



# Town of Danvers Zoning Board of Appeals

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

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

## Zoning Board of Appeals

### Members:

John Boughner, Chair  
Kenneth Scholes, Clerk  
Rebecca Kilborn  
Jeffery Sauer  
Kenneth Jarvinen  
Corinne Doherty, Alternate  
Katie Hislop, Alternate

## **March 13, 2023 7:00 p.m. ZBA MEETING MINUTES**

Board members present: John Boughner; Jeffery Sauer, Kenneth Scholes, Ken Jarvinen, Corinne Doherty and Katie Hislop.

Staff present: Brian Szekely

John Boughner called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m.

John Boughner briefed the public on the proceedings of the evening.

### **REGULAR ITEMS**

**5 AUBURN STREET (R-III):** Request for a Special Permit for in accordance with Table 1 and Section 30.2.A of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw to allow the keeping of four personal dogs on the residential premises. **Request made by Jason Koelewyn (23-5011).**

Kenneth Scholes read the request for a Special Permit for in accordance with Table 1 and Section 30.2.A of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw to allow the keeping of four personal dogs on the residential premises. Request made by Jason Koelewyn (23-5011).

Mr. Koelewyn spoke briefly about his move to Danvers from Swampscott and that they have four personal dogs and they are family pets and he is not breeding them. All are female and all are spayed.

Mr. Boughner questioned the applicant if the reason he was here was due to a complaint or simply that Mr. Koelewyn found out when registering the dogs that had too many according to zoning? Mr. Koelewyn explained it was the latter.

Jeff Sauer no questions.

Kenneth Scholes asked the applicant if he would take a condition that if a dog passes, he would keep it to three dogs.

Mr. Koelewyn stated he would.

Ken Jarvinen asked about the fencing.

Mr. Koelewyn gave a brief update on the fencing.

Katie Hislop asked the applicant to clarify what is partial fenced in?

Mr. Koelewyn stated the front yard is the only part not fenced.

Corinne Doherty asked the applicant if any neighbors have reached out since the letters have gone out.

Mr. Koelewyn stated no.

John Boughner asked how large the dogs are, and the applicant stated that the largest dog is 125 lbs. John Boughner asked about the attitude and demeanor of the dogs. Mr. Koelewn explained that these are generally sedentary dogs that lose their need for large amounts of exercise relatively quickly after the age of 2 and pose no risk to their children or other people in the neighborhood. They would be willing to get a letter from their trainer saying such as well. John Boughner said that was unnecessary.

John Boughner opened to public comment and returned to board after no comments.

Jeffery Sauer I would vote for this.

Kenneth Scholes I would voter for this along with the condition.

Ken Jarvinen I would vote for this.

Katie Hislop I would vote for this.

Corinne Doherty I would vote for this with both conditions.

John Boughner I would vote for this with both conditions.

Kenneth Scholes motioned to issue the special permit for our kennel uh in accordance with table one in section 30.2 Point a of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw to allow the keeping of four personal dogs on the residential premises in the R3 zoning District the Municipal Water and Sewer shall not be overloaded by the kennel the public Street shall not become overloaded by the kennel the value of other buildings and property shall not be depreciated by the kennel the specific site is an appropriate location for the kennel the kennel will not adversely affect the neighborhood there will be no undue nuisance to vehicles or pedestrians inadequate and proper facilities will be provided to ensure the proper operation of the proposed kennel the proposed kennel will be in harmony with the general purpose of the of the bylaw. If they for some reason go down to three dogs we stay at that limit and no higher.

Jeffery Sauer seconded the motion and All board members in favor.

**154 WATER STREET (a/k/a 170 Water Street) (R-II)** Request for a Special Permit in accordance with Table 1 and Section 30.2.F of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw to allow a new senior (55+ in age) affordable housing development consisting of 140 senior independent dwelling units (70 of which will be deed restricted affordable) with a preference for those residents who are deaf, deaf/blind, and near-deaf, and with an affordable income eligibility from 30% AMI to market rate. The subject applicant has been selected by the Danvers Housing Authority to be the project developer, in accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 30.2.F.1 The applicant is requesting variances from Section 30.2.F.2 and Table 2 to allow the development building to be four stories in height where two stories is the maximum, to be 49' in height

where 30' is the maximum, and to have more than 8 units in the development building. A variance from Section 30.2.F.3 is requested to allow the permanent parking spaces for the new development to be located within the dimensional side and rear setback of the property. **Request made by New England Home for the Deaf, Inc. and WinnDevelopment Company, LP. (23-5012).**

Kenneth Scholes read the request for a Special Permit in accordance with Table 1 and Section 30.2.F of the Danvers Zoning Bylaw. The subject applicant has been selected by the Danvers Housing Authority to be the project developer, in accordance with Zoning Bylaw Section 30.2.F.1

Nancy McCann spoke on behalf of the applicant New England Home for the Deaf, Inc. and Winn Development Company, LP. The existing New England home for the deaf campus is over 16 acres and was developed back in 1925. In 1996 the Thompson House was constructed that runs parallel to Water Street and is independent housing for low low-income deaf and deaf/blind resident seniors. In 2004 a nursing home was added to the site for deaf and deaf-blind residents who are seniors to meet housing needs of a higher skill level.

