



Meeting Minutes for December 19, 2016; 7:00 PM, Carver Town Hall, Room 1

Attendees: William Sinclair, Chair; Johanna Leighton; Mr. Abatiello; Charles Boulay

Also in attendance: Marlene McCollem, Planning and Community Development

The meeting was opened, by Mr. Sinclair, at 7:01 PM.

Further discussion of the Urban Renewal Plan; 127-acre parcel, owned by Rt – 44 Development, LLC - located off Montello Street, in North Carver.

A. Updated draft and outstanding items: Ms. McCollem – Unfortunately my laptop is in the shop so we will review the updates with the handouts provided (everyone received a handout with the maps, etc.). The board members have a version of the plan and appendixes.

⇒ Page 1, map B - the spot clearance map has been changed so you can see in the rectangular lot. The Tusher property is not existing property to remain

Map c – existing parcel boundaries – I want to make sure everyone is clear that the boundaries are approximate and based on public record. These maps are not surveyed boundaries.

⇒ Table 8 – This is from page 57 in draft plan and includes budget line for acquisition surveys and title searches. Before any property is acquired, a survey and title search would have to be done before property is transferred. This would document property boundaries. The figures in the plan are based on parcel data and not an instrument survey.

- ⇒ Map G – Two changes – the rectangle for the Tusher property has changed from full to partial acquisition. Northern Webby property also added to a partial acquisition.
- ⇒ The matrix - table 2 page 25 of the plan, lines 12, 23 and 24 are changes mentioned above.
- ⇒ Map H – disposition parcel amended to reflect map G change. The three dark grey are outlined as partial acquisitions for roadway realignment only. On the matrix table, the second column from the right on line 12, 23 and 24 is the table version
- ⇒ Map I – The warehouse was shifted so as to avert the Tusher property.
- ⇒ Next slide, which is page 67 of plan, 1st paragraph. Ms. McCollem read paragraph – What we are saying is that map I is one POTENTIAL concept and not a promise of what it will look like on the ground. The square footage may change, the buildings may be in a different configuration, etc. This is just one potential use.

Previous conversation

Table 5 & 6 (page 44 and 45 of plan); these have been finalized. Table 5 has sq. ft. and cost per sq. ft. for each type, with projections. This again is one estimate and not a promise. There may be actual variances when it comes time to actual construction. Table 6 has the same type of exercise. We are assuming, sq. ft., land uses and employment numbers. These are subject to change with actual construction.

The next slide shows the schedule of public actions (page 59 of plan) Board of Selectmen set hearing date for January 5. We have decided to notice the BOS hearing as Urban Renewal Plan developed under 121 B which doesn't specify notice to abutter and public notification in paper. BOH doesn't require newspaper ads, but does notice abutters, the planning board, under 40A and definitive plan under chapter 41 will require 2 paper notices and notify all abutter within 300 feet. An ad was in last week's paper and a second ad will be in this week's paper. Carver, Plympton and Middleboro will be mailed to this week. The planning board has to make a vote for two findings. If you are ready they could vote on the 27th (their next meeting.) The two findings are as follows:

1. The Planning Board vote is very specific. They have to decide that they can find that the plan is in concert with a master plan for the community. track.

2. The plan has to be based on a local survey. This is not a survey like a land survey. They are looking for the Planning Board to look at methodology of this current plan. Maureen Hayes and I have done numerous site visits and compared field cards, etc.

This board needs to take a vote and then it can be forwarded to planning board.

The Board of Selectmen will be the final and 3rd vote.

The next slide – MEPA doesn't issue a permit per say but they do a review. In order to submit, you have to file with MEPA. Ms. McCollem and the Board will be working on an environmental plan that will be sent to MEPA. Once you vote your plan, we can move forward with this. MEPA can be a little confusing because we are filing for the plan. Table 1 on page 6 are propose UR action. It doesn't include any individual building projects that will come late. The plan part will come under one MEPA review. If you need alterations, they will tell you how to handle. All of the environmental concerns dealing with the individual buildings. And impacts will be reviewed by MEPA separately when information is there. They will talk directly to the project developer for any building projects. This is a confusing process, don't hesitate to ask any questions.

