

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. Present were Chairman Zach Bergeron, members Vincent Chiozzi (arrived at 7:38 p.m.), Jay Doherty, Joan Duff, Ann Knowles; also present were Paul Materazzo, Director of Planning, Lisa Schwarz, Senior Planner and Jacki Byerley, Planner.

Other Business:**Pine Forest Park Waiver Request:**

Ms. Byerley informed the Board that in 2012 an 11-lot Definitive Subdivision Plan entitled Pine Forest Park was approved. The roadway has been constructed to binder coat and most of the utility work has been completed. No house lots have been constructed. A condition of the Planning Board approval required the applicant to deposit an erosion control bond with the Town to ensure the proper removal of all erosion controls at the completion of the subdivision. The Conservation Commission also required such a bond in the amount of \$10,000.00 which the applicant has posted. The Planning Board's bond is normally between the amount of \$3,700 and \$5,000. The applicant is requesting a waiver from the Board of that condition. Ms. Byerley stated that she has confirmed with Conservation that they will not release the bond until all work is completed and the erosion controls can be safely removed.

Mr. Bergeron asked if the Board holds a bond to make sure that everything is completed. Ms. Byerley stated that holding the bond money usually ensures that hay bales and silt fences will be removed by the developer and not left for new homeowners. Mr. Bergeron asked if this happens often and Ms. Byerley stated that there is usually better coordination with Conservation. Mr. Doherty noted that he recalls that this project was very detailed.

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board found the request from Angelo Petrosino for waiver of condition 37 to establish an account with the Town to be used to secure proper stabilization and removal of all erosion controls in the Pine Forest Park Subdivision to be a minor modification. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Ms. Duff the Board approved the waiver of condition 37 to establish an account with the Town to be used to secure proper stabilization and removal of all erosion controls in the Pine Forest Park Subdivision. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

459 River Road:

Mr. Bergeron opened the public hearings for 459 River Road, a Special Permit for Senior Residential Community Overlay and a Special Permit for Earth Movement.

Mr. Materazzo reminded the Board that the Senior Residential Community Overlay District was approved by Town Meeting in 2013. A task force was formed to write the language for the overlay district and a year and a half of planning went into the language.

Mark Mastroianni of Pulte Homes New England, LLC, the applicant, stated that he has had informal meetings with some of the task force members, the engineering department, DPW, Planning staff, Council on Aging and the Housing Partnership Committee to better refine the plan. Mr. Mastroianni described the site as 70.6 acres, zoned SRC and part of the Senior

Residential Community Overlay District. It is bordered to the north by the Merrimack River, to the west by the Melmark New England School, and to the east by the Franciscan Monastery and power lines. Across the street is the Avalon Bay rental apartment complex.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that Melmark is under a Purchase and Sale agreement with the Franciscans who currently own the property, and Pulte Homes has an agreement with Melmark to purchase a portion of the site to build the senior residential community. Mr. Mastroianni showed the 46.6 acres of land that Melmark would retain. Ms. Knowles asked if the land that is not part of this application falls under the overlay and Mr. Mastroianni stated that it does.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that their site is roughly 24 acres and includes a 30% protected open space area of approximately 7 acres required by zoning. He noted that members of Conservation have requested that the land be conveyed to either the Town or AVIS in informal meetings. He noted that the buildings are clustered to the front of the site to offer protection for the Merrimack River. A key component of the proposal is a new public access path and trailhead with five publically accessible parking spaces. The proposed path would start at River Road and connect to an existing trail to the Bay Circuit Trail along the Merrimack River. Mr. Mastroianni added that wetlands on the property have been delineated but the delineation has not yet been approved by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Mastroianni described the proposal as 200 units of independent senior living for those 62 years or older. No children under the age of 18 will be allowed to live in these units. The units will be privately owned condominiums with a homeowners association. There is a requirement in the Bylaw for an affordability component to the project. The requirement calls for 15% of the units to be affordable or for Board to allow the applicant to pay the Town a fee in lieu. The amount of the fee in lieu would be worked out between the Town and the developer. Mr. Mastroianni stated that they would comply with that component however the Town wishes.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that the 200 units would be in two different styles of buildings. There will be four garden style buildings housing 186 units, and 14 detached condominiums. Each garden style building will be four stories with two secure entrances and an underground parking garage. The garden style units will have 1-2 bedrooms and range from 900 s.f. to 1,800 s.f. The detached condominiums are one level living with a second floor loft and a two car attached garage. They are a mix of two and three bedrooms with square footages of 2,200 – 2,900 s.f.

