



# Town of Danvers Planning Board

1 Sylvan Street, Danvers, Massachusetts 01923 | p: 978-777-0001

[www.danversma.gov](http://www.danversma.gov)

## Planning Board Members:

William Prentiss, Chair  
John Farmer  
James Sears  
Margaret Zilinsky  
Charles Smith  
Nathaniel Sears, Associate

## **Daniel J. Toomey Hearing Room March 12, 2019 7:00 p.m. MINUTES**

William Prentiss called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Planning Board members James Sears, Margaret Zilinsky, John Farmer, Charles Smith and Associate Member Nathaniel J. Sears were present. Director of Land Use and Community Services, David Fields, was also in attendance.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

**Hilltop Estates Subdivision (Lots 1-6 and 16-28).** Request by Lindallwood Realty II, LLC for extension of completion date for incomplete site improvements from March 12, 2019 to March 12, 2020. (Assessor's Map 5, Lots 181-185, 189-196, 197-200).

Daniel Oullette appeared before the Board on behalf of Albert Ellis, Manager of Lindallwood Realty II, LLC, to request an extension of the completion date for incomplete site improvements at the site. They expect the work to be completed by September 1, 2019.

**MOTION:** Sears moved to extend the completion date for Hilltop Estates Subdivision (Lots 1-6 and 16-28) to March 12, 2020. Zilinsky seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**25 Popes Lane.** Request submitted by Michael Selig for property located in the Highway Corridor District for a Special Permit for a contractor's yard under Table 1 and Sections 6 and 30 of the Zoning Bylaw, and Site Plan approval under Section 4 for review of improvements to the site including a retaining wall, fenced area, new sanitary sewer service, second driveway entrance, landscaped areas and a stormwater drainage system. (Assessor's Map 40, Lots 17A) (*Site Plan/Special Permit action date: March 14, 2019*) [**Applicant requests the matter to be continued without discussion to March 26, 2019 with an extension of the action date to March 29, 2019.**]

**MOTION:** Zilinsky moved to continue the application for the Special Permit and Site Plan Approval for 25 Popes Lane to March 26, 2019 and extend the action date to March 29, 2019. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**Beaver Brook Woods.** Request for a Cluster Development by Special Permit in accordance with Section 33 of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw submitted by Beaver Brook Woods, LLC for the properties located at 303 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 023 303), 305 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 023 305), 307 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 023 307), 309 Maple Street Assessors Map 033, Lot 023 309), 305R Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 024), 313 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 021) 315 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 020), 317 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 019), 325 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 017), 325 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 017), 327 Maple Street (Assessors Map 033, Lot 016), 333 Maple Street – Lot #1 (Assessors Map 025, Lot 087) and 333 Maple Street – Lot #2 (Assessors Map 025, Lot 087), containing approximately 6.34 acres of land. Said property is located in the R-II Zoning District. The applicant proposes to construct an 8-lot Cluster Development. (*Special Permit action date: 30 days after the close of the public hearing*)

Attorney Nancy McCann appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant, John Colantoni. Scott Cameron, the project engineer from The Morin-Cameron Group, Inc. and Heather Monticup, traffic consultant from Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. were also here.

McCann said that she would do a recap of the project since they have not been before the Board since January 8<sup>th</sup>. They are requesting a Special Permit to allow the developer to go forward with the cluster subdivision as the next step. The purpose under Section 33 is to allow a decrease of the footprint of a project. This would allow the project to suck in the footprint and impact of the development on the environment. It would allow creative planning and less impact on the environment and have open space dedicated in perpetuity. This is a 6 ½ acre parcel. There are 2 ½ acres of open space that will be conveyed to the Conservation Commission. The open space is contiguous to the proposed continuation of the Rail Trail and other open space.

James Sears recused himself from the meeting.

McCann said that on January 8<sup>th</sup> they gave a full presentation under Sections 33 and 30. They did demonstrate that all requirements of the Special Permit were met. Prior to filing this application they met with staff, the Technical Review Committee (TRC) and the Open Space and Recreation Committee. The cluster and conventional plans both have eight lots. They had a site visit on January 19<sup>th</sup>. They have received department comments and some responses have been given. A second round of comments have been received from Engineering. The request for a Special Permit is before the Board tonight. Should this be approved, a definitive subdivision will be submitted.