Town council has to right an opinion that your plan is in compliance with 121 B. They haven't done it yet, but it is underway. The board will need to fix anything that comes up.

Page 64 of draft. – relocation due to URP. Table 9 has been revised to remove the Tusher property.

Section 12 citizen participation (page 68 of plan). This is not completed and will continue to be updated.

In the Appendix, #2 is engineering report. Describe assumption of budget estimates. This is not for the buildings its only for preparing site to be built on. Table 2 includes estimates. This may need to change (i.e. may need more or less main and hydrants)

Approved by the CRA on January 5, 2017

Appendix 2 - Included anticipated schedule for activities. This right now is just organized by year and dependent on the permitting process and the markets ability to fund.

Appendix 3 - Follows the process on page 59. This will be populated as dates and votes happen.

Appendix 4 - Location plan updated to remove the Tusher home

Appendix 5 – A copy is attached.

Appendix 6 - Citizen participation summary includes minutes, agendas and any correspondence. This will be updated as we go.

Mr. Sinclair – any questions from the board – Ms. Leighton - None; Mr. Abatiello – Yes, On map H, the corner across from the Tusher property at the bend in the road. There was an email. Ms. McCollem – Mr. Butler sent an email. This is in reference to the northern piece. This boundary will be part of the survey and title research that has to be done. It bounds the Walsh property. It is a line that we do need to determine before the property is turned over. Mr. Sinclair – no questions; Mr. Boulay – no questions.

Mr. Sinclair – I want to discuss the changes to the Tusher property. This property is now listed as partial for roadway realignment only. What does the board think? Ms. Leighton – I feel this should be removed and we do not need to take any roadway for realignment. I feel the board should make that correction and remove it. Mr. Abatiello – I would like to totally agree but we need to discuss language just in case we need to acquire any of the Tusher property to handle a roadway adjustment. If, however, the majority of the board wants to take it off, I have no problem with that. Mr. Sinclair – I agree with Mr. Abatiello as far as roadway improvement may have an effect on the Tusher property. We also still have concerns on the Webby property. To put a partial acquisition on a property that might be needed for roadway, Mr. Abatiello – Is there a town easement for property? Ms. McCollem – No, there is a layout, the property line is the layout. Currently there is space around the paved surface that can be used to change/widen layout. If the layout is not enough space to accommodate the design,

Carver Redevelopment Authority 12/19/16

we don't have a survey as of right now, we don't have a design, there is a lot of uncertainty. Using the layout won't affect anyone's private property. If you don't have the layout necessary, the project could be redesigned or you are going to shift improvements to the east utilizing more of the Webby property. If you want to say that 100% of the Tusher lot is off limits, you can do that, but you have to understand that you have to use as designed and/or move east to the Webby property. This is a very conceptual master plan. Mr. Abatiello – It looks like we have a couple of different options. If we remove the Tusher property it shouldn't affect us.

Motion to remove the Tusher property from the map and from the Urban Renewal Plan from partially acquired to Not to be acquired. Mr. Abatiello
Second Mr. Boulay
Approved Unanimous

Ms. Leighton – Master plan question. Ms. McCollem – The Planning Board had a very good discussion about this. Look in the draft plan on page 27. The Planning Board is concerned that we are out of sync. Page 27 second bullet. The 2001 plan is in effect. The town's master plan is being updated and it is clear the subject area will continue to be a priority. The Planning Board has to find that the Master plan is consistent with the Urban Renewal Plan. The Planning Board understand that it is in the old one and is coming in the new one.

Mr. Sinclair – Any other questions? – none

Mr. Sinclair – Are there any audience member with any questions or concerns?

Mr. Tusher – I just want to thank you for your vote. I don't know if the zoning of our property will be changed. Ms. McCollem - Currently your property is zoned as green business park. The Planning Board has made a motion to rezone some property. Would you like to have it rezoned to residential/agricultural? Mr. Tusher would like to think about that. Ms. McCollem – We won't change anything unless I hear differently from you.