John Kucich of Bohler Engineering, the applicant's engineer stated that the property would be accessed by two driveways located directly across from the Avalon Bay driveways. The property also has cross driveways connecting the two main driveways to access the units. The independent units each have four parking spaces including a two car garage, and the garden style buildings have underground garages and surface parking with a ratio of 1.7 spaces per unit. The property has sidewalks throughout to be fully accessible, as well as gazebos, bocce courts and sitting areas.

Mr. Kucich stated that in regards to grading, the site slopes down to the river. The design of the stormwater system is fully compliant with state standards and local requirements. All stormwater is handled onsite by deep sumped hooded catch basins that go to a series of four

detention basins three of which are underground and one that is aboveground that attenuate the flows from the development as well as infiltrate the water back into the ground and discharging it back into the river. Utilities are available along the frontage of River Road or in the near vicinity. There is an existing accessible water line in River Road, but as part of this application they will be extending the water line further down River Road. There is also an existing sewer line located along the frontage of River Road but an intermunicipal agreement with Tewksbury is needed in order to connect to that sewer. The lighting design is appropriate for a residential development and designed for safety and way-finding.

Matt Mrva of Bohler Engineering, the applicant's landscape architect gave an overview of the proposed landscaping. He stated that they intend to maintain the existing stone wall along the frontage of River Road as well as the trees that are directly behind the wall for screening. A fence and additional vegetation will be added along the back of the property. At the site entries the existing stone wall will be continued to make new entry walls on either side of the driveways. Approximately 255 trees and 250 shrubs will be added to the site in common areas and additional landscaping will be provided around each building and detached unit. A series of paths will run throughout the site with gathering spaces and seating, as well as a gazebo and a bocce court. A new park feature and a clubhouse have been added to the plan to the east side of the property to connect the neighborhoods within the community and provide additional space for gathering. The clubhouse is linked to a linear path feature that is buffered from the roadway and connects to the back of the property where the pathway system to the river can be accessed. Mr. Mrva showed an overhead rendering of the clubhouse and gazebo with their connecting paths as well as rendering of the clubhouse area as seen from River Road.

Mr. Bergeron asked what the white dashed box area on the site plan represented. Mr. Mastroianni stated that the white dashed lines are primary and reserve drip irrigation fields that would be associated with a privately maintained wastewater facility if they cannot obtain the intermunicipal agreement for sewer between the Town and Tewksbury. Mr. Bergeron asked if they have a strong sense that they will be able to come to an agreement. Mr. Mastroianni stated that they have a draft agreement from the Town of Tewksbury, and they will be meeting with the Andover Town Manager and engineering staff to go over the agreement.

Mr. Materazzo informed the Board that the peer review for traffic and drainage are both underway. He reviewed his IDR comment memo. The police department inquired about additional two way speed display signs, which is something that the peer traffic consultant can address in their review. The Engineering department has provided a punch list of items to be addressed. The Director of Elder Services raised questions about transportation and support services, an accessible trail network and sitting areas as well as the length of the hallways. The Preservation Commission has sent a letter inquiring about preserving the Franciscan Center building. The Planning division would like further discussion on utilizing the clubhouse for additional services for the population. Ms. Knowles questioned if the clubhouse would be used for doctor's visits or if there would be another area for that. Mr. Materazzo stated that further discussions can be had on the intent of that space. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was his understanding that this type of community would not have an in-house doctor or visiting doctors, as this is a 62 and older condominium development. Mr. Materazzo noted that he has received

inquiries on the possibility of using the clubhouse blood pressure clinics and things of that nature.

Mr. Chiozzi asked who was conducting the peer review. Mr. Materazzo stated that the BETA Group is conducting both the traffic and the stormwater peer reviews. Ms. Knowles asked if they will be looking at expanding the water service. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Engineering department has been working with the applicant and vetting the plans.

Mr. Materazzo noted that further conversations need to be had regarding open space which is a large component of the project. During the IDR there were questions about the flexibility of reducing some of the parking onsite for greater open space. The applicant is proposing 316 parking spaces, with 200 spaces required. Ms. Knowles noted that in her opinion the landscaping looks good, but it doesn't show a community yet. She would like to have an independent landscape architect look at the plans. She added that she is concerned about the species proposed because she knows the area already has some invasive species. Mr. Mrva stated that he would be happy to work directly with Ms. Knowles on the landscaping, specifically the species.