140 units are proposed this meets the density of regulations under Section 30.2-point F we are not seeking a density variance. There will be a makeup of Studio units, one bedroom and two-bedroom units within the within the building.

This project is proposing 50 percent of the units will be will be affordable what that does for the town in addition to providing needed affordable housing it also allows under the reg state regulations that all 140 of the units can be counted towards the town's SHI subsidized housing inventory so Danvers will get assuming 140 units 70 units of actual affordable housing but will also be able to count all 140 of the units. Section 30.2 Point F does require that the applicant be either the Danvers Housing Authority or a developer selected by the Danvers Housing Authority. We have submitted with the package a selection letter from the Danvers Housing Authority indicating that the Housing Authority has selected New England home for the deaf and Winn development as the developer for this project with the understanding that there would be the affordable housing component.

The property itself is very unique in that it is irregularly shaped and there are topography issues that plague this site as those of you who are familiar with this site. There is a wetland area located almost right in the center of the site that we've had to deal with there is 200-foot Riverfront buffer that goes along the entire northerly edge that runs along the water.

We have also requested a height variance to allow a building higher than two stories and to allow more than eight units per building and again that's a unique feature of section 30.2 Point F that limits the number of units in a building to eight and we are proposing one single building rather than many multiple buildings all over the site and a location of some of the limited number of parking spaces within the setback side and rear setback again please note that the density that we are proposing is compliant with section 30. We have included a full traffic report prepared by Weston and Sampson we have provided to you a parking analysis report again prepared by Weston and Sampson as well as a full site plan that includes these civil drawings and plans. The landscaping plan which we have prepared for you which is a very robust plan we have over a hundred trees being planted for this project and over 500 shrubs as well as many other plantings.

We met extensively with the town planning staff to coordinate this unique filing under Section 30.2 and met on site with the town engineer to discuss aspects of the site layout particularly the new curb cut that you see on the plans. We had a community meeting and that community meeting really informed and

formulated the plans that that you have tonight. Our civil engineer will go through with you the changes that we made and we did submit a letter to you as well indicating the changes that we made to the plan which were significant as a result of the comments that we heard. We also met with the fire department we met with the planning board and you do have the planning board's recommendations and we met with the Danvers affordable housing trust and that was back in February 15th I believe. The letter hasn't come through to you yet from the affordable housing trust but I did see Gardner Trask here this evening and I suspect he will speak to that but the affordable housing trust did vote unanimously to provide a favorable recommendation to you.

John Boughner asked the Ms. McCann to clarify exactly what they are looking for.

Nancy McCann stated they are seeking three aspects of 30.2 Point F on the variance side and the special permit.

Kenneth Scholes read in the letter from the Danvers Housing Authority. A copy of the letter can be found in the Land Use and Community Services Department. The Danvers Housing Authority is in strong support of this affordable housing project for seniors with a preference for deaf and deaf-blind residence's residents at the DHA's request the developer has agreed to provide a secondary preference to the Danvers seniors and this is signed by Cynthia Dunn, the executive director.

Chuck Crush, CEO and Executive Director of New England Home for the Deaf spoke next. A little bit about our history tells you a little bit about where we currently are and the need the why. You will so as you can see a long and rich history starting in 1901 in Allston Massachusetts but quickly moved in in 1924 to the to the Danvers area it's interesting to note that when the when the negotiation took place, we had two board members of notoriety Helen Keller and Annie Sullivan so we're very proud of our history and still a very proud.

The New England Home for Deaf Mutes (NEHDM) was incorporated in 1901.

In 1903, NEHDM rented a house in Allston, Massachusetts, and recruited a matron. The home had a waiting list by the summer of 1905; by 1920, NEHDM had already outgrown two homes.

In 1924, a capital campaign secured a larger facility with enough area for growth. NEHDM had two renowned board members: Helen Keller and her teacher/interpreter Ann Sullivan.

On June 1, 1925, NEHD bought "Riverbank" from philanthropist John Fredrick Hussey in Danvers, MA. They changed the organization's name to the New England Homes for the Deaf (NEHD).

NEHD offers a variety of services for deaf, deafblind, and hard-of-hearing seniors (55 and older). While most of our residents are from Massachusetts, others from all over the United States have moved to our community. NEHD Contains 24 affordable, independent living apartments for seniors ages 62+, 51-bed rest home, 30-bed skilled nursing facility.

The question comes who will live there.

- **Deeply Affordable Tier** - Full time server, retail sales associate, customer service, classroom aide. Individual HH Income: \$24,000/year. Two Person HH Income: \$27,000/year

- **Affordable Tier** - School teacher, administrative assistant, librarian, auto technician  
Individual HH Income: \$48,000/year, Two Person HH Income: \$55,000/year
- **Unrestricted/Market-Rate** Anyone 55+ with no income restrictions.

