



# 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 August 27, 2019 7:00 p.m. MINUTES**

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

### **OTHER MATTERS**

#### **Whipple Hill/Phase I/Sandpiper Circle**

Sandpiper Circle and Larrabee Avenue Easement – Lots 1-12 and 20

#### **Whipple Hill/Phase II/Carole Way**

Lot Numbers 13, 15, 16, 17, 18 & 19

Request by Whipple Hill, LLC for reduction of performance guarantee for completed site improvements for the Definitive Subdivision known as Whipple Hill. (Assessors Map 42, Lot 8A).

J. Sears recused himself from the meeting.

John Thomson, Manager of Whipple Hill, LLC, appeared before the Board. Thomson said that Engineering was looking to reduce the bond down to \$11,270.00 on Carole Way. Of that amount, \$3,200 is for bounds. Mylars need to be completed in the amount of \$570.00. He said that \$8,070.00 were for contingencies.

Thomson asked the Board what the last line item of \$5,000.00 for Engineering was for?

Fields explained that Engineering always holds back a 10% contingency.

Thomson said that there was already a 10% contingency right above that amount. He felt it seemed redundant considering the only work to be done is for the stone bounds and the mylar.

Fields said that the ask was to relinquish the agreements for Phase 1 and Phase 2, Sandpiper Circle and Carole Way, and establish one new performance guarantee for both phases. It would include the remainder of this project rolled in the remainder for Sandpiper. That way there would only be one Tripartite Agreement going forward.

Thomson agreed with this.

Prentiss deferred to the Board regarding the applicant's request to defer the contingency fee in the amount of \$5,000.00 to bring it down from \$11,270.00 to \$6,270.00.

Zilinsky confirmed that they were talking about the 10% contingency. She deferred to staff and agreed that it was duplicative.

Fields did not have any further insight as to why they were holding back an additional \$5,000.00 contingency.

Farmer said that he was comfortable reducing the amount by \$5,000.00. He did not feel that they needed a contingency on contingency. The Board agreed that they did not have an issue reducing the amount.

**MOTION:** Farmer read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the application for the Establishment of a Performance Guarantee for Whipple Hill in the amount of \$149,488.25. Zilinsky seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**MOTION:** Farmer read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the Release of Performance Guarantee for Sandpiper Circle. Smith seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**MOTION:** Farmer read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the Release of Performance Guarantee for Carole Way. Zilinsky seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

J. Sears returned to the meeting.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

**17 Cherry Hill Drive.** Request for a Major Modification to an approved Site Plan pursuant to Section 4 of the Zoning Bylaw submitted by The H.L. Turner Group, Inc. for property at 17 Cherry Hill Drive. The applicant proposes to create twenty-five (25) additional parking spaces at the facility. (Map 29, Lot 1)

Michael Hansen, from The H.L. Turner Group, Inc., addressed the Board. With him this evening was Mark Baker, the Property Manager for Millipore.

Hansen explained that they were expanding the parking lot in front of the building on Cherry Hill Drive. They had received Engineering comments right before the last Planning Board meeting. They got everything to Engineering that they were looking for. They had two additional minor comments which were addressed. Engineering is good with everything being proposed at this time.



Fields said that all matters have been satisfied at the staff levels.

Prentiss said that he was glad everything was able to be taken care of.

**MOTION:** Zilinsky moved to close the public hearing for the Major Modification to Site Plan approval for 17 Cherry Hill Drive. Sears seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**MOTION:** J. Sears read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the application for a Major Modification to Site Plan approval for 17 Cherry Hill Drive. Zilinsky seconded the motion.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

**50 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 the property located at 50 Spring Street. The applicant proposes to add a maintenance shed and a section of the bleachers to the Linus Athletic Field. (Map 19, Lot 17).

Prentiss read the legal notice.

Katie Cruz, from Hancock Survey Associates, Inc., appeared before the Board. With her was Steve Cunningham from St. John's Prep. They were here to present the Major Modification Application for the proposed shed and bleachers which will be located adjacent to the Brother Linus Athletic Field. The shed will be on the east side on the Summer Street side of the field. The bleachers will be on the southern side of the field next to the existing parking. The shed will be a maintenance shed for easy access to the field for maintenance. The bleachers will provide seating for people watching events. Both will be on concrete pads. The shed will be on a pad that is 18 feet by 25 feet. The bleachers will be on a pad that is 13 feet by 83 feet. They received comments from the Engineering Department which they responded to. Engineering has indicated that all is in order and had no additional comments.