Mr. Materazzo pointed out that the plan provides infrastructure for the development to be electronic vehicle ready. He stated that the Board may want the applicant to dig a little deeper into the lighting plan to see if there is any way to reduce the lighting. The Board also needs to look further into the affordability and if they want to consider a payment in lieu option.

Ms. Knowles noted that in the Bylaw there is a bonus density section, and asked if the applicant availed themselves to that. Mr. Materazzo stated that the applicant has limited themselves to the 200 units that are afforded in the Bylaw. He added that the Bylaw allows flexibility for the Board to consider waivers, but that is not before the Board this evening.

Arthur Friedman of 5 Stoneybrook Circle, Co-Chairman of the Franciscan Overlay Taskforce stated that this plan is consistent with what the Task Force envisioned for this zone. He felt that it is a great design to put the smaller houses in the front of the property to better mask the taller buildings in the back. He added that another plus is the access to the public trails. He would like the Board to consider a slightly different layout of having the common area in the center, moving the buildings back and having the parking behind the buildings to create a courtyard feature in the center for a more community-like feeling. He added that one of the drainage areas can be moved to the center to create a pond in the center of the courtyard.

Lou Poulo of 23 Johnson Road asked if the plan will grade down from River Road so that the elevations are getting lower as you get back to the river. Mr. Kucich confirmed the site's drop in elevation. Mr. Poulo asked if this helps to offset the height of the buildings and Mr. Kucich stated that it does. Mr. Poulo asked if there were any plans to expand the clubhouse area with outdoor exercise stops or a pool in the future. Mr. Mastroianni stated that the outdoor exercise features have not been incorporated in the plan but are something that can be discussed with the staff. He stated that he does not envision a pool at the clubhouse because from marketing and customer feedback on other projects they find that the homeowners do not use a pool, they prefer the patio and seating around a pool. Mr. Doherty asked how big the clubhouse is, and Mr.

Mastroianni stated that it is not yet fully designed. He added that they envision it as a common room with a kitchen area and a secondary room with a fitness area. The development is condominiums so providing the clubhouse will allow the condominium owners an area for extra services such as blood pressure clinics, yoga or cooking class.

Maddy St. Amand of 115 Bailey Road asked if the development is meeting ADA compliance throughout or only in the disabled units. Mr. Mastroianni stated that the project will comply with all accessibility requirements. Ms. St. Amand asked if all of the doorways are 35 inches. Mr. Bergeron asked if she was inquiring if all units are wheelchair accessible. Reid Blute from Pulte Homes stated that the doors are wide enough for wheelchair access in the garden style buildings, but there are stairs in the detached units. Ms. St. Amand asked if the showers are wheelchair accessible. Mr. Blute stated that they were not as a standard feature, but they can be retrofitted for that if necessary. Ms. St. Amand asked how much land is allotted for the detached units. Mr. Mastroianni noted that they do not have an allotted space to the unit, the condominium owns all of the common land around the structure. The home owner would have a limited common area such as a deck or driveway. Ms. St. Amand asked if the properties would be uniformly maintained and Mr. Mastroianni stated that all of the common grass areas would be maintained by the condominium. Mr. Chiozzi asked what the distance is between the detached units, and Mr. Kucich stated that it is around 25 feet. Mr. Chiozzi asked how many square feet of residential area is in the whole development. Mr. Mastroianni stated that he would calculate that number for a future meeting.

The Board decided the discussion topics for the next meeting would be affordability, ADA compliance, total square footage of living area, open space, parking and preservation of the Franciscan Center building. Ms. Knowles asked if aesthetics and massing should be included in the landscaping review. Mr. Materazzo agreed and stated that he would work with everyone involved in that aspect to get a specific date for the Board discussion on it.

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Chiozzi the Board continued the public hearings for 459 River Road to 8:30 p.m. on June 23, 2015. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

It should be noted that after the discussion on 459 River Road, Mr. Doherty left the meeting and did not return.

139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street Special Permit for Elderly Housing:

Mr. Bergeron opened the continued public hearing for 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street, a Special Permit for Elderly Housing. Ms. Schwarz stated that items to be discussed are updated landscaping plans, traffic information on assisted living facilities located in residential areas and the needs peer review.

