

MINUTES OF MEETING OF WAREHAM PLANNING BOARD

Date of Meeting: Monday, September 23, 2019

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: George Barrett, Chairman
Mike Baptiste, Sr., Vice Chairman
Richard Swenson, Associate Member
Emanuel Daskalakis, Member
Mike King, Member

Also present: Ken Buckland, Town Planner
Richard Bowen, Town Counsel
Charles Rowley, Engineering Consultant

III. PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

A. Meeting Minutes – September 09, 2019

MOTION: Mr. Baptiste moves to approve the minutes of September 9, 2019. Mr. King seconds.

VOTE (5-0-0)

B. ANR Map 90, Lot 1035, Cedar Village Inc. – 7 & 9 Old Stage Coach Road

Present before the Board: Brian Grady, G.A.F. Engineering
Nazih Elkallassi, Cedar Village, Inc.
Watie Akins, Cedar Village
Sheila Tierney, Esq., 26 7th Street, New Bedford, MA

A court reporter was also in attendance upon the Applicant's behalf.

Chairman Barrett stated that the Board had received a letter from the Wareham Fire Chief.

Attorney Tierney stated that she had not seen the letter.

Director Buckland read the letter into the record. The letter stated that the Wareham Fire Department found that Old Stagecoach Road was adequate for Fire Department emergency response vehicles to access homes along the road. See Fire Chief Rowley's letter, dated 09/10/2019, attached hereto.

Chairman Barrett asked which Board members had undertaken a site visit since the last Board meeting.

Members Daskalakis and King indicated that they had visited the site.

Chairman Barrett then asked if the members had any thoughts they wished to share.

Member King responded that the visit lasted about a half hour to forty minutes, that they had walked the road that it seemed adequate and of reasonable construction, and that he agreed with Fire Chief Rowley that it was suitable.

Chairman Barrett asked the Applicant whether there was an easement between Lot 1035 and the other two properties that allowed passage to Gault Road.

Attorney Tierney stated that she did not understand the question.

Chairman Barrett restated his question.

Attorney Tierney asked whether Chairman Barrett meant an easement to travel along Old Stagecoach Road to Gault Road.

Chairman Barrett replied in the affirmative, and did the easement allow travel across the Florindo and the other property.

Mr. Elkallassi replied that the other property belonged to Adam Johnson.

Attorney Tierney then stated that a perpetual easement from Adam Johnson had been recorded in the Plymouth County Registry of Deeds on May 29th.

Chairman Barrett then asked whether the same easement existed from Lot 1039A, the Florindo property.

Mr. Grady said yes, that Mrs. Florindo had reported such an easement.

Mr. Elkallassi said yes, that Mrs. Florindo knew there was a right to pass and re-pass.

Chairman Barrett stated that when that lot was created, it used Cranberry Highway for frontage.

Attorney Tierney asked whether that lot was 1039A.

Mr. Elkallassi stated that it was 1039A and that the Applicant did not know why 1039A got frontage along Cranberry Highway.

Mr. Grady stated that there was an access right of way out to Cranberry Highway, but that was not the frontage and that the right of way could not be used as it crossed a wetland and intermittent stream.

Chairman Barrett asked whether that property had since been purchased by the Applicant.

Mr. Grady replied yes it had been, and that the right of way still exists.

Chairman Barrett asked whether Town Counsel Richard Bowen, Esq. would like to weigh in.

Member Daskalakis asked whether he could ask a question or make a statement. He stated that he had gone to the site and had seen a wide road, and that it would be unreasonable to say that vehicles could not access the properties on the road. He stated that as a member of the Planning Board he was unclear about certain aspects of the Applicant's request and that he did not understand why this was not a subdivision. He stated that the Board had two options: to deny endorsing the Approval Not Required ("ANR") and requiring the Applicant to submit a subdivision plan, or endorse the ANR because the road was widened, trees had been cleared in contradiction to his view that the project required a subdivision plan. He stated that he believed that endorsing the plan was selective and would decrease the authority of the Planning Board. He then asked Town Counsel Bowen why the project was not a subdivision.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that the Planning Board's authority came from the state legislature and was prescribed by the law, and that the Legislature had decided what was in the Planning Board's jurisdiction. He stated that in this case the Legislature had given the Board the jurisdiction to grant the ANR, but that it had not given the Board the authority to require the Applicant to meet subdivision level requirements if the project met the requirements for an ANR. He stated that granting an ANR was not inconsistent with the Board's obligation to follow the subdivision control law, because a project meeting the ANR standards did not fall under the subdivision control law. He stated that the Board's ability to review an ANR was limited to asking certain questions. First, what sort of way was involved, public or private? He stated it was not a public way. He stated that if it was a private way, then the question became was the private way was in existence before adoption of the subdivision control law. He stated that in this case it was. He stated the next question is whether there is sufficient frontage along the private way, and the answer is yes. He stated the next question is does the private way provide access to the properties along the way, not illusory access but real access. He asked whether the Applicant had shown actual access existed.