Fields said that Engineering has been satisfied. He told the Board that the applicant has asked for waivers from the submission requirements for plan sets as this is a protected use under the Dover Amendment. He said that they did not see that as unreasonable.

N. Sears said that he looked at the diagram and photograph provided. St. John's Prep does a nice job on their campus. He has no questions.

Farmer asked where the stands were going to be located? He questioned whether there were previously stands located there.

Cunningham said that there are currently stands behind home plate. These are for the new field that was just resurfaced. The stands are being added to the second striped field.

Zilinsky questioned the waiver of the plan set. They have had so many changes with this site. She asked if they had a complete set of plans of what St. John's Prep has done at the site.

Sears said that an as-built plan would need to be submitted to the Town as projects are completed.

Zilinsky felt that they have had some major work done on this site.

J. Sears said that when they completed the wellness center, an as-built plan was submitted in order to get the Certificate of Occupancy.

Cunningham said that they have done some major projects during the last six years. There has been the addition of a middle school and a wellness center. As-built plans have been submitted to the Town.

Fields said that as-built plans would be needed for each filing. There is not one plan for everything. Each modification has an as-built plan.

J. Sears said that they could put 100 buildings on this site.

Cunningham confirmed that they did not have a compiled master list. They have the as-builts of projects.

J. Sears felt that Hancock could prepare a master plan if needed.

Bill Bradstreet, 18 Essex Street. Bradstreet said that he echoed what Zilinsky was asking. He would like a composite to see what the complete picture is.

Prentiss said that he does not have a problem with what is being discussed. They can bring that up for future preference for when a project is done.

Fields said that they could look at modifications to the bylaw.

J. Sears said that this project is a shed. If this was a building, you would be worried about water. This is a lot of work for a shed that they were required to do. It has been vetted by the Town and staff.

Bradstreet said that he heard what J. Sears was saying. He would like to see a plan of the property to see what the property will look like.

Zilinsky wanted to clarify that she was not objecting to the shed. It is for a resource of showing what has happened at this site. She does not object to the shed or stands. There has been a lot of work that has gone on up there.

J. Sears said that they have looked to have something like this be an administrative review.

Prentiss said that this turned into a Major Modification to Site Plan due to the size of the shed.

J. Sears said that they are trying to move things off Planning Board review that is di minimis.

**MOTION:** J. Sears moved to close the public hearing for the Major Modification to Site Plan approval for 50 Spring Street. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

**MOTION:** Smith read the Certificate of Action and moved to approve the application for the Major Modification to Site Plan approval for 50 Spring Street. Zilinsky seconded the motion.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Beaver Brook Woods.** Request for a Definitive Subdivision Plan Approval to construct an 8-lot single-family residential subdivision 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.

J. Sears recused himself.

John Colantoni addressed the Board. He thanked the Board for their time. He was hoping that tonight they would be able to get a vote from the Board with conditions. They want to do everything correctly. This has been a long on-going project, and he is hoping to move past this.

Scott Cameron, from The Morin-Cameron Group, Inc., appeared before the Board. He said that this was a continuation of a hearing from July. They received comments from a third-party consultant and the Town Engineer. They have issued a response to these comments. There were no changes to the plans. Most of the changes were technical notifications.

Cameron said that the would describe the adjustments made.



The third-party review asked for a waiver for the berm. They also wanted a waiver to use wood post and beam guardrails instead of a steel guardrail. They added a waiver for black vinyl-coated fencing instead of green vinyl-coated fencing.

Cameron said they added Sheet 4A to the plan which is a conveyance plan. This will be helpful for an attorney to take at the time of closing to see the boundaries.

Cameron explained that they took information on the lotting plan and stripped it off.

He said that they updated grading on the lots. Notice of Intent applications were filed for the road and three house lots. They hope to do a site walk on Thursday night.

Cameron said that here tonight was Heather Monticup from GPI to answer any questions that may arise from the Board. The roadway would come in between 333 and 327 Maple Street. This follows the existing right-of-way. There is a right-of-way reserved by 305R Maple Street to pass over all these lots. They are using the right-of-way and turning the road into a cul-de-sac. The lots on Maple Street remain, but they are being brought into a more regular shape. Most of what they have been working on is technical responses.

