



Haverhill

Planning Board

Phone: 978-374-2330 Fax: 978-374-2315

HAVERHILL PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Wednesday, December 11, 2019

Place: City Council Chambers, Room 202

Time: 7:00 PM

Members Present: Chairman Paul Howard
Member Robert Driscoll
Member Alison Colby-Campbell
Member Kenneth Cram
Member Karen Buckley
Member Karen Peugh
Member April DerBoghosian, Esq.
Member William Evans

Members Absent: Member Nate Robertson

Also Present: William Pillsbury, Jr., Director of Economic Development and Planning
Lori Robertson, Head Clerk

Approval of Minutes: November 13, 2019

November 13, 2019

After board consideration, Member Robert Driscoll motioned to approve the November 13, 2019 minutes. Member Alison Colby-Campbell seconded the motion. Members Nate

Robertson – absent

Karen Peugh – yes

Bill Evans – yes

Karen Buckley – yes

April DerBoghosian, Esq.- yes

Kenneth Cram – yes

Alison Colby-Campbell- yes

Robert Driscoll – yes

Paul Howard – yes

Motion Passed.

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

Member Karen Peugh: Read the conduct of hearings into the record.

Public Hearings:

Master Plan 2035: Please note at the December 11, 2019 Planning Board meeting the board heard a presentation from Utile, Tim Love and Will Cohen regarding the master plan 2035.

Mr. Pillsbury: We are having public hearing and people will be to express their concerns. We will not be looking for the adoption tonight. We will be postponing that until the January 8, 2020 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Tim Love of Utile stated we have been at this for at least a couple of months. Will is going to go through the format, structure and content of the draft plan. The draft plan is posted on the website. Anyone from the public who wishes to review the document, it's all on the website.

Will Cohen of Utile addressed the board. We will be focusing on the big pieces to take away. What the pieces mean for Haverhill going forward and also what has changed since the last time we came and presented. There has been some change based on comments from the Planning Board and other feedback from other City Departments.

Mr. Pillsbury stated we did have a detailed presentation at the prior Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Will Cohen stated that is correct. Overall the last couple of months we have had range of public meetings. What we presented to you last month is a skeleton of what the information is. It wasn't formalized into a PDF document. We have since revised the recommendations and since filled out the recommendations and filled out some of the recommendations. We will talk about what is in the plan and the two main sections. The idea of thinking about scenarios, some physical manifestations of the plan itself. The recommendations which are really the policy changes that the master plan would suggest that the City implement between now and 2035. Before I go any further as Tim pointed out its worth noting that all of the revisions are located on the website. Unless there are revisions this draft is complete as we see it. If there are some comments these changes will be made before January. Currently there are acknowledgements, table of contents, areas for targeted growth-which has three different labels. The first is industrial areas, downtown riverfront and village centers. The policy changes are going to help make these scenarios. This is our goal of what the physical outcome of these scenarios will be. The special focus a masterplan should take is about the physical developmental characteristics of the city. We talked some at previous public meetings about growth. We showed a chart a couple of times which shows the increase of population over time. When talking about growth it's important to see it on paper. This shows the absolute numbers and the change that does it relative to other cities in the commonwealth. That tells a story about what the point of this plan is. Haverhill is growing but is growing substantially less