Member Daskalakis replied yes.

Town Counsel Bowen stated those were the three things the Board was required to examine.

Member Daskalakis asked whether the inability to inspect the actual construction of the road caused any issue for the Board with regard to the access question. He questioned how a project with a road that he stated was previously impassable could not be forced into subdivision review.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that the factor was access, i.e. in what way was a lot inaccessible.

Member Daskalakis replied that the lot was accessible and had been made accessible. He questioned was it not made accessible by virtue of not following the subdivision control regulations.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that there was no question the roadway was cleared and paved, and that they had walked on it together. He stated that for the purposes of the ANR, the clearing and paving of the road is incidental. He stated that hypothetically an unpaved road could be approved if emergency vehicles could travel on it. The fact to be reviewed is whether the way provides access. He referenced the case of Wall v. Planning Board of Leverett, 58 Mass.App.Ct. 513. He stated the Court in that case wrote that the question was whether the road was deficient, i.e. could be better but manageable, or whether it fails to provide acceptable physical access to

the goals of the statute, i.e. is access illusory. He then asked if in the present matter, was access illusory.

Member Daskalakis replied no.

Chairman Barrett asked whether access was illusory prior to the improvements to the road.

Associate Member Swenson asked Town Counsel Bowen for a definition of illusory.

Town Counsel Bowen replied meaning imaginary or a figment. He then asked whether prior to the paving could vehicles pass upon the road.

Chairman Barrett replied that it was a driveway to a single family home.

Attorney Tierney reminded the Board that at the prior meeting on September 9th, the Applicant had provided evidence of police and other emergency vehicle responses taking place along Old Stagecoach road before the improvements had been made, and that the Applicant contested that the access was illusory.

Town Counsel Bowen then stated the Board had evidence that emergency vehicles could get to at least two and possibly three houses prior to the paving.

Member Daskalakis stated that he had walked the road prior to the improvements and that he believed that large emergency vehicles would have been hard-pressed to gain access, but that was water over the dam now. He stated that he did believe access previously was illusory.

Town Counsel Bowen summarized Member Daskalakis's remarks by saying that before the road was paved that he might find the access illusory, but now it is paved.

Member Daskalakis said yes.

Member King asked how ownership of a private way is determined with respect to upgrades.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that that was an interesting question and you would want to know who owned the way, that sometimes private ways are treated as a separate parcel but guessed that was not the case here, that he guessed there were easements by deeds or by prescription, that the Derelict Fee Statute might assign ownership to the centerline of the way to owners along the way, and that those owning along the way could get together and plan to assess costs to maintain the way.

Member King asked whether the Applicant could have taken liberties by improving the road without the input of those who have frontage along it.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that he did not know what process the Applicant followed to get the road paved.

Member King stated he was asking because during his site visit, Mrs. Florindo had indicated that her property extended under the road to the other side. He stated that Mrs. Florindo did not mention any process or discussion with the Applicant, and he suggested that it just happened.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that he recalled asking Mrs. Florindo whether she had a problem with the improvements, and that she had said that people could pass and re-pass over her property.

Member King said he wasn't questioning whether people could pass over Mrs. Florindo's property, and just wanted to know how the improvements had happened.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that while he recalled that Mrs. Florindo didn't seem pleased that the improvements happened without so much as a "by your leave," they didn't seem aggrieved to the point of going to court over it.

Member King agreed that the Florindos weren't pleased about not having any input, but that it did not appear that they would go to court.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that the Florindos might have potential claims against the Applicant for overburdening the easement, paying their property without permission, but that their decision whether to pursue such claims didn't matter in the matter before the Board. He stated that had the Florindos gone to court and gotten an injunction against the Applicant, then that would make it impossible for the Board to approve the Applicant's request for an ANR.

