



Town of Danvers
Planning Board

Danvers Town Hall
One Sylvan Street
Danvers, MA 01923
www.danvers.govoffice.com

Margaret Zilinsky, Chair
Kristine Cheetham
William Prentiss
Aaron Henry
James Sears
John Farmer, Associate

Daniel J. Toomey Hearing Room
January 26, 2016
6:00 p.m.
MINUTES

Chairman Margaret Zilinsky called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Planning Board members Kristine Cheetham, Aaron Henry, William Prentiss, James Sears and Associate Member John Farmer were present. Planner Kate Day was also present.

40R ZONING –PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Bill Reyelt and Elaine Wijnja from the Department of Housing and Community Development presented an overview of a [smart growth zoning tool, Chapter 40R](#).

Zilinsky opened the meeting and introduced Bill Reyelt and Elaine Wijnja from the Department of Housing and Community Development. She said that the Planning Board has been looking at rezoning the Industrial I-1 zones in Danvers. They have already rezoned I-1 zones in the Waterfront Village District and they did an overlay at Tapleville. They are now looking at the I-1 zone near the intersection of Maple Street and Hobart Street. They have heard about the 40R zoning offered by the State which they feel is a very attractive regulation in maintaining their percentage of affordable housing. This may allow the town not to fall below the 10% requirement of affordable housing which allows a 40B development to come in and circumvent regulations. The 40R also has a financial incentive for the town.

Day said that the Town was fortunate to receive funding from the DHCD's program called the Priority Development Fund, targeted to communities that wanted to focus on increasing housing in smart growth areas. They took the \$15,000 grant and worked with MAPC to do a study on the Maple Street I-1 area. The results were presented to us along with the downtown parking study. Day said that they were now in a position to conduct analysis to move forward and perhaps be ready for a special Town Meeting in the fall. She felt that the Planning Board deserved a lot of credit for looking at all the range of alternatives for working on this overlay zone. This is an overlay zone which is a smart growth technique.

Bill Reyelt and Elaine Wijnja started their presentation for 40R zoning.

Reyelt said that he and Wijnja have been working on 40R zoning since 2008. They enjoy sharing information about the program. It is an incentive program to encourage cities and towns to adopt overlay zones in smart growth districts that have an inclusionary element in exchange for financial incentives. He said that they would provide background, and an update of where they are along with showing some examples in other communities.

Reyelt explained how the 40R program came about.

The basic requirement is to meet certain location requirements. The zoning overlay has to allow certain densities. There is an inclusionary requirement of 20% affordability. There are three types of payments. The first payment is a zoning incentive payment that ranges from \$10,000 for 20 or less units. It is up to \$600,000 for a district that would allow 501 units over and above what is allowed. There is also a \$3,000 payment for each unit when a building permit is issued. The community applies for the 40S payment for reimbursement if it can be demonstrated there has been a net increase in school cost.

Reyelt said that the zone needs to be in one of three eligible locations. It needs to be ½ mile from a transit location, train, bus or ferry. It has to be a station. This is not applicable to Danvers. The second is the area of concentrated development which the Industrial -1 zone falls under. The third is a highly suitable location. The location would not fall into the previous two categories but has existing infrastructure and smart growth characteristics.

Reyelt described the zoning requirements. He said that it is an as-of-right zoning, but you can have site plan review and design standards. The zoning does not need to be all inclusive. The district needs to be primarily residential, but it can be mixed-use.

Reyelt said that there has to be a minimum of 20% affordability in the zone. It does not have to be applied to projects fewer than 13 units, but you have to achieve 20% affordability in the district overall. A project can be exempted. The affordability component needs to be spread proportionally throughout the project area.

Reyelt described the income limits.

Reyelt said that the process is to contact the DHCD. Then there would be a site visit. A local hearing needs to happen before an application is submitted. DHCD reviews the draft zoning, and within 90 days they issue a letter of eligibility. It would then go back to the community to adopt the zoning. Then it would need the approval from the Attorney General's office. There would be another letter of approval. The community is then eligible to receive the incentive payment and can start permitting projects.

