

**Planning Board  
Lakeville, Massachusetts  
Minutes of Meeting  
January 13, 2022  
Remote meeting**

On January 13, 2022, the Planning Board held a remote meeting. It was called to order by Chairman Knox at 7:00 p.m. LakeCam was recording, and it was streaming on Facebook Live.

**Members present:**

Mark Knox, Chair; Peter Conroy, Vice-Chair, Barbara Mancovsky, Michele MacEachern, Jack Lynch

**Others present:**

Marc Resnick, Town Planner; Gregory Drake, Landscape Architect, Outback Engineering, Inc.; Robert Lucey, PLS, Dean's Point Survey, Consultants; Stuart Burnham

**Agenda item #1**

Mr. Knox read this item into the record. It was an explanation of how the provisions of Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 allowed the Board to continue to meet remotely.

**Site Plan Review –Assawompsett Golf Company, continued, - 183 Rhode Island Road**

Mr. Drake was present. He advised the Plan had been revised according to comments made by the Planning Board, Fire Department and Open Space Committee. He then shared the Plan. He advised they had moved three ADA spaces closer to the entrance so they did not have to have a crosswalk, which he indicated on the Plan. Regarding the Fire Department comments that the landscaping was too high at the hydrant and sprinkler connection, they will be modifying that with low growing vegetation for visibility.

Mr. Drake stated they had also added an extra entrance that wasn't on the Plan before, per the Route 79 improvement plan. They also did not diminish any of the curbing or radiuses coming in, but improved and widened the main entrance which had been an issue for both delivery trucks and fire trucks. He said that a note had been added to the Plan which indicated that any new plantings would be native plants. He also stated that Mr. Resnick had asked if the fence, not shown on the Plan, was part of the original approval. Atty. Mather had indicated to him that it was not. That was added after the fact because of a neighbor's request. Mr. Resnick added that because the Golf Course stated they did install the fence, even if it was after the fact to provide some screening and buffering for the neighbor, he would recommend they repair or replace the fence as needed, as a condition of the approval.

Ms. Mancovsky noted that when you are entering and exiting the main entrance, the visibility from that lot is horrendous. Will the new plantings allow for better visibility? Mr. Drake replied the shrubs there will be removed and the boulder will be moved up into the circle which will open that area up. Ms. Mancovsky asked the total amount of handicapped spots. Mr. Drake responded there are two existing, and they are adding one next to it.

Mr. Knox then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to recommend approval of the Site Plan for 183 Rhode Island Road with the following conditions:

1. The existing, damaged fence along the north edge of the parking lot will either be repaired or replaced.
2. The present sight lines will be improved by having only low plantings within 15 feet off the road in both directions.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. Mancovsky-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

**ANR Plan – 33-35 Myricks Street – submitted by Robert A. Lucey, PLS, Dean’s Point Survey Consultants**

Mr. Lucey was in attendance to present the plan. Mr. Stuart Burnham, who was planning to purchase Lot 2 was also present. Mr. Lucey advised that both lots meet the ANR criteria and then asked if there were any questions. Mr. Resnick noted that the Plan did meet the ANR standards, and he had also discussed it with the Building Commissioner.

Mr. Knox then made a motion, seconded by Mr. Lynch, to endorse the Form A Plan for 33-35 Myricks Street.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. Mancovsky-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Mr. Knox said he would like to have a brief discussion to voice any concerns regarding the following three items, the change of the sign by-law, the design standards, and the fee review project.

**Sign By-law – update**

Ms. MacEachern noted that what had been included in the packet was not the most up to date, and they had discussed removing the white and black coloring. Mr. Resnick said that he had read it over but had some questions about sign prohibitions. What was used to determine the standard of static images which refresh more than three times per minute. Ms. MacEachern said they had changed that from refresh to change. The reasoning was that was a good amount of time to not be distracted when driving by. Mr. Knox said they were also trying to eliminate flashing or animation. Ms. Mancovsky added that the community has been clear that they want to maintain the rural

character of the Town. Part of their thinking has been as increasing signage appears, how can they balance the business need with maintaining that character.

Mr. Resnick also asked how they had determined the 100 lumens? Do they know how bright that is compared to less or more? Ms. MacEachern said that she had done some research on it and said the document states that 100 lumens is considered bright enough for most walkways, including commercial properties. It is equivalent to about 20 watts. 1000 lumens could irritate visions and a typical led headlamp puts out approximately 50 to 100 lumens. Mr. Resnick said that 100 lumens would probably not be very bright for a sign that might be 20 feet up in the air, or on a building and set back. Standard lights for a home might be anywhere from 250 to 1200 lumens. They could look into that further.