Cameron addressed the Board and told them they would not get into technical details. These are schematic level plans. They intend to document everything in the next step of the project. An adjustment was made to the roadway layout. There was concern about the distance from the entrance of this road to Forest Street. The 300-foot site distance can be provided. Cameron stated that there is low traffic generated from this subdivision. Another adjustment was that they eliminated the curve in the road. They showed smaller and larger footprints of homes on the lot.



Cameron showed the cluster and conventional plan. They kept the right-of-way at 42 feet. They are holding the 50-foot width in the conventional plan. They widened the road to 24 feet. They went to 30 feet at the cul-de-sac. The footprint on the conventional plan is greater than the cluster.

N. Sears wanted confirmation that there were going to be eight single-family homes.

Smith felt everything was covered. He is curious as to what constitutes an adequate right-of-way width.

Fields explained that the 50-foot requirement is due to the regulations for maintenance and safety reasons.

Farmer said that there are a lot of comments from Engineering and asked if they were all addressed. Cameron responded that a lot of the comments were due to not having a fully engineered plan.

Zilinsky asked if they were confident that there would be eight lots with a definitive plan. Cameron confirmed this.

Zilinsky said that she is concerned with the height and length of the retaining wall. She is concerned that the wall needs to be fenced if it is over four feet in height. She asked if that would be affected by the roadway. There would be a guardrail for vehicular protection, and there would be a four-foot rail for pedestrians.

Zilinsky asked how long the portion is over four feet. Cameron said all of it. The wall allows for gravity sewer connection and replaces the need of a pump station for the eight homes.

Zilinsky confirmed with Cameron that the retaining wall would be needed in the conventional subdivision as well.

Zilinsky asked what the size of the houses would be in the cluster subdivision. Cameron said they would be the same as the conventional subdivision. Approximately 2,400-2,500 square feet with three to four bedrooms.

Zilinsky asked if there was open space between the homes on Maple Street. Cameron said there was a small strip of greenspace.

Fields asked Cameron to point out the stone wall presently on the site. Cameron showed the wall on the plan.

Zilinsky's concern is that what they are voting on for a cluster subdivision is beneficial to the area rather than a conventional subdivision.

Prentiss prefers the cluster over the conventional. One thing that stood out was the notation from the Conservation Agent. It sounds like there was an issue if the plan went either way. The Conservation Commission needs to look at this on their own. He is not sure if they should talk about this now. Does the Conservation Commission take into account whether this Board discusses this? The Conservation Commission tends to meet after the Planning Board.

Fields said that if this plan is successful and goes to the Conservation Commission, they will be making their own determination based on the merits of the proposal presented to them. They have to go through the wetland which will be a hurdle after this meeting.

Prentiss said that he does not want the Conservation Commission to feel that they are compelled to approve the plan.

Fields said that he does not think they would feel that type of pressure.

Matthew Duggan, 41 Chase Street. Duggan had a question about the distinction of a regular subdivision and a cluster and the impact that the wetlands would have. He felt Lot 8 at the top corner looked like it was in the 100-foot resource area from Beaver Brook. He doesn't understand how this could happen. He felt like the cluster is the only option for this property.

Prentiss explained that the cluster was what the Board was voting on today for a Special Permit. They will have to go to other boards to address wetlands.

Duggan felt this board should consider this issue.

Prentiss said that they are taking the conservation comments issued by staff.

Duggan felt the open space would never be used by the public. The open space should be moved to have a buffer with the people that live there today.

Duggan said that the property at 321R Maple Street is owned by the Town of Danvers. He asked how they could build a road across a piece of property even though there is an easement.

Fields explained that the way was laid out in an earlier plan. All owners have rights to that way as they all appear to be fee owners in the way.

Duggan asked if that easement was open to the public. Could the public walk on the easement to the land owned by the Town of Danvers?

Fields said that could not happen because you have to traverse private land. The fee in the way is owned by the abutters.

Duggan reiterated that he was concerned about the corner lot, Lot 8.

Fields explained that the wetlands issues with Lot 8 will be addressed by Conservation Commission, if necessary.

Cameron said that they looked at alternatives. Town Meeting voted not to sell the land owned by the Town. Beaver Brook is a perennial stream, and they are not proposing work in that area. Cameron said that they would file with the Conservation Commission for the roadway.