Reyelt showed slides which summarized the activity to date within Massachusetts including communities that had received payments and some completed projects.

The meeting was opened to questions.

Zilinsky said that they had been looking at an overlay in the Industrial-1 area and said that the project at 20 Locust Street would be of similar density to a 40R. She and Day went to the Town of Reading to look at their 40R project. There is a building with a yoga studio, wine bar and fitness studio on the first floor. The design fit nicely in the area. She explained that under 40R certain design criteria can be built in for the overlay.

Farmer asked if some of the communities had multiple districts. Reyelt said that was correct. Norwood has a 50-unit district and another small one. Belmont was a surplus property that was redeveloped. Farmer asked if each district received separate incentive payments. Reyelt said that was correct, but they have discretion to determine whether it is a new district or an amendment to a previous district.

Prentiss asked how much flexibility did the towns have to tweak the zoning and stay within the 40R smart growth criteria. Reyelt said that the town's real charge, and what they need to do by statute, is to determine that design standards are feasible and not unduly restrictive. If it can be shown that a building has been developed under the same design standards, the DHCD will accept it. They want the design as clear as possible. The main concern is that the applicant can comply with what is required.

Wijnja said that zoning requirements, height and setbacks are all established by the town. Reyelt said that as far as the mixed-use, they will encourage commercial on the first floor with residential above. He explained that a commercial-only district can be done. It is an opportunity to rezone other areas of this district. They will allow up to 50% of non-residential on a qualifying parcel and still count it towards the zoning incentive payment.

Prentiss confirmed that when the town comes up with the zoning changes, the application is submitted. The DHCD does not tell the town anything concerning design. Wijnja said that the town determines what it wants, and then the DHCD makes sure that it fits into the statute and regulations. Reyelt said that they encourage smart growth approaches.

Cheetham asked for an explanation of a highly-suitable category. Reyelt said that there are areas not close to transit or not near a town center. Instead, the town has infrastructure or previously developed sites. It cannot be greenfields. Infrastructure is the key. He described a location that was an old air field. They generally have some flexibility in regulations. They look at the regulations with an eye that there is decent transportation access.

Cheetham asked Day what the total acreage was for the downtown area. Day said that there are 10 acres in the Maple Street Industrial -1 zone at present. She said that they have spoken with large land holders in that district. She said that if this district was built out to the max, it would be in the range of 200 units. Wijnja said that the payment of a district with 201 units would be \$350,000.

Day wanted to clarify that it is not out of the question to extend the district. There has been an interest of property owners that about this district that might want to be included. Reyelt said that

they need to be clear that not every parcel in the district is going to count for the zoning initiative. There can be a patchwork of zoning, and some parcels can be eliminated.

Henry questioned not having the requirement of an applicant looking for a Special Permit for certain uses. He asked if there was any scenario where you would require a Special Permit. Wijnja said that as long as it is being treated as other like-uses it is permissible. You need to stick to uniformity. Reyelt said that the as-right is the emphasis for the residential. For zoning legality, the commercial area can be separated out and made to be more discretionary. Communities will put in exactly what is allowed and not allowed.

Henry asked Reyelt and Wijnja if they felt this district was eligible after doing the site walk. Both thought it was an eligible area. They said they are very supportive and offered to do anything they could to assist the Town.

Sears felt this was another alternative to look at. His concern is that there is not a big public transportation use in town. Philosophically they do not want to overdevelop it and question where do you draw the line. This discussion could come out with town meeting members and residents. He asked Reyelt if they get opposition from towns that did not pass at Town Meeting. Reyelt said that most towns have adopted it before they apply. Reyelt said that one 40R project is coming back to the town as a 40B, so he told everyone to keep that in mind.