Member King asked whether there might be a problem for the Applicant down the road if the Florindos went to court.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that might create a serious problem for the Applicant, but that wasn't among the factors for the Board within their purview.

Member King asked whether the Board could be held responsible if purchasers of the new homes subsequently were denied access as a result of a successful action by the Florindos against the Applicant.

Town Counsel Bowen said that would be a weak claim, as all the Board would be doing in approving the ANR would be saying the lots had adequate frontage and access, and nothing more, and that the Board was not warranting the properties.

Associate Member Swenson asked whether Member Daskalakis had gotten an answer to his question.

Member Daskalakis stated no, but that he didn't want to take up any more time. He stated to Town Counsel Bowen the application could not be deemed a subdivision if the ANR criteria were met. He stated that prior road conditions had been corrected. He stated that he did not understand the process of how the improvements had been made and whether the Board had any role in that process, and that he did not understand why the subdivision rules did not have to be followed.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that the subdivision rules did not apply to the application, and that while the process by which the improvements were made was certainly of some interest and that were he a purchaser of one of the lots he'd certainly be interested, but that wasn't what was before the board. Town Counsel said that the Board could vote to turn down the ANR, but he asked the Board to consider what would happen if the matter went to trial and the judge and/or jury learned that there was frontage, the road was a private way in existence before adoption of

the subdivision control law, and that the Fire Chief said that a fire truck could come down the road. He asked Member Daskalakis how he thought the trial would end.

Member Daskalakis said it would be very expensive for both sides.

Town Counsel Bowen said he worked on retainer.

Associate Member Swenson stated that he understood the subdivision control law did not apply to this application and that all the Board could vote on was whether the application met the by-laws.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that the question was whether the application met state law, and that is the only question.

Chairman Barrett stated that the zoning by-law question would be answered by whether the property received a building permit.

Town Counsel Bowen said it had nothing to do with buildability.

Chairman Barrett stated that he meant that by issuing the ANR endorsement, the Board was not saying whether the lots were buildable.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that was absolutely right.

Chairman Barrett stated the determination of buildability would be made by the building department.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that was absolutely right, the Board would not be saying it met zoning or that the property was buildable, that it could connect to sewer or needed a septic system, or that it had water, and all the Board would be saying is that it met the three characteristics of an ANR.

Chairman Barrett stated the road was private and not town accepted, and was maintained by agreement with two of the abutters. Now two and possibly four more houses would be added. He stated that down the road if residents should ask the Town to accept the road, that was their responsibility and had nothing to do with the ANR.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that Chairman Barrett was absolutely right, and that the Florindos had asked about what would happen if residents wanted the road to become a public way. He stated that the residents would have to petition the Board of Selectmen. Town Counsel Bowen then went through the steps of road acceptance, including the Board's role in making a recommendation and reviewing the quality of the road. He stated that while he didn't want to anticipate the future, he had previously seen the Board take a keen interest in the quality of roads proposed for acceptance, but that this process was not what was before the Board today.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that he knew the project was controversial and that people's expectations of what the Board could do might be unrealistic. He stated that since the Board's ANR review was very limited, those who had concerns about the project should take those concerns to other boards or officials.

Chairman Barrett asked whether this would establish the layout of Old Stagecoach Road.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that it did not.

Chairman Barrett stated that he had seen an overhead photo of what Old Stagecoach Road looked like, and that it was laid out differently then than now. He asked whether this would mean there might be a different ANR sought in the future.

Town Counsel Bowen said that sounded illusory.

Chairman Barrett said the current plan was even more illusory. He then asked whether Board Engineer Rowley had anything to say.

Board Engineer Rowley stated that he had a dilemma in terms of how to draw a distinction between a road that had been there since time immemorial, and making a distinction between that sort of road and the current project where the improvements had been made in the last two months. He stated that the subdivision control law prevented road construction until approval under the subdivision control law. He stated that the subdivision control law also required the Board to make a determination of the adequacy of construction. He stated that he did not know what the construction was and that he had only seen it after it had been paved, and did not know how it was constructed. He asked what could be done when improvements were made unilaterally and then an applicant came before the Board seeking an ANR.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that it was an interesting question, but that the question was built upon a false assumption that subdivision rules and regulations apply to this application, which they do not, as there is a private way in existence before adoption of the subdivision control law.

