

WAREHAM PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
Multi-Service Center
54 Marion Road, Wareham, MA 02571
Monday, April 10th, 2023

The following record pertains to a meeting held by the Wareham Planning Board at 6:00PM local time. A video recording of this meeting is available for viewing. The record for the proceedings includes the videotape of the meeting, the resolutions passed, and any document presented during the course of the meeting.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair King opened the meeting and proceeded to call the roll.

PRESENT MEMBERS: Michael King, Chair
Carl Schulz
Jane Gleason
Mike Baptiste
Sherry Quirk, Associate Member
Sam Corbitt

ALSO PRESENT: Kenneth Buckland, Director of Planning and Community Development
Jonathan Dickinson, Assistant Town Planner

ABSENT: -

II. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Approval of Minutes

MOTION – Move to approve the meeting minutes for May 23, 2022.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

A brief discussion ensued between C. Schulz and J. Gleason regarding the organization of documents and filing of appropriate By-Laws in folders.

MOTION – Move to approve the meeting minutes for June 13, 2022.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

MOTION – Move to approve the meeting minutes for June 27, 2022.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

MOTION – Move to approve the meeting minutes for July 7, 2022.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

MOTION – Move to approve the meeting minutes for July 11, 2022, with the noted corrections.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

C. Schulz motioned to request the Planning Board to request Planning Office to file a copy of relevant By-Laws within the project folders.

MOTION – Move to have the Planning Board request the Planning Office file a copy of relevant By-Laws within each project folder, with a naming system that allows them to appear first in the list of documents.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz	X		AYE
S. Corbitt		X	AYE
S. Quirk			AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

2. Shell Point Place – Street Name Application – 69 Great Neck – Map 41, Lot 1019

The Planning Board briefly discussed a June 12, 2022, EMS letter. M. King suggested EMS and the Police Department provide input on naming approval. The Planning Office agreed to reach out to EMS and the Police Department.

MOTION – Move to not act on the issue until EMS and the Police Department provide confirmation that the proposed streetway of Ben’s Way will not cause confusion with emergency response.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

3. Report to Town Meeting by Planning Board

K. Buckland provided M. King with information on public records for town meetings. C. Schulz raised a concern about the sparse parking regulation in Section 921, “Table of Parking Regulations,” requesting that the topics be addressed next meeting.¹

S. Quirk questioned whether the Article 6 amendments had gone through the proper notice process for Town Meeting, and K. Buckland confirmed that it had. However, there was a small adjustment regarding the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and building coverage.

¹ Zoning By-Laws. (2022, April 12).

Bill Lockwood, Lockwood Architects

B. Lockwood shared that his clients had informed him that the FAR might be changed during the course of the meeting. He noted that FAR has been a long-standing issue, particularly for small lots in Onset where he works. He stated he has been involved with the Zoning Board of Appeals far more than necessary due to the significant impact of FAR on small buildings.

J. Gleason and M. King clarified the difference between FAR and building coverage. They explained that FAR dictates the total square footage, calculated as a percentage against the square footage of a lot. J. Gleason's work in clarifying and modifying Article 6 had no intent to change the content. She acknowledged the Scrivener's error and recommended changing "building coverage" to FAR.²

MOTION – Move to make a motion on the floor of Town Meeting to address the Scrivener's error for Article 6 with the intent not to change the dimensional information but correct the description information to FAR which it should have been.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

4. For Discussion and Vote: Appoint SRPEDD Member

MOTION – Move to appoint Sherry Quirk as the Planning Board's SRPEDD representative for the coming year.

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk			RECUSED
M. Baptiste		X	AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 5-0-0

5. Discussion for Design Guidelines for Downtown

² See: Wareham Planning Board, *Proposed Articles: Drafts & Planning Board Revisions*, Wareham.ma.us.

A discussion occurred regarding design guidelines for the new Redevelopment Zone.³ J. Gleason and K. Buckland noted they had formed a focus group to provide feedback on the guidelines.

J. Gleason felt that the reaction was in favor of more specific guidelines. She expressed that there was a desire to get the By-Law passed, but expressed concern that there was no body with the mandate to review designed or draft design guidelines. She further noted the present guidelines attached to Rules and Regulations are not substantial enough to guide those putting together proposed. C. Schulz asked what the Planning Board or Town's challenges are if they move forward without design guidelines in place. J. Gleason responded that the current guidelines going before Town Meeting are vague, and she expects a reaction. She noted strong guidelines should be in place, but it will be difficult to reach consensus on what is appropriate. She suggested putting together a design review committee for the Downtown Redevelopment District. At the start, the group's mandate would be putting together the guidelines and then it would review projects presents.