Ken Cram of Bayside Engineering, the applicant's traffic engineer reviewed his memo which identified five assisted living facilities in Massachusetts within residential zones and gave available traffic information for each facility including both traffic reports and peer reviews. He noted that a key issue for facilities that had peer reviews performed on their traffic reports was safety at the access. Mr. Cram reviewed the number of units for each facility, one of which has not yet been built. He noted his memo also includes a list of fifteen other facilities that are

located in residential areas. Mr. Cram stated that Chuck Edgerly, the Town's traffic safety officer has suggested that solar powered variable message speed signs be installed on existing telephone poles on Elm Street on both the north and south sides of the street. Mr. Cram gave the Board cut sheets of what these signs may look like. Mr. Chiozzi asked if the signs would be radar and Mr. Cram confirmed that they are radar detectors that can be programmed to say a number of messages. He added that it is a cloud based system and a module can also be installed for data collection. Ms. Duff noted that there are similar signs on Route 114 and she has found them to be effective in slowing cars down. Ms. Knowles asked if the hatched crosswalks suggested by the peer reviewer were something that DPW would do or if the applicant would be required to do it. Ms. Schwarz stated that the Board could place a number of conditions on the applicant for traffic mitigation purposes.

Chris Huntress of Huntress Associates the applicant's landscape architect reviewed the modifications made to the landscaping plan. He highlighted five items that are the major changes made to the plan. Additional planting material has been added to the area between the front of the building and Elm Street including 24 evergreen trees and 20 ornamental trees. The size of all landscape material has been increased. Evergreen trees have been increased from a minimum of 8' tall to 12' tall and shade trees have been increased from a minimum 3" caliper to 4" caliper. The seven trees along the entry driveway have been changed from Maple to American Elm which are Dutch elm disease resistant. The largest size elm tree available is 3.5" caliper. Mr. Huntress stated that they are dedicated to rebuilding the stone wall and sidewalk along the entire frontage of Elm Street. The sidewalks within the property have been extended to make better connections internally and externally to the surrounding properties. Ms. Knowles asked Mr. Huntress about the pathways and he pointed them out on the plan. Ms. Knowles asked if the surface of the pathways would allow for those who are unsteady on their feet to navigate them. Mr. Huntress stated that the pathways are designed up to code to be ADA accessible.

Judi Barrett of RKG Associates, Inc. the peer reviewer of the demographics and market assumptions reviewed her memo to the Board. She stated that most of her work in Massachusetts focuses on housing, specifically affordable and senior housing. She noted that she has performed peer reviews on other assisted living facilities and senior housing developments and is a Planner by training. Ms. Barrett gave a description of the project and stated that she looked at the demographic assumptions that the applicant provided. She noted that the two key demographics focused on by the applicant were the current seniors and the adult children makers for aging parents and who are also the next generation of residents of these facilities. She stated that the data given by the applicant came from the 2010 census. In validating the data she also looked at the 1990 census to examine population trends and compared two sets of population projections for the community published by the Metropolitan Area Planning Council and the UMass Donohue Institute. She stated that you can see from the numbers that the projection calls for the over 65 population going up to as much as 23% of the total population by 2030. She noted that for assisted living residents, the average age is 86.9 years, and 75% of the population is women. The average age is younger in independent living senior facilities.

Ms. Barrett noted that Andover has this application in front of them for several reasons. The demographics make sense, the supply of beds available in Massachusetts is less than the national

average, and Andover and surrounding towns have higher incomes to afford the private pay facilities. Ms. Barrett reviewed the regional supply of facilities from data gathered from the Executive Office of Elder Affairs which certifies assisted living residences in Massachusetts. She noted that assisted living facilities are certified by the state, not licensed like skilled nursing facilities. Assisted living facilities typically provide housing, meals and assistance with daily living activities. For their certification they are required to provide annual reports to the EOEI which includes information on demographics and occupancy. Ms. Barrett stated that she obtained information on 17 area facilities and noted that 62% of people occupy facilities within 10 miles of where they lived. She noted that the data is the average for the year with the occupancy rates ranging from 78.7% to more than 98%. She noted that she took out the highest number and the lowest number and came to an average of 92.2% occupancy. In her opinion, with these occupancy statistics, anyone in the industry would say there is an opportunity in the market. This sample includes 1,265 assisted living units with over ¾'s of the residents being over 80 years old, and women making up 80% of the population. She added that this is very in line with what the national statistics tell you about assisted living, except that the occupancy rates in this area is higher than the national average of 89.3%.