Board Engineer Rowley stated that he did not assume that the road did not previously exist, and that what he was saying is that without any input from the Board or requests for waivers for construction, construction was done and then the ANR was applied for. He asked how this or any other applicant was able to do that under the subdivision control law or the ANR standard.

Town Counsel Bowen stated stop, that the subdivision control law did not apply.

Board Engineer Rowley then asked if anyone could just make improvements to a road to get an ANR, why were we all here.

Town Counsel Bowen answered because there was an application before the Board asking for the Board's determination of sufficient frontage, on a private way in existence before adoption of the subdivision control law, on a private way that has real rather than illusory access. That is why we are here.

Board Engineer Rowley asked what could be done to improve the Board's subdivision rules and regulations to make sure something like this did not happen again.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that this was not a subdivision, that the subdivision rules could not be applied to something that was not a subdivision.

Associate Member Swenson stated that he thought Board Engineer Rowley's point was valid but could not be addressed now.

Chairman Barrett asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

Associate Member Swenson stated that since Member Bianco was absent, he wondered if he should vote.

Chairman Barrett stated this was not a hearing where an Associate Member would vote in the absence of a full Member.

Director Buckland agreed.

Board Engineer Rowley noted this was not a Special Permit application and that was the only instance where an Associate Member would vote.

Chairman Barrett asked about Note 2 on the plan, which involved Beaver Path.

Mr. Grady replied that it was just a lot line reference from previous survey plans of the area relating to an abutting property, including a survey performed by Board Engineer Rowley.

Member Baptiste said that it was a shame that this whole plan was circumventing the system, that he did not accept it, and he did not agree with Town Counsel Bowen.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that he hoped that Member Baptiste's comments were not made in a disparaging way, that he was reciting the law of the Commonwealth as it has been handed down by the Legislature and the Courts of the Commonwealth. He stated that he didn't have to like it or agree with it, but that he had no say in the law. He stated that the law allows what the law allows. He stated that it was not Member Baptiste's job to like it, but rather his job to follow it.

Chairman Barrett then asked for comments, motions or observations.

Associate Member Swenson then asked if there need to be a motion for a vote.

Chairman Barrett replied yes.

Associate Member Swenson then moved to vote on the ANR application.

Member Baptiste asked whether Associate Member could make such a motion.

Chairman Barrett stated that was an interesting point.

Associate Member Swenson remarked that in the past he had made such motions.

Member Daskalakis stated that he had received a lot of information and law that did not match his understanding of the law, and was not ready to vote.

Chairman Barrett replied that some sort of decision had to be made tonight and filed tomorrow.

Member Baptiste stated something that could not be heard.

Chairman Barrett replied that the Board had a very short window to decide ANRs.

Associate Member Swenson stated that he was under the impression that time ran out tonight to make a decision.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that if the Board chose to do nothing, then the ANR was constructively endorsed.

Member Baptiste stated they could make a motion to deny and go back to square one.

Town Counsel Bowen stated no, and then you'll go to court.

Member Baptiste stated maybe that's what should happen, as he did not agree with Town Counsel Bowen, that the whole plan came in through the back door. He then asked if the Commonwealth allowed back door plans.

Town Counsel Bowen replied that he would be sure to call Member Baptiste as his first witness.

Member Daskalakis stated that they did have Town Counsel Bowen advising them.

Member Baptiste stated that there were always two lawyers and a judge and that the Board was not required to agree with Town Counsel Bowen's advice, and that he did not.

Associate Member Swenson stated that he had made a motion but there was a question as to whether he was allowed to.

Chairman Barrett asked for Town Counsel Bowen to answer the question.

Associate Member Swenson stated he was withdrawing his motion.

Member Daskalakis asked whether instead of waiting two years and making the lawyers rich, was there a way –

Town Counsel Bowen interjected and stated he worked on a retainer.

Member Daskalakis continued and asked whether there was any way to shorten the time frame if the Applicant submitted a subdivision plan and requested waivers.

Attorney Tierney stated that their position was that the subdivision control law did not apply to their application, that they already had a prospective buyer, and that her client would sustain damages by any further delay. She reiterated that during the meeting on September 9th, the Board had specifically asked for additional time in order to get the Wareham Fire Chief's input and to inspect the road, and respectfully requested a vote tonight.