The Thompson House currently has a 3-5 year wait list –the time to expand is now!  
All units will be independent living for residents ages 55+  
Primary preference for those who experience deafness, near-deafness, and/or deaf-blindness  
Secondary preference for Danvers residents.

John Boughner asked Mr. Crush if the Thompson house had 24 apartments.

Mr. Crush stated yes there are 24 apartments in the Thompson house with 26 residents because some are shared by couples.

Ken Jarvinen asked about how many two bedrooms are you going to have that are affordable?

Mr. Crush stated he would defer to the Winn Development Partners.

Corinne Doherty asked Mr. Crush do you have any teenagers or any children or are all of the occupants of these various type of living facilities are they all 55.

Mr. Crush stated the youngest resident is in her 50's but the typical average age is 75-80 years old. We have no pediatric housing and no license or provision for that nor is that who we serve.

Adam Stein of Winn Companies. Winn Companies is a private, family-run company founded in Boston in 1971. We have a long history in the North Shore the first property developed by Winn 50 years ago is in Salem it's Pequot Highlands off of Highland Ave and it's still managed by Winn residential today. We spent a lot of time on I think what is a very thoughtful plan that will be presented tonight we met with New England homes we met with the community we met with its staff we met with his residents we met with a town we met with the neighboring community and we thought through important items like access traffic parking and architecture all of which are driven by the unique population and special needs of the deaf deafblind and hard of hearing.

We would like to focus on two quick things the expansion that we're proposing will be professionally managed by Winn residential the property management team will oversee day-to-day operations including items like access security maintenance of landscaping signage snow removal and will hopefully address some of the operational conditions or questions that you may have tonight.

Jesse Johnson with Weston & Sampson, civil engineering and traffic engineering consultants for this project went through the existing conditions on site. There are additional condominiums that are part of this overall lot not calculated in the land area but it's of reference because it shares the common access driveway coming from the signalized intersection and then to the north you have Waters River that's the river that was referenced before. On the right we have Jacob's Landing and the abutters associated with that area and then page South we have Jacob Ave and the abutters associated with that so that kind of gives you a reference point all the way around our lot and then it was mentioned with the Thompson house we internally been calling it kind of the barbell building that you see up near the Frontage that falls parallel to the road and then the NEHD building in the middle of the site. You can see the primary access

coming off of Water Street with the roadway coming in that allows you to go to the Thompson Building as you enter in you can take the right into the Thompson you could take a left to go to the condos or you continue to the back in the center of the property that gets you the access to the main NEHD building and you can continue around the back that's the what we're calling the Ring Road and that brings you to the back of the house where a lot of the employees park and there also deliveries back there. If you continued in that counterclockwise fashion there is an access drive that goes back out to Water Street however that is not intended to be a primary access or even a secondary access, that's more of a an emergency access you cannot take a left out of that driveway because of a painted median in Water Street so it's only restricted to a right out and it's not encouraged to use that so we didn't consider that to be part of our project.

The top side of the site shows a 200 foot Riverfront buffer, but it's actually a resource area 200 feet from any River in Massachusetts. a perennial stream is considered a resource area that's as valuable as a wetland itself there's very strict guidelines of what you could do for disturbing impervious coverage so we had to really know where that that line was and we got that delineated by a wetland scientist As you move over to the right we have the abutters at Jacob's Landing we obviously want to be very sensitive to where there are existing developments were where their lawns were if there was any encroachments that came over into our property where their houses were what their existing vegetation looked like for screening on those property lines and then obviously just keeping in mind where they are and what their view lines are what their site corridors are as you shift to the bottom we have an electrical easement 200 foot wide coming from that property line to the South going into our site that's a National Grid high tension line electrical easement that has its own set of restrictions that we had to contact Ngrid about and understand what the impact would be for our site layout and then moving back to the frontage and the existing level of development within the site that we had to be considerate towards that we didn't want to redesign the whole site just to fit a new building on the property and then we have some pretty interesting topography challenges. There is a bit of a knoll you've got from around elevation at the Ring Road 23 feet up to as high as 37 Feet within that same area.

We learned that we had to be very sensitive to this type of community and we found out that they were very strong opinions that we should not have any new traffic coming in through their existing access drive for the fear that it would just be a potential for more traffic that could impact the population that they have walking around the facility we wanted to make sure that any new development would have a nice connection to the rest of the campus to be able to have a full connection with the pedestrians all the way around that would be safe that make sure that again vehicular access throughout the site would not impede that access and have to be ADA accessible throughout as well and then they also told us that they're having some challenges with parking that some of the parking that they need for their staff is existing along non-designated parking areas along the Ring Road that's dirt and gravel so they asked us if we can consider adding some formalized parking spaces into our development scheme to make sure that they would be able to accommodate the existing population and existing staff.

NEHD didn't want a building that was sitting on top of the knoll that was going to be towering above the site and they wanted something that would be in harmony with the rest of the campus. Previously, we showed you that was viable but we had all the parking underneath the ngrid easement and the high tension lines we thought that that wasn't going to be a good balance for us to try to utilize the whole area and not expand on that envelope and what we were hearing was some real strong pushback from the Jacobs Ave residents.

