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Introduction

Vision Plan Summary

In 2015, the Board of Selectmen and Planning Board for the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea appointed a Master Plan Committee (MPC) tasked with the responsibility of engaging the community, building consensus, and creating a new 10-year Master Plan that could help guide community land use decisions. The planning process proceeded in two phases: Visioning followed by Study & Recommendations.

Throughout 2016, the Master Plan Committee engaged in both internal visioning with Town boards, committees, and departments, as well as external outreach and visioning with the larger community. Working with its consultant, the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC), the MPC hosted community visioning events in the form of targeted focus groups, tabling events, an online survey taken by 549 residents, and a well-attended Vision Open House. Following an internal and community review of the Visioning for the Master Plan draft report, it was adopted in December 2016.

The findings of the Visioning for the Master Plan report are organized around five key themes grouped under two main headings that represent ideals for Manchester-by-the-Sea: Strong Community and Good Governance.

Strong Community Themes:

- **Natural** – Preserving our natural resources is critical to Manchester’s character, environmental health and social well-being.
- **Built** – Our built environment, including public infrastructure and facilities, schools, housing, and businesses that support our local economy must be cared for. Well maintained public infrastructure and facilities are a top priority.
- **Social** – We value those elements of our community that contribute to a high quality of life: housing that is affordable, support for seniors, recreational facilities and programs, and opportunities for social interactions including community events.

Good Governance Themes:

- **Financial Management** – Management of the Town’s finances to fund public infrastructure and facilities requires that the Town identify and assess spending, funding opportunities, and choices.
- **Working Together** – The Town’s best chance for success in meeting its challenges is creating a process that is transparent, engages more residents, and focuses on working together respectfully.

These themes were bolstered by findings from the online survey and other public outreach throughout the visioning phase and served to help identify the most widely-held community values, a foundation for the Master Plan. When asked by the survey to identify what top 6 community values are most important, residents prioritized well maintained public infrastructure, open space and natural resources, a high quality school system, and fiscally responsible local government.
what [top 6] community values are most important to you?

- Well maintained public infrastructure (water, sewer, stormwater, roads and sidewalks) 420 votes
- Open space and natural resources including the harbor, beaches, water resources, and conservation areas 393 votes
- A high quality school system 389 votes
- Fiscally responsible local government 332 votes
- Managed growth/development to balance revenues and sustain public services, facilities, and infrastructure 207 votes
- Inclusive and supportive community for people of all ages and walks of life 206 votes
- Strong local economy with a variety of commercial activity 185 votes
- Recreation facilities including parks, playgrounds and playing fields 185 votes
- Environmental sustainability and climate change resiliency 175 votes
- Ability to get around using different modes of transportation (walkable/bikable community) 168 votes
- Housing options for a range of household incomes and life stages 150 votes
- Active community participation, communication, and spirit of volunteerism 123 votes
- Rich variety of civic and cultural programs, events, and facilities 117 votes

what do you consider to be the [top 6] greatest assets facing the town? the [top 6] greatest challenges?

- natural landscape/scenic views 279 votes
- beaches 443 votes
- harbor 314 votes
- housing options 12 votes
- exceptional buildings 11 votes
- variety of neighborhoods 24 votes
- town center 285 votes
- low crime/personal safety 361 votes
- small town/rural character 312 votes
- support for seniors 66 votes
- recreational programs 55 votes
- level of public services 74 votes
- transportation options 99 votes
- recreational resources 174 votes
- schools 321 votes
- public facilities 22 votes
- community spirit 163 votes
- other votes 141 votes

Greatest asset votes

Greatest challenge votes
When asked to identify Manchester-by-the-Sea’s assets and challenges, residents chose natural resources such as beaches and the harbor, the downtown, schools, and the town’s rural character and low crime as top assets. Top challenges included housing options, public facilities, and level of public services.

The themes and values captured during the roughly year-long visioning phase culminated in a Vision Statement that reflects the Town’s view of itself and can help guide the final crafting and adoption of a Master Plan.

---

**A Vision for Manchester-by-the-Sea**

In 2027, Manchester-by-the-Sea embodies the character, beauty and resilience of a small New England town.

Our fiscally responsible and transparent Government manages growth and development to honor the town’s authentic character and balance revenues to sustain public services and infrastructure.

Accessible open space and well-managed green spaces, harbor, shoreline, and beaches reflect the town’s long-term commitment to its natural resources.

Balanced and diverse housing options, a strong local economy, walkable neighborhoods, a dynamic downtown, and an exceptional public school system are the foundation that we have built for our healthy community.

Respect for the ideas and contributions of residents, volunteers, and Town employees is a fundamental principle for working together and sustaining community spirit.

---

**Scope of Study**

The focus of the second phase of the Master Plan process was to undertake a Housing, Economic Development, and Land Use Scenario Study and identify supporting recommendations that will inform those three elements of the Master Plan. MAPC worked with Town planning staff and the MPC to create a series of maps and smart growth development scenarios to reflect development and preservation potential and other ideas for Manchester-by-the-Sea. Recommendations were offered and tested following identification of a preferred scenario.

In order to craft the development scenarios, Town staff and the MPC identified areas of town that could potentially be well-suited for residential and/or commercial development based on environmental, economic, demographic, and other criteria. MAPC then used new GIS-based
modeling tools to predict the impact that different development scenarios might have if they were built. Input from focus groups, an online survey, and two Community Open Houses helped refine the scenarios explored during this process. Scenarios developed by MAPC and the MPC were compared against the baseline "business as usual" buildout scenario allowed under current zoning. The scenarios tested how zoning changes in targeted locations could affect overall buildout and development potential in town. A more detailed explanation of the scenario development process is described in section 3, following Recommendations.
Recommendations

The following strategies support Manchester’s Community Vision and the preferred scenarios identified through this Land Use, Housing and Economic Development Study.

Land Use Strategies

Strategy 1: Create a Planned Development Overlay District in the LCD to accommodate a greater diversity and density of commercial development, assisted living, housing, public facilities, and other needs.

- Purpose: Add revenue, service, and housing options
- Timeframe: 1 to 3 years

Because the Limited Commercial District holds both environmental resources and scarce developable land, development considered for the area should be measured in a comprehensive fashion that meets the needs of the town and is developed under high environmental standards approved by the town. In order to best accomplish this, MAPC recommends that the Town consider adopting an overlay district for the LCD based on the following process:

a) Rather than create a traditional overlay district with pre-determined uses and dimensional standards that the developer then has to match in its application, the Town chooses to create a process where developers present concept plans to the Town, details about the size and type of the project they want to pursue, building and landscaping plans, impact studies, supporting documentation, and a list of any underlying zoning regulations that are not met by the project.

b) Following presentation of the concept plan, also known as the Preliminary Development and Use Plan, the Planning Board holds a community-wide public hearing and, if approved, the plan ultimately goes to Town Meeting. A Town Meeting vote will determine the approval of the concept plan; the use, dimensional, and other requirements; and the establishment of the Planned Development Overlay District (PDD).

c) By approving a PDD, Town Meeting creates a two-year window within which the Planning Board may grant a special permit and site plan approval for a detailed plan that substantially conforms to the developer’s preliminary development and use plan.

d) Depending on the detailed plan, the project may require a second community-wide public hearing process.

e) The district designation expires if the Planning Board does not grant a special permit within two years or if the developer fails to construct under the special permit within two years of its issuance.

f) Although the PDD zoning model is a long process, the collaborative public process that developers and the Planning Board follow may be a good fit for Manchester-by-the-Sea and the site. Other towns such as Lincoln, Berlin, and Lexington have used this process to successfully create this type of planned development overlay district.
Strategy 2: Draft a Town Character Statement and adopt design guidelines (with images and text) to document and encourage desired physical characteristics.

- Purpose: Plan for and preserve town character
- Timeframe: 1 to 3 years

The Manchester-by-the-Sea Town Character Statement (TCS) would be designed to describe the distinctive qualities and characteristics of the community from the perspective of the residents. It is a non-regulatory guidance document that identifies and discusses the many common and unique features of the town.