Gordon Massingham – Montello Street, Plympton. – Thank you for removing the Tusher property. I would also like to bring some facts and figures. Something north of \$32,000,000,

1500 job, +\$5,000,000 in taxes. Page 8 Citizen participation I noticed in the added parts you put in a lot of the minutes and comments. But no where was it noted the overwhelming lack of approval from the citizens. This should be noted. A map proposed a giant substation, this should be rethought. Page 31, the town master plan encourages use of tax incentive. Has any been offered to RT 44 Development? Mr. Sinclair- NO. North Carver Water District - I approached the chairman and was informed that it wasn't on his radar; Overcoming a major obstacle to the development of the NCWD has not been overcome. You are not considering the cost of all this. There is inadequate water pressure to provide water to an enormous park. The priority should be fire protection. Water supply is not reflected in the plan. Page 50 - Expand housing opportunities in Carver; in particular, affordable housing. It also talks about design elements which appeared recently in this process. There should be some type of barrier between houses and warehouse, such as a green area or a wall. Mr. Massingham also noted that it has been suggested that the parking lots face the roadway and not residents, there is nothing reflected here. Page 60 – As they are the only financial option, has anyone followed up to see documentation that Route 44 Development is able to pay for this project? Ms. McCollem – Yes, it was part of the analysis done last April. Appendix – The statement “statistically unreliable”. Have we looked at the marketing plan to follow up – No evidence to that. Appendix 5 – the phrase eminent domain is still used and should be removed. The citizens are against this idea.

Ms. McCollem – Mr. Chairman I would like to clarify the North Carver Water District had a DIF that includes this area. 50% of the increase of new growth is sent to fund the North Carver Water District; this won't change for this project. Table 8 - in the plan on page 58, \$2.5 mill dollars for a water tower that would provide the water for the hydrants in this development and is tied into the public water system. It would serve this development and storage. Appendix 5 – In the preliminary development agreement, the phrase *eminent domain* has been in existence since April and I don't recommend you strike it.

John Bonaserra – South Carver. I am happy you took the Tusher property from the plan but there are 11 additional properties. I would like to say that taking property through eminent domain is not ok.

Approved by the CRA on January 5, 2017

Karen Tusher – Thank you to each of you for your vote. It means more than you will ever know.

Darlene Cassiani – Plymouth – Eminent domain properties – Is the town prepared financially, to absorb the cost or is the developer going to absorb this? Ms. McCollem – it is covered in the developer's agreement.

Mr. Sinclair – Thank you for your comments and questions.

B. Possible vote to approve the Draft North Carver Urban Renewal Plan:

Ms. McCollem. – If you move to vote the plan it would be conditioned with all updates including removing Tusher property from partial to no acquisition. Mr. Sinclair – This will be noted in any motion. Ms. Leighton – This will also contingent on any other changes. Ms. McCollem – Yes when the final vote happens all changes will be included.

*Motion was made to approve the Draft North Carver Urban Renewal Plan with the removal of the Tusher property from partial acquisition and listed as Not to be Acquired, with any updates: Ms. Leighton
Second: Mr. Abatiello
Approved: Unanimous*

Receipt of an offer for 94 Forest Street – Discussion and possible vote

Mr. Sinclair - At this time I will excuse myself, as the potential person who made an offer is my landlord.

Mr. Abatiello – Purchase price is \$170,000 to seller for purchase of this premises. Do we accept that offer? Ms. McCollem – this is the lot that you own across the street from the glass company/Quickeez. Morse engineering did some preliminary work for you. We listed the property at \$250,000 with no activity. As some point you lowered the price to \$200,000. This is the first offer received. Ms. Leighton – Are there any restrictions? Ms. McCollem – No, just the regular town zoning limits. Mr. Abatiello – They will have to file for permits? Ms. Carver Redevelopment Authority 12/19/16

Approved by the CRA on January 5, 2017

McCollem Yes. They have to meet all requirements for set backs. Ms. Leighton – What were the engineering costs? Ms. McCollem – they were minimal. Mr. Abatiello - What is the pleasure of the board?

Motion to accept the offer for \$170,000: Mr. Boulay

Second: Ms. Leighton

Approved: Unanimous (3-0) – Mr. Sinclair was recused

Bills Payable and Treasurer's Report –

The balances, in the following accounts, are as of November 30, 2016.