Richard Shaffer, 301 Maple Street. Shaffer said that they were glad that they did a site walk. He can see the environmental concerns. He felt the road was in the 100-foot buffer zone. He felt they have serious issues before them, and they should get together with the environmental board. They are giving up land that they cannot build on. He will see the houses of the new subdivision.

Shaffer said that there was a right-of-way, but the road does not follow the right-of-way. He felt they deviated off the right-of way. They need a variance to put in the road over 600 feet. Prentiss corrected him and told him that it would be a waiver to put the road in. Shaffer felt that the applicant was already over the requirements.

Shaffer asked if the Board had the agreements with the property owners to be able to put this application forward.

Fields confirmed that he had the signatures of all land owners involved.

McCann said that they had submitted authorization from all the land owners, and they have assented to the application. There have been no conveyances yet.

Shaffer felt that there were ulterior motives of money going to the abutters approving this plan. Shaffer asked the Board if they were looking for preliminary approval.

Prentiss said that they are voting on the Special Permit. The applicant will have to come back to the Board with a definitive plan.

Richard Ash, 315 Maple Street. Ash has one of the lots with the long “tails”. His lot will improve by the cluster design, and he is in favor of the cluster design.

Jose Velasquez, 315 Maple Street. Velasquez is in favor of the project. He felt it would improve the neighborhood. He moved here in 2005 and has done major improvements. The Town property was used as a dumping ground. He did not want to sell his property initially, but he felt it would improve the property.



Laurie Dickson, 303 Maple Street. Dickson is here representing the condominium located at 303-309 Maple Street. They are in favor of the project.

Fields told the Board that staff did not do a draft decision. He told them they can close the public hearing and have 90 days to issue the decision. That could be done at the next meeting if the Board has time to review a draft. If there is no further information to present, the hearing could be closed tonight.

Prentiss asked the Board if there were additional questions.

Zilinsky said that she has concerns with how extensive the changes were. Usually they have a revised plan reviewed.

Fields said that the last round of comments were based on this plan being presented.

Zilinsky confirmed that this plan satisfied Engineering.

Fields said that the planning staff was satisfied with the roadway with regard to the subdivision regulations.

Zilinsky asked how beneficial it would be for another round of review.

Fields said that future changes can be addressed at the definitive stage. A lot of comments are stormwater based.

Zilinsky said that she would not have a problem closing the hearing. She has an interest for an access to the Rail Trail.

McCann said that could be included as a condition.

McCann asked if they could poll the members of the Board so they know where they stand on the super majority vote.

N. Sears would like clarification on the purpose of the vote. He recited the special permit requirements.

Prentiss explained that they were voting on whether the cluster can continue to the next step.

Fields said that N. Sears is correct that this is a Special Permit. It does not foreclose other development options.

N. Sears said he is most concerned on the effect on abutters. He confirmed that they are not deciding whether this land is developable at all. It is whether this is a cluster verses a



conventional. He would echo the concerns of Mr. Shaffer. This plan seems to satisfy the concerns of the public.

Smith said he would be comfortable having staff draft a decision, send it out and allow them to comment.

Farmer said he was comfortable closing the hearing. It is an emotional topic, and he is in favor of the Special Permit.

Prentiss has made himself clear. He is in favor of the poll, closing the hearing and deferring the vote to have staff come up with a motion for the Board to put through.

Colantoni said that he does not have anything more to offer. He wants to move forward with the definitive plan. He asked the Board to take a vote for or against the project tonight.

Zilinsky felt they can't vote to approve tonight. Language should be in the Certificate of Action to make it cleaner.

Prentiss said that given that they are going to have a definitive project in front of them, it is a matter of putting down some general conditions that are boiler plate. They need an agreement with Town Engineering regarding the roadwork.

Fields said he would like to give the decision to the Town Engineer for his input as well.

Colantoni said that if the project passed tonight as a cluster, the conditions could go on the definitive plan. They are not losing any ground or protection by taking a vote tonight.

Farmer said that he wants the staff to have the ability to do this right. He is in favor of it but wants input from staff.

Zilinsky agreed with Farmer. She is in favor of this. Normally they have a clean decision where conditions are listed.

McCann asked if in addition to the straw poll, they decide on another issue. They have requested a reduction of the road from 50 feet to 42 feet. Engineering is not in agreement with that. The Board makes the decision regarding waivers. She asked if she could have a poll whether this Board would be willing to grant a waiver for the road layout.