Design guidelines provide non-binding recommendations to landowners about how they can build and renovate properties in a way that is sensitive to Manchester’s character. These guidelines would provide detailed information in text and pictures about context and site planning, building massing, and building elements like materials, awnings, entries, and more.

The goal of the TCS and Design Guidelines is to preserve the distinct historic character of Manchester-by-the-Sea as well as protect the diverse community and environmental resources that define the town. The TCS and Design Guidelines are resources for developers, community members, and Town officials.

Strategy 3: Develop a framework for assessing Town-owned land for potential uses, including resource protection, housing, public facilities, and economic development, or to save for future needs.

- Purpose: Actively manage Town lands
- Timeframe: 1 to 3 years

Land uses should be informed by the land’s physical attributes including existing use and conditions, resources, location, surrounding uses, access, available utilities and other attributes. A land assessment framework would identify policies and procedures for assessing Town-owned land prior to making a decision on how land should be used. It would outline attributes to be assessed, a ranking procedure and public communication and engagement recommendations.

Strategy 4: Assess the potential for relocating the Wastewater Treatment Facility from its current location at the end of its useful life to allow for redevelopment that focuses on harbor uses and needs.

- Purpose: Add revenue and strengthen connection to harbor
- Timeframe: 4 to 7 years

With the Wastewater Treatment Facility nearing the end of its useful life in the next ten to fifteen years, now is the time to consider alternatives to this use on the waterfront. It is expected that a pumping station would likely need to remain, however the balance of the site may offer opportunities for different uses including an expansion of mixed use, housing and public access. Redevelopment of the site would also consider the projected impacts of climate change.
Strategy 5: Review and update Town strategies, policies, zoning and general bylaws, and capital plans for clarity, climate resiliency, and climate change improvements on a five-year basis to coincide with the renewal of the Town’s federally-mandated natural hazard mitigation planning process.

- Purpose: Incorporate resiliency and prepare for climate change
- Timeframe: Ongoing

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requires state and local governments to develop and adopt hazard mitigation plans as a condition for receiving certain types of non-emergency disaster assistance, including funding for mitigation projects. Jurisdictions must update their Hazard Mitigation Plans and re-submit them for FEMA approval every five years. The Town should use this opportunity to review and update all associated strategies, policies, bylaws and capital plans to reflect current climate change projections and up-to-date best practices.

Strategy 6: Institute an annual all-boards and committees workshop; develop a follow-up tracking mechanism for resulting ideas and projects.

- Purpose: Increase Town boards/committees communication and efficiency
- Timeframe: Ongoing

The purpose for holding these annual workshops would be to report on on-going projects, share ideas for new projects, provide information on best practices, and reflect on town planning, preservation, and development goals.

Housing Strategies

Strategy 1: Review allowed uses in established residential zones to determine if they allow for the housing types needed.

- Purpose: Allow for more diversity in housing types
- Timeframe: 1 to 3 years

Manchester’s current residential zoning does little to encourage the diversity of housing options needed to meet local demand, including affordable rental and ownership opportunities for families, young adults, and seniors, market rate housing for downsizing, and accessible units. Ideas to consider include allowing a greater variety of uses by right, eliminating or reducing obstacles to housing types such as accessory units, two-family and multi-family units, and considering density bonuses for development consistent with local needs (affordable units, small or accessible units, etc.).

In addition, the Zoning Bylaw offers a definition for Dwelling and Dwelling Unit only. The Town should consider adding definitions for Two-family, Multi-family, and Attached Single-family dwelling units to clarify and update the bylaw and specifically allow a broader range of housing options.
Strategy 2: Update zoning to allow more housing variety and density in the General District by right or Special Permit, to encourage more housing downtown to support businesses, increase walkability and increase housing diversity.

- Purpose: Increase residential uses downtown
- Timeframe: 1 to 3 years

The Town does allow for new developments up to four units in new or enlarged dwellings within the General District, up to 15 units per acre, by Special Permit. It should consider allowing buildings containing more than four units within the G District by Special Permit, to encourage greater use of multi-family development downtown, allow for design flexibility, and encourage high quality proposals.

Strategy 3: Create a new Downtown Mixed Use Overlay District with accompanying design guidelines and regulation.

- Purpose: Increase residential uses downtown
- Timeframe: 4 to 7 years

The Zoning Bylaw does not currently permit mixed use buildings. It should consider adding a definition for Residential Mixed Use and allowing it by Special Permit (or right) within the General District. As an alternative to allowing mixed-use by special permit in the General District, the town could create a new Downtown Mixed Use Overlay District with accompanying design guidelines and regulations. This could also offer an opportunity to address projected climate change impacts in the downtown.

Strategy 4: Examine Open Space Planning zoning and consider updating parcel size, allowing a diversity of housing types, adding open space and housing bonuses.

- Purpose: Increase incentives for and flexibility of cluster-type developments
- Timeframe: 4 to 7 years

Manchester currently offers an Open Space Planning option under its zoning. In order to preserve open space while using land more efficiently while offering more housing options, the town should consider studying its Open Space Planning option as follows:

a) Revisit the required parcel sizes in the A, C, and E Districts and determine if the current minimums of 20 acres in the E and C Districts and 10 acres in the A District are still best for the town’s needs.
b) Study allowing more housing options beyond single-family detached in the Open Space Planning option.
c) Consider including density bonuses for plans offering greater open space or affordable housing in excess of that required by the town’s Inclusionary Zoning bylaw.
d) Determine how features from the Open Space Planning and Planned Residential Development could be combined into one bylaw.
**Strategy 5:** Modify the Accessory Dwelling Unit Bylaw by decreasing the minimum lot size required, reducing the amount of off-street parking required and allowing conversion of garage, stable, or other detached structures.

- **Purpose:** Allow more accessory units
- **Timeframe:** 1 to 3 years
- **Purpose:** Create housing in existing accessory structures
- **Timeframe:** 4 to 7 years

Current language in the bylaw calls for twice the required lot size in all Single Family Districts except District E and parking spaces for four vehicles. The current bylaw also only allows accessory units in a detached structure to be occupied by an employee of the property’s owner and must be employed on the premise.

**Strategy 6:** Study potential impacts of expanding the area within the General District to create more opportunities for residential mixed-use in the downtown area.

- **Purpose:** Increase downtown area
- **Timeframe:** 4 to 7 years

Expanding the area within the General District could make a number of existing uses conforming and would allow more opportunities for incremental commercial and residential growth close to transit, goods and services.

**Strategy 7:** Identify potential location for a 40R/40S District to increase housing density through local actions and receive state funds for increasing housing.

- **Purpose:** Assess benefits of increased density in select locations
- **Timeframe:** 8+ years

Possible areas to consider: Parcels within the General District, the current site of the Mason’s Lodge, the current DPW site, or as part of the development of an overall mixed use overlay district for the Limited Commercial District.

In 2004, Massachusetts enacted the Smart Growth Zoning and Housing Production Act (“Chapter 40R”). Chapter 40R encourages cities and towns to zone for compact residential and mixed-use development in “smart growth” locations by offering financial incentives and control over design. It is unique in providing for direct cash payments to cities and towns that create zoning overlay districts that meet location and procedural standards set out in the statute. Localities become eligible for a zoning incentive payment when they adopt the overlay and a density bonus payment ($3,000 a unit) if and when units are built using it. There are no restrictions on how municipalities use their 40R payments.

The districts must be in “smart growth” locations (near transit or commercial centers, in areas with existing infrastructure, or otherwise highly suitable) and local officials must certify that existing infrastructure (water and sewer) is or will be adequate. Locations are presumed to be highly
suitable if they have been identified as an appropriate location for higher-density development in a local plan adopted prior to the submission of the 40R application. The district overlay must allow housing to be built as of right at densities ranging from 8 single-family homes per acre to 20 apartment units per acre. It must also require that at least 20% of the new units be affordable. This program allows communities to set detailed design standards for projects built in the districts and to reject projects that don’t meet the standards. To address fears about school impacts, a companion law (40 S) offers “school cost” insurance.