Fields told the Board that most of what they have is there. The Engineering memorandum was for technical aspect. Engineering wanted a geotechnical analysis and structural design for the proposed retaining wall. At the request of some residents, Town Counsel looked into the right-of-way and currently there is no information for the right-of-way shown on the plans that may or may not be existing. To traverse Town property without rights in the way being known, Town Counsel gave pause due to the lack of ability to cross Town land.

Zilinsky said that she is concerned about the right-of-way. She is not sure what can be done about it.

Fields said that they have not been furnished with this information from the applicant.

Zilinsky said that she does not have a problem with the traffic. Route 62 is terrible. The number of houses being built will not have an impact on Route 62. She is concerned about the retaining wall. She is glad that Engineering has asked for more information regarding the wall. She felt this application was not at a place for approval.

Farmer said that he watched the video of the last meeting. He is concerned with the legal issue coming up now instead of a few months ago. This issue would have been the same at that time. It bothers him that this is a new issue coming up tonight. He is not concerned with the left-hand turn. That is the homeowner's decision. He is concerned that this application is dragging on. The decision needs to be made sooner or later.

Smith echoed Farmer's thoughts. This has been close to a year. He felt bad that it has been drawn out for so long. There are legal issues coming to light now. It makes him conflicted on voting on this tonight.

N. Sears said that he feels bad that this is dragging on. The questions on the retaining wall need to be addressed. Town Counsel's concerns need to be addressed.

Prentiss asked the applicant regarding the length of the road. He said that there was a concern about whether the water needed to be cycled over to one of the other mains on the street.

Cameron said that the Town Engineer has reviewed the water system and has not addressed any concerns. The water pressure on Maple Street is very good. It is a main line on Maple Street that is new.

Prentiss said that should the Town take ownership of the road; the retaining wall and water pressure would be the Town's responsibility. He asked if there was a water pressure issue.

Fields said that it is fine if the main does not need to be looped. They are looking for an easement from the subdivision out to Maple Street for the future to loop the main if needed.

Cameron said that there would be no benefit of looping the water. Whipple Hill did have a water pressure issue, so that water main was looped back down. It looped the Bayberry neighborhood back onto Pine Street. There is no reason to put the loop in this road.

Cameron said that they just did two other subdivisions with a 16-foot retaining wall and an 11-foot retaining wall. This wall is 9 feet in height and does not require a structural design. It requires a building permit only. This is the shortest wall done in recent projects. They do not have a structural design because it is not required, and the manufacturer would not do this until a contract was signed to purchase the blocks. He does not have a concern regarding the wall since he stamped the plans. He would like to propose a condition to provide the fully designed wall prior to some benchmark. The next step from here is to go out to bid, hire the site contractor and at that point, they will have a contract to purchase the blocks. At that point, they will receive the fully engineered plans.

Colantoni said that a condition like that would be fine. They want to keep Mr. King happy and give him what he wants, even if they do not have to provide this information. They would like this as a condition rather than having to do it ahead of time.

Prentiss said that he did not have that much of an issue with the left-hand turn. There are plenty of other roads coming out on Route 62 without these requirements. The Town trying to enforce this will be overextending for no reason. In terms of the easement, he does have a question for staff. If they proceed forward and the easement is not verified prior to building, is the onus on

the applicant to change things? If approved, and the easement is not what they think it is, would they have to rearrange things?

Fields said that he would strongly recommend not doing it. The Town would be giving away rights in the land that the Town owns.

James Cote spoke on behalf of the applicant. Regarding the easement, if they have the rights, they have the rights. If they do not have the rights, they do not have the rights. No one has been asking about our rights in these other properties. They have numerous parcels being transferred in order to create the subdivision. Those transfers have not been looked at. It is not the purview of the Planning Board to determine ownership at the time of application.

A discussion ensued regarding the Town-owned land and the right-of-way.

Cote said that the Town took title through a tax title.

Colantoni said that the easement question was discussed at the end of the road to see if the road could go farther. When we seem to come to the end, something else is always thrown at us last minute.

Prentiss said that this was brought up a month ago. Colantoni said that was about the road going farther.

Colantoni said that he does not want a legal problem for the Town. They are going to own all the other properties. They could put the road where they want. They are talking about the Town piece. They have to use the right-of-way. The Town wants proof that it exists. They have had two licensed surveyors at different times at the site and they have both come to the same conclusion. There have been three different attorneys that have looked at this project. If it was an issue, they would not have brought this project this far. If it is a condition that they have to prove, they will provide that to keep Town Counsel happy. There is no problem with the condition. If we can't cross Town property, they can't do the project. The Board will have control over this.