- Checking - \$ 1602.07
- Urban Renewal Plan Account - \$28,886.27
- Savings Account - \$27,845.43
-

Savings interest YTD is \$29.34

Urban Renewal interest YTD is \$8.90

A. Susan Hannon - \$75.00 – Checking Account

B. Hayes Development Services - \$12,975.00 URP Account

We will need to move \$12,975 into checking account.

*Motion to pay as submitted with movement of \$12,975 from Urban Renewal Plan account
to the checking account: Mr. Abatiello*

Second: Mr. Sinclair

Approved: Unanimous

Motion to approve treasurer report as presented: Mr. Sinclair

Approved by the CRA on January 5, 2017

Second: Mr. Boulay
Approved: Unanimous

Motion to pay Susan Hannon and Hayes Development Services: Mr. Boulay
Second: Mr. Abatiello
Approved: Unanimous

Correspondence:

Rockland Trust letter dated 11/3/16 – a copy of this letter is attached

Mr. Sinclair read the letter to the Board.

This is great news. Job well done by Ms. Leighton, Valerie and Ms. McCollem!

Ms. Leighton - Requested yearly report be moved to April. This was not an issue.

Minutes: November 21, 2016

Minutes were reviewed.

Motion to approve meeting minutes as recorded: Ms. Leighton
Second: Mr. Boulay
Approved: Unanimous

Approved by the CRA on January 5, 2017

Next Meeting: January 5, 2017

Ms. McCollem. I recommend that you post your next meeting Thursday Jan 5, 2017 at 7:00 p.m., during the next Board of Selectmen meeting. If you want to address the board you can. You may want to post it to start at 6:30. I can put you in room 4 and then you can move to room 1 at 7:00.

Motion to hold our next meeting on 1/5/17, in room 4: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Mr. Boulay

Approved: Unanimous

Mr. Sinclair – I would like to wish everyone a safe and happy holiday.

Christine Joy – I emailed you re: closing Montello to thru traffic. Ms. McCollem – Yes, we have this, it is in Appendix 6.

Adjournment:

Motion was made to adjourn this meeting was made at 8:28 PM: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Ms. Leighton

Approved: Unanimous



APPROVED 12-27-16

Town of Carver, Office of Planning and Community Development

Planning Board Meeting Minutes, December 13, 2016, Carver Town Hall, Meeting Room #1. This meeting was videotaped for cable cast area 58, channel 15.

Attendees: Bruce Maki, Chairman; James Hoffman; Kevin Robinson; William Sinclair

Also present: Marlene McCollem, Director of Planning and community Development

Absent: Chad Cavicchi

Bruce Maki, Chairman, opened the meeting at 7:00 PM, followed by the pledge of allegiance.

Approval Not Required:

A.D. Makepeace Company – ANR – to create four unbuildable parcels off of Meadow Street (Map 75-22-C3-A), under MGL Chapter 41, Section 81-P.

Filed with the Town Clerk: December 8, 2016

Last Meeting: December 27, 2106

Deadline: December 29, 2016

Ms. McCollem – Beals and Thomas prepared the plan but were unable to attend tonight. Four parcels 3 outlined in pink (2 small and one large) and one other large. Does not fit subdivision as defined. These are not building lots. Ms. McCollem – I can recommend that the board endorse the plan as approval is not needed.

Mr. Maki - Any discussion/questions? Mr. Hoffman – Why does this have to be filed? Ms. McCollem - They are creating separate pieces. This will allow them to retain them or finance them separately. The two small pieces have pumps on them so they are also separating their water infrastructure.

Mr. Robinson – Were any intentions shared? Ms. McCollem - No all they need to do is show that this is not a subdivision. Mr. Robinson - This entire piece will be separated into five pieces? Ms. McCollem - No just four. If you reference the handout, there are 2 small pink parcels, one large pink parcel and one large yellow parcel. The yellow parcel follows the lines of the rivers and canals. Mr. Sinclair - Why did they land lock C3B? Ms. McCollem – That is what they chose to do. We don't need to worry about it as it is not a subdivision.