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

quickly than its surrounding communities and only a little bit faster than other communities in the state that are having a much harder time economically. Methuen and Lawrence are growing substantially faster both in terms of absolute numbers and relative ones. Thinking more long term about the economic vitality of Haverhill addressing some of that gap seems important. At the last Planning Board meeting one issue that came up was the relationship of growth, planning and infrastructure needs. The school department and Massachusetts School Building Authority have been working with other state agencies to do long term projections. One source they received information from is the UMASS Donahue Institute. These charts show total school enrollment. In 1990 (inaudible) In 2000 the birth rate fell quite dramatically. Donahue has predicted that it will continue to fall. Since the mid-2000 the population has grown fairly steadily. The chart to the right shows how it will effect school enrollment. In 1990 it was high. It rose and rose up to 2000 then between 2000 and the early 2000 it fell quite dramatically. Since the mid-2000 the population has grown fairly steadily. It has risen pretty dramatically since 2005. The line is where we are right now. Umass Donahue Institute sees up to about 2026 it will continue to rise some. It will not go beyond the peak at what it was at in the early 2000's and from there it will begin to decline. At this moment the master plan does not project the need for new schools in the coming years. In the previous masterplan for Haverhill around 1990 there was a strong recommendation for four new elementary schools. During that process part of the recommendation were coming out of a larger formal setting by the school department for the need for more police, fire and schools. We have a quote in the master plan for urban planning related to these coming changes. There was a book that was just published a few weeks ago by another urban planner who often times gets the jobs that Utile doesn't get necessarily he says this "growing appreciation for urban lifestyles within these two cohorts (of millennial and empty nesters), which constitutes a sizable majority of all households, is a long term trend, not a short term fad...(longer lifespans) have reduced the dominance of that demographic mainstay-the household made up of a married couple with school aged child or two (and likely a pet) Early in the twentieth century, that description would fit more than half of all households. It now represents less than 25% and by some accounts less than a fifth of all households." The big take away is not to be planning for a big influx of children wanting yards and more about planning for the increasing growth of households seeking more urban lifestyle in a slightly more dense way. After that we go through some land use. We get in what the land uses are: Industrial growth, downtown and riverfront and the development of village centers. In industrial areas the goal is to demonstrate the impact of adding commercial use to the City's existing industrial site. Right now, rents in the area north of Boston are almost twice that of the area south of Boston. The average size of building in the metro north region is approximately 80,000 s/f. They want to move in and have a space and make new things. Being able to have more capacity on a larger scale is key. This also talks about modular construction. This reduces the cost and time involved in fitting out the full occupied space, but it does require that the space to be able to accommodate these modules. What this means is that the buildings need to be a little taller than what the buildings in Ward Hill currently are. We are allowing for the densification of the Ward Hill area to allow for these types of buildings. We also looking at creating a second industrial park. At the end of the industrial section we have zoning changes that are required to improve the usage of the

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

industrial park. These are all the changes that we were looking at last month. Allowing mixed use in the business park district, changing the parking ratio, changing the minimum green-space requirements. Also rezone two CH districts at Computer Drive and Broadway to BP zone. Rezone OP and CH districts between Newton Road and Amesbury Road along I-495 to BP districts. All these zoning changes in the BP zone would apply to those locations. Downtown and Riverfront – this is a picture of the old paperboard site. We have levels of density from low to high. Then we have information on the downtown. The key here is having the idea of what the parking issues will be. This is not a new idea to any of you. This master plan strongly encourages thinking through the redevelopment of the Goecke Deck so it relates to the development downtown....There are many different strategies to think about how to make a smaller but replaced deck and tie some of the funding with that with which a developer who would be wanting to do otherwise downtown. Some of the recommendations the 2015 plan made about downtown aren't as relevant. We don't think there needs to be as much office. We are not making many formal recommendations as to the specific mix of uses or the exact fit out of the buildings there. Also things have been changing in other buildings there. We do think regardless of the specific buildings and projects having the development and the deck happen is key. Part of what is important down there is seeing how the deck is important downtown....isn't just about downtown. Its actually about other issues. Having the deck be better with better capacity encourages better utilizing with the commuter rail. Its actually encourages more people to get on the commuter rail. Also, having more units near the station downtown creates more of a natural audience. Part of what we have been proposing is a spectrum of different development types in Bradford and downtown. There are some bigger things down here that make the numbers work for developers. And levels of density that are lower but are still not single family. Some version of that which would look like this. There is some density along the river but as you get closer to the existing residential fabric it still has a New England feel to it. The zoning changes here are much less. The City has already gone through a great deal of effort to rezone the riverfront. This accomplishes almost all of what we would be needed to make a development of this scale happen. There are a couple of things we might recommend tweaking. We would change the setbacks of the sides and fronts of lots to be a little bit smaller. This would encourage a sense of place along the streets. Having houses along the sidewalks might make places be more walkable. It allows for a little bit more density while still leaving room for open space. Finally the village centers. This is an image of what this could look like. There has been a lot of confusion of what we mean by village centers. I think this image is actually useful. If you look at it you can see that everything is about 2-3 stories in height. We are not talking about putting large sky scrapers all over the outskirts of Haverhill. We also are not talking about sprawl. We are not talking about a bunch of one story houses all over the place. We are talking about 8 locations throughout the city having this level of density to ground senses of place (shows three different towns with the same style located in Acton, Medfield and Plymouth, MA. We projected out how much housing at that level of three stories-ish allowing for some ground floor retail generally how many units we can get. What we are talking about per village center is 40-60ish. If they all don't develop it wouldn't be all that much. All these areas with the exception of rivers edge area is the CN zone. That is currently commercial only. Most of the CN zones have one nail salon and a chain store. We would allow