**Strategy 8: Similar to Open Space Planning, examine the Planned Residential District to see if it still fits the Town’s needs.**

- **Purpose:** Simplify zoning
- **Timeframe:** 8+ years

Designed for development that allows a mix of housing types while preserving open space in a cluster style similar to the town’s Open Space Planning zoning, the PRD is allowed in the Residential C and E Districts and requires a minimum parcel size of 50 acres. Decreasing the minimum required lot size could help increase its use but the PRD may be redundant if provisions from the Open Space Planning and PRD sections are combined into one bylaw, or if both are combined with the Resident Conservation Cluster bylaw to form one updated Open Space Preservation Cluster Bylaw.

**Economic Development Strategies**

**Strategy 1: Revise zoning in the Limited Commercial District to allow more commercial and residential opportunities such as community housing, medical, assisted living, hotel and others.**

- **Purpose:** Add revenue, service, and housing options in LCD
- **Timeframe:** 1 to 3 years

Manchester-by-the-Sea should integrate an assisted living village with support services such as medical facilities and offices within the Limited Commercial District.

**Strategy 2: Find new and innovative ways to alleviate parking restraints and encourage other forms of transportation, such as a pedestrian connection from Town Hall parking lot to Beach Street, a parking garage in the Commuter Rail parking lot, and Transportation Management Strategies like shared parking, paid parking, and others.**

- **Purpose:** Improve downtown circulation and mobility
- **Timeframe:** 1 to 3 years

The Town should identify potential funding for a parking and circulation study to ease the parking situation in downtown Manchester-by-the-Sea. The Town should implement findings that may
include pursuing funding of parking garage on the Commuter Rail parking lot. Additionally, the Town should create a pedestrian connection between the Town Hall parking lot and Beach Street.

**Strategy 3: Actively support the development and operation of a Business Group to foster long-term stability and growth for Downtown businesses.**

- **Purpose:** Strengthen downtown businesses
- **Timeframe:** 1 to 3 years

This could involve the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea creating an online directory of businesses, hosting trainings and business support events, starting a “Shop Local” program, and creating a downtown business map advertising local business. The Town could also provide technical support, advocate in the regulatory process, and create a business retention program where it visits and strategizes with local businesses.

**Strategy 4: Revise zoning Downtown to generate more commercial and residential opportunities such as residential over retail or a boutique hotel.**

- **Purpose:** Add revenue, service, and housing options downtown
- **Timeframe:** 1 to 3 years

Revised zoning in the Downtown should focus on encouraging village-scale development that will create a vibrant mixed-use downtown. Height, mass and general scale should not be significantly different than what exists today. Additional uses with community support include boutique hotels, and residential over retail.

**Strategy 5: Work with state and regional education and economic development agencies to assess the feasibility of marine educational programs/facilities, a marine aquaculture industry, and recreation programs/facilities.**

- **Purpose:** Strengthen harbor and maritime industries
- **Timeframe:** 4 to 7 years

Manchester has a commercial fleet that is ranked 19th in the state; last year the wholesale value of lobster was $1.5 million and retail was $6 million. Lobstering is currently well managed and sustainable. The Town should work with state and regional education and economic development agencies to assess the feasibility of additional marine based industries such as aquaculture and small-scale charter/cruise boats.

Boutique hotels in small towns are generally ideal for leisure travelers, especially in communities like Manchester-by-the-Sea that already have a tourism industry. Although finding financing in the hotel development arena can be difficult (there is a financial viability in having independently-owned boutique hotels in smaller communities), there are various incentive programs and grants that make them unique, as options developers can pursue when considering taking on a boutique hotel in town.
Strategy 6: Seek opportunities to create more public access to the harbor including a harborwalk.

- Purpose: Improve public waterfront access
- Timeframe: 8+ years

Focusing on the harbor, through improved access, maintenance, and management will help Manchester retain its authentic character that is defined in a large part by its relationship to the water.

Strategy 7: Consider an Estate Preservation bylaw that would allow the conversion of large estates for commercial, institutional and residential uses.

- Purpose: Add revenue and preserve character
- Timeframe: 8+ years

The re-use of estates (large homes and grounds) could provide opportunities for an inn, conference/event space, a spa, studios of any variety, healing centers, housing, and an education facility. Beverly and Ipswich have added this option successfully.

Strategy 8: Assess the cost and benefits provided by a waterfront Harbormaster facility.

- Purpose: Improve safety and support harbor activities
- Timeframe: 8+ years

Active management of Manchester’s harbor and maritime environment has strong support from the community as these resources are at the core of the Town’s culture, image and quality of life. Providing an appropriate Harbormaster facility demonstrate the community’s commitment to its water based assets and may improve safety and public services. The facility would include public restrooms and other amenities.

Strategy 9: Work with businesses to support transportation services between the Limited Commercial District and Downtown, such as a bus trolley system or a region-wide shuttle service.

- Purpose: Increase connectivity from LCD to downtown
- Timeframe: 8+ years

Assess potential for transportation options such as a bus trolley system, similar to one in Sanford, Maine, that could connect multiple areas, such as parking lots, the commuter rail station, and points of recreation. There may also be an opportunity to work with other Cape Ann communities to consider a region-wide shuttle service.
Plan Process

Scenario Development

The scenario development process used during this project is depicted in the following process diagram. The maps were part of an iterative process to identify and assess development and preservation ideas. Manchester-by-the-Sea residents and other stakeholders were able to provide feedback on the ideas throughout the scenario-refining steps. Assumptions and equations used for the scenario development can be found in the Appendix.
Map residential and commercial capacity of each parcel under current zoning:

Through this mapping exercise, the Master Plan Committee could see which parcels may be able to accommodate development under current zoning. This map showed no change in allowed land uses, but instead showed which parcels had additional capacity for residential and commercial development. Most areas that showed opportunities for commercial square footage are located north of 128 in the Limited Commercial District. Small parcels in the downtown area and large parcels on the eastern and western parts of town that are largely surrounded by open space showed the most additional capacity for residential development.

Map buildout of development parcels at current zoning:

This mapping exercise allowed the Master Plan Committee to test specific parcels that could potentially be developed in the future based on the capacity map and local knowledge. The buildout showed, under current zoning, the maximum number of dwelling units and commercial square feet that selected parcels could accommodate, as well as the sorts of impacts and revenues that the upper-bound of development would create. Many sites that showed capacity in the last mapping exercise are areas that residents do not want to see developed, such as the Essex Country Club and Town-owned land on the border of Beverly. Even at full buildout of parcels, current zoning does not allow for dense development outside the General District in the center of town.
**Map buildout of development parcels under smart growth zoning:**

Similar to the last mapping exercise, this exercise showed the buildout of selected parcels, except under a smart growth zoning scenario. This enabled the community to compare the difference in potential development square footage and impacts between selected parcels under current and smart growth zoning. This map was presented at the focus group meetings and the first Open House so stakeholders could weigh in on the development options. Many residents felt that the upper-bound of development on these sites under the smart growth scenario was too high to preserve community character.

**Map the impacts of developments at smart growth buildout:**

This mapping exercise took the ideas from the previous map iterations that were shown to have the most support and combined them into a map of broad goals for development in the town. Impacts were broken into three broad types—Transformative, Concentrated, and Supportive—and assigned to the different development areas. Impacts, including tax revenue and water usage are derived from realistic development amounts under overlay zoning using development types discussed with the town.

**Map land use scenario:**

This was the final map presented during the public process documenting the full land use scenario developed by MAPC in response to resident input. The map was updated based on feedback received at the last Open House. The final land use scenario map is on the next page.
Community Engagement

June Open House

Manchester-by-the-Sea’s Master Plan Committee and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) hosted a Master Plan Scenario Open House the evening of Wednesday, June 21, 2017. When attendees arrived, they had a chance to mingle and take a first look at the Open House stations. Sue Brown, Town Planner, and Susan Beckmann, MPC Co-Chair, then welcomed attendees to the event and introduced the Committee and MAPC staff. Following their introduction, Sam Cleaves, Project Manager, gave a brief presentation summarizing the Visioning Phase of the Master Plan and the scenario development process. After the presentation, MAPC, with assistance from Town staff and the MPC, hosted six interactive stations where participants could provide input to help shape the Master Plan Scenario. Approximately 100 people were in attendance.

