

**Planning Board  
Lakeville, Massachusetts  
Minutes of Meeting  
Thursday, February 27, 2020**

On February 27, 2020, the Planning Board held a meeting at the Lakeville Senior Center. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hoeg at 7:30. Ms. Murray, recording secretary, was audio recording and LakeCam was making a video recording of the meeting.

**Members present:**

Brian Hoeg, Chair; Sylvester Zienkiewicz, Vice-Chair; Peter Conroy, Mark Knox, Barbara Mancovsky

**Site Plan Review, continued – 57 Long Point Road**

The applicant had sent an email on February 24, 2020, requesting to continue as they had not received certain information that had been required.

Mr. Conroy made a motion, seconded by Ms. Mancovsky, to continue the Site Plan Review for 57 Long Point Road until March 12, 2020, at 7:30 p.m. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

**ANR Plan, continued – Hickory Lane**

The applicant had sent an email on February 24, 2020, requesting to continue.

Mr. Conroy made a motion, seconded by Ms. Mancovsky, to continue the ANR Plan for Hickory Lane until March 12, 2020. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

**Informal hearing – 26 Crooked Lane**

Mr. Knox then recused himself from the Board so he could make his presentation. He stated his name for the record and advised he lived at 87 Pierce Avenue. He was representing himself for a property located at 26 Crooked Lane. He is currently doing some renovations to the property to make a new tenant space and displayed an existing Site Plan of the property. It showed the existing parking and buildings with the dumpster pad.

Mr. Knox advised the proposed plan shows no major change to the building except a small new entry way on the northeast side of the building. At the back entrance, he is proposing a number of parking spaces with van accessible parking area and a handicap ramp to that entrance. Currently, this is a single lane with parking along one side but this will become two-way traffic. There is also an existing sign indicating left turn only, and that will stay in place. He did not feel the current

lighting on the building is dark sky compliant, so they were going to change all of it and encompass within the new parking area one light pole in that area. On that side of the building next to the entrance, there is currently a wall pack light. They will move that over so that it lines up on the edge of the parking to light that area as well. He next displayed a plan of the tenant office space with one elevation of the building. A door has been added and one window has been removed. He then displayed what the building looked like today with the new entry way. He is proposing a walkway out to the parking area, and he indicated where the proposed light pole would be located. He would also like to put a small sign that would meet the sign regulations in the Zoning By-law.

Mr. Knox said those were the changes he was making, and he had wanted to share them with the Board. He also wanted to use this as an example, as they had been reviewing the tenant bylaw for the disturbance or change of 1,500 square feet of aggregate. It is unclear if it is inside or outside of the building. He noted that one of the things he wanted to do was talk to the Board about this project to make sure that everyone was okay with it, and if he needed to do anything else or make any changes. If not, then he wanted to use this as an example of one of the things the Board may review or not review in the future. The Board had talked about the following triggers that might require a Site Plan Review: the impervious coverage, maybe a square footage of additional paving for parking, addition of a sign, outside lighting, or adding additional space.

Mr. Knox asked if they wanted to have a Site Plan Review because somebody made more floor space inside their building. Mr. Hoeg said this wasn't a problem as far as Mr. Knox's plan and him coming to the Board to get approval. However, if there is a change of use, there really should be a Site Plan Review particularly if you have a subdivision of a building inside the building. His fear was someone getting a building permit for modifications to a building and then leading to possibly more people or having something that is not allowed. The Planning Board is more sensitive to those types of issues than someone just giving a building a once quick look over.

Mr. Knox then stated that an email had been circulated that was on the agenda at their last meeting. It had a specific section of the bylaw highlighted, and did they want to just change the wording. Mr. Conroy asked if the wording could be changed to something along the lines of any two of these items should trigger a Site Plan Review. He thinks it's a good tool that adds a layer of protection to the Town. Mr. Knox said that was also his point. Should it be added impervious, added signage, and lighting and if you trigger two, it triggers the Site Plan Review? This would be rather than the 1,500 square foot of interior remodeling that may not really affect the Board. Members then discussed various scenarios that could occur.

Mr. Knox said he believed that was why they had been given that section of the bylaw. They could eliminate 1,500 square feet and say a tenant space outfit triggers Site Plan Review when one of the following items occurs: additional lighting, additional signage, or additional square footage of impervious. Mr. Zienkiewicz noted after looking at the bylaw that a lot is required for their Site Plan Review. They receive a different range from applicants in regards to quality and completeness.

Mr. Hoeg felt that change of use should be part of it. Mr. Knox noted an insurance company to a lawyer's office would not be considered a change of use by definition, but would office to retail? Maybe they would need specific terminology to that.

