

**CITY OF BEVERLY
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**

BOARD OR COMMISSION: Beverly Planning Board
SUBCOMMITTEE:
DATE: January 20, 2021
LOCATION: Remotely held meeting through Google Hangouts Meet
MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Ellen Hutchinson, Vice-Chair Alexander Craft, Sarah Bartley, Derek Beckwith, Ellen Flannery, Wayne Miller, Rodney Sinclair, Andrea Toulouse
MEMBERS ABSENT:
OTHERS PRESENT: Planning Director Darlene Wynne, Assistant Planning Director Emily Hutchings
RECORDER: Sarah Scott-Nelson

Call to Order

Chairperson Ellen Hutchinson calls the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and reads a prepared statement introducing the meeting, the authority to hold a remote meeting, public access and public participation, and meeting ground rules. She takes roll call attendance.

Supporting materials that have been provided to members of this body are available from the Planning Department. The public is encouraged to follow along using the posted agenda.

Chair Ellen Hutchinson notes that Allison Kilcoyne has resigned and welcomes Rodney Sinclair as a new member of the Planning Board. Sinclair introduces himself.

1. Subdivision Approval Not Required Plans – 9 & 11 Fillmore Street – John Vitale

Hutchinson invites Vitale to share his plot plan and to describe what the original parcels looked like and what the plan is now. Vitale explains the plan, describing how a section of land at 9 Fillmore Street will be transferred to 11 Fillmore Street, reducing the nonconformity of 11 Fillmore Street and having no impact on the conformity of 9 Fillmore Street. Hutchinson asks how large each parcel will be with the change. Vitale states that 11 Fillmore Street will now be 8,000 square feet, while 9 Fillmore Street will be slightly over 11,000 square feet. Beckwith comments that the frontage on 11 Fillmore Street is also nonconforming, and that there is not enough frontage between the two parcels to make them both conforming. Wynne comments that there is no requirement that it has to become more conforming. Hutchinson confirms that all three standards are met. Miller asks about the proposed garage at 11 Fillmore Street, shown on the plan, and what direction the garage door will face. Vitale notes that the garage door to be facing the street.

Miller: Moves to endorse a plan for 9 & 11 Fillmore Street as an Approval Not Required. Seconded by Toulouse. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Flannery: Moves to recess for Public Hearing. Seconded by Miller. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

2. Public Hearing: Modification to Site Plan Review #141-19 – 108 Bridge Street – 108 Bridge Street Development LLC c/o David Cutler

Wynne reads the public notice. Atty. Thomas Alexander, representing the applicant, describes the project and notes that only minor changes have been made from what was approved in September of 2019, including the reconfiguration of an easement so that the neighbor at 106 Bridge Street can access their driveway directly from Bridge Street, rather than from Carleton Avenue. Daniel Ricciarelli, the project architect, comments that the driveway and the angle of the garage for Unit 1 have been altered. Ricciarelli also describes the changes that have been made to the exterior design. Alexander states that the location of the four units is the same, but there is no longer a paved easement at the rear of 108 Bridge Street, and the area instead will be landscaped.

Hutchinson asks if there has been a square footage change to any of the housing units. Applicant David Cutler states that Unit 1 has increased by about 100 square feet and in front of Units 2-4 there are front balconies, with the balcony on Unit 4 wrapping around the side of the building. Sinclair comments that it looks like there is a significant grade change on the property and asks about runoff plans. Alexander replies that this should not be an issue and that neighbors at the bottom of the hill have had no flooding in their basement. He notes that a drainage plan was submitted during the original application, and no changes have been made.

Miller asks Flannery about previous Design Review Board discussions. Flannery comments that the Design Review Board recommended that the Planning Board approve the plan, and concluded that all the Design Review Board's requests had been met. Craft asks about the specific location of the previous easement and how its removal will change the property. Cutler confirms that the rear area where the easement was previously located will now be grass and part of a common area, not for specific use of one of the units. Hutchinson asks how many cars the driveway on 106 Bridge Street will hold and whether there is street parking in front of the property on Bridge Street. Cutler and Ricciarelli reply that there is room for 2 cars in the 106 Bridge Street driveway, and there is ample street parking as well.

Hutchinson asks if there are letters from other Boards or Commissions. Hutchings states that the Design Review Board and the Parking and Traffic Commission have both provided letters recommending that the Planning Board approve the modification and noting that other previously required conditions should be maintained.

Beckwith asks if the Bridge Street rendering is in the packet the Board received. Hutchinson confirms that it was included. The Board reviews the changes to each elevation, comparing the previously approved plan with the revised renderings. Hutchinson asks whether there are comments from members of the public and hears none.