Sears felt that it could be tailored to certain heights and densities. He struggles with the parking counts. If you had major transportation, you could relax the parking. In a town like Danvers, it would need to be shown. The trend is to have housing close to trains, but that could be a hard sell in Danvers. Reyelt said to gather as much information as possible from the locations being targeted.

Farmer asked if there was a look-back provision. Reyelt responded no.

Bartha asked what were some of the creative ways that communities have used the money. Wijnja said that they are not sure since they wire the funds to the Town. They are not sure what they are used for. Once the funds go into the general fund, it can go out to a revolving fund to be used in the district. Reyelt said that they need to do more research to have the answer to this question.

Henry confirmed that there were no statutory restrictions. Reyelt confirmed this. He said that in Reading, some of the money and CPA funds were used to create more affordability. The development was concurrent with the adoption of the zone, and the town helped the developer.

Bennett asked how could they give the owners and developers incentive to redevelop their property with these funds. Reyelt said that if construction does not start within three years, they can claw back the funds. They have been very generous with their timelines and have never clawed back any incentive payments. Wijnja said that some communities have requested to delay receiving their incentive payments.

Zilinsky said that they were thinking of using the incentive payments to improve facades and sidewalks.

Maloney asked if in the history of the program, had the incentive payments been subject to funding shortfalls. Reyelt said in the very beginning they did say they were suspending the density payment, but that is not the case now. They have paid all the bills.

Wijnja said that this is a program that the State House likes. Their funds have always been replenished.

Henry felt it did not pay to wait. He felt they need to be an early adopter. The success of the Community Preservation Act (CPA) was because a lot of communities figured out that it was good and should do it. He felt that they should take advantage of it sooner than later.

Bennett asked if the 40S funds come through the same funding source. Wijnja said that the funds for 40S come through the Department of Revenue.

Henry asked how complicated the 40S process was for municipalities to document and apply for. Reyelt said that the Department of Revenue (DOR) administers this. They have a spreadsheet that needs to be populated on the DOR website. Henry felt they could take that spreadsheet and put in hypotheticals to see how it works. Wijnja said that if you could estimate the information, you could look at data points. Reyelt said that they did that for a project proposed in Beverly. The DOR also looked at it to see the calculations.

Jeremy Lee asked what made 40R more attractive for owners, other than the high density. Reyelt said it allowed more possibilities. Wijnja said that a by-right is allowed. It is predictability and higher densities.

Zilinsky thanked everyone for coming. She felt this was an attractive alternative to look at in the future.

PUBLIC HEARING

50 Spring Street, 65 Summer Street, 21 Spring Street. Request for a Major Modification to an approved Site Plan pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by St. John's Preparatory School for property located in the R-III District for the demolition of Griffin Hall, a utility building, and construction of a new 78,960 square foot Wellness Center. A new maintenance building consisting of 1,800 square feet will be constructed behind the STEM building. (Assessor's Map 19, Lot 17; Map 20, Lot 49; Map 25, Lot 74) (*SPA action date: February 19, 2016*)

Zilinsky read the legal notice.

Attorney Nancy McCann appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant, St. John's Preparatory School. With her this evening were: Steven Cunningham, Director of School

Facilities at St. John's Prep; Vaclav Talacko, Project Engineer from Hancock Associates; William Beatrice from Flansburgh Architects; and Stuart Meurer from Windover Construction. She told the Board that they were here two years ago for the STEM building, which has been constructed and is occupied. They are now here to seek a modification to the site plan to allow the construction of a Wellness Center. This center was mentioned at the time they were before the Board for the STEM building. St. John's Prep is a non-profit organization that is exempt from zoning. However, the bylaw can regulate bulk, density, setbacks, lot sizes and parking, as long as those regulations are reasonable. This project meets those regulations. They did a full site plan package. She said that Beatrice will talk about the center, and Talacko will talk about the technical aspects. McCann said that they have received comments from Engineering, Building and Fire, and they are in the process of responding to those comments. They did attend a Technical Review Committee (TRC) meeting, and the plan submitted incorporated comments from that meeting.