We were asked if there was anything we could do to be sensitive to the height of the building and we started to modify the design to see what we could do to accommodate that. We took all those comments back we modified the design substantially we have a new footprint that wasn't the original footprint that's



probably the third or fourth iteration. The biggest thing that we did was we tried to get that parking all the way around our building in close proximity to the building with multiple entrance points we thought this would be not only beneficial to the surrounding neighborhood having it concentrated and compact around the building but it's also actually better for the population to be able to have multiple access points and a shorter distance from parking to get into the building. The Wetland area that was mentioned by Nancy that's in that central location that's got its own local bylaw restrictions that we had to be sensitive to where we could grade up to where we could put a pavement up to same thing with the 200 foot Riverfront you can see how close we are with our edge of pavement we can't increase the impervious coverage at all within that 200 foot riverfront we can grade into it we can put some storm water controls but we can't put any pavement and then the biggest thing was making sure our proximity to the abutters around us we did a lot of things to move the parking away from residents near Jacob's. We were able to shift the building away from those abutters from a direct distance and then able to cut the grade down quite a bit to help differentiate and take some of the curse if you will off the top of that knoll where it exists today and then we were going to have that building sit and looking at the overall layout of this. As far as utilities, we have water coming into the site already so we're just going to extend the water from the existing one that's already servicing the facility sewer. Coincidentally all the folks over on Jacob's Landing have sewer that goes through our site through an easement that we're going to be able to connect into so we don't have a long extension for that and then the other standard utilities like electric and gas will extend from Water Street into our site. The town engineer indicated that there's a pump station just downstream it's basically right at the bridge before it goes over the bridge page North and so we have to make sure that the pump station is adequate for the increase in capacity. We are increasing impervious area on this site so we have to be sensitive to our storm water runoff where are we putting it and we have to make sure that we dissipate it treat it and get it back into the ground as best we can so we propose two storm water basins one up near our main entrance coming in from the site and one on the back where it's in the riverfront zone before it goes towards the river. We have a new curb cut it was mentioned that we have a curb cut off of Water Street this is a separate and independent curb cut so it'd be a two-way access point to come into the site as you're following in you'll see some new parking stalls on the left that I'll show you a table a little bit later but we've increased the parking by 25 designated new spots that would be for the NEHD facility for their employees and then as you come to the back of the site you would then enter into the area where we're proposing parking around our building we have a 141 parking spaces designated for the 140 units and then we have five additional for visitor parking and then we have a bank of 10 on the left hand side if you can see that turn around if you will in the front we have a bank of 10 across from that that's designated as overflow just in case for whatever reason maybe there's an event or something that we would need additional parking. This would service as a new access point for deliveries going to the back of house and for employees. We designed a whole sidewalk Network that would not only circulate around our facility and our parking area but then would connect into the existing sidewalk network for NEHD so you'd have really good access paths throughout all ADA accessible and then ultimately getting a new sidewalk right to the front so you can get to Water Street for your Frontage in order to accomplish this new curb cut we do have to do some modifications on Water Street.

The grading was considered substantially it was mentioned about the topography being a challenge and it is we have 37 Feet as a height of land what we did was we're proposing a finished floor grade the first floor of that building at 25 feet so we're cutting the grade down in some areas as much as 12 feet to give us some differentiation between our abutters and make sure that we're sensitive to that we do have good soils so we know we can do that relatively easily. We did get confirmatory soil testing that said we can push that dirt around and level that off if you will and essentially create a level pad area as much as possible all the way around that building again trying to maintain a low level trying to maintain ADA access throughout that whole campus. Our closest point of the building to the abutter is 51 feet away from the property line it's 152 feet away from the closest structure. We are proposing a retaining wall in order

to make the cut of the slope and now the trees that are shown the more mature trees that are on the slope that is the actual grade of our abutters property. We're showing a proposed Evergreen buffer that will be at the top or the highest point of that place that we have control over on our property so that's going to be at least at installation those are what the trees are going to look at we're not showing you what the trees would be like in 10 or 20 years we're showing you at installation or reconstruction that will be able to immediately put in a buffer that will help with that view line coming from that closest point.

I wanted to point this out this gives you an idea of the traffic patterns it shows you what the circulation is coming in and out of our site we have a new curb cut as I mentioned there's actually an existing raised median that's in Water Street now that separates the lanes of traffic in order to accomplish this new curb cut we're proposing to remove that median the physical median proposed to re-stripe it and that will allow us to have full access left and right out as well as the abutter across the street would now have full access left and right out but coming into the site we're showing you through the blue arrows how you would get around our area how we have a main entry that I didn't mention it before but that main entry on the prior iterations was facing page South towards the Jacob Ave residents we thought we should try to turn that like we did here clockwise and face it in towards the NEHD campus that way that if there's any potential for noise or anything or higher traffic volumes at the pickup and drop-off point we wanted that face towards us and not towards any of the abutters. We made sure that the trash and move-in loading area was in an area as far away from all the abutters as we could possibly put it there's no outside dumpsters proposed this is an area where a trash truck will be able to actually just back out of the way and they have a rollout service that would be able to come. There will not be any large metal dumpster areas that you would typically see and then we also noted that black dash line that the delivery trucks will now be routed back out so in and out through this new access point and then what you can see from this design again I keep mentioning the parking because we're really proud of how we were able to modify that and really consolidate the parking all around that building and try to not impact the footprint outside.