**Station 1: Capital Plan and Revenues.** The first station allowed attendees to compare Manchester-by-the-Sea’s capital needs with anticipated revenues. This was meant to illustrate the purpose for the entire scenario development exercise: the Town has a major funding gap. Based on multi-year budget projections and the need for infrastructure improvements, the Town calculates that it will need to spend almost $3 million a year on capital maintenance and investments. Further, capital expenditures for new facilities over the next 15 years total more than $50 million.

**Station 2: Getting Around.** The Town and MAPC, in partnership with Toole Design Group, engaged in a nine-month Complete Streets Prioritization Planning process during 2017. The Planning Team developed a prioritized list of eighteen project concepts that the Town has submitted to the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) for funding consideration as part of MassDOT’s Complete Streets Funding Program. The recommended interventions range from intersection reconfigurations to the installation of bicycle racks, bicycle lanes, and benches. MAPC ranked each project according to an evaluation criteria defined by the Town’s Complete Streets Task Force. The criteria includes four equally weighted factors: demand, safety, stakeholder input, and opportunities and constraints. Attendees had the opportunity to provide feedback on project concepts displayed.
Station 3: Housing and Land Use Scenario Map. This station revealed the results of the preliminary scenario development exercise and asked attendees to weigh in on ideas presented. A menu of smart growth ideas were displayed on a map, including potential sites for medical/office development in the Limited Commercial District (LCD) north of Route 128, an assisted living complex in the LCD, mixed use development with ground floor retail in the downtown area, and multifamily development on scattered sites throughout Manchester-by-the-Sea. Also included in the menu of options were potential locations for the preservation of open space and for construction of Town-owned facilities for public safety and utilities.

For each of the development options, projected impacts were listed, including the maximum number of new housing units that could be added under model zoning (minus space for parking and building setbacks), commercial square footage, tax revenue, vehicle trips per day, residents, residents in the labor force, schools students, education expenditures, and gallons of water consumed per day. This was under the assumption that the ultimate number of housing units would be far less after modifications to final zoning and permitting considerations such as traffic, waste water treatment, landscaping and other design considerations.

Station 4: What should it look like? In addition to inquiring about which scenario options Manchester-by-the-Sea residents most supported, the Open House provided an opportunity for participants to identify what they thought potential growth should look like. This was done through a visual preference survey where attendees could pick out building designs they like (from both Manchester-by-the-Sea and elsewhere) and write comments saying what they liked about the designs. Participants were specifically asked to offer input on design ideas for offices and assisted living in the Limited Commercial District, mixed use in the downtown area, and other housing options throughout town.

Station 5: What do we want and where do we want it? This station provided another opportunity for Open House attendees to share what they would like to see in town and where. Using icon stickers and post-its, participants marked-up a map of Manchester-by-the-Sea to share what business and housing types they would like to see and where in town. The icons were split between 11 various business types and six different housing types—ideas that MAPC compiled from working group meetings with community stakeholders.
Station 6: Where do we go from here? At the last station, Open House attendees were asked to write what they think are the most important things that the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea needs to do to move forward. They were also asked to generate other ideas for development of the Land Use Plan.

Working Group Meetings

MAPC, with the assistance of the Master Plan Committee and Town Planner, held a series of working group meetings during the scenario development process to get targeted stakeholder feedback on ideas. Working groups/focus groups are designed to obtain input from a broad array of constituents during small group sessions. The MPC-led stakeholder interviews during the beginning of the Visioning Process highlighted the importance of understanding the different issues that residents, Town staff, and volunteers face on a regular basis.

A Housing and Neighborhoods Working Group Meeting was held on the afternoon of May 18, 2017 in the Community Center. Following a brief overview of the planning process to date by MPC Co-chair Susan Beckmann, the 21 attendees from Town boards, committees, and area nonprofits introduced themselves and shared their reasons for becoming involved in the workgroup. MAPC reviewed the Visioning Plan’s goals and introduced the maps with buildouts of development parcels at current zoning and under a smart growth scenario by MAPC and the MPC. After attendees reviewed the map, MAPC engaged them in a facilitated discussion of land use ideas and scenarios: what worked for the group, what might need to be modified or replaced, how the Town might pay for the capital improvements indicated by studies, and what other new ideas the group might like to add.
Many of the responses centered on redevelopment of the downtown area, parking, and mobility, particularly as they relate to accessing Singing Beach and the harbor. While some favored a boutique-style hotel and new mixed uses in the area behind Town Hall and in the General District, others felt that it would create too much traffic and negatively impact town character. Some attendees spoke on the need for a greater diversity of housing types in town, such as through constructing additional mixed use buildings downtown, increasing rental options, and adding workforce housing at the DPW site off Pine Street.

There was a general consensus that parking and traffic flow need to be better managed throughout Manchester-by-the-Sea, with some saying the change in Beach Street parking has not worked, that the Town needs to consider various options such as offering drop-off zones at the beach, and that structured parking should be added near the train station. Attendees also suggested allowing shared parking arrangements, using the High School parking lot for seasonal downtown parking, creating park and pedal options at the Manchester Athletic Club and/or in the Limited Commercial District, and making Pine Street safer and more attractive for bike and pedestrian connections to the downtown and harbor.

In the afternoon of May 25, 2017, the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea and MAPC held an Economic Development and Public Facilities Working Group Meeting at the Manchester Community Center. Twenty people representing various businesses and organizations within town attended the working group meeting.

A brief overview of economic and labor data was presented by MAPC, highlighting wage, tax, and employer data in Manchester-by-the-Sea. The group then had an open dialog about which types of businesses the town should target, how to better utilize the waterfront, and what new development complements the town’s historic character and sense of place. Lastly, attendees participated in an exercise to identify which type of economic activity and development they would like to see in Downtown Manchester, the Limited Commercial District, and town-wide.

Finally, MAPC and the Town facilitated a joint Working Group Meeting at the Manchester Community Center on October 19, 2017. Those attending took part in breakout groups and gave input on the draft action strategies, including selecting their top land use, housing, and economic development strategies crafted during the scenario development and mapping process. Attendees also took part in an activity where they used housing icons to indicate where they would distribute 150 additional units of housing over a ten-year period, reflecting the current annual home building rate for the Town.

December Open House

The MPC and MAPC hosted a Master Plan Draft Recommendations Open House the evening of December 5, 2017. The leading purpose of the meeting was to evaluate draft strategies developed for housing, land use, and economic development elements, as well as associated
efforts related to the Master Planning effort like improving mobility and open space protection. Master Plan Committee Co-Chairs Susan Beckmann and Gary Russell kicked off the event by introducing staff and giving an overview of the Master Planning process to date. Approximately 75 people were in attendance.

Following the presentation, MAPC and the Town hosted six interactive stations in an open house format. Three stations were organized by topic (land use, housing, and economic development) and were supported by a context description, facts that illustrate the current context, and important questions for considering while participants reviewed and provided feedback on the draft strategies. Staff and MPC members were on hand at each station to answer questions, provide background information, and describe how the strategies were developed. At the housing, land use, and economic development stations, attendees could use dots to select strategies that made sense to them (ranking them as high, medium or low priority) and to indicate what timeframe their chosen strategies should be considered for (short-, medium-, or long-term).

At the other stations, attendees could see the results of the MPC online survey and find out what’s coming next for the Master Plan after the scenario development process is over. There was also a station dedicated to schools, with members of the School Committee on hand to discuss current school district initiatives, challenges, and opportunities.

Multiple copies of the land use scenario maps were available at tables for attendees to provide general and site-specific comments on and 29 comments were posted on the maps. Comments included support for permanently protecting town land in west Manchester and a desire for more affordable housing options, including allowing more than one unit in existing single-family homes and the creation of work force housing for teachers and others providing critical services to the town. There was some support for the creation of new housing at the DPW site and also general acceptance of an expanded General District.

Some offered cautious optimism about being able to do commercial development within the Limited Commercial District, but only if done with strict environmental safeguards. Other comments on posters lauded suggestions for improving bike safety adding bike lanes, as well as creating new trails and improved paths connecting the outlying woods to the harbor, the beach, and the downtown. There was also support for multi-level parking at the existing Commuter Rail parking area.