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

a mixed use to allow residential multifamily which would be two to three stories above ground retail. We would expand the nodes, because it makes no sense to build 3 houses. This also makes sense for the businesses because there needs to be more homes and households around these centers. The next page is plan recommendations and planning topics which deal with economy, open space, housing, transportation and mobility and cultural and historical resources.

William Pillsbury, Planning Director: One element that is important – the components of the master plan – these items are mandated by the state and commonwealth. In an approved master plan that is acceptable by the state must have these five categories.

Mr. Will Cohen: That is a good point. Economy- Haverhill has a large manufacturing and industrial sector. A fair number of workers work in Haverhill many of them work out of Haverhill. Finding a way for people who live in Haverhill and to also work in Haverhill is a broader goal. Its hard to solve in one master plan but it is something we should be striving for. We have three goals for economy - its access to opportunity and education, job creation and location.

Mr. Tim Love stated we don't have time to go through all the goals.

Mr. Will Cohen: These goals are what we asked the public about in the survey. We received feedback from them and we revised them. We got a lot more detailed and based on the feedback from those meetings. We then revised those and those became the policy which we hope help enables the scenarios.

Mr. Tim Love: We had to do extensive public process. (inaudible)

Mr. Will Cohen: I will skip ahead. After the five goals we talk about the process of community outreach, the different meetings we have had and the different feedback we have had. The most important we felt was the scenarios and recommendations workshop. We have the action boards that say what people did and didn't like. These recommendations are what we had for the skeleton in November to this draft document today. We had questions about zoning, changing density. A lot of what has changed since November in the action is stressing that the recommendations to increase zoning to certain areas is exclusively for the purpose of seeing these scenarios. We are not saying increase density across the entire City of Haverhill. When we talk about infrastructure issues instead of loosely saying there is capacity, it's saying create the amount of it that is needed to see these things happen. For issues of senior housing it is the same. We are not talking about creating assisted living facilities all over the place but instead creating housing. Also creating housing that is appropriate for millennials. A lot of that framing is what we found through the process of the workshop made more sense to the community members that attended but wasn't present in the language itself. We want the document to be able to stand alone.

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

Mr. Paul Howard asked if anyone from the public wished to speak.

Ms. Christine Kwitchoff addressed the board. I have attended several of the workshops. In the sessions I didn't hear any conversation about building out a second industrial park. I was surprised when after that meeting the Mayor sent a congratulation note when he won the election that he specifically talked about that you would be looking for a new location for another business park and yet I don't remember that in November at all. I was surprised when I read the Mayor's statement and now it seems that you have presented it here as well. I am curious why we didn't get to have more feedback on that.

Mr. William Pillsbury: I think the opportunity exists now for feedback. That has been discussed extensively from day one. If it wasn't brought out in some specific form one night in November, I don't disagree with you. We have always had a dual approach to the industrial piece. Make changes with the existing industrial park but also to look for opportunities. One new location that we are talking about is one that is previously zoned industrial park for many years, Computer Drive area to a highway zone.

Ms. Kwitchoff: I am familiar with that one.

Mr. Pillsbury: The other one....again, I thought you said we didn't talk about it.