McCann described the plan to the Board. The Wellness Center is 79,000 square feet. They are also proposing a new 1,800 square foot maintenance building behind the STEM building. They will be relocating parking spaces to the other side of Summer Street. The proposal does not trigger the need for more parking spaces. There is an existing utility building called Griffin Hall that is used for storage. They have met with the Preservation Commission. They deemed that this building was not historically significant, so it will be demolished. The Wellness Center is going to serve the existing population. There will be no increase of new vehicles, parking needs or students. The center will meet the wellness needs of the existing campus population.

Beatrice addressed the Board and described the overview of the floor plan. The building is going to be nestled between the two fields on campus. The Brother Linus Field slopes down to the parking area, which then slopes down to the Cronin Field. The lower level of the building is where the present parking area is. The first level of the building will be at the grade of the Brother Linus Field. There will be three areas to this building: the gym/field house, pool and academic suite. The field house is at the lower level which will house three basketball courts and five tennis courts. The upper level has a track. The main basketball court will have a wood floor, and there will be a synthetic floor around the court. Adjacent to the field house is a fitness room. On the lower level will be the weights and benches. The upper level will have the treadmills, bikes and cardiovascular equipment. Both areas are connected to the field house. The next main area is the eight-lane pool. It will have a shallow end, a deep end and a diving board. There will be seating around the deck for the teams. There will be viewing balconies for spectators, which will accommodate 90 occupants. The last space is the academic suite at the upper level which will be for instructional use. The group area could be used for various activities. There are support spaces located around all these specific areas. A central corridor connects all the spaces. Beatrice said that wellness is not just about sports and lifting weights. As you walk through the corridor, you can look into the pool area, see the fitness area and look into the academic activities. As you continue down the corridor, you can look into the field house. Everything is transparent and connected. Beatrice described how this building fit in with the other buildings on the campus. He said that the building is free standing. They utilized the same red brick, metal roofing, sloped ends and pre-cast bands that run around the building. They have a metal skin around the field house area. This building is long, so they put a glass slot in

the center that runs through the entire building. You can make a visual connection from the Linus Field to the Cronin Field. He said that it helped break down the scale of the building. Beatrice said that the landscape plan showed that they are proposing deciduous trees and flowering trees at the front of the building. Everything else will be lawn.

Beatrice described the lighting. They did photometric plans for the building and parking area. The fixtures are similar to what were used at the STEM building. The new parking lot light fixtures will be the same as the parking area located at 21 Spring Street.

Farmer felt this was a great plan. He asked what the plans were for the present Memorial Gym. Beatrice said that it would be utilized as the middle school gym. Farmer said that the seating capacity for a basketball game in the new center will be larger than the Memorial Gym. Beatrice said that they will be having moveable bleachers that are pulled out, and the target population for the gym is from 1,600 to 2,000 people.

Farmer asked if there was a parking plan for major events. Beatrice said that they did not anticipate additional parking. Farmer said that he was concerned with large events. The Memorial Gym does not have a 2,000 seating capacity.

Cunningham said that the most attended events in the Memorial Gym are basketball games. They are never in a position to turn people away, and he does not see that changing. The primary function is that if everyone from campus is brought in, the facility will hold them. The parking will not change. People disperse and find parking all around the campus.

Farmer asked if the parking lot off Summer Street behind the dining hall was going to be buffered. This was confirmed. Cunningham pointed out that people park where parking is available.

Farmer asked if there was going to be a diving pool. Beatrice said no. McCann confirmed that there would not be a separate diving pool.

Cheetham said that she would like to echo Farmer's concerns. She felt a similar situation existed at the Pingree School where there is an ice rink used for commercial use by people in the area. She felt the Prep would have a field house and pool which may now have more events. She is concerned about event planning.

Prentiss had no questions on design. He will wait until the presentation is complete. Henry and Sears concurred with Prentiss.