Ms. Barrett reviewed the cost assumptions and stated that she confirmed with the applicant that their unit prices will range from \$3,000 to \$6,000. She noted that the cost of assisted living facilities is hard to compare because of the different pricing structures, services and activities provided. She noted that the applicant's charges are very consistent with national studies and assisted living rates in the northeast. She noted the Bylaw requirement to provide affordable units is very important and really matters because the cost is so high.

Ms. Barrett concluded that in looking at the age assumptions, pricing, and regional supply, nothing looks out of line. It looks like a competitive market, and it makes sense that Andover has an application before them.

Ms. Duff noted that she found it very interesting that the report stated that almost 69% of Andover homeowners who are 65 and older have no mortgage. Ms. Barrett stated that this information is from census estimates from the American Community Survey which reports data every year. She noted that this makes the community even more advantageous from a housing provider's point of view because it has a population that will be able to pay with an asset even if they do not have high cash incomes.

Mr. Chiozzi asked Ms. Barrett if with skilled nursing care being so much more expensive, if she felt the government will ever make assisted living Medicare eligible. Ms. Barrett stated that she has not heard of that happening, but it is surprising to her that the government hasn't figured that out. She noted that states can do some things to try to make assisted living more affordable. In Massachusetts there is a way for the service based costs to be reduced but not every facility chooses to participate. She added that some facilities reduce the cost of the housing through Section 8 subsidies.

Mr. Materazzo asked Ms. Barrett if there was a reason why there is such a large population of women in these facilities. Ms. Barrett noted that over the age of 75 the ratio of surviving women to men increases significantly. Mr. Chiozzi asked Ms. Barrett what the average length of stay is

for a resident. Ms. Barrett stated that the length of stay varies for multiple reasons, but noted that people don't go into assisted living because they are healthy and estimated that the average stay is 1-2 years. Mr. Chiozzi asked Ms. Barrett if she knew what percentage of people comes from out of state to be closer to their children. Ms. Barrett stated that it is a large group, and when she called local facilities and asked where they got most of their referrals from, everyone said from the adult children decision makers first and then the senior population and professional referrals.

George Thorlin of 115 Summer Street asked what the demographics of Elm Street are right now. He also stated that he had questions about traffic and how many cars go up and down, and if the upgrades to 114 between Lawrence and Merrimack have been taken into consideration. Mr. Bergeron stated that those items were included in the traffic study figures. Mr. Thorlin asked if he could see the numbers and he was informed that the traffic study and every document submitted for this project is available to the public in the Planning Department.

David Silverstein of 26 Burton Farm Drive stated that the end of Burton Farm Drive is a designated MassDEP site with repeated stormwater washouts for several years. The stormwater drainage overflows are a public health hazard with manhole covers popping off and the sewer lines backing up with raw sewage flowing out into the street. He stated that this proposed facility will only exacerbate the problem and maybe the state Department of Public Health needs to get involved. He noted that he had previously requested that the DPW provide a written impact statement, but nothing has been done with his request. He added that the DPW has raised questions on the project that have yet to be answered. He asked why no one from DPW has attended any meetings to answer questions and give a presentation on the impact of the facility. Mr. Silverstein asked the Board to take a site visit to the bottom of Burton Farm Drive. He reiterated that he is very concerned about the public health hazard of the raw sewage in the street and the prospect of another 92 units generating sewage and kitchen waste that will go into that system. Mr. Bergeron stated that the preexisting condition should be addressed now, and DPW is aware of it, but it is not within the jurisdiction of this Board. He asked Mr. Materazzo what can be done in regards to the preexisting condition and if he could follow up on it. Ms. Schwarz stated that Tom Carbone, the Director of Public Health, and Brian Moore, the Town Engineer have been involved with this project from the beginning and have written memos to the applicant. She added that the reason stormwater is not on the agenda tonight is because DPW and the Health Department are still providing input for the applicant to address which will be before the Board on June 23rd.

Don Silberstein of 28 Burton Farm Drive stated that his house has been affected the most by the drainage issue because he has the easement. His lawn has been ripped up four times, it still is not right, there is still a smell and no one in the Town seems to give a damn. Mr. Bergeron stated that he is addressing it now but there is nothing that he can do besides make a notification. Mr. Silberstein added that another issue is when the new dorms at Merrimack College, for which the line was increased, come online. Ms. Schwarz stated that the new Merrimack College dorms will not be coming online to the Andover system. Merrimack has rerouted the entire sewer system and they will be going to the North Andover sewer system. Mr. Silberstein asked why Merrimack College paid for alterations to the sewer system. Mr. Bergeron stated that Merrimack College is not part of the discussion this evening.