Kenneth Scholes asked Jesse Johson where the new curb cut is?

Jesse Johnson with Weston & Sampson stated there's an existing opening that's about eight to nine feet wide we're going to keep the return that's on one side of it and then we're going to open it up more to accommodate this so it's half open half not so we will have to do demo one a portion of that wall.

Jesse Johnson with Weston & Sampson continued with his presentation regarding the parking numbers. I had mentioned to you and we feel this is right size for the use again 55 plus an age-restricted you use that is a one-to-one if you do the calculation per the site manual and you do it for 140 units Senior Living multi-unit and one building it actually comes out to 85 spaces required we are proposing more but again we feel it's right size for the population and what we're proposing to do here sometimes you see two to one we don't think two to one is necessary here at all especially because we don't have a full unrestricted site we have an age restricted site so we feel strongly that we've got the right parking here for that. We did a full traffic report and what you do when you're starting to look at traffic you want to obviously understand what is it going to be the potential impact from your project on the street that you front and any nearby intersections so we coincidentally have an intersection right at the front of our site that's a signalized intersection and we also want to look at what's being generated by the current uses on the site or in the neighborhood. We have a very unique use on our site that doesn't fit into any of the existing codes and when that's the case they say all right we'll go out and measure what the traffic counts are in real time and use that that'll help you understand not only what you're getting for trips in and out of the facility but what the patterns are where the traffic is going left right straight coming out of the facility so we did do traffic counts back in June 1st of last year to try to understand what's happening at this unique facility. We wanted to use only the baseline of the NEHD facility so we took the existing condos out and



got a baseline data. You'll see we show the proposed driveway on this one image to give you an idea of where we come out of our driveway it kind of makes sense right if you come out of that driveway you're likely going to take a right and go to that intersection so you can go straight or take a left.

For traffic code requirements, we used an independent living Use because that's more conservative than a multi-unit if it's all in one building which we have we said so we decided to be more conservative and say what if they were all individual which would tend to lend itself to have more traffic trips and even when we did that we came back with a calculation of only 50 and 40. Now 54 PM peak hour so 50 trips either in or out is considered a trip so 51 for the peak hour during the PM and 45 during the peak hour for the am so on average less than a minute per car of either coming in or entering the site so not a huge impact at all we also thought the preference is obviously going to go to deaf and deaf/blind or near deaf but what happens if we can't fill up that whole facility with that whole that population what if market rate comes in and just somebody else that's 55 or over with no restrictions comes in we took that into account as a 25 occupancy so that we at least we're trying to be conservative in that respect.

Even if you took the whole building and occupied it with everybody that had no handicap restrictions at all it still isn't as conservative as using the rate that we found from doing those traffic counts so again we put at least two or three layers of conservative estimation in the traffic report to make sure we understood the potential impact. Typical guidelines say you want to look seven years out so we started with a baseline of 2024 then they say all right well what's going to happen for General build out over the course of that roadway system over a year the accepted ratio is 0.5 percent that's what they said compound that annually to whatever you're getting for Baseline traffic starting in 2024 but then also look to see what are projects that are proposed either proposed or approved that haven't come online yet and we did our research on that as well and understand there's a couple projects off of Pulaski Street that are about to come online with one of them being a 51-unit residential project and another the bigger one I think everybody's concerned about which is 67 Pulaski which is a charter school. Both of those projects will be online according to all reports by 2031. What we found was that the level of service does not change for any of the movements coming in and out of that intersection with our project except one goes from an A to a B because you have just under six second delay so it was on the threshold already and an increase of six seconds going north taking a left changes from an A to a B but that's still an excellent and acceptable level of service so ultimately no impact at all. We're going to change the striping and the painting to have a designated left turn lane that would have at least two cars fit in that queue so you could get out of the traffic lane and take a turn into the site so the plans that you have before you show what those proposed improvements would look like.

So we also have to be sensitive to our new lighting design I had mentioned that we had to be aware of what the Ngrid easement restrictions were but obviously always aware of where our abutters are to make sure we're not going to do any light pollution so these are all dark sky compliant full cut off fixtures and we did a full photometric analysis showing how we would angle our lights away from all the abutters we only have a 0.1 foot candle extension over the property line on the right that stops at 10 feet that goes to zero at 10 feet and that doesn't even account for vegetation so to give you an idea 1.0 foot candle that is an absolute minimum for safety when you're down to 0.1 it's not even noticeable so again no impact to any of our abutters.

Mr. Boughner asked the board if they had any questions. The board had no questions at this time.

Mr. Boughner asked the applicant with this new curb cut there's not another light there won't be a flashing light or anything of that nature it's just after you come through this intersection where the light is

currently or nature there'll just be another opportunity to turn left into this site if you're heading towards Peabody.