Motion to approve: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous

Discussion:

Planning Board's role in the North Carver Urban Renewal Plan local approval process –

Mr. Sinclair – Stepped aside from the board as he wishes to discuss this as a Redevelopment Authority member. Mr. Sinclair approached the microphone for this discussion.

Mr. Sinclair, Redevelopment Chair – We have been working on this plan since the summer of 2016. The board has not voted to bring this forward to you yet. Please take some time to review this document that has been presented to you today. There has been lots of involvement from the board members and the people of this community. To give you a little background. The town had been working on the redevelopment in carver for over 20 years... Some of the steps the town has taken include:

*The Economic Development Strategy
The Town Master Plan 2001
Engineering Study 2006
Feasibility 2006, 2008
Financing 2006, 2010
Water source 2007 completed 2010
Comprehensive Economic Study*

These are just some of the tools that have brought us to this point.

The proposed plan consists of 23 private and 2 public parcels. It clearly lists on page 5, table 2, all parcels affected. The input from the residents, including the town of Plympton, have been instrumental in

developing the document in front of you. We have been working to maximize the potential for jobs in this town. There is a lot of important information for you to review.

Mr. Maki – This board hasn't had a lot of time to review. Ms. McCollem – Yes, let me layout the steps and timing of things.

The draft you have on the table tonight is revised from the one distributed previously. We will send you a final complete draft once the Redevelopment Authority meets and possibly votes to endorse (next meeting is on Monday 12/19/16). If they vote, it will come to you at your next meeting on Dec 27. You would be asked to make the two findings previously discussed.

Taken from Planning Board minutes of 11/29/16 –

1. Redevelopment will vote first.
2. The local planning board has to make 2 findings.
 - a. Your vote is very specific. You have to decide that you can find that the plan is in concert with a master plan for the community. We have outlined all prior plans and documents that have been building up to the point. You have a well documented track.
 - b. The plan was put together, based on a survey – Methodology is based on the ground conditions and up to date info. We have documented site visits, public records for properties have been utilized.
3. Vote by Board of Selectman. They will hold a public hearing and then vote on whether to submit to state.

It complies with the master plan. It is mentioned in the 2001 Master Plan which will be the master plan you will be making this finding under. You do have a copy of the most up to date master plan. It has been carried forward in the new master planning process.

The methodology is based on a local survey, using the most up to date information we have. We have also done a number of site visits to verify public information from the records. If the Redevelopment Authority votes on 12/19/16, it comes to you.

Mr. Robinson – if I want to view the master plan, is it available to the public? Ms. McCollem - Yes, both the 2001 and the one being updated is available.

Are there specific updates in this document that would help us in our review? Ms. McCollem - If you see a vertical line in the margin, that notes a change from the version you received last time. Mr. Robinson – so as on Page 4? Ms. McCollem – Yes, the new text that was added is also underlined. Ms. McCollem This plan is not your 2001 master plan this is your current Urban Renewal Plan. I don't have a copy of the 2001 master plan for everyone, at this time. If you do want to see that, it is available online or I could copy what you need to see. This is a large, multi volume, bound document. The revisions in this December 8 draft are noted as the changes from the last meeting

Mr. Hoffman – This is the proposed new master plan? Ms. McCollem Yes. Mr. Hoffman is there a major difference from the 2001? Ms. McCollem I can't really speak to that as I wasn't here during the 2001 plan. Some guidance I could give you would be to send you the 2001 master plan specific to subject – i.e. Page 27 of this document. Section 6 on page 57 approvals on legal data. Yours is the second point here. This Urban Renew Plan is based on State law, chapter 121B. The 2001 master plan is not as

specific as the document in front of you. This boards job is to say whether what you see in this plan is in alignment with the master plan as a whole. We have documented site visits, public records for properties have been utilized.

Ms. McCollem - 2001 master plan paragraph we do want to note that the master plan is being updated and is consistent with this plan. Mr. Hoffman – We don't want the perception to be that we are just trying to get this done before the master plan is updated. Mr. Sinclair – A lot of the items mentioned in the 2001 master plan have been implemented and adopted by the town. This has given us more tools to give us a better planning document. This is a great tool to use to control the development in the north carver area.

