plympton residents don’t matter. She also stated she has attended all the meetings noting Plympton residents do matter.

**Gordon Massingham** – expressed his concerns regarding the following issues:

The number of meetings held during Holiday weeks suggesting they were hurried

Marketing Plan going to a warehouse. He also pointed out the amount of water needed for this project would come from.

**Jean Winslow** – suggested the developer does not offer the residents affected anything. Her concern was all the concern regarding all the additional road traffic. She also noted the lack of effort to make Plympton’s residents aware of this plan.

**Kathy Figaro** – noted the plan will devalue her property. She also acknowledged the tower she will now have to look out at and development traffic. She owns a house farm and does not want to see this go in.

**Melissa Singlartary** – reiterated what Jean said. She implored the board to think about this voting yes.

**Richard Jackson** – questioned how does the decadent area and blighted apply to the Urban Renewal Law law.

**Marlene** – explained early in the process Dec. 2015 the representative from DHDC did come and toured the site with the RDA. DHDC provided feedback after receiving the plans from the RDA. DHDC agreed with the Urban Renewal Plan.

**Dunham** asked for a motion to close the meeting

**Hewins** would like a motion made to delay the closing the Public Hearing Process to give the public time to read the plan. There was no 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Dunham** asked for a motion to be made to end the Public Hearing Process portion of the meeting to be adjourn at 11:20pm.

**Marrone** made the motion to end the Public Hearing Process meeting, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Robertson Meeting was turned over to Chairman Clarke

**Clarke** asked the Board if they had any more questions.

**Marrone** – noted her biggest concern is that 121B is not being able to remove eminent domain. She also noted she's was under the impression that people had come together and agreed on this plan. She suggested jobs aren't guaranteed and she has still has concerns with the North Carver Water District as it stands currently. She is not convinced to make a vote tonight.

**Hewins** – stated there is a lot to think about, it took her a while to understand the Urban Renewal Plan there is a lot to digest. She asked if the Board could postpone the vote allowing them more time to think it over.

**Hewins** made a motion to delay the vote night, No 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Dunham** noted to Hewins he did not 2<sup>nd</sup> Hewins motion in delaying the vote because people will want to know tonight. Also noted again eminent domain is the absolute last resource. The developer is willing to work with all affected to get rid of the eminent domain happening. He also noted how the taxes have gone up along with this eminent domain. Without doing anything with this land there is no chance to have a shot to bring in revenue. He noted he can live with the vote to help by reducing the taxpayers for the town of Carver.

**Hewins** – wanted to note that the amendment made that should this project fail the taxpayers will not be affected.

**Clarke** – thanks the RDA for all their work and for making the plan available to the public. It's been in the process for a little over a year ago. Clarke thought this vote would be happening back in October, it was not rushed. Didn't agree with the eminent domain language the state acquired. The property has been lying dormant for years. If there is commercial development best to be on the outskirts of the town. He firmly believes eminent domain is a possibility but takes McLaughlin word he will do everything to omit that from happening. The opportunity in an isolated portion of town land to make it available to make revenue for the town of Carver. If residents of Carver were against this project this room would overwhelmed with residents – it is not.

**Dunham** asked to make a motion for this vote to be made by Role call, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Marrone.

**Dunham** made the motion to approve the Urban Renewal Plan by Role call, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Clarke

**ROLE CALL:**

**Dunham** - Yes

**Hewins** -Yes

**Clarke** - Yes

**Marrone** - No

**Robertson** - Yes

**Clarke** made a motion to adjourn the meeting, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Dunham at 11:44pm.

**VOTE: -4-1**