Jesse Johnson with Weston & Sampson replied that is correct.

Mr. Boughner asked you indicated there would be a lane with a queuing allowed for two vehicles.

Jesse Johnson with Weston & Sampson stated it is 50 feet long and at least two vehicles.

Steven Prestejohn with Cube 3 Architect's reviewed the design goals for the practice.

- Architecture should feel like a continuation of the NEHD campus that has evolved over time
- Respond to neighborhood edge and scale
- Respect historic character of nearby buildings
- Substantial relationship to New England vernacular in the proposed cladding, materials, color, and detailing.
- Reinforce a connection to the water and emphasize views of the Crane River while minimizing impact on existing water views on campus.

Steven Prestejohn with Cube 3 Architect's also reviewed the building elevations from all sides of the new proposed building. The Presentation can be found in the Land and Planning Use Department. Mr. Preston also showed views from Water Street with the existing condominiums and the proposed building.

Mr. Boughner asked the board if they had any questions. Kenneth Scholes, Ken Jarvinen, Corinne Doherty and Katie Hislop all had no questions.

Jeffery Sauer voiced his concern regarding the four-story building and the safety of the deaf residents. Mr. Sauer asked the applicant how do you get the residents down four flights of stairs? Mr. Sauer also asked if the hallways and doorways are ADA compliant

Steven Prestejohn with Cube 3 Architect's stated this building would have elevators which the eight-unit buildings would not. People won't need to use stairs we'll have potentially standby power for elevators so we and centralized emergency services that are catered to that population. Mr. Preston noted that all the hallways and doors are ADA compliant. The code minimum is five feet and we are actually having 10 feet.

Mr. Boughner asked Steven Prestejohn what thoughts went into the design of the new proposed building.

Steven Prestejohn stated there was a lot of iterative designs we've been looking at this site for two years now of many different footprints some far more contemporary than what we're seeing here. I think as far as the question of roof line or pitched roofs and dormers that's something we're definitely open to considering and we have considered it I think our major goal here is to limit height and so that's always beneficial with a flat roof structure the apparent height of the roof line for the abutters and we have an image in a later slide that shows you what at least like a Gable hip roof would look like. Pitch roofs they really limit your available space to put equipment on the roof and so then in turn all that equipment would move to the ground and propose or present other impacts.

Mr. Boughner asked Mr. Preston are there's Mechanicals or anything on this flat roof?

Steven Prestejohn stated they are on the flat roof.

Michael Blier landscape architect director of LandWorks Studio, Inc. of 83 North Street in Salem. Mr. Bleier showed the proposed layout and materials plan. The plan can be found in the Land and Planning Use Department. We're using a lot of native plant material and drought tolerant plant material for the project we understand we want to use a low resource intensive planting strategy for the project.

Mr. Boughner asked the board if they had any questions regarding the planting. All board members had no questions.

Nancy McCann stated in conclusion to her presentation outlined the specific variances they are looking for noted in the application and thanked the board and her development team. I want to make sure that everybody understands that these are independent units so the staff is going to be consisting of what you would have in a standard apartment type of building a manager type of things there is no community kitchen there is no industrial kitchen here these are independent units there's no industrial laundry service again these are independent apartment units so it's different from the nursing home that's on the site now so the management is going to be managed by Winn development.

Jeffery Sauer asked why 140 units? What's the economic reason for this is a big building?

Adam Stein of Winn Companies replied is it's three to five year waiting list in the 24 units. It is it's demand we found that these lease up and have high demand these lease up in a two to three month period of time so I don't think we've ever built a community where we've said oh we over built or oh we have too many units or oh we can't occupy the housing so for this demographic 55 plus in coordination with NEHD because of their waiting list because of their special tendency and because of the demand in the market this is also going to allow for people to age in place in the town of Danvers so as people get older loss of spouse want to downsize want to stay in the community that they grew up in with their children their grandchildren this serves as a unique opportunity for them to stay in that community.

Kenneth Scholes stated he is ok with pretty much everything but the height variance. Have you considered going from four story to three story?

Nancy McCann replied to Mr. Scholes there is one section that is three stories and that section faces the Jacob's Landing. We've tried to do is lower the grade and have the building and the Landscaping create the Community campus that this that this has grown up to be and this is an expansion of the campus that started in 1925.

Jesse Johnson replied when we looked at this one of the restrictions we have on this site related to the topography and also the soils is the 200 foot Riverfront resource area prevents us from moving down the hill if we had our way we would try to move the elevation down the hill more but what I had to do is I had to hold the elevation at that 200 foot buffer and work back from there towards the building. We're at 23 feet at that access drive at that 200 foot resource we are at 25 feet for our first floor for the building. Nancy had mentioned we are actually within a foot and just under the total height of the existing NEHD building even with our four stories so our height at four stories is still under the height of the NEHD building.

Ken Jarvinen asked the applicant how high would they be and then it was said that they would be screened and will there be like a knee wall or something on the roof. Mr. Jarvinen also asked the Winn Companies if the other facilities you managed are deaf and deafblind?