S. Quirk discussed limitations that would have to be considered, and that the authority of the Planning Board should be preserved in the formation of the review body. C. Schulz noted in Article 15 a design review By-Law had been developed. Members of the board recognized the obligation to the town to approach the question of design guidelines thoughtfully.

K. Buckland then reviewed a presentation, and discussed the feedback received. He noted that design review examines the architecture, landscape, and public spaces. It would involve the regulation of materials, color, roof style, windows, etc. Design review is limited to ensuring the design of a project is compatible with community standards.⁴ Previous drafts had included the following public amenities:

1. Public Access to waterfront, including physical and visual access;
2. Active uses on Main Street, off the sidewalk;
3. Landscaping and street furniture on main street and waterfront;
4. Special standards from increase in height;
5. Additional performance standards included dark sky lighting compliance and enclosure of utilities and waste disposal.

The following draft, voted upon after input from Rules and Regulations, included comparison with nearby buildings and open spaces, and the consideration to specific design elements including scale, signs, height, proportions, etc. A general building standard of three to five stories would be encouraged.

S. Quirk and J. Gleason discussed the current state of design guidelines, and whether the Planning Board would be able to implement conditions for projects if the public found it objectionable in some way. Presently, the design guidelines fall under the rules and regulations of the Planning Board, not the By-Laws, as such, they function as recommendations.

C. Schulz and J. Gleason briefly discussed the specifics of accomplishing the task, whereupon it was suggested the review body should function as an advisory group.

³ See: WV-1R Village Reinvestment Subdistrict Amendment Proposal. (2023, March 7).

⁴ Presentation not found.

C. Schulz suggested that if the spring Town Meeting passes the package, the Planning Board must quickly hold a public meeting on the current design standards, and then modify the guidelines through Planning Board public meetings.

~

Patricia Anne Wurts, Citizen

P. Wurts expressed concern that if the Planning Board approved a project prior to the implementation of substantial design guidelines, it could set a precedent. She noted that similar issues had occurred with the Conservation Commission.

J. Gleason questioned how changing laws could impact previously set precedents, to which S. Quirk responded that a proposed project is subject to whatever rules are in place at a given time. Members of the Planning Board emphasized the importance of open meetings in this context. P. Wurts suggested some members of the working group that had provided feedback to K. Buckland and J. Gleason could serve on the advisory group for the design guidelines.

~

The proposed design review group's role in the design process and their interaction with the Planning Board were discussed. Two key issues were identified. The first issue concerned drafting substantial and appropriate design guidelines for the new redevelopment district. The second issue was how the Planning Board would implement these guidelines and review projects.

C. Schulz raised a concern that if the Planning Office were designated as the preapplication review or design point, the reviews would not be subject to open meeting laws. However, a longer process may provide a better end result. The currently existing guidelines attached to the Zoning By-Law will be discussed at the May 8th, 2023, Planning Board meeting. These guidelines were created to work in conjunction with the By-Law change to add WV1-R.

M. King provided a summary of the proposed design review body, stating that it would be a citizen advisory group tasked with establishing design standards. The group would meet, draw upon their collective talent and experiences, and present their findings to the Planning Board as a group of citizens at an open meeting.

S. Corbitt supported M. King's assessment of the plan but recommended that the Town Council be consulted to ensure that the formation of the advisory group was legal and appropriate.

III. OTHER COMMENTS

The Planning Board briefly discussed the upcoming public hearing schedule. C. Schulz noted a number of documents that had been read into the record for other solar projects should additionally be read into the record for Fearing Hill.

IV. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

S. Corbitt discussed a map presented by N. McHale previously at a Planning Board meeting. He conducted further research and noted the coverage of the aquifer by the entirety of the town of Wareham.⁵ Fearing Hill, as noted by C. Schulz, is part of a different aquifer.

M. King requested J. Dickinson put together a list of running solar arrays with approval dates. He expressed the need to put together a schedule to plan to review these arrays when they meet the five-year mark. Furthermore, he noted that there were projects on the list that arrived prior to the implementation of decommissioning requirements.

V. AJOURNMENT

MOTION – Move to adjourn.

WAREHAM TOWN CLERK
2023 JUN 12 PM4:46

MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	VOTE
M. King (Chair)			AYE
J. Gleason			AYE
C. Schulz			AYE
S. Corbitt	X		AYE
S. Quirk		X	AYE
M. Baptiste			AYE

Seconded and passed without dissent. 6-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:23PM local time.

Approved by Planning Board Clerk: _____



Date submitted to Town Clerk: _____

⁵ See: Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, *Plymouth Carver Aquifer Advisory Committee*, Mass.gov.