Zilinsky found it hard to believe that more people would not be coming to this facility. She is concerned with traffic. She pointed out that the Town Engineer had a comment regarding traffic.

McCann said that the parking calculations are for a school campus based on the student number. The calculations take into consideration the fact that there will be events.

Vaclav Talacko addressed the Board regarding parking. All parking spaces are within 500 feet of the entrance. Most swim meets are after school or on weekends when students are not on the campus. All the parking will be available at this time. He showed the other parking lots on the site. The parking lots meet zoning requirements.

Talacko described the other parking lots. More than 50% of the parking is within 500 feet of the Wellness Center. There are many entrances to the parking lots. They can force people to take a right turn out of the parking areas. These lots meet zoning requirements.

Talacko described the Wellness Center. He said that the building is set up that the upper level is at the Brother Linus level, and the lower level is where the present parking lot is. The main entrance is from Spring Street or Summer Street. There is a fire access that is seventeen feet wide that allows the Fire Department to go through and turn around. The access road also allows the stormwater management equipment to get to the stormwater area.

Talacko described the drainage of the site. They are going to intercept the drain around the building and bring it towards the back of the site. The roof drainage and parking drainage will be separate.

Talacko said that the utilities come from Spring Street. They will be connecting to the sewer line that goes to Spring Street. Gas, water and power will be coming in from Spring Street.

Cheetham confirmed that the runoff from Linus Field would be captured and channeled toward the wetland. Talacko confirmed this. Cheetham asked him to describe the difference in elevation from Linus Field and the neighborhood. Talacko said the field was 104 and the houses in the back were 110, indicating that some of the houses in the back are higher. The road in the neighborhood does slope down. He stated that there would be no impact on abutters as far as grading goes.

Cheetham asked if there was any landscaping in the back area. Talacko said that the access road will be grass. The landscaping that the architect mentioned will be in front of the building. There are trees buffering the neighborhood in the back.

Cheetham asked if the roof runoff was being captured for irrigation. Talacko said that they were considering it, but storing the water is the difficult part. Cheetham felt that this should be planned as they are doing construction. McCann said that they were looking into this.

Zilinsky asked if they saw the Building Inspector's comments regarding the setback. McCann confirmed that they will provide answers.

Talacko described the parking lot next to the dining hall. He said that there is currently an entrance for a receiving area for the dining hall. They will provide a separate entrance for the dining hall parking, employees and deliveries and a separate entrance for additional parking. The drainage will be provided by catch basins.

Talacko said that the final item being proposed is a storage shed behind the STEM building. This will be accessed through the Spring Street parking lot. There is a paved area that will need to be extended to construct the storage building. There will be no issues with setbacks, and they will show the property line on the revised plan.

Henry felt it was worth having an analysis done for traffic. He felt that they would be having special events in a facility that size. He said it was hard to imagine that the school was not going to take advantage of this facility. He would like to see some traffic analysis. He asked how 1,600 people coming to the gym would be accommodated for parking.

Talacko showed some spots on the plan for parking. He pointed to some small gravel areas that are used when they have an excess of cars.

Henry would like to see that this new facility was not going to have any additional parking requirement. He would like to see some sort of acknowledgement in the presentation materials.

McCann said that they would address special events and provide information to the Board.

Henry said he was concerned with screening at the far end of the building since it is close to the neighborhood.

Cunningham said that they have had neighborhood meetings, including one with the residents of Lobao Drive. They did speak with the neighbor at the corner of the Wellness Center. They met on site and are going to accommodate him one way or another.

Henry felt that the building was designed not to be intrusive, but there will still be some issues like lighting.

Henry also brought up the left-hand turn lane on Nichols Street.

McCann responded that a financial contribution was made for that improvement, and the Town is to undertake the work for the left-hand turn.

Henry confirmed that they have not yet gone before the Conservation Commission, and Talacko confirmed this.