**Online Survey**

Guided by a clear Community Vision, in Phase II of the Master Planning process residents and other stakeholders identified a number of ideas for protecting the character of Manchester-by-the-Sea while allowing for changes that would improve the Town’s vitality and health. As these potential recommendations emerged, the Master Plan Committee administered an online survey to assess community support and invite additional ideas. The survey asked citizens to share thoughts
on how the Town should manage and position town assets focusing on housing, land use, economic development, infrastructure, and public facilities. It also looked to both share information and ideas and give a voice to as wide an audience as possible. The survey was widely publicized in the Cricket, in local Board of Selectmen monthly mailings, in committee and department newsletters, and on the Town’s web page. Paper copies were made available in Town Hall, the Library, and at Senior Housing sites. 500 residents completed the survey.
Current Context

Land Use Context

Part of what gives any community its unique character is the way land is used, developed, and preserved. From a social, environmental, and financial perspective, land uses have a big impact on a town’s character, livability, and sustainability. “Land use” is a term used to describe the primary use, or combination of uses, occurring on a parcel of land at any given time. A number of factors influence land use patterns over time such as population and economic growth, historical development patterns, infrastructure and transportation investment, environmental constraints, and more. It is not a fixed element of a community, rather it can and does change over time.

The primary land use in Manchester-by-the-Sea is housing, with over half of land in town dedicated to residential use. Approximately a third of land is protected open space, made possible by robust planning and land acquisitions on the part of the Town and the Manchester Essex Conservation Trust. Less than 8% of land in the community is dedicated to commercial or industrial uses. Other land uses in Manchester-by-the-Sea include municipal, institutional, and nonprofit uses. This combination of uses, along with the presence of scenic resources in town like the beaches and harbor, has created a sense of character for the community that residents want to see retained.

However, Manchester-by-the-Sea has a major budget gap. The Town does multi-year budget projections (done through 2027) based on historical experience which reflect an average annual growth rate of approximately 2.5% in order to maintain the current level of services provided by the Town and the School District. The projections only fund a status quo capital maintenance and investment plan, they do not provide for additional infrastructure investments that are needed, including water and sewer pipe replacement, drainage work, and seawall repair that could net $2.9 million a year. Other than basic infrastructure investments, potential capital expenditures for new facilities over the next 15 years total more than $55 million and include the construction of two new elementary schools (one in Manchester-by-the-Sea and one in Essex), construction of a new DPW Garage and Police Station, expansion of the Library, upgrades to Town Hall, and water and sewer plant upgrades. The Wastewater Treatment Facility has an estimated remaining useful life of about ten years.

Some targeted development can enable the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea to more readily address its backlog of capital needs while maintaining smart growth principles. In general, there is limited good land available for development. However, there may be opportunities to redevelop existing sites in the community to generate additional tax revenue that is not being captured by their current use. Further, there is potentially developable land in the Limited Commercial District (LCD) north of Route 128, including six acres of Town-owned land and 64 acres on the east side of the district that are privately-held and undeveloped. There are about 174 acres of privately-held, undeveloped land on the west side of the LCD, though they have some limitations due to wetland and other resources. There are also more than 60 acres of undeveloped Town-owned land in western Manchester that are currently being identified and assessed.

To meet the Community Vision developed during the Visioning Phase, Manchester-by-the-Sea needs to manage its land to preserve the town’s historic small town, coastal character and to
protect and celebrate the town’s natural resources including harbor and beaches, uplands, and wetlands. Further, land must be managed to provide for economic development opportunities, a diversity of housing options in safe and livable neighborhoods, public facilities (buildings, parks & open spaces, cemeteries, infrastructure) and a vibrant town center.

Housing Context

Manchester-by-the-Sea's population and housing supply have been generally stable since the 1990's; the population has changed less than 1% in the last 20 years, from 5,623 in 1997 to 5,620 in 2017. However, home sizes, number of rooms per home, and home prices in town are all growing, with prices for homes among the highest in the Commonwealth. The following chart shows how median sales prices have increased since 2000. According to Warren Group Data, the median sales price for a single family home in Manchester-by-the-Sea in 2017 was $855,000 (for 61 sales), down slightly from the 2016 peak of $942,000 (for 55 sales). Only 12 homes in town are assessed for less than $300,000, while more than three quarters of homes are assessed at over $500,000 and a quarter are assessed at over $1,000,000.

Median Sales Price (Source: The Warren Group)

Individuals 60 and over are the fastest growing segment of Manchester-by-the-Sea's population, with close to 30% of town residents falling into this age group based on the 2010 U.S. Census. As shown in the following figure, this age cohort is expected to make up over 40% of the town’s population by 2030, according to MAPC Stronger Region Projections. At the present time, limited options exist for a senior to remain in this community while downsizing into either a market rate or affordable unit that is smaller, designed for aging in place, and has lower maintenance. For older adults and people with disabilities that cannot receive the support they need in their homes, assisted living units along the continuum from independent to full care are needed.
Close to three quarters of homes in Manchester-by-the-Sea are single-family houses. As shown in the following figure, this typology makes up 74% (1,756 units) of the town’s total housing units (2,370 units), compared to 58% of units in the Commonwealth as a whole. Though 61% of all households in town consist of one or two people, only 23% of all houses have fewer than six rooms. Further, only 3% of households contain more than five persons yet over 45% of houses have eight or more rooms. For context, a small home is generally one that contains up to three rooms, while a large home is one that contains eight or more rooms.

There is a need for more housing options for all life stages and household sizes in Manchester-by-the-Sea. In addition to options for seniors, affordable rentals for beginning householders and
families are also needed. Affordable rental options that exist in town today are primarily one and two bedroom units with 0% vacancy. Only one subsidized ownership opportunity has been available since 2005; within two weeks of becoming available, over 30 residents indicated they were qualified and interested.

Economic Development Context

Economic activity has greatly influenced the history of Manchester-by-the-Sea. Once known as Jeffries Creek, Manchester was primarily settled by fishermen upon its incorporation in 1645. A town of approximately nine square miles of land area, Manchester-by-the-Sea has grown to its current size as a primarily residential community. The town has two distinct commercial areas—the Limited Commercial District (LCD) north of Route 128 and Downtown Manchester—that serve both local and regional needs and are important contributors to the town’s commercial tax base. Moreover, there is a Commuter Rail station located downtown along the Rockport branch of the Newburyport/Rockport line.

Manchester-by-the-Sea is known for its grand estates, scenic beaches and vista points, residential character, gorgeous harbor, and its historic charm. When asked what they love most about Manchester, residents almost always reference the town’s coastal location, its beaches, open space, history, sense of place, schools, and intimate community. These community values and physical attributes hold potential for future economic growth in Manchester; the vitality of the Manchester Harbor waterfront corridor, a charming and accessible Downtown, strong schools, a strategically-developed LCD, and the integration of greenspace into a larger economic strategy will further diversify the Town’s commercial tax base, while reinforcing Manchester-by-the-Sea’s identity as a quiet, community-focused, seaside town.

The population of Manchester has grown slowly and, as of 2016, was 5,321 residents based on ACS; local records indicate the population in 2017 is 5,620. Over half of residents work in the Educational Services (21.8%), Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation (21.8%) and Retail Trade (11.3%) sectors. Manchester’s largest employers are J. Barrett & Co, Crosby’s Marketplace, Essex Country Club, and the Manchester Athletic Club. It also has a lower unemployment rate (as of September 2016) compared to the Commonwealth of 3.0% and 3.3%, respectively. The median age in Manchester-by-the-Sea is 49.9 years old, higher than the state median age of 39.4, and is slated to increase. The following figure shows that the town’s working age population (15 to 64 years old) is projected to shrink in the coming decades.
Residential property taxes comprise the main source of revenue for the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea, with 93% of the tax base for Fiscal Year 2017 coming from residential properties. In 2016, the average single family home was assessed at $1 million and had an average tax bill of $11,700 based on a single tax rate of $11.07. The per capita income of $60,405 is comparatively higher than other North Shore communities and above the state average of $38,069, according to 2016 ACS 5-Year Estimates.