George Thorlin of 115 Summer Street noted that the Board had stated that they would do a walkthrough of the property. Mr. Bergeron noted that the Board did have a site visit. Mr. Thorlin asked if they have an assessment of it. Mr. Bergeron stated that they toured the site. Mr. Thorlin asked if he could read the assessment to provide feedback. Mr. Bergeron stated that there wasn't a meeting based on the site visit so there are no minutes.

Lance Fromme of 23 Burton Farm Drive informed the Board that the Council on Aging will be presenting the results of their survey to the Board of Selectmen this Monday and it will then be published on the Town's website. He asked the Board for their commitment to review it thoroughly before they make any decision on this development. Ms. Duff noted that the Council on Aging will be giving the Board copies of the document after the presentation to the Board of Selectmen.

Mark Bernardin of 140 Elm Street asked if one of the outliers was Marland Place and if it was disregarded when the averages were calculated. Ms. Barrett stated that Marland Place was an outlier, but it was not disregarded, it is in the report. She noted that typically when you are trying to get an average, you take out the extreme low and the extreme high, of which Marland Place was the extreme low. Mr. Bernardin noted that Andover law doesn't talk about a good business plan, it talks about needs. It is an important distinction, and although the units can be filled by Merrimack Valley residents, he doesn't think Andover needs another facility.

Brad Weeden of 5 Summer Street asked if there is a speeding problem on Elm Street right now. Mr. Cram stated that recorded speeds were over the 35 M.P.H. limit. Mr. Weeden asked if there will be more speeding if this facility is built. Mr. Cram stated that no one has made that determination. Mr. Weeden then questioned why Mr. Cram is talking with Officer Edgerly about putting up digital signs if they have no idea if speeding is going to be increased or decreased. Mr. Cram noted it is because he is the traffic safety officer. Mr. Bergeron stated that Officer Edgerly should be asked directly if regardless of this project the speed signs are appropriate for Elm Street. He noted that it seems regardless of this project, having those signs is a good idea, and if approved this project would be taking care of that. Mr. Weeden stated that he is not interested in Mr. Bergeron's opinion on if that is positive or not, he is interested in Mr. Bergeron facilitating the discussion. He is interested in if this is a solution for increased speed and traffic on Elm Street if this is built.

Lori Paglia of 2 Farnsworth Road stated that she is concerned about the kids walking to the middle school during and after construction. She noted that the other day she counted over 20 cars in 30 seconds not stop for her child to cross the street. She questioned if there is a need for this on Elm Street in a neighborhood. She stated that her property will not be protected from the caretakers who are not CORI'd walking residents around the property. There are better places in Andover to put a facility like this.

Louise Cummings of 87 Elm Street stated that she would like to address the demographic issues from the neighbors' perspective. She noted that people move to the neighborhood because it is a walking neighborhood. She is concerned that her son who has a disability and walks to work at Merrimack will no longer be able to do that and lose his independence. She stated the traffic is already bad today and it took her over a half hour and eight light cycles to get 1.5 miles down the

road to the North Andover Middle School today. The homes in the neighborhood range from \$550,000 to 1 million, and people put their life savings into their homes. The neighbors are losing the money in their homes that is being used to fund the development.

Chuck Papalia of 64 Summer Street stated that every person who bought a house in the immediate area, bought with the knowledge that their land and all of the properties around them were zoned residential. These applicants are proposing a commercial operation designed to make money in a residential neighborhood. He stated that for you people to authorize a special permit to put a commercial operation in the middle of a residential neighborhood that has been residential for decades, you would be bastardizing the neighborhood, and performing a disservice to fellow Andover homeowners.

On a motion by Mr. Chiozzi seconded by Ms. Duff the Board continued the public hearing for CSH of Andover, LLC assisted living project located at 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street to the June 23, 2015 Planning Board meeting. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

Other Business:

Minutes:

On a motion by Ms. Knowles, seconded by Mr. Chiozzi, the Board moved to approve the minutes of March 31, 2015. **Vote:** Unanimous (4-0).

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.