Mr. Conroy thought this topic should be covered over multiple meetings. Mr. Zienkiewicz agreed and said that there should be other ways for Site Plan Review to be triggered. Mr. Knox mentioned having a curb cut be a mechanism to trigger a review. Mr. Zienkiewicz noted the Board no longer does curb cuts, that is done by the Selectmen. After discussion, Mr. Zienkiewicz noted that they should expand that 1,500 to a longer list of triggers. Mr. Knox stated to prepare a Site Plan, have the engineering done, and go through all the Boards is an expensive process. He would not want someone with an existing building to have to spend a large amount and go through that for 2,000 square feet of additional parking.

After further discussion, Ms. Murray asked if they wanted to place this on their next agenda. Mr. Conroy replied they should keep this going but then at a certain point, they should come up with a change that will possibly sit for a few months. They can then put it on an October agenda for a fall Town Meeting. Mr. Knox agreed and said that they shouldn't stop until its completed. Mr. Conroy clarified they need to figure out what they're going to do, which may take four weeks or four meetings. Then they schedule a couple of hearings, and then they get ready for the fall. Ms. Mancovsky then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to place this on their next agenda. The **vote was unanimous for.**

#### **Schedule public hearing for Pauline's Path, a definitive plan for a subdivision off Howland Road**

Mr. Hoeg asked if they were asking for a particular date, or if the Board was just giving them a date. Ms. Murray said she was just asking for a clarification of their policy. After consulting the calendar to allow the required advertising, Mr. Zienkiewicz made a motion to schedule the hearing for March 26, 2020. It was seconded by Mr. Knox. The **vote was unanimous for.**

#### **Approve meeting minutes**

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to approve the Minutes from the November 14, 2019, meeting. The **vote was unanimous for.**

#### **Old Business** – Discuss bylaw creation for design standards for business zoned new construction

Mr. Knox said they were going to look at the Master Plan and see if they could change their regulations to add architectural standards to their code regulations rather than to write a bylaw. This was based on what SRPEDD had put in the new Master Plan. He would like that on the next meeting as well. Mr. Hoeg thought this would have to be a bylaw. Ms. Mancovsky thought the three issues they have been talking about; the bylaw change, the tenant space change, and the potential overlay district for architectural standards in the business zone could work together. They could make them so they have stronger controls. These are the three things on their list that they need to keep rolling forward. Mr. Zienkiewicz added that the rules governing the subdivision of land are only for the subdivision of land. It is pretty hard to add much else in there, like Site Plan Review or anything like that. The good thing about it is they can change regulations on their own

just by telling people they are voting on them. The reason they can do that is because it only affects what is in that subdivision. There is a law that permits them to do that but only within that subdivision. Ms. Mancovsky said that in her mind this conversation is only about commercial properties. They are not going to get into design standards for someone's home. Mr. Zienkiewicz said they haven't been doing any commercial subdivisions but they can. That is part of their purview but people just haven't been building that way.

Ms. Mancovsky then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Knox, to place the three items on their next agenda. The **vote was unanimous for.**

### **New Business**

Mr. Mike Nashawaty was present in regard to the ANR plan for Hickory Lane. He discussed the drainage issues his neighborhood continues to have and said additional development would only exacerbate this situation. Members discussed a possible site visit. Mr. Nashawaty was advised the ANR plan for Hickory Lane was on the March 12<sup>th</sup> agenda.

It was noted the Citizen Planner Training Collaborative conference schedule was out. The Town will pay for members to attend if they would like to go.

Ms. Mancovsky advised there was a SRPEDD meeting last night. A World Caucus Advisory Board has been formed. This is a committee of people to come together to advise at the State level. The State has a committee that has been formed to start taking information from rural communities, and Lakeville qualifies as one of them. She is on that caucus and will circulate what it is about, and what they are going to do. It is a great resource for them to start getting information up to the State level.

Ms. Mancovsky noted that next month the Cannabis Commission would be coming in to give a talk. There are quite a few of these businesses that are not going to be opening, and the profit margins are changing. Several of the very large companies have decided to move out. Other communities have said that Towns need to take a look at who you have signed contracts with as you might not be getting the tax revenue that is anticipated. She stated this speaks to the need to have a date and performance guarantee in the Community Host Agreement.

Ms. Mancovsky said they also talked about some cameras that they had. It is a picture that you can watch move back and forth, like a virtual tour. It also lays down buildings in different perspectives. This is something that could be very beneficial for the Town and public safety. They also have drones, which for a fairly low cost, could be used for different projects. She suggested using it to inspect culverts to see if they are draining properly. Members then discussed a procedure for maintenance of these drainage systems in Town.

Ms. Mancovsky advised the last item discussed at SRPEDD was the re-numbering of the highways. The exit numbers are going to be changed, and this project will start soon.

It was then noted that their meeting on March 12<sup>th</sup> would begin at 7:00 rather than 7:30.

### **Adjourn**

Mr. Conroy made a motion, seconded by Ms. Mancovsky to adjourn the meeting. The **vote** was **unanimous for**.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45.