Any other questions? None.

Articles for April Town Meeting –

Bedroom density limit revision to the Water Resource Protection District:

In Carver, the water resource protection district is town wide. No resident shall produce more than 110 gallons per day, per 10,000 sq. ft. lot. This would limit to no more than 1 bedroom per 10,000 sq. ft. lot area. This is a density control measure.

Mr. Sinclair – Do we have things in place, already, to control density? Ms. McCollem - Yes. Mr. Sinclair - I am struggling with more restraints added to residents. This would be challenging for in laws, kids returning home, etc. Mr. Maki – I have a 20,000 sq. ft. lot and a 3-bedroom home. This would limit me to a 2-bedroom home? Ms. McCollem Yes. Mr. Maki – This would limit any existing homes from expanding. How many lots do we have in Carver that are ½ acre, that are buildable? Ms. McCollem – I don't know the definitive number but there are some. Today, if one of those lot owners came in to get a buildable permit, they would have to meet set back requirements, they are allowed to build on their lot with the number of bedrooms. For example, they would be limited to 2 bedrooms for a 20,000 sq. ft. lot. Mr. Maki – Has any nitrate pollution in town been reported? Ms. McCollem - I can't answer that. I don't know to what extent this would be a problem. Mr. Maki – It would be interesting to know if the Board of Health has run in to this. Ms. McCollem – They are looking at it. If someone can't meet setback, they are putting in nitrogen systems. Mr. Sinclair – there is tool, if the 40B went through, there is something that

can be done without this. There are other tools without going through more restriction. There has been concern in Crystal Lake about nitrate levels, but there are systems available to take care of it. Mr. Maki – if someone was selling and a title 5 was done, and the old septic system didn't meet requirements, they could *install* de – nitrification system. There are ways to get around it without restricting land owner. I think this is something I would like to think about it. Ms. McCollem – If this board doesn't want to advance this, we can take it off the list. Mr. Sinclair –my point of view as a property owner, this is just more restriction. If they came in and the Board of Health deemed a nitrate system is needed, it would be costly to the homeowner but there is choice for the homeowner. At this point, I wouldn't want to bring it forward. Mr. Robinson – I want to think about it. I don't appreciate that we would put these restrictions on the property owner but also understand the need in a highly populated town water area. Mr. Hoffman – I am not comfortable with this, as written. Mr. Maki – Suggested that we keep it on list for one more discussion. Mr. Sinclair – Can we get input from Board of Health? Mr. Hoffman – who came up with 110 gals/day per 10,000 sq. ft. Ms. McCollem - This is pretty standard and is the same as title 5 standards. This is a tool to protect drinking water. Ms. McCollem - The Board of Health discussed this back in June but is not able to meet now due to health issues on the board. A health agent can speak to this but not as a representative of the board. We could also bring forward the group of proponents that have brought this concern. The fact that the planning board can't talk with Board of Health right now, might be reason enough to put this on hold. We will leave this on the list for one more agenda. Ms. McCollem will arrange for the health agent and the proponents to bring in further discussion.

Zoning Map change for Carver/Plympton properties off of Montello Street (from GBP to RA)

Ms. McCollem - The very top one is the map change for the two parcels of land that are in both Carver and Plympton. The Plympton side has residential lots, once you cross to Carver, those portions are zoned green business park. (refer to urban renewal map). From discussion with Urban Renewal plan, those lots in carver will never be used for industrial service and therefore no reason to list as Green business park. Should be rezoned to residential / agricultural. If this board is ok with this change, we can take a vote to send to warrant tonight.

Motion to approve the addition of this revision to the warrant for town meeting: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Hoffman
Approved: Unanimous

Add "Medical Office" to list of uses:

Ms. McCollem provided a copy of the chart. I've added the words "including Medical office." If This board is okay with this addition, then I will recommend that we add this to the warrant.