Given the cost of needed capital improvements (water, sewer, seawalls, and other facilities) and the town’s strong dependence on residential taxes, respondents to the fall 2017 Master Plan Survey indicated that the Town should support new commercial development that boosts tax revenues. This funding option was the top choice and received nearly double the support of other funding options.

According to Manchester-by-the-Sea’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for 2016, the Town has gone through “a slow but positive change in commercial property value with some sales in the downtown area.” The report describes the desire to increase and improve commercial development in Manchester-by-the-Sea and to review the need for rezoning within the district’s commercial areas. This has echoed through the Master Planning process. Some zoning changes in the commercial areas would allow for more targeted growth, which in turn would increase tax revenue and employment without a substantial cost to the Town.

With regards to job growth in the last ten years, Manchester-by-the-Sea’s fastest growing industry was Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation, which grew by 70 positions to 326. This was followed by Educational Services, which grew by 43 positions to 326 positions. Both Health Care & Social Assistance and Accommodation & Food Services saw double-digit growth within the ten-year period. Conversely, Construction saw a drop of 39 positions to 89, Professional and Technical Services fell 28 positions to 80, and Retail Trade, which has been experiencing declines throughout the country, fell 26 positions to 169.
Scenario Options

As described in the Scenario Development section, MAPC and the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea underwent an iterative process to develop scenario options, present them to the community, and incorporate public feedback. This section describes both the preliminary and preferred options that were assessed through new GIS-based modelling tools, potential development impacts, and feedback obtained during the community engagement process. Assumptions and equations used for the scenario development and impact calculations can be found in the Appendix.

Based on the modelling exercise, the following proposed scenario options could bring in a total of $1,723,100 in annual tax revenue, compared to $1,707,540 if sites were completely built-out at their current zoning. While the final revenue figures do not differ greatly, the proposed scenario options represent a concerted effort to plan for development that reflects community goals and is respectful of the town’s character, rather than just building the maximum allowed under current zoning. In addition, estimated tax revenues differ on a site by site basis, with some properties able to capture more revenue under current zoning than with the proposed scenario and vice versa. As such, it is important to assess each development or redevelopment option and compare potential tax revenue with other impacts like increased vehicle trips and water consumption.

Economic Development Options

The first question on the online survey asked respondents to prioritize five statements in the order in which they would support them given the Town’s capital needs and strong dependence on residential property taxes. Of the five statements, “Support commercial development that boosts tax revenues and reduces the dependence on property taxes for home and land owners” received the most support (in terms of weighted average). This was closely followed by the
statement regarding selective Proposition 2½ override to pay for capital projects and services. The statement regarding a reduction in services to gain savings received the least support from respondents.

The Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea has a relatively small economy, based on percent of tax revenue from commercial uses. Nearby towns have seen significantly more commercial development in recent years, although most have available parcels of land in close proximity to highway exits or are otherwise well-situated; direct highway access is a key factor attractive to commercial developers. Given its relative size and built-out nature, Manchester-by-the-Sea is limited in the types of industries it can attract as well as the locations that can support them. Further, open space acquisition and protection, while an important priority of the town and necessary tradeoff, constrains future commercial development options.

During the public outreach process, residents and stakeholders in Manchester-by-the-Sea had multiple opportunities to comment on the types of commercial development they want to see in town. At the June 2017 Open House, participants had the ability to mark up a map with icons and post-it notes with the business types they want to see in Manchester-by-the-Sea and where. The most prominently used icon for business types was for Small-Scale Retailers (10 icons), with most people placing the icon in Downtown Manchester, and a few placing it within the Limited Commercial District.

**Prioritization of Statements (Source: Online Town Survey)**

- Support commercial development that boosts tax revenues and reduces the dependence on property taxes for home and land owners.
- Increase the tax rate to the extent as discussed above (7%) to assure sustainable maintenance and improvement of infrastructure and facilities as needed regardless of debt retirement and annual budget capacity.
- Propose selective Proposition 2 ½ overrides as has been done in the past to pay for new borrowings, only as specific projects are mandated to maintain service, even if such new borrowings are in excess of old debt retirements or are otherwise supported by the annual budget.
- Provide for roads, water, sewer and facility maintenance only as allowed within the annual budget complying with Proposition 2 ½ and fund any capital projects as best we can, issuing new debt only as old debt is retired or otherwise as supported by the annual budget.
- Reduce services in order to gain savings that are redirected toward infrastructure needs.

Closely following Retailers were Residential Care & Assisted Living Facilities and Boutique Hotels/Bed & Breakfasts, both with nine icons. Residential Care Facilities icons were placed
throughout Manchester-by-the-Sea. Boutique Hotels and Bed & Breakfasts icons were also located throughout town, with four icons clustered near the Commuter Rail station downtown.

Of the eight icons for Restaurants, Bars, and Other Food Service/Drinking Places, most were placed within the Downtown, though a few were located in the Limited Commercial District. Science and Technical Services, Outpatient Health Care, and Creative Economy industries each had five icons, and were mostly clustered within the Limited Commercial District, whereas Marine Trades, Fishing, and Aquaculture icons were placed near the Downtown waterfront. Additionally, Motion Picture and Sound Recording Industries had four icons, and Professional Offices and Tourism & Recreation each had three icons.

The online survey created by the MPC asked residents to indicate their level of support for a number of business types (shown in the following figure). Similar to the findings from the June Open House, the strongest support was for Small-Scale Retail, with 94% of survey respondents showing strong or moderate support for the business type. Other popular business types with strong support by the survey are Restaurants/Bars/Food Service and Arts/Artisan. Light Industry/Manufacturing had much less support from residents and ranked last in terms of popularity, with 57% of respondents indicating low or no support for those business types in town.

**Support for Business Types (Source: Online Town Survey)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Strong support</th>
<th>Moderate support</th>
<th>Low support</th>
<th>No support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Retail</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/Bars/Food Service</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts/Artisan</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Trades, Fishing, Aquaculture</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Offices</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique Hotels/Bed and Breakfast Facilities</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and Technical</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Care/Assisted Living</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industry/Manufacturing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Live/Work/Play Village Development**

**Location:** Limited Commercial District – East

**Current zoning:** Limited Commercial District

**Current use:** Manchester Athletic Club, medical office building, storage facility, Town-owned undeveloped land, and privately-owned undeveloped land

**Proposed use:** Phased, environmentally-friendly, village-style development focused on health and wellness

---

**Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Allowed</strong></td>
<td>0 units</td>
<td>300 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mix of assisted living &amp; other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Footage Allowed</strong></td>
<td>883,731 square feet</td>
<td>152,600 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$835,900 per year</td>
<td>$667,200 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Trips</strong></td>
<td>10,200 trips per day</td>
<td>5,060 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Consumption</strong></td>
<td>84,200 gallons per day</td>
<td>47,600 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scenario option most likely to have a transformative impact on the Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea is the Live/Work/Play Village Development in the Limited Commercial District. The proposed use for this site is a phased, environmentally-friendly, village-style development focused on health and wellness that includes additional recreation facilities, an assisted living facility, independent living units, and office/medical uses. Other possible uses include a hotel, and other housing types.

The online survey developed by the Master Plan Committee asked residents to indicate their level of support for a number of ideas and initiatives that would likely require a Town Meeting vote. When asked about support for a greater diversity of commercial uses within the Limited Commercial District, almost three-quarters of survey respondents (73.4%) selected moderate or strong support.
A draft scenario map with buildout of development parcels under smart growth zoning was presented to attendees at the June Open House. The idea that generated the most support from meeting participants was the development of office and medical uses on part of Manchester Athletic Club’s land and on other parcels in the LCD. Though residents had concerns about how this development could impact the watershed, there was understanding that such commercial growth is likely the most efficient way to increase the Town’s revenue: it will generate a large amount of additional tax revenue without impacting school enrollment. There were limited votes for developing retail in the LCD area.

Residents supported the idea of constructing an assisted living facility in the LCD for similar reasons. Such housing specifically for seniors would also generate additional tax revenue without directly burdening the school system. Further, it will provide new options for seniors looking to downsize or receive living assistance without having to leave Manchester-by-the-Sea.