Farmer asked why Town Counsel was having a hard time with this.

Fields said that he understood how long this has gone on. Fields reminded the Board that this was two separate permits. This application was first heard at the last meeting of the Planning Board. He said that they have been asking for the information for the wall and the deeds from the Special Permit phase. The applicant's attorney kept telling them that that information would be provided at the definitive stage. We asked again about this at the last meeting.

Farmer said that reading Town Counsel's memo, they cannot validate that the easement exists. It should not be that hard to determine whether the easement exists or not. He asked if this was something that a title insurance company would insure over.

Fields said that it is not the purview of Town Counsel to find these things.

Farmer asked the applicant if they know whether the easement is recorded.

Cote said that the easement was recorded in 1954, and it has been in existence ever since. They have not been required to provide title for any other parcel. He has never seen this at the Planning Board process.

Farmer said that this is the Town's piece of land. He is stunned to hear that this is still outstanding.

Cote said that the Board could vote to approve with a condition that the approval is subject to the applicant's ability to use the 50-foot right-of-way over Town property.

Colantoni said that this is the first time they are hearing about Town Counsel. That was never shared with them. It was never discussed at the meeting they had last week with staff. This issue should have come up if it was an issue for the Town at the time of the cluster subdivision.

Cote pointed out that the cluster subdivision was approved.

Fields said that the use of the Special Permit was approved, but they still would have had to come back for the second phase. Technically that is what they are in now.

Zilinsky asked why they were not presenting the information if they had it.

Cote said that it does not negate a vote.

Fields asked them to supply the remedy if you have it.

Colantoni said that this is the first time that they are being asked for the Town property piece. They come here in good faith to go over things, and then they are blindsided. They have no problem providing it. No one has had to pay for a peer review, but they had to pay for a peer review. Now they have to pay for structural engineering plans that are not required at the state level. They come into a town to do a project as a team to make this project the best and safest for the town. There is a give and take to make it work. They are willing to do what the Board wants, but they need direction. They have spent funds. They come in good faith that they are willing to go the extra mile. They do not skimp on projects in Town. They keep their promises to the Board.

Henry said that they did ask for things at the Special Permit phase of the project. They brought up significant concerns with the process. There were fundamental questions for the proof plan and the rights embodied in the subdivision. They were told that they would get these answers at the definitive phase. We wanted to deal with these problems back then.

Prentiss remembered that when they were voting on the Special Permit, Zilinsky asked why they were voting on a Special Permit without a subdivision plan in front of them at that time. We were voting on just the Special Permit. The questions regarding the wall as well as other questions would be answered when the final subdivision was in front of them. Prentiss said that the questions between the Town and the applicant makes him uncomfortable to vote for this.

Farmer said that the Board was in a bad spot. Pushing for a vote may not be in the best interest of the applicant.

Zilinsky said her comfort level was not there for having everything they need in place when they do a Certificate of Action. They had questions back in the cluster stage. She is not against this project. She agreed that this has been a long haul. This has been two separate projects. If you have the information we need, get it to us.

Farmer felt the easement issue was a critical part of the piece. The lesson is that if the Town owns a piece of land that is being developed, it should be cleared up.

Prentiss said that he cannot think of another subdivision that has crossed Town property. They have talked about easements on every other project that has come before them.

Cameron said that this is the first they have heard about the question regarding the easement being there. Both surveyors placed the easement on the plan. They will get the documents together. This is the first time they heard about the Town's piece. They are not developing the Town parcel. They are proposing to exercise rights in an existing right-of-way.

Cameron said that the applicant is going to have to spend money to have a wall designed because they do not have a contract for it. It would be helpful to hear where the Board stands on this.

Farmer said that he was comfortable with a condition for the wall. That seemed reasonable to him. The easement concerned him. The priority has shifted.

N. Sears agreed with Zilinsky regarding the homeowner's taking a left turn. He did not see a problem with the plan proposed for the wall being approved with a contingency on it. As long as Engineering is satisfied, he did not see a problem. Regarding the legal issue, this Board is here representing the Town of Danvers, and we are talking about the Town of Danvers property. We need to get that issue squared away.



Zilinsky said she would approve a condition for the wall. The rub with the wall is that the wall goes over the easement. The Town is going to be accepting this road. She can't remember if the prior projects with walls that were taken as public ways or if they remained private ways.

Cameron said the other projects are not yet finished. The expectation was that the road would be taken by the Town.

