



Meeting Minutes for November 21, 2016; 7:00 PM, Carver Town Hall Room 1

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

Also in attendance: Marlene McCollem, Planning and Community Development

The meeting was opened by William Sinclair at 7:03 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 Preliminary Relocation Plan:

Ms. McCollem: The only major language added includes site development guidelines the economic and community benefits and the costs. The quantitative data, the acreage, percentages and the parcels that are part of the preliminary plan are updated for the Melville and Cole property. This draft lays out the process that includes a section for relocation costs and the management of that.

Mr. Sinclair: Is it detailed enough? *Ms. McCollem:* Yes, for this point in the process. The budget cost is \$7500 for planning. All of your appraisals, surveys and title searches are broken out separate and not included in relocation plan. A much more detailed plan would be done when the urban renewal plan is approved.

Questions from the Board:

Mr. Abatiello: A comment on page 3 of the relocation document. Can you (Ms. McCollem) breakdown the second paragraph of that page?

Ms. McCollem: The chart on page 5 should clarify the properties. Is it the numbers or steps you want broken down? Mr. Abatiello: It looks like there is some flexibility in this. Mr. Abatiello then proceeded to read the second paragraph of page 3.

Ms. McCollem: There is some flexibility in there. The only thing that has changed is that we have passed the threshold of 5 parcels. This plan is dependent on that. However, the list in the plan, property to be acquired or not being acquired is set in stone.

Ms. Leighton: Page 7, section E - What is qualifies as a farm? And how do you relocate a farm?

Ms. McCollem: The state has a method to determine if the parcel is a farm. My understanding is that this is something that is not common for agricultural purchases. He is working on his understanding of this. His understanding is that you don't relocate, you pay for property and the cost would be determined during negotiations. The uniqueness of the agricultural land would perhaps require a more specialized appraisal. This would be Included in the budget on table 7, Urban Renewal Costs, Land Acquisitions. There would be two appraisals for each parcel. Every parcel in blue on Table 1 would require 2 appraisals and is budgeted for.

Ms. Leighton: Section C - Total cost for this project is between \$250,000 and \$300,000, could you clarify? Ms. McCollem - Table 7, after land acquisitions, relocation payment is \$300,000. Additional costs are broken out for managing, etc.

Ms. Leighton: Section F – The project funding will come from a combination of local, state and federal sources. What is local? Ms. McCollem: Right now there is zero local dollars.

Ms. Leighton: Section G - "A signed assurance statement from (s/b form) will be forwarded to the bureau of Relocation with the final relocation plan." Ms. McCollem: - This typo will be fixed.

Ms. Leighton: Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we have our lawyer review the language on this.

- B. Revised Maps - Revisions on the maps include change of labels at the beginning. At the end, the concept plans that the board put together – these have been combined and integrated within the legend.

There was one plan that was not included before, the Thoroughfares, the yellow roadway was pulled off of the concept plan that was worked on over the summer. There is a realignment of Montello St. and the internal site roadway.

Ms. Leighton: When you are coming off the beginning of Montello, the Cole property would require a sharp left turn onto the property. Ms. McCollem: This is a very large scale map, only for defining the route not the engineering specifics.

Ms. Leighton: The parcel shows the Webby property as a partial taking. Yes, this will be used for the access changes.

Ms. Leighton: Will there still be a need for a traffic light? Ms. McCollem: Nothing has been proposed for a traffic study yet. That data will be necessary to determine if a signal warrant is required.

Mr. Sinclair: Does the existing curb cut from Montello to route 58 need to be relocated? Ms. McCollem: Yes, the access to Silo Market Place will need to be redesigned.

Ms. Leighton: On Map B – Counting the red markers on the map, I don't see landscaper on property shown. Ms. McCollem: There is no structure there, it's a trailer. Also, there is no permanent structure in the contractor's location. The red

marker on the left of map is just a very large garage on the former Whitworth property. Ms. Leighton: On Map D1 - There are two red parcels for relocation and nothing behind it and two more on the green. Ms. McCollem: Those are parcel numbers. Not every parcel has a structure. There are three houses in there. The green parcels are the bog roads to the Cole bogs. The contractors yard has no permanent structures.