Member Daskalakis stated if a vote was taken and the result was denial of the application, which would not help either the Applicant or the Town. He stated that with all due respect to Town Counsel Bowen, there were still questions about the process of improving the road and that it should have been done in a different manner. He stated that the Board was simply trying to do the right thing in the manner Mr. Elkallassi did in his position on the Zoning Board of Appeals, and asked whether there was an intermediate way to address the application.

Attorney Tierney stated that his responsibility as a Board Member was not to follow his feelings but rather to follow the law. She stated that Town Counsel Bowen had made it very clear what the law is, that Town Counsel Bowen had cited the same case she had cited during the September 9th meeting, and that she believed that under the law of the Commonwealth her client was entitled to an ANR endorsement.

Member Daskalakis asked again by what mechanism available for review by the Board had the road been modified. He reiterated the Board's authority to not allow a subdivision until a definitive plan had been produced, reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.

Attorney Tierney reiterated that this was not a subdivision.

Chairman Barrett asked Town Counsel Bowen whether the fact that improvements were made prior to the application being submitted had any bearing on the decision to be made.

Town Counsel Bowen stated the decision was to be made based upon what sits on the ground right now. He stated that he knew he was delivering harsh truths and meant no disrespect to the Board, but that it was the Board's job to follow the law as it is given, and it is not the Board's job to legislate and create law that does not exist. He stated that the Members should ask themselves are they legislators or are they there to carry out the law as it was given to them.

Member King stated that he had one last comment. He stated that Town Counsel Bowen had explained access and frontage, but if there was no document from the Florindos authorizing the Applicant to improve the property, then isn't the Applicant gaining access through suspect terms.

Town Counsel Bowen stated that was a question the Applicant should probably answer, but that during the site visit the Florindos had indicated their assent.

Attorney Tierney stated that Mr. Florindo had asked the Applicant to pave his driveway and to mulch his yard.

Chairman Barrett stated that he thought the Board had discussed the matter enough, and asked for a motion to endorse the Form A and ANR for Lots 1035A and 1035B.

Member King stated that the motion would have to come from Chairman Barrett, and that he would second it while holding his nose.

MOTION: by Chairman Barrett, to endorse the ANR for Lots 1035A and 1035B, Map 90. Second by Member King.

Chairman Barrett stated that he didn't think anyone liked the feel of the application and that other access might have been better suited, but was what the Board had before them, and that the application met area and frontage requirements.

VOTE: 3-1 to endorse.

Following the vote, Board Engineer Rowley said that he thought the situation stank and that he felt sorry for the Florindos.

C. 27-19 - ANR Map 1, Lot 544A, 544B, 4 Longwood Ave., c/o JC Engineering Inc.

Present before the Board: Brian Wallace, JC Engineering

Mr. Wallace speaks into the record that in front of the board is an ANR plan that depicts two existing dwellings, one being built in 1940, and the other in 1910 per the Wareham Assessor's card built on one lot. Mr. Wallace states that both dwellings were existing prior to the Subdivision Control Law. The applicant is proposing reconfiguration of both lots to provide one

single dwelling on each. Mr. Buckland mentions that since Attorney Bowen has left that he would like to go over the exemption that applies to this particular case. It is called the 81L Exemption. He reads the exemption into the record. Mr. Barrett asks Mr. Wallace if the real lot line has changed at some point, and Mr. Wallace states that yes, because it was all one deed that described both lots, however he was unsure for how long that has been established and it was unclear when he looked through the records.

MOTION: Mr. Baptiste moves to endorse the ANR plan for Lots 544A, 544B, 4 Longwood Ave.

VOTE: (5-0-0)

D. 28-19 ANR Map 105, Lots 16, 17, & 1010/Map 106, Lot L2 - Charlotte Furnace Road - A.D. Makepeace Co., Inc. c/o G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.

Present before the Board: Bill Madden, G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Madden mentions that he is here tonight in behalf of A.D. Makepeace. The purpose of the plan is to reconfigure the two existing Lots 16 & 17 on Map 105, to enlarge the lot area using a portion of Lot L2 on Map 106. In addition three new lots are created using Lot 1010 on Map 105 and a portion of Lot L2 on Map 106. The remaining area of Lot L2 is shown as 289 acres and maintains 226.21' of frontage on Charlotte Furnace Road.

Mr. Baptiste asks Mr. Madden what happens to the remaining area of Lot L2 and Mr. Madden states that at this present time there are no plans.