Ms. Kwitchoff: I am familiar with Computer Drive.

Mr. Pillsbury: The other one is the one area in the City that is zoned in the last master plan as office park. The other area is the old Dutton's airport along Route 108 with the opportunity to connect ourselves to the 495 interchange. Those sites are not publicly controlled. We are presenting the opportunity to look at these sites from a market prospective to see if the owners might be interested in doing something. Those are the areas that we are talking about. Those are the two areas that we are talking about. It has been discussed in every context I have been involved in from the beginning of this process maybe not specifically on that night. I apologize for that if I didn't bring it up. It has been part of the Mayor's concern from the beginning and always has been in front of our minds.

Ms. Kwitchoff: To be clear...I mentioned the November meeting but I have been to several others as well. It struck me as odd that I haven't heard about it. I am not saying every single thing has been divulged. I think it's really interesting that everything that has been suggested for Ward Hill...(inaudible) tree removal at exit 52.

Mr. Pillsbury: There is no specific tree removal. The Research Drive and Computer Drive area we have done a site assessment with state resources. It's really already an area that has master plan.

Ms. Kwitchoff: Again, I am totally clear on that Computer Drive. Its more about exit 52.

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

Mr. Pillsbury: As I said earlier, we don't even control it. Part of the master plan is looking ahead and trying to project the possibility about sites making sense. I think that is what we asked Utile to take a look at and evaluate and have our input from the City's prospective since day one. We look for these opportunities. There aren't many more occasions to find land along the highway that we can turn to industrial use. That is one that we found and it may never come to fruition. In reality if we don't take the first step and identify it as a possibility to rezone then we would never get it off the ground. That's really what we are doing. We are trying to see if there is a feasibility.

Ms. Kwitchoff: I am just expressing my concern.

Mr. Doug Edison of 28 Towne Hill Road addressed the board. We are looking at the next 15 years ourselves and where we want to be. One of the things we talk about doing is downsizing. The cluster seems like a really good idea when you are empty-nesters. We don't need a 3,000 s/f house now but we would like to still be in a neighborhood. I really like the aspect of the whole thing with the village center so you don't have to get in your car. I might even learn how to ride my bike. Going forward that suits what we would want to see in the City.

Mr. Don Cox of 595 East Broadway addressed the board. I would like to congratulate Utile on a well thought out plan and for taking the time to get a lot of feedback. The targeted growth of village nodes is a good idea as well as increasing the density of our industrial parks and redeveloping the Goecke Deck and the downtown. I have followed the process closely, gave my feedback and communicated with many people about it. How do we have smart growth that doesn't sacrifice our rural character from what I have seen the plan seems to take that feedback into account. I have a question that I have heard from some people. I am not sure if its fact or fiction. Is there any discussion about potential changes to required building requirements in special conservation or rural residential zones? Are there any changes to building requirements in those zones proposed, such as the lot size requirements, frontage, etc.

Mr. Pillsbury: No, not at this point. Interesting enough we are going to have zoning changes coming forward; we are actually going to change the name of the SC zone to something different. It has always been confusing as to what a special conservation zone means. We are actually going to change it to residential special. Its primarily a residential zone. One thing I will point out is a lot of what you see in the master plan about making recommendations about zoning; the next step is to bring all those recommendations forward to the City Council and move for adoption. That would operationalize this plan.

Member Alison Colby-Campbell: This is from the beginning...what is the advantage of being the fastest growing?

Mr. Will Cohen: This is a good question. In talking about neighboring cities is not saying growth is always good. That is not the point of the sentence. Its more about the many other needs the

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

city already knows it has to face. All the questions about infrastructure are really questions about how to pay for infrastructure. All the questions about pensions, increasing cost of city services is really about money. When we are seeing that there is more growth happening in other cities all that really means is that the easiest way to solve the equation of solving all those other problems is currently happening more in other places than here. I think that is how far the statement needs to go. Another way to look at the city has grown consistently since forever. Its unrealistic to think that the city is not going to grow again. To the degree that other communities are finding their middle ground its worth remembering that context. To the degree that growth helps solve all these pressing issues that every city never has enough money to pay for things those tools are being used different ways by other cities.