Jesse Johnson replied the Mechanicals is through the parapet on the wall so the wall will continue up for four or five feet so that'll be continuous from the outside you won't see necessarily an independent roof screen but from the ground level that would mask everything as far as the height of the equipment that's maybe something we can give you some more information on next time.

Ramie Schneider with Winn Development we have not managed a deaf deafblind near-deaf facility but that's also why we're doing a long-term partnership with NHD as part of the owner for this facility we know that they have extensive experience with this unique population and we feel as though the marriage between our two entities will really benefit this population. All of the units will be designed to accommodate hearing impaired individuals. Our own maintenance staff and a resident will be able to call maintenance if something were to be broken or out of order that's part of our standard level of care for our residents.

Katie Hislop asked Ramy Schneider to confirm the selection process on who will reside in the units.

Ramie Schneider during lease up we'll work with NEHD to develop a marketing plan that will have Outreach to the deaf deaf/blind and hard of hearing community in the event that during lease up or at any point in the future there's no longer a waitlist based on that preference an individual that's deaf deafblind near deaf it will go to Danvers locals and Danvers residents. Let's say that 39 units are leased there's one that's opened we don't have anyone on the wait list right now that's deaf near deaf deafblind but we have individuals on the wait list that are from Danvers and then we have other it other individuals that are just from Peabody right it would first go to Danvers local all of these individuals will have to be 55 plus in order to live here that that is not a preference that's a full-on restriction.

Steven Sacco chairman of the NEHD spoke about the need and demand. Mr. Sacco stated it's a culture and just like any other culture and ethnicity of any kind people tend to gravitate to like people.

Corinne Doherty asked the applicant will there be an employee on site at all times for this facility or will there be someone from nine to five? What is the management responsibility with regard to on-site management? Ms. Doherty also asked about the selection process.

Ramie Schneider stated we'll have an employee on site from nine to five pm and then maintenance and on-call individuals as we do at all of our buildings. A new entity between Winn and NEHD will own the building that sits on any NEHD land. Ms. Schneider stated that NEHD and Winn will develop a marketing plan jointly and Winn will execute on.

Corinne Doherty asked the applicant what happens after the 40 years is up for the affordable housing.

Ramie Schneider stated 13% of the units will be for thirty percent AMI or less the Department of Housing requires that for any low-income housing tax credit project so there will be a scale of affordability within this property. Of the thirty percent to eighty percent AMI units, 25 percent of those units will be deed retracted in perpetuity so all of the 140 units will forever be able to count in Danvers subsidized housing inventory. The 25 percent will be in perpetuity the balance of the 25 percent will be for a 40-year term which is coterminous with the term of the low income housing tax credits that will be on that will be part of the financing for this building. After the 40-year term we could either at that point go back and layer on

additional tax credits probably for a rehab of the building at that point it'll be 40 years old it will need some repairs and maintenance Etc. We would then use affordable low-income housing tax credits to upgrade the building and could extend the term of those tax credits or the tax credit and the turn and the affordability component would fade off and they would potentially become market rate units.

Adam Stein with Winn stated that almost 100% of the affordable housing you see developed with Mass housing or DHCD similar to what we're financing with NEHD at the at the expansion runs a 30-to-40-year period of time it's highly atypical for it to be in perpetuity so most affordable housing you see in the state is developed under the housing tax credit program and runs a 30-to-40-year period of time so that's pretty common and almost exactly how it's done across the country.

Corinne Doherty asked the Planning Staff that if this site is approved that the Fire Department would review because of the concerned with putting residences in an elevator in a fire.

Brian Szekely stated that the Fire Department, and Building Department would have all have to sign off.

John Boughner asked Nancy McCann how deep is the current waitlist? And how many on the list are from the North Shore or from Danvers.

Nancy McCann stated she will get more data for the next meeting.

John Boughner asked about the safety features in the current NEHD building.

Nancy McCann stated the Thompson House was built in 1996 things have improved since then for meeting safety needs. This is going to be an up-to-date state-of-the-art facility that will go through a complete review by the fire department as well as the building department when we get to that stage, we have by the way already met with the fire department with regard to circulation around the site. We've named some of the safety features but there are a lot of things that are built into this design to meet the needs of the deaf and deafblind community and will it both needs for living as well as safety needs and we'll put that list together for you.

John Boughner asked the applicant to confirm the height in the middle of the building and how many units on each floor.

The applicant stated 49 is the height we're seeking in the application because what that Dimension is taken from is the first floor elevation not the average grade around the building. Our fourth floor here due to the height step down is smaller so I'll say on a typical floor the largest footprint we're looking at about 45 units per floor. The applicant stated the first floor has amenity space as well.

John Boughner asked how to you come up with the total number of units for this building. Did you think about taking the fourth floor off and reducing the number of units?

Nancy McCann stated the plan submitted will meet the needs and a financially viable project and a good design that fits the campus.

John Boughner stated we got input from the planning board which a few have been addressed earlier.

1. The recommendation that the rendering and floor plans should be consistent to accurately demonstrate the proposed project.
2. Explore and consider reducing the scale of the proposed building.