Henry asked if they had thought about permeable pavement for the parking lot around the dining hall. Talacko said that permeable pavement is good for a small parking lot because of the maintenance issues. Henry did not agree. Talacko said that manuals say that the permeable pavement needs to be swept and vacuumed four times a year.

Talacko said that as far as infiltration, they have done an excellent job. There is an infiltration system under the tennis courts that recharges a tremendous amount of water.

Cheetham asked about the traffic mitigation at the intersection of Route 62. Nelson said that funding was provided to the Town and it is now the responsibility of the Department of Public Works (DPW) to get that moving. She said she would follow up with the DPW. Cheetham said that at the last expansion of the Prep, the Board sought mitigation funds. She wanted to tie them to occupancy. There is plenty of room for the left turn onto Route 62. She would like information at the next meeting.

McCann said that St. John's Prep's obligation was to pay the money prior to occupancy. It was their obligation to do the work at North and Summer Street. They have completed what they were required to do.

Prentiss said that most of his questions have been answered. He agreed with Cheetham that capturing the runoff from the building to be used to water the fields may provide an opportunity for St. John's Prep to reduce the water usage. If this is coordinated with Engineering, it might be able to reduce their WUMP fee. McCann said she liked that idea.

Cunningham said they agreed, and they have started looking into this.

Prentiss would also like to echo what Henry said earlier. He does not have a problem with the parking when students are there. He has a problem when the parking is shifted to another location off-hours during school events or special events when abutters are home. He also is concerned with people leaving at the same time instead of arriving at the same time. He would like to have some sort of plan for people exiting the parking lots to alleviate traffic. He does not have an issue with the amount of parking, more how people are going to get through it.

McCann said that they have this plan in place, but they need to provide it to the Board.

Zilinsky opened the meeting to the public.

Beth Klemm, 3 Rockland Road. Klemm said she went to a neighborhood meeting last month. She said that the Prep had talked about solar panels supplying electricity to the building. She asked why these were not shown on the plan.

McCann said that they were looking into a couple of ideas. She pointed out that any field changes or solar array would be a change in the site plan that would have to be a new filing before the Board. She said that they do not have the proposal ready. They are still investigating the option.

Cunningham told her that nothing has changed from what they discussed last week.

Tom Tobyne, 8 & 13 Spring Street. Tobyne said that they were here with the STEM building. They have met with the Prep and are glad to say that a majority of their concerns have been corrected. He supports the Wellness Center, but he felt the parking lot should be larger because there are times that there are issues with parking on the side of the street. It is temporary, and not

every day, but they have learned to live with it. He asked to see if there is anything that can be done to create parking for the future.

Bob Pawlak, 60 Summer Street. Pawlak said that he lives three houses down from the campus/university. He is concerned with the traffic that is going to be generated by a facility of this size having all these amenities and expanded seating. He wanted to be sure that this Wellness Center is only going to be used by students and not by graduates and club members. He asked if the building would be opened up for other activities. He asked if the summer camps would be expanded. He felt that that building would not be allowed to collect dust over the summer months. Conventions could use the facility to generate income for the school, which generates traffic. He said that they have learned how to deal with the traffic. He listened to the presentation of the STEM building. There are an additional 300 students at the school. This is bigger than the Smith School. They were told the middle school would stay on one side of Summer Street, separate from the upper classes. They do cross the street to go to the gym. Pawlak said that they have done a good job smoothing out the traffic. There are activities that happen after school. From 2:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. there are students walking around the campus. You need to be careful driving. He felt St. John's Prep was going to take advantage of that facility and felt the camp would expand. He said that he was not proposing to stop this expansion. He would like these issues considered. He pointed out that you seldom go by the school without an "open house" being done. The events never end. He said as a Board, there is more to consider other than just putting up a building. He wanted to voice his concerns about activities going on after school and during the summer.