Zilinsky said she would want this worked out with Engineering.

McCann said that the Engineering Department did not recommend reducing the road below 50 feet. They would like to know whether this is something that the Planning Board would

consider, which is less than what the Engineering Department is telling you. She said it was important to the cluster layout.

Zilinsky said that they rely on comments from the Engineering Department. This issue should be worked out with Engineering. She would be voting on whether to proceed with the Special Permit. She would not make any decision regarding the road.

Farmer agreed with Zilinsky. He would like more information as to why the Engineering Department feels so strong about this.

Fields said that the right-of-way layout is the layout of the way from years ago on the existing layout and the regulation require a 50 foot right-of-way. Engineering has indicated that they would recommend not to accept this road as a public way as it would be sub-standard.

Prentiss said that he sees a lot of streets come before Town Meeting to be accepted as public ways.

Smith asked what makes the Engineering Department feel that it would be more difficult to maintain?

Fields said that it is due to a staging area for repairs, maintenance, and public safety. How would the retaining wall be maintained in the future?

Zilinsky confirmed that the right-of-way is not the full width of the pavement.

Smith echoes what others say. He would be more comfortable allowing staff to draft the language. He is comfortable moving forward with a cluster.

N. Sears said that he was not educated enough on the impact to the Town to comment on the road. He would leave that to Engineering. He has no problem with the straw poll.

Prentiss agreed with the Board. He needs to be convinced to go against what Engineering is saying.

**MOTION:** Zilinsky moved to close the public hearing for the Special Permit for Beaver Brook Woods. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Zilinsky, Farmer, Smith, Sears and Prentiss indicated that they would support the cluster subdivision.

## PUBLIC HEARING

**197 Newbury Street.** Request submitted by Nelson Mendoza for property located in the Highway Corridor District for a Special Permit for a pet day care and training facility under Table 1 and Sections 4 and 30 of the Zoning Bylaw, and a Major Modification to Site Plan approval under Section 4 for construction of a small shed-style building and enclosed fenced area associated with the pet day care use. (Assessor's Map 24, Lots 21B) (*Site Plan/Special Permit action date: 90 days after close of the public hearing*)

Prentiss read the legal notice.

Attorney Nancy McCann appeared before the Board on behalf of the applicant, Nelson Mendoza of The Happy K-9 Pet Day Care. They are seeking a Special Permit and a Major Modification to Site Plan for the 197 Newbury Street location located in the Highway Corridor zone. The application sets forth the requirements under Section 30 for the grant of the special permit. Mendoza is a pet trainer with facilities in Medford, Malden and Plaistow, New Hampshire. They have run a secure and clean pet day care facility at 197 Newbury Street. They will occupy Unit B in the existing building. This unit is 1,680 square feet. They are proposing an outdoor play area at the end of the site. Inside is a recreation day care and private training. They have a transportation van that picks up and drops off the dogs, and 80% of the clients will utilize this service. For people that do not use this service, the dogs would be brought to the front area, and an employee will get the dog and bring it inside. There are overhead doors on the Route 1 side of the building. The van will utilize the overhead door and will unload the dogs inside at the start and end of the day. The van will go into the site through the door in the back. They have an outdoor play area that will be fully fenced with a gate. They are proposing a small shed containing 380 square feet with no electricity or heat. There will be water. The van will drive the dogs from the indoor area to the fenced area and let the dogs out. No dogs will be walking to the play area. They anticipate two van trips in the morning and two in the afternoon. The play area is enclosed with fencing. The hours will be Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. with variable times on the weekends. There will be no overnight boarding. There will be four full-time employees and one to two part-time employees. The proposal meets all requirements for the special permit. The pet waste will be picked up daily by employees and removed from the site weekly by a company.

McCann said that they are requesting a site plan modification. She showed the original plan that was approved. She highlighted the proposed changes. They will be adding a water line. The 360 square foot shed will be a standard type of shed on blocks. Fencing will be added around the back area. There will be no decrease in plantings; they are being moved. Snow storage has been moved, and the applicant will take a condition to remove snow from the site if necessary. McCann showed the design of the shed.