Mr. Sinclair, Chairman – any other questions? No further questions from the Board

C. Correspondence:

- a. K. Tusher – 9/27/16 email - The email was read by Brian. Joanna – on relocation plan it is listed as Kusher. Ms. McCollem will fix these errors. Ms. McCollem - This property is currently red on the map. Mr. Sinclair – Can we look at The proposed access map. The impact to the Tusher's brings up whether this should be included in the acquired parcels. Do we keep them as to be acquired or not to be acquired? Mr. Abatiello - The map F2, shows that they should be put on the not to be acquired. The majority of the traffic will be going down the Cole property. Ms. Leighton - How do you cross that property to go to Park Ave? Mr. Sinclair - We would have to figure out a change. Ms. Leighton – This is a long term process. 5-10 years. Mr. Sinclair asked board to consider the change to Tushers' property.
- b. G. Day – 10/25/16 email – Mr. Abatiello read the email. Mr. Sinclair – The Coppercreek property is the Waterstone property (Old Shaws). On map A1 look at the southern border of the Waterstone property, Route 58 along the tree border is where Mr. Day is referring to. A member of the audience indicated that this was already being used as an access. There used to be large rocks there but they were removed. Previous discussions have determined that this would not be a viable solution as there are wetlands, etc. Ms. McCollem will send an email back to property owner.

Audience –

- Mr. Court Jr., North Carver Resident – We elect people to represent our town. There are other options to make the Park St. access. This is a disgrace. You need to get the private developer off of these peoples back.
- George McGlaughlin, Developer - Mr. McGlaughlin spoke with the Tusher's prior to this meeting and he acknowledged they are having difficult times. And they do not want to sell. Mr. McGlaughlin said that this is fine. We are able to do this project without the Tusher's property. I would suggest to Board, audience and Tusher's that we have to study and look at the details of the plans. As an alternative, we have spent a lot of time looking at the Waterstone property. The state has indicated that they would never give us permission as we would have to alter too much. Therefore, we would have to realign the road and hope to not have to touch any of the Tusher's property. We may need to keep an open mind when laying out the plan as roadways may need small amounts of property. Perhaps we can leave in as a "Partial" for those purposes. I have talked with potential tenants who are very interested in relocating here and still believe this is a good thing for Carver. I recommend taking the Tusher's off of the acquire list. These are good people and they don't want to sell. Mr. Sinclair – What potential tenants are you talking to? Mr. McGlaughlin – We are unable to disclose as there are signed confidentiality agreements with these people.
- Bruce Tusher – Thank you for removing us from the list. Thank you to the audience for their support. We want to stay in our home. When can we see a definitive answer? Mr. Sinclair – A decision will be made at the next meeting.
- Melissa Singaltary – Heathers Path. I commend you for wanting to take their property off the list. To Mr. MCGlaughlin – specify what you mean by needing partial property for roadway. Why do you need that area? Ms. McCollem – One of the important issues that has been talked about over the summer is the curve at Montello (right at the Tusher's driveway). It is my professional

recommendation that if you are going to this level that you seriously look at that. We can look at alternatives however in context with larger reconstruction of Montello as a public way it is my recommendation to address safety problem at that curve. We don't have plans for "partial" acquisitions at this time. If the board changes to accommodate that change, we need to remember that they currently have frontage on Montello and they need to continue to have frontage so as to avoid land lock issue. I can't promise that all will be accommodated on the Webby property. There may be the need to acquire a section of the Tusher's property (Probably northern corner) to accommodate safety issue. Also a partial taking on the northern section of the Webby Property Table 1, line 23 (southern piece – partial for roadway alignment). Suggest line 24 for partial to accommodate. Table 1, line 12 recommend it change from "to be acquired" to "partial taking." We also have to change the spot clearance map that shows that Tusher's house is not to be demolished (the red squares are the structures to be cleared). Mr. McGlaughlin will take this information and adjust as recommended. It was noted that Mr. Webby was not in attendance.

- John Moniserra – Confusion as to why the Tusher's property is no longer important but other still are. Map D1, everything in yellow. Ms. McCollem – The other properties wrap deeper around and into the project site and will be the least impacted by shifting the warehouse location. The Tusher's are the edge piece and most easily avoided. Mr. Sinclair reminded everyone that this map is conceptual.
- Mr. Belbin– Map D2 – On Montello St., There are wetland designated. There is a wetland on Park Street, as well.

Ms. McCollem - Comm Con and Ms. McCollem have looked at the Webby property and the southern part is the dry part. The Northern area would just be a sliver of the property; the wetlands are further inside the property.