Mr. Pillsbury: I think it is also important to contextualize where we are as a city verses other cities. I think many of us the thought about growth in Haverhill many, many people have the perception that the growth in Haverhill is astronomical that it has been through the roof. Its useful to present a table like that to show the reality. Sometimes the reality and perception is not exactly the same.

Member Karen Buckley: inaudible

Mr. Will Cohen: That is a very good point. The hope that is all the things in this plan are precisely to have the potential growth happening in Haverhill be the kind of growth that Haverhill wants. Its creating households that are in the scale and type that make sense to the community and its insuring that there is job growth. Its definitely not saying having the population be higher to say that you are the best.

Mr. Pillsbury: The next step is to continue the hearing. We will keep it open and we will be coming back next month. If there are any changes or additional information those will be done. The website is there and if someone needs a copy made please come to planning and we will make you a copy. I would invite everyone to continue to stay involved in the process. Thank you for your participation thus far.

List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting.

Draft Master plan draft Dec. 11 – December 2019

Frontage Waiver for 316 Gile Street and 146 Crosby Street:

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti of 70 Bailey Blvd. addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. This has been a long process. It has been a few months that this has been looked at. This development initially came in as a thru street from Gile Street to Crosby Street. It was scaled back. By right we could put as many as 13 lots and a cul-de-sac. After working together with the Planning Director and neighbors, the developer (which is highly unusual) decided to scale back the development to only 5 lots. We are asking for this frontage waiver because instead of

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

putting in roadways he is going to be putting in driveways to access these lots. We went to the Board of Appeals and were granted the appropriate variances and now we need a frontage waiver.

Chairman Howard asked if anyone would like to speak on this project? Hearing none, I will close the public portion of the hearing and turn it over to comments from the Planning Director.

Mr. Pillsbury stated this plan received approval for frontage variance and no appeal has been taken. The role of the planning board in acting on the frontage waiver is to ensure that there is adequate access provided to the site from the reduced frontage. The review of the plan indicates that the adequate access exists via reduced frontage. The plan has been reviewed by the city departments and their comments are in your packages. No objections have been received.

Mr. Pillsbury: I would recommend the approval of the frontage waiver as presented.

After board consideration, Member Bill Evans motioned to approve the frontage waiver for 316 Gile Street and 146 Crosby Street as recommended by the Planning Director, William Pillsbury. Member Alison Colby-Campbell seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. Member absent: Nate Robertson. Motion passed.

City department reports are attached to and considered part of this board's decision and notice of decision. Any appeal of this board's decision and notice of decision shall be taken in accordance with M.G.L. Chapters 40A and 41 within twenty (20) days of the board's filing of this decision/notice of decision with the city clerk.

List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting.

Frontage waiver plan 10-25-19

Board of Appeals decision 10-16-19

Form D-1

Form D

Frontage Waiver application

Email, 11-19-19

Comment due sheet

Letter, Brian Dubina, 12-11-19

Fire Department letter, 11-20-19

Building Inspector comments, 12-5-19

Conservation Commission letter, 12-9-19

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

Definitive Escrows:

Carrington Estates Phase I:

Please be advised, the Haverhill Planning Board at its meeting held on 12-11-19 reviewed the request of to reduce the amount being held for completion of work within the cited subdivision.

The board advised that the request was referred to the city engineer. The request was to review the work cited as required; advise if all work cited was completed under the approved definitive plan; if the work was completed in accordance with the approvals; and if all required remaining work was listed and if the dollar values were accurate. Please note that Planning Director William Pillsbury, Jr. recommended that the board vote to reduce the account as recommended by the City Engineer in his report to the board dated 12/11/19.

In consideration of the report from the City Engineer, John Pettis, Member Karen Buckley motioned to reduce the amount \$113,988.00 from the \$285,430.00 balance and maintain a balance of \$171,442.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report to the board dated 12/11/19. Member Kenneth Cram seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor to reduce the account to the balance of \$171,442.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report addressed to the board dated 12/11/19. Members Absent: Nate Robertson. Motion passed.