3. Limit hours and prohibit outdoor audio on the proposed roof deck.
4. Explore considering installing your own irrigation and wells.
5. Request that the project undergo necessary archaeological and historical artifacts on site.

Nancy McCann stated she has touched on #1 and #2. Ms. McCann noted there is a roof deck proposed over a section of the three-story area that's closest to the river. The applicant showed on the slide presentation the location of the roof top deck and noted it is just an outdoor garden area for the residents. We are investigating doing an irrigation well and touched on the plantings. With the request for the project to undergo archaeological/historical artifacts that is a standard a requirement for projects that require State review and that's done in the normal course of a development and would be done here there's a form that the development team fills out and files with the state and then the state checks its archives and all that kind of stuff and determines whether there is any need for review and what level of review. If such items are found the Planning Department would be notified.

Ken Jarvinen asked the applicant what the breakdown for one- and two-bedroom units/apartments?

Nancy McCann stated they anticipated a mix - 16 are studios and 84 one bedrooms and 40 two bedrooms. The affordable units that are required have to match that ratio of Studios one bedrooms and two bedrooms we can't say okay we'll make all the affordable unit Studios no it has to be the percentage of the overall floor plan.

Jeffery Sauer asked Nancy McCann for clarifications on the use of elevators.

The applicant stated he would like to correct his message and that it is one possible life safety measure and there are many more in the toolkit.

John Boughner opened to public comment.

Mr. Gardner Trask of Danvers Housing Trust. We did vote unanimously to send a letter of support to this board as well as the planning board.

Andrea Daly town meeting member precinct 3 spoke about the density. Ms. Daly is not in support.

Mr. Knox of 11 Jacobs Landing is in support of the development but the design needs to be reconsidered to make this a friendly project for the neighborhood.

Bernie Mason of 27 North Shore Ave spoke about his concerns on the traffic.

Jesse Johnson replied to Mr. Mason we measure the existing curb to curb and currently there is a median that is in there that creates only one lane to travel in both directions however the curb to curb width does allow for that median to come out and for paint to replace it so that median strip would be removed. We have examples of this also in town over at Endicott I believe that's almost exactly as we're proposing. that'll would allow the abutter across from us to take a left turn into their residence if they are traveling north and then if you are traveling south on Water Street to take a left into our facility you we both have 50 feet of lane for two cars to stack that would get you out of the traveling so you still have maintained traveling.

Mr. McKenna of 383 Andover Street asked for clarification on height and asked about the archaeological survey stated there is archaeological findings and hoping the town will do their part. Mr. McKenna sees



the need for housing I'm not opposed I just think some tweaking and improvements need to be made prior to approval.

The applicant responded to Mr. McKenna the calculation does ultimately have to be from an average grade so there's going to be a differential because you have to slope away from the building but as Steven mentioned right now we're indicating that the height from the first floor to the top which considers the proposed grade around the whole foundation so it's not taken into account that cut which was only it's a four foot retaining wall just for clarification.

Jim Morose Precinct 3 asked how many acres is the 200 feet easement? Mr. Morose expressed his concern about the height.

Nancy McCann stated we can get that answer for you.

Cindy Dunn I'm the executive director of the Danvers Housing Authority. We desperately need affordable housing for our seniors. The Danvers Housing Authority only has 205 units and part of those are for handicapped individuals that are under 60 so really, we only have about 180 units they're always full and as soon as we have an opening, we pull a list of 50 people and we fill it again we have people currently in our housing that could be better served in this project so there are plenty of Danvers residents that could benefit from this development.

Mike O'Malley of 6 Jacob's Landing asked if the height of building includes the air conditioners, etc.

John Boughner replied no it is not included and would be another 3-4 feet.

Kevin Gibbons Precinct 3 has been a UPS driver for 30 years for that neighborhood and surrounding areas. Is concerned with the new charter school going in and the traffic associated with NEHD proposed project. Mr. Gibbons is in favor of the project and can see the need as long as we make Jacob's Ave and Jacob's Landing residents comfortable.

Andrea Daly precinct 3 of 36 North Shore Avenue expressed her concerned with the density of the project and noted she has found 9 arrowheads when walking in the fields.

Brian Szekely suggested to Ms. Daly to contact the Massachusetts Historical Commission on the items she found on her walks through the farm/fields.

John Boughner asked Nancy McCann for a site visit and would like to see site markers of the building.

Jeffery Sauer stated he thinks the project is too big. He appreciates the need for the 40b but it's just too large.

Kenneth Scholes stated is ok with everything else but not the building height.

Ken Jarvinen stated he sees the need for this project and the advantage for the Danvers residents.

Katie Hislop stated she see the need for the community and sees the variances needed. She agrees the height and it's too big.

Corinne Doherty states she thinks it is just too big.

John Boughner echoed his fellow board members. I am not comfortable with the building height and doesn't like the look of it. It looks to commercial. I do see the need for the project though.

Kenneth Scholes motioned we continue this case to March 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023 and was seconded by Jeffery Sauer. All in favor.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Kenneth Scholes motioned to close the meeting. Jeffery Sauer seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:50 p.m.