McCann said that comments were received from the planning staff. They had a staff meeting and have some modifications to be made to the plan. They have been requested to look at a



Planning Board Minutes

March 12, 2019

system to deal with liquid waste in the pet area. They have done some research, and the recent dog park approved by the Town has a pea stone surface and hosing down system. A sewer system or containment was not used for Endicott Park. What they are proposing is not unusual. They will put together that information and attempt to address Engineering's comments. They are not impacting stormwater. They will remove the power line to the shed. Given the limited changes to the modification, do they need to submit a new plan set or is a single sheet sufficient. They are looking for a waiver for submitting a single sheet. They are not proposing any exterior lighting. The play area is for daytime play. Mendoza would like to bring this business to Danvers with a project that is financially viable.

J. Sears confirmed that the building on the plan was a shed. He felt a full plan set was not necessary. He asked how many dogs would be at the site along with the hours of operation.

McCann said that there would be 15-25 dogs and hours would be Monday through Friday 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. There would be 4 full-time employees and 1-2 part-time employees.

J. Sears asked the color of the shed. McCann said it would be the same color as the building. McCann indicated that there would be no outdoor audio.

J. Sears asked if the plantings near the shed would be accessible to the dogs. McCann said that the fence will keep the dogs away from the plants.

Zilinsky asked what the other uses were for this building. McCann said auto sales and repair and Sign-A-Rama. Zilinsky felt it was important to look at the stormwater management plan due to the brook.

N. Sears asked what the impact would be on other people who work in the building with dogs barking.

McCann said that Route 95 and Route 1 run along this building. This building has an industrial use, with a dog use in the building above this. There are no residential neighbors within hearing distance.

Mendoza said that they have not had that issue. They use smaller play groups.

N. Sears asked if they proposed to do something at the shed for shade for the dogs.

McCann said the shed will give shade. The dogs are brought out for limited periods of time. The day care is indoors.

N. Sears confirmed that dogs will not be there unattended.

Mendoza said that there is one person for every 4-5 dogs.



N. Sears asked if there were any large trees. McCann showed the white pines and cherry trees being proposed on the original site plan. These should provide some shade.

Smith asked if the person driving the van into the fenced area stays with the dogs. Mendoza responded yes.

Farmer asked the difference of training verses day care. Mendoza said that 65% is training. Farmer confirmed that the dogs are screened before they are accepted. Mendoza said that they screen the dogs.

Prentiss asked why they drive the van back and forth. Mendoza said that it is peace of mind. Prentiss felt the businesses nearby would appreciate that.

Kathy Copeland. Copeland uses K-9 Edge at 199 Newbury Street. She asked what the percentage of the dogs were there for training of aggressive dogs. K-9 Edge runs a training/boarding facility. Copeland said that Mendoza's website states that they deal with aggressive dogs. She asked what precautions were being used to allow dogs from getting hurt. She asked where Mendoza received his degrees to be considered an animal behaviorist.

Stephanie Costa. Costa is the owner of K-9 Edge and is concerned with the outdoor area. She had not had a chance to look at the plan. She is concerned with the outdoor area close to 199 Newbury Street and 197 Newbury Street. She does not want her customer's dogs reacting to their dogs.

McCann said that there is an eight-foot high white stockade fence.

Costa asked if there will be safety barriers on the fencing known as coyote rollers. She felt something was necessary.

Prentiss asked staff to check with Engineering.

Fields said he would check with Health.

Costa said that the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) guidelines are 100 square feet for every large dog and 75 square feet for small dog. She is concerned with the number of dogs. She is also concerned about bringing the van into the daycare area.

Prentiss felt the applicant was aware of these standards.

J. Sears asked if she had been permitted through this Board.



Costa said she went through the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). She also said that Danvers uses the ASPCA's guidelines.

Fields said that there are five dog daycare facilities in Danvers.

Costa said she would like to see the plans. Fields said that he would be in touch with her.

William Bradstreet, 18 Essex Street. Bradstreet asked whether a dog would know that another animal is on the other side of the fence.

Prentiss said that they would look into this through staff.

Zilinsky asked how far the outdoor area was from her business.

McCann said that she would provide the distance.

McCann asked for a continuance to the first meeting in April.

**MOTION:** Farmer moved to continue the public hearing for Special Permit and a Major Modification to Site Plan approval for 197 Newbury Street to April 9, 2019. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## **DISCUSSION**

Downtown Corridor Study. Consulting team from Brovitz Community Planning and Design will meet with the Planning Board to discuss draft zoning recommendations for the downtown area.