Cameron told the Board that on Sheet 2, Note 7 it stated that the wall was to be designed and certified by a Massachusetts licensed structural engineer required by the Massachusetts Building Code. There is a condition that they have to do this. At a minimum, they have to pull a building permit for the wall.

Matt Duggan, 41 Chase Street. Duggan said that his comment is specific to 321R Maple Street which is the Town-owned property. That property had a lot of interest in it. On May 21, 2018 at Town Meeting there was Warrant Article 8 asking the Town of Selectmen to dispose of that property. There was considerable discussion of how that parcel would be intertwined with the Rail Trail. That article failed. Town Meeting did not want to sell the parcel and wanted to keep it for open space. Many meeting members were aware of this project. They felt that if they did not sell the land, the project would not go through. The easement should have been flushed out early on. The easement being discussed now is part of the process. It looks like the retaining wall is nine-feet high and is blocking access to the Town property. That elevation of the road is a taking of the Town property by adverse possession. It is important to get this easement resolved. The Board should not vote on this without having this answered. That is the Board's responsibility.

Bill Bradstreet, 18 Essex Street. Bradstreet said that part of what he is hearing is that this is drawing on too long. However long this takes does not matter. They do not make more land. He asked the Board not to make an agreement tonight if they are not happy with what they have been given for information. If you need more time, that is how long it is going to take.

Jose Velasquez, 317 Maple Street. Velasquez approved this project. It will benefit the Town and the residents of the neighborhood.

Richard Ash, 315 Maple Street. Ash supported the project. He felt this will improve some of the lots. He felt it will be a good thing.

Henry wanted to address Colantoni's point about getting comments back from Town Counsel is not a big deal. The fact that the language could potentially not exist is not a hard question to answer. That should not be a big deal to prove those rights. McCann said that she would provide this information. They have heard a lot from the Board regarding conditions. They could use the two weeks to work on draft decision. It also allows the applicant to provide this information to Town Counsel.



Fields said that it was not just finding out that the easement exists. The Town may have rights in that easement.

Prentiss said that the applicants will take a condition on the wall. The Board is comfortable that the applicant will come back to the Board should it not meet the standards required. The issue regarding the easement should be easily answered, and they should have a draft decision at the next meeting as long as the applicant brings information forward.

Zilinsky said that she has no issues other than the easement. If they have the information, it can be brought forward. If it satisfies staff and Town Counsel, she is fine with it.

Farmer said that the easement issue needs to be resolved. It is Town-owned land. He wants to have that issue resolved.

Smith said that he was in agreement.

N. Sears said that he had raised an issue regarding building the road over Town of Danvers land. The land would be an island that would be unusable. Why is the Town agreeing to give that up? There was to be a connection to the Rail Trail. If someone is on the Rail Trail and goes onto the Town land, they run into a wall.

Prentiss pointed out that there is no access to the Rail Trail from this project.

Cameron confirmed that there is no connection from the Town of Danvers land to the Rail Trail. There is a pond between the two.

Farmer asked Cameron their location on the plan when they did the site walk. Cameron showed Farmer where they were on the plan.

N. Sears confirmed that there is no public access to the Rail Trail since they are not doing the cluster.

Zilinsky asked who would take care of the piece of land on the Route 62 side.

Cameron said that it was a wooded parcel.

Prentiss said that he remembered the discussion at Town meeting regarding this parcel of land. He felt it got into other areas that were not built.

N. Sears said that it is unusable land. People will not be able to walk between point a and point b due to the nine-foot wall.

Colantoni said that his team would zoom in on proving the right-of-way through Town property as well as answering questions regarding the wall. He asked the Board if there was anything else that they wanted him to zoom into.

Prentiss polled the Board.

Fields asked that they furnish them the easements, access and who has rights to them.

Colantoni confirmed that they were going to get the information on the right-of-way over Town property as to where they were placing their road.

Prentiss confirmed that they were not looking for any other easements.

**MOTION:** Zilinsky moved to continue the application for Definitive Subdivision Plan to September 10, 2019. Farmer seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

### **OTHER MATTERS**

The Board will hear from Land Use & Community Services staff regarding updated, town-wide economic and demographic trends.

Fields told the Board that he and Henry will do a brief presentation for trends in demographics and development in the Town of Danvers. This is to tie everything into the 40R. Change is happening in the community no matter what they do for rezoning. Hopefully this ties into the conversation for what they are trying to manage for growth.