McCann said that they would provide information. This is a school campus, and it can be used for many things. The traffic calculations and reports done with the STEM building took into account all the activities to come up with the traffic and flow. This building would not change that. Events would still go on. Part of the reason is that the statute protects those educational uses. She said that they have met the bylaw requirements. She said that they would be willing to provide information for where parking would go for a large event.

Zilinsky asked if St. John's Prep had plans to expand the camp or use the Wellness Center during the summer months.

Cunningham said that he wanted to clarify the reason for the Wellness Center is mission based. The Xavarian Brothers, who founded the school, wanted to educate the whole person. They try to offer programs for kids to try different things, and they have a lot of programs that allow students to get these experiences. This is now done in spaces in basements. They are not thinking outside the school right now.

Bill Bradstreet, 18 Essex Street. Bradstreet questioned the salt shed near the maintenance building behind the STEM building. He asked if this salt could affect the wetlands. He asked if this question should be brought to the Conservation Commission.

Talacko said that they will file with the Conservation Commission, and the salt shed is on their radar. He said that they have asked the Town of Danvers what they do for their salt storage. He is researching what is needed to minimize any runoff from the salt shed area.

Cunningham said that they are salting the roads on the campus right now. They also use it for the walkways. They are not changing functional use of the salt.

Bradstreet is concerned how it will affect the wetlands.

Talacko said that they are looking into this.

Henry said that he agrees in theory that the applicant is meeting the parking and traffic issues within the bylaw. He pointed out that the parking has not been updated since he has been on the Planning Board, and he is not certain when the parking rate was established. He doesn't know if what they have now still agrees with ITE or Standard Best Practices methodology.

McCann said that they will address the parking. She said that the recent parking studies say that the Town is overparked. She said that they do have parking plans in place.

Pawlak asked what the purpose was for the road going down to the stormwater area behind the building.

Talacko said they have to allow trucks go down there to the stormwater area for maintenance. This allows for a turnaround. It also will be used by fire trucks.

He asked how far away the maintenance building was from the nearest abutter. Talacko said that is not sure, but believed it was around 400 feet.

Cunningham said there was a big grade change between where the shed is and the baseball field. The baseball field is 20 to 30 feet higher than where the shed sits.

Pawlak asked how many square feet the shed was, and Talacko said 1,800 square feet.

Pawlak asked if the shed was anywhere near the turnaround. Cunningham confirmed this.

Pawlak confirmed that the building was going in behind the bleachers. He asked about all the utility hookups at Spring Street. He asked who would pay for the tie-ins and asked if there was a Town commitment. Talacko said that St. John's would pay these fees.

McCann confirmed what the Board was looking for would be addressed at the next meeting.

Farmer asked what streets were invited to the neighborhood meeting. Cunningham said he did not know. Farmer said that he lives on Ledgewood Drive, and he did not receive a notice.

MOTION: Prentiss moved to continue the public hearing to February 9, 2016. Cheetham seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

STAFF BRIEFING

Day said that she did a site visit at 1 Southside Road. The project is finishing, and they want a Certificate of Occupancy. She said it was interesting because parking was tight, and there were stormwater issues. The Board persuaded the applicant to go with permeable pavement.

They have an application for a crematory at Walnut Grove Cemetery. They also have an incomplete application for the expansion of the Merrimack Valley Distributors. They are now doing custom beverages, and they are looking to do a small addition for storage on area that is currently paved.

Day said that she spoke with John Coughlin, the developer of 1 Southside Road, and asked if he had thought about rooftop solar on the large roof at the site. He told her that due to the tax credits, they are looking at eight properties for solar installation. She said that Danvers Electric is interested in this.

Henry asked if the schools thought about renting their roofs for solar panels. Day said she was not sure about this.

MINUTES

January 12, 2016

MOTION: Henry moved to approve the minutes of January 12, 2016. Prentiss seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Prentiss moved to adjourn. Cheetham seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Francine T. Butler

The Planning Board approved these minutes on February 9, 2016.