Attendees at the June Open House had the opportunity to take part in a visual preference activity to give feedback on what future development in Manchester-by-the-Sea should look like. There were varied opinions about what the development in the LCD should look like. In terms of buildings with office and medical uses, participants most liked an image of a village-style development with commercial buildings surrounding a central parking area; and an acknowledgment of a “nod to the architecture of the region.” They liked that it seemed to provide sufficient parking to support the traffic generated, that the parking lot was filled with ample green space, and that the area seemed to be pedestrian and bike oriented even if you had to drive to get there. Residents did not typically like bigger office buildings with larger footprints, though they did not mind modern-style buildings constructed to scale.

When shown one image of a large assisted living facility from another Massachusetts community, attendees felt that it had a nice design for its use: its appearance seemed warm, inviting, and less institutional looking. They also liked that it had a covered entrance and an easy pickup/drop-off area, which would be helpful for the elderly and disabled. However, when shown another image of a facility of a similar size and scale, they felt like it looked more like a standard motel. In addition, there were positive reactions toward the assisted living facilities in large, old homes, like the Federal-style John Bertram House in Salem and colonial-style Harborlight House in Beverly.

**Top office/medical designs:**
Top assisted living designs:

At the Economic Development and Public Facilities Working Group Meeting, local business leaders agreed that assisted living and housing for those 55 years of age and older would be ideal for the Limited Commercial District, particularly as an integrated village. The village would contain all of the needed amenities for the population and could include small medical facilities and offices. This would align with the desire for Manchester-by-the-Sea residents to stay in the community as they grow older.

Attendees of this working group meeting generally felt that new commercial businesses should be located north of Route 128 in the LCD. Uses discussed ranged from inland boat storage to high-tech industries such as biotechnology and health care.
Mixed Use Development Options

In addition to identifying business preferences and locations at the June Open House, attendees also had the opportunity to select their top housing types. Mixed Use Buildings with ground floor commercial space and residential upper stories was the icon selected the most by residents (with fifteen icons). Almost all of these icons were placed in Downtown Manchester, with one being located in the Limited Commercial District.

Mixed use development can encourage incremental growth by mixing housing with retail, office, and/or service uses. Support for mixed use development was echoed by the online survey; residential over commercial was selected as the most popular housing type after small houses on small lots. Of the hundreds of residents who completed the survey, 78% showed moderate or strong support for mixed use development.

Location: Downtown Expansion

Current zoning: Single Residence A

Current use: Single-family housing

Proposed use: Mixed use development with ground floor retail and two stories of residential units

Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Allowed</td>
<td>2 units</td>
<td>50 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Footage Allowed</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>37,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$15,800 per year</td>
<td>$232,500 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>10 trips per day</td>
<td>1,860 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Consumption</td>
<td>440 gallons per day</td>
<td>9,400 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The southern end of Manchester-by-the-Sea’s General District extends across the Commuter Rail line and includes the station, Manchester Community Center, two commercial buildings, and parking. Extending the General District would incentivize additional mixed use development in a transit-accessible, walkable location. Any changes to this area should take into account projected impacts of climate change.

**Location:** Mason’s Site

**Current zoning:** General District

**Current use:** Masonic Lodge

**Proposed use:** Mixed use development with ground floor retail and two stories of residential units

### Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Allowed</strong></td>
<td>5 units</td>
<td>16 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Footage Allowed</strong></td>
<td>5,350 square feet</td>
<td>8,050 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$24,800 per year</td>
<td>$70,700 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Trips</strong></td>
<td>255 trips per day</td>
<td>425 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Consumption</strong></td>
<td>1,510 gallons per day</td>
<td>3,290 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the visual preference station at the June Open House, attendees had mostly positive reactions to the mixed-use precedent photos provided. They liked the images that included street trees and greenery, broad sidewalks with active uses like outdoor seating and bike parking, dedicated public space, and little to no cars/traffic. Some residents particularly liked the courtyard-style developments shown that offer “nooks and crannies” to use and explore. They felt that these designs encourage browsing, provide opportunities for events like farmers markets, and offer a bike and pedestrian friendly space free from traffic.
**Top mixed use designs:**

**Location:** Limited Commercial District – West

**Current zoning:** Limited Commercial District

**Current use:** Vacant

**Proposed use:** Low-impact, mixed use development and resource protection

---

**Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Allowed</strong></td>
<td>0 units</td>
<td>200 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Footage Allowed</strong></td>
<td>470,448 square feet</td>
<td>500,000 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$445,000 per year</td>
<td>$1,103,600 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Trips</strong></td>
<td>20,230 trips per day</td>
<td>30,200 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Consumption</strong></td>
<td>42,650 gallons per day</td>
<td>66,650 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of land in the western part of the Limited Commercial District, of which Gordon College is the primary landowner, has the potential for a mix of uses including housing, offices, and recreational fields and facilities. Due to the fact that much of this area is wetlands, it is imperative that any future development utilize low-impact development (LID) and green infrastructure like permeable paving, and bioswales to ensure minimal impacts on the watershed.
Housing Options

Residential Neighborhood Opportunities

Changing demographic characteristics and anecdotal evidence point to the fact that there is a need for a greater diversity of housing types beyond the traditional single-family home. In the online survey, 56% of respondents expressed moderate or strong support for a wider variety of housing types in town. About 61% of respondents indicated moderate or strong support for mixed income residential developments that focus on quality of design.

The online survey asked residents to indicate their level of support for a number of housing types (shown in the following figure). Based on survey responses, there is the most support for small houses on small lots and mixed use with residential over commercial. Other popular housing types include pocket neighborhoods with a small cluster of houses gathered around a shared open space, accessible single-story homes, assisted living units, and townhouses. The scenario development process eliminated a number of potential housing sites based on feedback received.

Support for Housing Types (Source: Online Town Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Strong Support</th>
<th>Moderate Support</th>
<th>Low Support</th>
<th>No Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small house on small lot</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential over Commercial</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket Neighborhoods (small cluster of houses</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathered around a shared open space)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible single-story homes</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted Living Units</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouses</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clustered subdivision (1- and 2-family)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family conversion to Apartment</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Buildings (5+ units)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd House on a lot</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Location:** DPW Site

**Current zoning:** Residence D and Single Residence B

**Current use:** DPW site, public facility use

**Proposed use:** Clustered, multifamily housing

### Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Allowed</strong></td>
<td>12 units</td>
<td>35 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Footage Allowed</strong></td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$94,600 per year</td>
<td>$137,900 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Trips</strong></td>
<td>60 trips per day</td>
<td>175 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Consumption</strong></td>
<td>2,640 gallons per day</td>
<td>7,700 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of all the multifamily housing options presented at the June Open House, there was the most support for such development on the current DPW site off Pleasant Street. Though a small number questioned the effect of added traffic in this area, the overall consensus was that this would be a good location for a higher-density residential development project.
**Location:** King’s Way Site

**Current zoning:** Single Residence A and Single Residence C

**Current use:** Vacant

**Proposed use:** Clustered, multifamily housing

Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units Allowed</strong></td>
<td>29 units</td>
<td>50 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial Footage Allowed</strong></td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$228,600 per year</td>
<td>$197,100 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Trips</strong></td>
<td>145 trips per day</td>
<td>250 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Consumption</strong></td>
<td>6,380 gallons per day</td>
<td>11,000 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The currently vacant site on the Manchester/Gloucester border represents another opportunity for a clustered mixed-income development.
Location: Wastewater Treatment Facility

Current zoning: General District

Current use: Wastewater Treatment Facility with ten-year life expectancy

Proposed use: Clustered, mixed use with multifamily housing and expansion of downtown, public space, and the harbor walk

Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Allowed</td>
<td>11 units</td>
<td>29 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Footage Allowed</td>
<td>12,270 square feet</td>
<td>14,600 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$54,960 per year</td>
<td>$128,100 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>580 trips per day</td>
<td>770 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Consumption</td>
<td>3,400 gallons per day</td>
<td>5,960 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Redeveloping the current site of Manchester-by-the-Sea’s Wastewater Treatment Facility at the end of its useful life would unlock a key piece of the town’s waterfront for public access. It could also create an opportunity to concentrate a mix of uses including denser housing in an area that is walkable and well-served by public transportation. As with any change along the waterfront and flood prone areas, redevelopment must consider the projected climate change impacts.