MOTION: Mr. Daskalakis moves to endorse the plan. Mr. King seconds.

VOTE: (5-0-0)

E. 18-19 - Submission Of Definitive Plan, David Mather, Oak Street

MOTION: Mr. King moves to set the Public Hearing date to 10/21/2019. Mr. Baptiste seconds.

VOTE: (5-0-0)

IV. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

VI. REFERRALS

VII. ANY OTHER BUSINESS/DISCUSSION

A. Factory Five Racing – Modification of Special Permit

Present before the Board: Bill Madden, G.A.F. Engineering, Inc.

Mr. Madden states he dropped off some revised plans with Mr. Buckland back when the project was run through Site Plan Review and there were some conditions of approval and the most significant one was one that he had to work with the neighbor with respect to some of the materials that he had stock piled on the property that Factory Five was acquiring. After some discussion held by the Property Manager, it was suggested that a modification be made to the drainage to offset some of the discussion points that the abutter was making.

Mr. Madden mentions that the changes that he shows on the plan are mainly around drainage but there are other several minor changes including relocating landscaping here and there, reason for the new plan. Mr. Madden reviews the changes on the plan with the Board.

Mr. Rowley states the only question he has is on the drainage calculations. He asks if there is a plan of where the various sub catchments are and Mr. Madden states there were no changes from the original drainage calc as they are not visible in this new plan, only the changes. They are within the same designation as before he tells Mr. Rowley. Mr. Rowley turns to Chairman Barrett and says that from his perspective he would only need a quick overview of the drainage calculations. Mr. Rowley feels as if there has not been enough difference in the overall design to warrant going into detail on the plan. Mr. Baptiste asks Mr. Rowley that it sounds like he feels the same as they feel as far as considering this to be a minor change, and Mr. Rowley, stated he did. Mr. Baptiste and Mr. Rowley suggest moving a red maple tree to the front and Mr. Madden says that he is happy to comply.

MOTION: Mr. Baptistes moves to approve as a minor modification subject per Mr. Rowley's review. Mr. Daskalakis seconds.

VOTE: (5-0-0)

B. Bay Pointe Drive – Phase II – Subdivision & Covenant Endorsement

Mr. Swenson asks Mr. Buckland for some clarification regarding this document and Mr. Buckland explains in detail. The board reviews a draft and discusses some of the details on the Covenant. Town Counsel to review along with plans for endorsement.

C. Cahoon Drive Reconfiguration Discussion

Clerk Buckland states that Tim Fay is suggesting a turnaround at the end of the public section of Cahoon Drive and link Bay Pointe Dr. Ext called the existing Cahoon Dr. section within his golf course subdivision called Bay Pointe Dr. as it was originally proposed with emergency access in between. Conversation ensues regarding some different thoughts from the board.

Mr. Daskalakis is wondering why there isn't a plan being submitted for this type of project and Mr. Buckland states that Mr. Fay is just looking for an opinion at this point. Mr. Daskalakis

states that it is difficult to form an opinion without seeing it. Mr. Barrett does not see a benefit. Mr. Swenson also agrees that with this type of significant change that the Applicant should submit plans for the Board to review.

D. Master Plan Discussion Continued

Mr. Swenson discusses the process and would like to agree on some dates in order to do a presentation regarding the Master Plan. The Board agrees on Monday, September 30th and Thursday, October 3rd of 2019.

Mr. Swenson passes out a document to the Board for a discussion regarding the history of the current Master Plan. It was prepared by the Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic District (SRPEDD).

The Wareham Congress Proposal will be presented to – Board of Selectmen, Finance Committee, Zoning Board of Appeals, Conservation Committee, and Redevelopment Authority. The mission of the Congress is to get the Boards to work together with the Master Plan as the Agenda in driving activities out of that.

VIII. STAFF REPORT

IX. NEW BUSINESS (This time is reserved for topics that the Chairman did not reasonably anticipate would be discussed)

X. CORRESPONDENCE

A. See correspondence in packets

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Daskalakis moves to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Baptiste seconds.

VOTE: (5-0-0)

Date signed: Nov 18 2019

Attest: [Signature]

WAREHAM PLANNING BOARD

Date copy sent to Town Clerk: _____

WAREHAM TOWN CLERK
2019 NOV 19 AM 9:31