Motion to approve the addition of this item to the warrant for the town meeting: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Robinson

Approved: Unanimous

Add Hobby Kennel exemption to definition for owner's dogs kept as pets:

I propose we add "Except for a collection of six (6) to ten (10) dogs owned by a single individual, and permanently maintained on the premises as pets, all of which are spayed or neutered, shall not be considered a hobby kennel." The special permit should be limited to commercial activity. Mr. Robinson – I am comfortable with this change, if a certificate of spay or neuter is presented. Ms. McCollem - That is presented when the owner is licensing. If someone came in without a certificate and 6 or more dogs, then they need to do special permit.

Motion to bring to warrant: Mr. Sinclair

Second Mr. Robinson

Approved: Unanimous

To see if the town will vote to amend the Town of Carver Zoning Bylaw, dated April 2016 to amend Section 3522. Prohibited Signs to add the following:

Ms. McCollem Proposed that individual freestanding signs are not permitted for multiple occupancy commercial buildings. Mr. Robinson - The directory sign needs to be big enough to accommodate. This is the property owner's responsibility. Ms. McCollem. – if we have a multiple tenant building, any signage must be in a directory sign. Mr. Robinson – can language be included in warrant? Ms. McCollem Yes. This would add another bullet in your prohibition (j. Individual freestanding signs are not permitted for multiple-occupancy commercial buildings. All tenant information must be contained within a directory sign permitted for the entire premises). Mr. Sinclair – I am struggling with enforcement; to obligate town

resources to keep going out there. I feel that we are losing the rural character of this town by over use of signs. Ms. McCollem – we can't issue tickets for sign violations. Mr. Sinclair – we need to find a way to enforce, come up with a fee schedule and fine those in violation (those that ignore the bylaws of this community). We would address the violation(s) with the property owners not the business owner. The landlord knows what he/she got permitted for. Ms. McCollem – not entirely confident about fining for signs. I am not sure it would be a zoning bylaw. Ms. McCollem will look into this. This is not usually through zoning. Mr. Sinclair – The community is very clear about what they want to see. Mr. Maki – if we have an area with six business with one landlord then we can go to landlord and address and give them 30 days to comply. Mr. Sinclair – language in addition to zoning bylaw is very clear. Ms. McCollem – we can go forward with language change and try to figure out this rest.

Motion to forward to town warrant: Mr. Hoffman

Second: Mr. Sinclair

Approved: Unanimous

Not Zoning (majority vote):

Master plan is almost done. The Master plan committee is going to meet at least one more time for editing. When satisfied they will send it to you. The Master plan has to be adopted by the Planning Board. Although you can stop the process at your approval, this document will be a much stronger plan if moved on to the town meeting.

Other Business

- A. ***Planning Board Member Notes*** - Mr. Sinclair – as discussed the Urban Renewal Plan will be coming forward in a short amount of time. The Redevelopment Authority will take some action shortly. Mr. Maki – I would like to wish everyone on the board a Merry Christmas and Happy Hanukah, with a special mention to Chad Cavicchi who was not able to attend tonight's meeting.

B. Minutes –

Motion to approve minutes from November 29, 2016, as recorded: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous

C. Next Meeting date:

The next Planning board meeting has been proposed for December 27, 2016.

D. Adjournment:

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 PM: Mr. Sinclair

Second: Mr. Hoffman

Approved: Unanimous



TOWN OF CARVER

Office of Planning & Community Development

PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

POSTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF M.G.L. CHAPTER 30A, SECTION 20B

PLANNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA

December 13, 2016

7:00 PM

Carver Town Hall Room #1

Approval Not Required:

A.D. Makepeace Company—ANR—to create 4 unbuildable parcels off of Meadow Street (Map 75-22-C3-A)
under MGL Chapter 41, Section 81-P.

Filed with the Town Clerk: December 8, 2016

Last Meeting: December 27, 2016

Deadline: December 29, 2016

Discussion:

Planning Board's role in the North Carver Urban Renewal Plan local approval process

Articles for April Town Meeting:

Bedroom density limit revision to the Water Resource Protection District

Zoning Map change for Carver/Plympton properties off of Montello Street (from GBP to RA)

Add "medical office" to list of uses

Add hobby kennel exemption to definition for owner's dogs kept as pets

Other Business

- A. Planning Board Member Notes
- B. Minutes –November 29, 2016
- C. Correspondence
- D. Next meeting date: December 27, 2016
- E. Adjournment