When asked on the survey about preferred options for the site at the end of its useful, almost 55% said harbor access (i.e., harborwalk, park, Harbormaster facilities) and 55% said sell/lease for development that expands downtown and increases public access to harbor.
Location: Portion of Landmark School site

Current zoning: Single Residence C

Current use: Landmark School Faculty Housing

Proposed use: Clustered, multifamily housing

Potential development impacts under current zoning and proposed use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Proposed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Units Allowed</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
<td>12 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Footage Allowed</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
<td>0 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$7,880 per year</td>
<td>$47,300 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Trips</td>
<td>5 trips per day</td>
<td>60 trips per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Consumption</td>
<td>220 gallons per day</td>
<td>2,640 gallons per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the visual preference station at the June Open House, MAPC presented housing images that ranged from small clustered units to townhouses to single-family homes. There were many positive reactions to the Cottages on Greene development; residents felt that the separate but closely clustered homes were appropriate for the town and that Manchester-by-the-Sea could use more of this type of community living. Participants noted that DPW site should be built like this, and it would also be appropriate for a transit-oriented development (TOD) due to its general proximity to the Commuter Rail Station. In terms of the townhouse-style developments, attendees liked that there was density coupled with open space, though some felt that there were just too many units.

Top other housing designs:
Land Use Options

While the scenario development process focused on modeling the impacts of residential and commercial development, other land use options were explored that center around transportation and circulation, public facilities and services, natural and historic resources, and open space and recreation.

Open Space Protection

Residents of Manchester-by-the-Sea support the continued acquisition and protection of land for open space. As lands are proposed for development, it is important that this is balanced with efforts to keep land in an undisturbed state for resource protection and recreation. The online survey asked residents to indicate their level of support for a number of ideas and initiatives that would likely require a Town Meeting vote. The most popular idea suggested was permanent protection of Town-owned lands with sensitive resources, with 88% showing moderate or strong support. There was also support for the acquisition and permanent protection of private lands with sensitive resources, with 69% of respondents indicating moderate or strong support.

The Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea is interested in evaluating Town-owned land in western Manchester to determine appropriate uses, including resource protection, recreation, trails, cemetery, public facilities, or a housing pocket neighborhood. There is also an interest in permanently protecting interior lands in the Essex County Club in the event that the site is ever converted to an alternative use.

Pedestrian/Trail Connections

Manchester-by-the-Sea already has an impressive inventory of trails and walking paths in town. These trails are maintained mostly by the Manchester Essex Conservation Trust and are all located within conservation areas. The Town has an opportunity to expand this network of trails to not only provide additional recreational resources, but connect residents to major destinations in the community. A significant pedestrian connection that should be explored by the Town is one that connects downtown Manchester with the Limited Commercial District; this becomes even more important should that area see substantial development. The Town and residents of Manchester-by-the-Sea have also expressed a desire for a pedestrian connection in the downtown that would connect the Town Hall parking lot to Beach Street.

Public Facility Investments

The primary goal of the scenario planning exercise was to identify additional sources of revenue to pay for public facility investments and infrastructure improvements. The online survey asked residents about their support for various facility improvements and additions. Respondents had generally low support for building new facilities and gave more support for improving existing buildings. Of potential new facilities proposed, there was the most support for developing a new Senior/Community Center, with 45% of respondents indicating moderate or strong support, followed closely by developing new playing fields with 42%.
The Town of Manchester-by-the-Sea is evaluating the Pine Street Burn Site for potential public facility use. A use restriction on the site prohibits residential development on the site. When asked on the survey to identify their top choices for repurposing the site, respondents gave the most support for playing fields and public solar arrays.

The online survey also asked residents to identify their top choices for repurposing the current compost/yard waste site on Upper School Street. There was the most support for placing new DPW facilities on this site, followed by selling or leasing it for commercial development.
Finally, a potential site being considered by the Town for construction of new athletic sites is on land owned by Manchester-by-the-Sea’s Water Department in Hamilton. Attendees at the June Open House generally supported this idea but felt that the location was too far from the center of town for athletic fields.
Appendix

Assumptions and Equations Used for Scenario Development

The Metropolitan Area Planning Council used the program CommunityViz to develop a series of informative maps that led to the recommendations of this plan. The assumptions in the table below were used to approximate the impacts of future development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Assumptions and Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Tax Revenue</td>
<td>The tax revenue is calculated by multiplying the value of a parcel with the allocated development/redevelopment by the 2013 municipal tax rate (10.51). In determining value, we assumed a regional commercial rate of $90/square foot and $250/square foot for residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips Per Day</td>
<td>The trips per day measure is not based on travel demand modeling. Instead, this model assumes general values by building type. The residential trip generation is 5 per day, while industrial is 40, office is 11, and retail is 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallons of New Water Demand</td>
<td>The assumed water demand per housing or commercial unit is listed with the building type information. The sum of this demand across all parcels creates the total new water demand measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAPC used CommunityViz to develop a series of informative maps that led to the recommendations of this plan. The assumptions in the table below were used to approximate the building types that could be seen within the town under different types of zoning. Building types are combined to create place types. Place types were put on development parcels to determine the impact a development may have on that parcel given a place type. We accounted for frontage requirements by creating a parcel efficiency value based on place type. The parcel efficiency was based on the town’s buildout analysis from the early 2000s and indicates the percent area of the parcel that the FAR of a given place type should be applied to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>DU Size</th>
<th>DU Count</th>
<th>“Comm. Floor Area Count”</th>
<th>Water Use/DU or “”</th>
<th>Required Lot Area</th>
<th>Type Code</th>
<th>DU/100k sqft</th>
<th>Res FA/100k sqft</th>
<th>Comm. FA/100k sqft</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_a</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>13,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_b</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_c</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_e</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res_Manchester_d</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>RESD</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res_Manchester_G</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>RESG</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res_Manchester_G4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>RESG4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>133,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI_Manchester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,204</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>217,800</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD_Manchester</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,204</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>217,800</td>
<td>GRM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res_Manchester_GSF</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>RESGSF</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>41,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G_Manchester_Commercial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>GMRG</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_a_W</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>SFAW</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>DU Size</td>
<td>DU Count</td>
<td>“Comm. Floor Area Count”</td>
<td>Water Use/ DU or “”</td>
<td>Required Lot Area</td>
<td>Type Code</td>
<td>DU/100k sqft</td>
<td>Res FA/100k sqft</td>
<td>Comm. FA/100k sqft</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF_Manchester_b_W</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>SFBW</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester_G_MU</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>GMURES</td>
<td>74.63</td>
<td>74,627</td>
<td>37,313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>ALM</td>
<td>62.50</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 parking spot/unit, 25% of lot surface parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MedPark</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>217,800</td>
<td>MEDM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47,521</td>
<td>Parking under building and overflow to surface, 123 spaces under building and 84 on surface, which is 35,280 sq ft or 16% of lot. 23% of lot has building/parking on it, for total built area of 39% (2/1000 spaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF_Manchester</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>MFMAN</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>83,333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Modeled after recent development in town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD_Retail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>RETLCD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>2 stories, 4500sqft footprint, 18 parking spaces, 7,500 sqft of parking, 40% lot size built, 25% of lot size parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Types</th>
<th>Building Type 1</th>
<th>% Building Type 1</th>
<th>Building Type 2</th>
<th>% Building Type 2</th>
<th>Building Type 3</th>
<th>% Building Type 3</th>
<th>Building Type 4</th>
<th>% Building Type 4</th>
<th>Weighted average FAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence A</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence B</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence C</td>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence D</td>
<td>RESD</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence E</td>
<td>SFE</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Downtown</td>
<td>RESG</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>RESG4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>G_Comm</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commerce</td>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Industrial</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence A Water not on sewer</td>
<td>SFAW</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence B Water not on sewer</td>
<td>SFBW</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>