Ted Brovitz, from Brovitz Planning and Community Design, addressed the Board. They had begun looking at these areas last summer and have expanded the areas to include the areas from the downtown to High Street, Danversport and Tapleyville. They are creating a template in the zoning bylaws for Maple Street and the downtown area which they will try to use for the High Street corridor just south of the downtown area, Danversport and Tapleyville.

Brovitz said they are taking the form-based standards for Maple Street and slightly reconfiguring them to apply to other districts. Section 12 is the base design and development standards. These can be applied to the individual districts.

They are trying to create an opportunity for mixed-use and a walkable district by looking at streetscapes and open spaces for good mixed-use neighborhoods. The design and development standards are based on buildings, parking, landscaping and the interface between private realm and public realm.



There is the opportunity for outside dining treatments and on-street parking. These are the elements of a mixed-use district.

They put together a vision and plan which showed developments, streetscape improvements, open space improvements and connection to the Rail Trail. These were translated into Design Standards.

The purpose and intent is:

- A. To guide the physical character of development with standards that reflect the scale, design characteristics and settlement patterns existing or envisioned for the district.
- B. To create a public realm with high quality streetscape, and active public or publicly-oriented open spaces that will enhance the district.
- C. To encourage quality housing for a variety of age groups, household types and income ranges and encourage business development opportunities using the advantages of access and visibility along major corridors and providing services to surrounding neighborhoods.

Brovitz described the basic parts of Section 12. He showed the area on the Zoning Map and Regulating Plan. The core area has high density mixed-use while the live/work area is geared toward neighborhoods and residential use with some mixed-use.

Identified on the plan are civic spaces trying to improve the public open spaces where people can gather. If someone is developing in an area, they can contribute to improving the area. This will allow the ability to reinvest in the civic spaces.

There are street-type standards such as large corridor mixed-use. There is on-street parking and wider sidewalks versus the side streets that are narrower that have an urban design to support active streets, sidewalks and commerce.

The pedestrian frontage zone is similar to Maple Street. The street level is commercial use. The residential use is above and behind the commercial use. They are trying to keep the ground level for commercial use.

Transitional buffers are required between these districts to alleviate large developments being on top of residential neighborhoods.

The general standards for buildings and lots are related to where the building and parking is placed and orientation. They want to create a walkable district.



There are standards for height for different types of roofs. There are recommendations for the facades facing the street. You want a lot of windows at ground level in the commercial space. In the residential buildings there is more of a setback and less requirements for windows.

There are building setbacks and street enclosure standards. They have previously had discussions regarding the appropriate height verses the setbacks. The height can go to 45 feet, but there has to be setbacks at certain distances. This will prevent a canyon effect.

There are standards for different building type requirements. The dimensional requirements for an apartment building are not the same as a mixed-use building. Standards are specific to the types of buildings.

There is a separate use table. They have good design standards for building and development sites and are allowing a variety of residential, commercial, trades and civic uses based on the type of district it is in. A special permit would be required for larger uses.

The density standards are similar to Maple Street. They used this as a template for the other districts that they are proposing.

The core area downtown is similar but a little higher for mixed-use density. Things like a single-family detached home would not be allowed. This would be allowed in the downtown neighborhood, but not in the downtown core.

Site development standards would include how you lay out internal circulation, access for pedestrians, service areas, as well as parking. They will have parking standards that allow flexibility for remote/shared parking.

The design of parking can be flexible to do tandem parking. You could do valet parking if you were a restaurant.

You may allow street side parking where parking is on private land.

The outdoor amenity space in these bylaws can be an athletic field, small park or small dining terrace. These can be part of the development based on size.

The land has to be usable and active open spaces.

There is the interaction between the private and public development in the interface zone, such as a dining terrace.

Brovitz showed that the through zone is a clear walking passage for pedestrians. The frontage zone can be public or privately owned. Clear Passage needs to be maintained as clear passage for pedestrians.



Projecting signs and awnings can stretch out over the public right-of-way. There are opportunities to interface with the sidewalk.

There is a new section on signs. They are not sure if they will go under Section 12 or under Section 35 and 37. Brovitz showed the different types of signs.

These were in the guidelines for the Maple Street development. They received positive feedback for these signs, and they wanted to carry this into the downtown area.

The design standards in Section 12 get applied to the individual districts. He showed slides of visioning plans with existing and proposed development. Parking needs to be coordinated behind the buildings along Maple Street.