Flannery: Moves to close the public hearing. Seconded by Beckwith. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Craft: Moves that the Planning Board approve the modifications to Site Plan Review #141-19 at 108 Bridge Street with regards to the updated, revised proposed plan, incorporating the submitted letters from the Design Review Board and Parking and Traffic Commission. Sinclair asks about bringing back the drainage plan for review. Cutler says that the only change is that with the removal of the easement at the rear of the property, the impervious driveway is changed to grass. Sinclair rescinds his question. The motion is seconded by Flannery. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

3. Discussion/Decision: Minor Modification to Site Plan Review #78-04 – 19 Dodge Street – Brian K. Olsen, CVS Health – c/o Marlon Gonzales, Menemsha

Hutchinson states that there are two parts in this discussion: determining if the modification is minor in nature; and either voting on the modification, or scheduling a public hearing if the modification is considered major. David Godfrey, representing the applicant, explains the request to place kiosk -style COVID-19 testing facility, which will be a temporary structure, for testing and potentially vaccines. This plan includes the structure placed close to the building, blocking off certain spaces in the parking lot with Jersey barriers for safety reasons and reserving several parking spaces for those with appointments at the kiosk. Applicant representative Kevin Nelson states that those with appointments will be checked in at their cars by a clinician, and will then go into the kiosk with the clinician for testing or vaccination. Nelson states that there will be only four appointments every hour, which, in conjunction with the buffer parking spot, will protect healthy customers.

Beckwith asks about the material of the kiosk unit. Nelson states that it is a modular unit of aluminum and is connected to a panel on the building for electricity. Beckwith comments that parking on the site is already tight and taking 5 spots away may further complicate that; he asks if there are any plans for improving traffic flow. Nelson comments that because of staggered appointments and signage will indicate the by-appointment system, there are no other plans concerning traffic flow. Beckwith asks how long the temporary structure will remain on the site. Nelson states that the kiosks are expected to remain on site for up to one year.

Wynne comments that the Police and Fire departments have found no issues with the barriers and staggered appointment times, and that the Health Department and the City Engineer also found no issues from a technical perspective. Hutchinson asks about the distance from the CVS drive-through to the kiosk. Nelson replies that the distance is about 12-16 feet, so there is no health concern.

Sinclair asks if other areas on the property been explored for the location of the kiosk to potentially mitigate traffic congestion. Nelson replies that the kiosk does need to be located close to the building to have safe access to electricity.

Bartley asks if cars will be able to flow through the first traffic aisle where the kiosk is located, and if there are any concerns about the loss of parking. Nelson replies that the Jersey barriers are not as imposing as they look on the plan, that traffic can flow through the aisle, and the parking

lot was deemed large enough for this unit. Beckwith asks if people will wait for results on the property after their appointments. Nelson replies that there will be no waiting for results, people will be contacted via phone with results. Hutchinson asks if it would be overly cautious to prevent a turn up the first aisle. Godfrey replies that this would create more of a traffic problem. Beckwith suggests that a sign be placed for cars coming out of the drive through to continue to the next exit. Nelson states that this would be acceptable, and agrees to get the signage in place.

Beckwith: Moves that the Planning Board determine that the modification request for Site Plan Review #78-04 – 19 Dodge Street, to install a temporary kiosk for the purposes of COVID-19 testing and / or vaccination be determined as minor in nature. Seconded by Craft. Hearing no further discussion on the motion, Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Beckwith: Moves that the Planning Board approve the Minor Modification request for Site Plan Review #78-04 – 19 Dodge Street, to install a temporary kiosk for the purposes of COVID-19 testing and / or vaccination, for up to one year, to be removed by January 20, 2022. Seconded by Craft. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

4. Election of 2021 Officers – Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Hutchinson turns over control of the Board to Craft. Craft asks for nominations for Chair of the Beverly Planning Board.

Beckwith: Nominates Ellen Hutchinson as Chair. Seconded by Toulouse. Craft takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 7-0-1, Hutchinson abstaining.

Hutchinson asks for nominations for Vice Chair.

Beckwith: Nominates Craft as Vice Chair. Seconded by Flannery. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 7-0-1, Craft abstaining.

5. Approval of Minutes: December 15, 2020

The Board reviews the minutes and offers edits.

Craft: Moves to approve the December 15, 2020 minutes as amended. Seconded by Flannery. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 7-0, Sinclair abstaining.

6. Other / New business

Wynne raises the issue of setting the Inclusionary Housing Fee for the Affordable Housing Trust. Beckwith asks a clarification about the formula. Wynne notes how the change in the fee is calculated and offers to send the excel sheet to the Board. Hutchinson comments that it would be beneficial if the Assessor's Office could provide a neighborhood map, and raises questions about

the condominiums being classified as their own category instead of being assigned to a neighborhood. The Board discusses the regulations surrounding condominiums versus single-family homes in terms of the sales fee.

Craft: Moves to endorse the 2021 Inclusionary Housing Fee in lieu of Calculation Matrix. Seconded by Beckwith. Hearing no discussion, Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.

Hutchinson notes that she was disappointed with the lack of preparation by some of the meeting's applicants, and suggests reminding applicants to come prepared ready to present their requests, including a description of how it meets relevant requirements. Hutchinson notes that one of the applicants presented their request as though their changes were not significant and had to be guided through what to present to the Board. Toulouse and Bartley echo Hutchinson's sentiments. Hutchings comments that this particular applicant has consistently needed additional guidance to understand the process and how to submit a complete application.

Miller states that there is not very clear guidance on what constitutes a minor modification and that sometimes a strategic choice to not be upfront with the Board, so that the Board may consider changes to be minor because the applicant treated them as minor. Wynne states that applicants' levels of experience may vary, and that two of the applicants at the meeting were less experienced. She agreed that clearer guidance can be provided to applicants to clarify expectations of the Planning Board.

Adjournment

Toulouse: Moves to adjourn at 8:47 p.m. Seconded by Craft. Hutchinson takes a roll call vote. The motion carries 8-0.