As a condition of the board's vote, the **BANK is required** to notify the board that the minimum amount of \$171,442.00 is held for the completion of all remaining work. The account shall not be further reduced or released without formal board approval.

List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting.

- **Escrow Materials**

Carrington Estates Phase II:

Please be advised, the Haverhill Planning Board at its meeting held on 12-11-19 reviewed the request of Stephen Franciosa to reduce the amount being held for completion of work within the cited subdivision.

The board advised that the request was referred to the city engineer. The request was to review the work cited as required; advise if all work cited was completed under the approved definitive plan; if the work was completed in accordance with the approvals; and if all required remaining work was listed and if the dollar values were accurate. Please note that Planning Director William Pillsbury, Jr. recommended that the board vote to reduce the account as recommended by the City Engineer in his report to the board dated 12/11/19.

In consideration of the report from the City Engineer, John Pettis, Member Karen Buckley motioned to reduce the amount \$244,685.50 from the \$429,053.50 balance and maintain a

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

balance of \$184,368.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report to the board dated 12/11/19. Member Bill Evans seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor to reduce the account to the balance of \$184,368.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report addressed to the board dated 12/11/19. Members Absent: Nate Robertson. Motion passed.

As a condition of the board's vote, the **BANK is required** to notify the board that the minimum amount of \$184,368.00 is held for the completion of all remaining work. The account shall not be further reduced or released without formal board approval.

List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting.

- **Escrow Materials**

Delhaven Estates:

The Haverhill Planning Board at its 12/11/19 meeting held on Wednesday evening at 7:00 pm reviewed the request to reduce the account to a zero balance in return for the completion of all work.

Economic Development/Planning Director William Pillsbury, Jr. advised the board members to reduce the account to a zero balance as recommended by the City Engineer. The City Engineer recommended the board reduce the account to a zero balance. The City Engineer had reviewed the subject bond, inspected the roadway and associated improvements, and compared the quantities to the roadway definitive plan. The calculations indicated that all items had been completed and therefore recommended that the board reduce the cited escrow account to a zero balance.

In consideration of the City Engineer's recommendation along with the Planning Director's recommendation, Member Karen Buckley motioned to reduce the account to a zero balance. Seconded by Member Robert Driscoll. All members present voted in favor. Members Absent: Nate Robertson. Motion Passed.

List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting.

- **Escrow Materials**

Form A Plans:

Estate of Michael Sullivan for 150 Riverside Avenue: It was noted the building inspector commented on 12-3-19 "Lot 7 BOA approved non-conformities on 9-18-19 not appealed. Lot 3 complies with frontage, area and access for a duplex lot." Member Robert Driscoll motioned to approve the Form A plan. Seconded by Member Bill Evans. All members present voted in favor. Motion Passed.

**Planning Board Meeting
12-11-19**

Ernest DiBurro for 30 Lyons Farm Road: It was noted the building inspector commented on 12-3-19 "lot 5a and lot 4a complies with frontage, access and area previously approved subdivision plan." Member Robert Driscoll motioned to approve the Form A plan. Seconded by Member Karen Buckley. All members present voted in favor. Motion Passed.

Thomas Chasse for 95-97 Pleasant View Avenue: It was noted the building inspector commented on 12-3-19 "complies with frontage and access for a duplex in a RH zone." Member Alison Colby-Campbell motioned to approve the Form A plan. Seconded by Member Robert Driscoll. All members present voted in favor. Motion Passed.

Endorsement:

Definitive Plan for Lot 8 Curtis Street:

Member Karen Buckley motioned to endorse the Definitive Plan for Lot 8 Curtis Street. Seconded by Member Kenneth Cram. All members present voted in favor. Motion Passed.

Definitive Plan for South Central Street:

Member Karen Buckley motioned to endorse the definitive plan for South Central Street. Seconded by Member Alison Colby-Campbell. All members present voted in favor. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned.

Signed:

Paul Howard
Chairman