He showed what could happen in the Lummas Avenue neighborhood along the Rail Trail. He also showed a slide showing a concept plan of development near Townsend Energy. He showed the Cottage Court development on Charter Street adjacent to the Trail.

When Section 12 standards are in place, it is easy to apply these standards to different districts. The standards are condensed to one table.

The standards in the Danversport Waterfront Village District and Tapleyville are integrated into the umbrella approach under the character-based zoning district.

Henry said that there are no dimensional changes in the overlays that were approved.

Brovitz said that the design guidelines have been reconfigured as well.

Zilinsky said she did not have questions. She is an advocate for formed based zoning. She felt it was a great way to go. She is interested in High Street. She felt the downtown is what it is. High Street has a lot of areas that they need to stay on top of.

Brovitz said there are a lot of vacant spaces on the upper floors. If this goes into place, some of those upper floors could turn into residential units.

Zilinsky felt the CVS building could be a much better design.

J. Sears thought this was great, but the parking availability needs to be there.

N. Sears would like to see pictures of other towns or computer-generated models to see what the imagery would look like. He has issues with parking.

Prentiss said that they have struggled with determining the correct height.



Smith said that his focus is on the downtown. He echoes the concerns for parking. The downtown is the means of connecting Route 62 with Route 128. The traffic is heavy from 3:00 p.m. to 5-6 p.m. He felt the area was like a parking lot. He is looking at walkability and focusing on the downtown as a civic space rather than a street. He asked what the possibilities would be for traffic calming elements like reducing the speed limit or making it one-way. The pedestrians should be able to get from one business to another and the cars are guests to this space.

Fields told the Board that he and Aaron Henry went to the Selectmen to do a Complete Streets application to have funding for crosswalks and lights. Another thing is a transportation management overlay district in this zone. The developer may have to pay into a fund to enhance the downtown area.

Brovitz felt bump outs could be used to calm traffic. They could also have street trees. He suggested taking the parking lot at CVS and making it a square. There are things that could be done to make people stop and enjoy the area. One-way traffic does not work.

Smith is not advocating for the downtown to look like Essex Street in Salem. He wants to advocate to successfully make it a civic space until we put pedestrians first.

Henry said that the Transportation Management Overlay concept would require that the Town be on the hook. The developer would contribute to the fund and the Town would be accountable for how they program the streetscape. There will be a discussion of what needs to be done. Rather than reacting to a development, this takes the guesswork out of the way.

Zilinsky said that the Nelson Nygaard report said to have a developer pay into the fund that would be for transportation improvements.

Henry said that this is different than what they are talking about. Danvers does not charge for parking.

Zilinsky pointed out that Beverly had a new parking plan that includes meters. It would cost more per hour in front of a business than if you parked in the back.

Brovitz said that there were a lot of good ideas in the Nelson Nygaard report. Funds raised from developments could be reinvested into the parking system.

Henry said they did complete the wayfinding signage work. They now have some recommendations.

Henry said that they are going to pivot to more public outreach and to expect a couple of different models.



Prentiss felt one model will influence what happens.

Farmer said he liked the vision. One completed project will provide a visual for others.

Henry pointed out that 20 Locust Street has street side parking.

Prentiss asked Brovitz how long gas backwards has been used.

Brovitz said that the idea goes back about 20 years. It has been used in towns and cities for 10 years. Some people are reluctant to flip the gas to the back.

Prentiss said that they are encouraging applicants to do this. Prentiss questions if there would be a change in business.

Prentiss said that on Maple Street there is presently commercial on the second and third floor of the buildings. He asked if there were any statistics if it was more viable for residential on these floors.

Brovitz said that it was much more viable for a developer to have residential on the upper floors.

## **BRIEFING**

Planning staff and chair will update the Board of various items of interest. This agenda item may include requests to set public hearing and workshop dates; sign plans, informal discussion regarding future projects and current projects under construction.

Zilinsky noted that McKinnon's had restriped their parking lot, but they have never come before the Board for permission for anything they have done on the site.

Fields said that he would follow up.

## **MINUTES**

February 26, 2019

**MOTION:** Farmer moved to approve the minutes of February 26, 2019. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 4-0. Zilinsky abstained.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Zilinsky moved to adjourn. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.



The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Francine T. Butler

The Planning Board approved these minutes on March 26, 2019.