Mr. Belbin – Knows of other areas of replication of wetlands, so there are other options. Under the existing zoning map, it calls for a green business park – I took it to be similar to something like the business park in Pembroke. Your zoning map is quite different the zoning change is only for one little area. Is this what the town approved? Mr. Sinclair indicated that, Yes, this it what the town approved. A developer would understand the maps when moving forward.

Mr. Belbin – I am all for an industrial use of this property but we've been burned by claims that "checks are in the mail." There are no employees from Plympton that work at Sysco. We need to guarantee that jobs will be available to Carver residents. We need to know who/what is going in. We don't want a chemical plant. This isn't going to lower the resident's property taxes. We have another possible development in South Carver (Makepeace). Mr. Sinclair – We can't predict the future but will come up with some type of tool to get information for the residents. We will work hard at it and do the best we can. Mr. Belbin - I don't think eminent domain should be used in this town.

Christina Walsh, Director, Institute for Justice - I appreciate the discussion of the Tusher parcel. If we abandon this, I will encourage you that eminent domain is not something used for private property. This plan is not about urban renewal. Authorizing this acquisition would be an abuse of power. You should not be addressing property that is coveted by a developer. You're sending a message that you are teaming up with developers. You are sending a message to people seeking property in the town of Carver. Please remove them off your list and do so swiftly.

Gordon Massingham – Montello St – The plan is saying that it will provide jobs and tax benefits. The plan doesn't show either. Jobs – Unemployment rate in Carver? Are there people in carver looking for warehouse jobs? I don't think so. Where are the numbers to show the economic benefit in the town? Taxes – What do we envision they will pay? The plan shows tax rebates. What are they? In the relocation Plan there was

mention of buying and relocation for a total cost of \$300,000 which is laughable. You need to prove the benefit to the town. Attleboro did not work out.

Benjamin Dexter – Spring Street - Table 7 Project budget – How much of this goes on the back of the tax payers? Ms. McCollem - The board has been clear that they will not be issuing any bond. Cost will be through the private developers and grants. Benjamin – How much tax revenue from this? Mr. Sinclair – we don't know what type of business? It's too far out in the future to give you an answer. There is no specific proposed development. Benjamin – we should have some idea as to how much revenue would come in.

Reggie Jackson, Heathers Path – On map, squiggly line represents my back yard and two of my neighbors. Can you take the Tushers off the list tonight? Mr. Sinclair – Thank you for your input.

Bill Shannon, Bow St – the relocation plan is only dealing with relocation. How much tax payer money has been used? Mr. Sinclair. - None, Developer has paid all costs to date.

Bill D – 285 Meadow - The immorality of taking someone's property in our future. We should be able to do what is needed without taking peoples property.

Motion was made at 8:29 for a five-minute recess: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Mr. Sinclair

Approved: Unanimous

Meeting was called back to order at 8:34, by Mr. Sinclair.

Bills Payable and Treasurer's Report –

The balances in the following accounts are as of 10/31/2016,

- Checking - \$78.07
- Urban Renewal Plan Account - \$28,886.27
- Savings Account - \$29,368.04

Savings interest YTD is \$26.95

Urban Renewal interest YTD is \$8.19

Ms. Leighton – Rockland Bank- We still haven't heard anything. I will follow up for the next meeting. The end of the year is coming soon.

A. Chris Champ - \$75.00

B. SRPEDD - \$948.88 (Master Plan Public Participation) – Miscellaneous Supplies for agricultural open space workshop. Ms. Leighton - Will we have another workshop? Ms. McCollem -Yes

Motion to pay as is: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Mr. Boulay

Accepted: Unanimous

Ms. Leighton - \$1025 in expenses. Mr. Sinclair - We will need an additional \$500 to cover additional expenses for the end of the year; move \$1525 out of savings into checking.

Motion: Mr. Boulay

Second: Mr. Abatiello

Approved: Unanimous

Motion to approve treasures' report, with the addition of a \$1525 transfer to checking:

Mr. Boulay

Second: Mr. Abatiello

Approved: Unanimous

Minutes: October 24, 2016

Minutes were reviewed

Motion to approve meeting minutes as recorded: Ms. Leighton

Second: Mr. Boulay

Approved: Unanimous

Next Meeting: December 12, 7:00 PM

Motion: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Mr. Boulay

Approved: Unanimous

Adjournment:

Motion was made to adjourn this meeting was made at 8:41 PM: Mr. Abatiello

Second: Mr. Boulay

Approved: Unanimous