Mr. Resnick advised he understood they don't want these very bright signs you can see along the highway, but they do want their businesses to be able to be seen. Ways of doing that could be by defining how many internally illuminated signs would be allowed, encouraging wood and painted signs lit with spotlights, and to try to have better and less offensive signage. He also noted at 6.6.3.2, the word feet should be added after the number 20. Mr. Resnick questioned 6.6.4.5 regarding the black and white lettering, as well as why in 6.6.6 the Zoning Board is the Special Permit Granting Authority for other types of signs.

Mr. Knox said maybe they should change all signs to the Planning Board. Mr. Resnick said that there should be consistency through the By-law. After further discussion, Mr. Conroy asked how may sign reviews the ZBA would typically handle. Ms. Murray replied that it does vary and they have done a few over the last year or so, with an average of one or two per year. She noted that this current ZBA has been pretty stringent and has either not granted relief or relief has been very limited. Mr. Resnick also asked about the section pertaining to turning off the signs. Are there businesses that stay open after 11:00? Ms. Mancovsky said there were none that did.

### **Design Standards – update**

Mr. Knox advised that although they did have a density bonus that triggers architectural design if there is over 50% lot coverage, the design requirements are not clear. Ms. Mancovsky noted that many years ago when they worked on the Master Plan, these goals were discussed. Mr. Resnick replied that there could be a general paragraph on the goals trying to be achieved in reviewing commercial building design, like New England style buildings using traditional materials such as clapboard siding, cedar shakes, or brick where appropriate, etc. This will give a framework in order to review and some leverage. You could also go further and have extensive architectural design guidelines where every element is broken down and includes diagrams and pictures. Mr. Resnick said that he could start with a paragraph or two to provide a framework for commercial buildings. They would then have to discuss where it would be applicable.

### **Master Plan Implementation – Fee Review Project - update**

Mr. Knox advised that this is something they have worked on for a couple of months as their fees were a bit antiquated. However, now that they have a Planner, there is justification the Town could take in some revenue to offset some of the costs. In addition, at their last Town Meeting there was a change to the gravel removal bylaw. A fee exemption had been added if it was an already permitted project. If they had a subdivision or a Site Plan Review go through the Board and work was permitted, the Town would receive nothing when gravel was removed if they did not have something in their fee schedule. Mr. Knox thought it was a fine bylaw but that there were a few holes in it they need to address before there is a problem. Mr. Resnick said that he could look into it and see how it could be applied. He would also look into how other Towns are handling this.

### **Review the following Zoning Board of Appeals petition:**

#### **a. Velozo – 300 Pond Lane**

Mr. Conroy made a motion, seconded by Ms. MacEachern, to make no comment on the petition for Velozo at 300 Pond Lane.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. Mancovsky-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

### **Approve Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Ms. MacEachern, to approve the Minutes from the November 18, 2021, meeting.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye, Ms. Mancovsky-Abstain

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Mr. Conroy, to approve the Minutes from the December 9, 2021, meeting.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Abstain, Ms. Mancovsky-Abstain

### **Old Business**

There was no old business.

### **New Business – Decision for Bud’s Goods-informational**

Ms. Murray explained that as the Board had commented on this petition, it was just an informational document for them to review.

### **New Business – Draft Guidelines for MBTA Communities**

Mr. Resnick advised there are some new regulations that have been drafted by the State for MBTA communities. The guidelines indicate that in order to continue to be eligible for a variety of State grants, you need to comply with this new requirement to zone areas around the train or bus stations for multi-family housing by right. They will need to create the opportunity for this but it does not mean that you actually have to build it or facilitate its development.

Mr. Resnick said the following are the parameters for this zoning:

- It needs to be a minimum of 50 acres.
- The density needs to be a minimum of 15 units per acre.
- It needs to be a half a mile from either a train or bus station, or some other place where there is reasonable access to public transit, or in a downtown where there are businesses and shops.

Mr. Resnick explained if they do not go forward with this, they will become ineligible for a variety of State grants including MassWorks. He noted that this does not mean they will have to change the underlying zoning district, and that at this early stage he would recommend an overlay district so the underlying district can still be developed. He expected there would be some technical assistance grants, probably through the regional planning agency, available to assist communities in late spring.

### **Next meeting**

Mr. Knox advised the next meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2022, at 7:00 p.m.

### **Adjourn**

Mr. Knox made a motion, seconded by Ms. Mancovsky, to adjourn the meeting.

**Roll Call Vote:** Mr. Conroy-Aye, Ms. Mancovsky-Aye, Ms. MacEachern-Aye, Mr. Lynch-Aye, Mr. Knox-Aye

Meeting adjourned at 8:06.