Henry was asked what the plan is with the downtown. Change is due to new development. In this part of the country, that is not what is driving change in our communities. This will be discussed tonight. They want to talk about what is going on and where they think they might be going with these changes.

There are four big things that change a community

- birth/deaths
- housing unit supply
- changes within current population
- housing stock is flipping over

Henry said that they have given this presentation four times within the last six months. Some people may recognize these slides.



The largest single factor happening is within the existing housing stock. There are 11,000± housing units in Town. Every year 450 ± single-family homes are being sold. There have an elastic market based on the economy. This means that in 2010, 20% of the population lived here before 1979. In 2017 that number went down to 16%. Today, 17% of the community moved here within the last 10 years.

Fields told the Board to remember they can never go backwards.

Henry said that a little over 40% of the community moved into the community in the 2000s. They do not know how sticky this will be in this new economy. They see a lot of change happening.

Henry showed the census blocks. There is a huge amount of housing turnover in eastern Massachusetts. There is a big demand for residential.

Henry showed the demographic changes between 2013 and 2017.

The population and households are increasing. The empty-nesters are selling and are being backfilled with a family of four to five people. There is change between where we were and where we are. Danvers is growing faster than the nation and state. Danvers is also older than the nation and state.

The income numbers for Danvers is going down, where the nation and state are going up. This could be due to the change in households coming in.

Danvers is seeing a decline in school enrollment. This is all students enrolled in schools. Graduate degrees have climbed, which is probably due to the housing turnover.

Danvers has never been as diverse as it has been today.

They have 11,102 housing units. There was a lot of building between 1970 and 1979. Bedrooms are being added to homes. Houses are bigger with more bedrooms. The Danvers demographics are people wanting to downsize. They are removing them from the existing housing stock.

Prentiss asked where the re-use of homes into condos would fall into this.

Henry said that this would be a modification to the structure which would update the date of the structure. A two-unit four-bedroom unit may have been turned into a four-unit two-bedroom unit.

They keep hearing about small units for early households and empty-nesters.



Danvers has low unemployment. Danvers is close to everything and has a huge competitive advantage over our neighbors. The drive time to work is going up.

There is a decrease in employment for Danvers residents from sales and office jobs to an increase in management, business and science. They see the continued decline in manufacturing. There are increases in education, healthcare, retail and professional scientific and management field.

During July 1, 2017 and July 1, 2018, Danvers grew a little bit. Nationally our growth is weak, but in the Northeast, Danvers is strong. They need to grow more. They are adding more jobs than housing units.

Smith asked if there were any statistics of decreasing unemployment rate with people that have more than one job.

Henry said that they have not come across that.

Fields said that full-time employment is how a person responds on the census.

Henry said that the projection for growth is that Danvers will grow by 100 persons per year from 2020 to 2030.

We are offering people to think about recalibrating growth going forward. People want to downsize to the downtown area. Millennials want to move, but they are not ready to afford the single-family detached homes. They want to try to hit that market. They will have environmental impacts. They can address affordability issues they hear about. They need to devise a strategy.

For current growth opportunities, there are properties that could yield another 650 units out in the R-3 zone. Those are more infrastructure intensive. There would be more environmental impact. They want to focus downtown where there is already infrastructure. If they develop some of these residential properties, there will be no open space.

Farmer asked if the presentation could be forwarded to the Board.

Henry said that he hopes the Downtown continues on its trajectory. They would like to talk to the Board about what is next. They would like to continue a conversation at a high level with the community. They have done planning in bits in pieces in the Town. They have not talked about the strategy of what they are trying to do. There is a lot of attention that should be given to the mall area and Endicott Street. There are some changes coming to that site. There are a lot of car dealerships on Route 114.

Henry said he hoped the presentation would give the Board some concept and depth.



Zilinsky said there was the Dufrene and Henry study done years ago, and she felt they had completed what had been planned. Their recommendation was to either leave it alone or meld it into what was around the area. She felt that they had fulfilled their objective with this study downtown.

Farmer said that they are seeing dramatic changes in retail, and communities need to get ahead of it.

Henry told the Board that they have met with representative from the malls. They need to be sure that they are growing and cultivating that relationship.

Farmer said that communities are trying to make the shift. He pointed out that there is already a residential condominium on the mall site.

Zilinsky asked if there was any update regarding the downtown.

Fields told the Board that they met with Ted Brovitz last week. He will send out the timeline for the remainder of the year. There is going to be a February Town Meeting.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

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

The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted: Francine T. Butler

The Planning Board approved these minutes on September 10, 2019.