

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. Present were Chairman Zach Bergeron, members Vincent Chiozzi (arrived at 7:34 p.m.), Jay Doherty, Joan Duff, Ann Knowles and Associate Member Steve Pouliot (arrived at 7:35 p.m.); also present were Paul Materazzo, Director of Planning, Lisa Schwarz, Senior Planner and Jacki Byerley, Town Planner.

**503 South Main Street – Primrose Schools:**

Mr. Bergeron opened the public meeting for 503 South Main Street, Primrose Schools, a Site Plan Review, Dover Use.

Mark Bobrowski, an attorney representing the applicant introduced Ted Tillman of Primrose Schools and Bill MacLeod of Andover Consultants, the applicant's engineer. Attorney Bobrowski stated that the applicant is currently before the Zoning Board of Appeals for two variances, for the size of both the building and the sign. The ZBA has chosen not to make a decision before Planning Board action. The Zoning Bylaw limits a child care facility to 3,000 s.f., with this facility proposed to be 12,000 s.f. The existing building on the property is not usable as a child care facility, so they will be building a modern, new facility. He added that in 2001 a variance was granted to a Robert Walker at the location for a 19,000 s.f. child care center.

Mr. MacLeod stated that the site is 3 ¼ acres with delineated wetlands in the northwest corner of the site. This proposal is in compliance with all Conservation Commission Bylaw distance setbacks, no disturb zone and no build zone. The Conservation Commission opened their public hearing on the Notice of Intent and have continued the hearing to the first week of August. The single story building will be approximately 12,000 s.f., and provide 54 parking spaces which is more than required. There will be one curb cut at the site to enter/exit with adequate sight distance in both directions for the posted speed limit. South Main Street is a State Highway so the applicant will need to obtain an access permit and an excavation permit for the water line connection from MassDOT. The site will be connected to Town water and sewer with a sewer stub already onsite. The parking lot will have two catch basins which will bring all runoff into an infiltration basin that will infiltrate the water back into the ground onsite. There will be two level fenced in play areas on site. The building meets all zoning setbacks. Mr. MacLeod stated that the applicant had an informal IDR with staff before filing their application and a formal IDR was held on July 7<sup>th</sup>. The applicant is waiting on the peer review on drainage before they make the changes that were requested by the departments at the IDR.

Ms. Knowles noted that the building is within the 100 foot buffer zone. Mr. MacLeod stated that they are required to file a Notice of Intent with Conservation to perform work within the 100 foot buffer zone. Ms. Knowles asked if the site was in any flood zones and Mr. MacLeod stated that it was not.

Ms. Byerley reviewed the comments from the IDR. The Planning Division asked for more information on the ages and number of children, as well as an explanation of the drop off and pickup process. Planning also requested that a formal landscaping plan be submitted, and for the applicant to add certain notes and labels and to make minor changes to the plan's appearance. The DPW requested a profile of the drainage and for a construction detail of the basin. DPW noted that permits will be needed from MassDOT. They also requested that the applicant look

**503 South Main Street – Primrose Schools (cont'd):**

into sewer construction plans from 2005 to see if an existing water service has been cut and capped. DPW asked that the applicant request to demolish the building prior to working on the water line so that South Main Street will only have to be dug up once. The Health Department noted that an exterior grease trap will be needed. The Fire Department asked that a hydrant be added to the front of the property and for an evacuation plan to be provided. The Conservation Division noted that they have undertaken a peer review on the drainage and will copy the Planning Division on all correspondence. Mr. Bergeron requested that Ms. Byerley provide the Board with the specific items that the Board can look at for a Dover Use.

Mr. Doherty questioned if there is a need for this type of facility, considering that there are two other childcare facilities in the vicinity. Ted Tillman of Primrose School stated that they have performed a market study for the need. Mr. Doherty asked if the children will be the same age as those at the other childcare centers, and Mr. Tillman stated that they would. Mr. Doherty asked if a traffic study had been performed. Ms. Byerley stated that Officer Edgerly has reviewed the traffic information provided by the applicant on their Burlington facility. Mr. Bobrowski added that they will provide the Board a Traffic Impact Assessment. Mr. Bergeron questioned if they were providing too many parking spaces. Mr. Bobrowski stated that they feel there is a definite need for 30 parking spaces. Ms. Schwarz noted if the parking is reduced, she would suggest an overflow area for special events. Mr. Tillman stated that they are satisfied with providing 54 spaces. Ms. Knowles asked if street trees could be planted across the frontage. Mr. MacLeod noted that they will be clearing the trees that are there now, and this may be an opportunity to plant better trees.

Heather Lauten of 243 Lowell Street stated that in addition to Kindercare and Next Generation Children's Center, another child care facility in the area is the Andover Montessori School which accepts children at the age of 2.9 and should be taken into account in the saturation of the area. Mr. Bobrowski noted that not all Montessori schools are licensed child care facilities that qualify for Dover because they take in older children as well. Mr. Tillman reiterated that an extensive market study of the area has been performed.

Andrea Stidsen of 38 Canterbury Street stated that Andover Montessori School offers childcare, and questioned what the traffic will be like with four programs clustered in the same area with pickups and drop offs will be at the same time every day. Mr. Bergeron noted that Officer Edgerly will review the traffic assessment.

Piotr Siwik of 497 South Main Street asked if it will be just day care and how many children will be there. Mr. Tillman stated that it will be daycare for 189 children. Mr. Siwik asked what the start and end times would be for the facility. Mr. Tillman stated that the facility would be open from 6:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Mr. Siwik stated that he is an abutter to the north and he is opposed to this project. The children will create a lot of noise and right now there is a synagogue on the property that only has activity on the weekends.

Jianhua Shen of 502 South Main Street stated that he is also concerned about noise, as well as traffic with the large number of children being picked up and dropped off at the same time.

**503 South Main Street – Primrose Schools (cont'd):**

Mr. Pouliot stated that he is concerned about drainage and the slope to the northwest corner where the leeching field is, and he will wait on Conservation's review.

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board continued the public meeting on 503 South Main Street Primrose Schools to August 11, 2015 at 8:00 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

It should be noted that after the discussion on 503 South Main Street, Mr. Doherty left the room and was not present for the public hearings 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street.

**139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street:**

Mr. Bergeron opened the continued public hearings for 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street, a Special Permit for Elderly Housing, a Definitive Subdivision Plan and Special Permit for Earth Movement.

Ms. Byerley noted that the public hearings were kept open for a final review by the Department of Municipal Services. DMS has now confirmed that all of the outstanding items except for two have been addressed. The two outstanding items can be taken up during deliberations. Ms. Schwarz stated that the applicant has provided the Board additional information on local preference as well as information on property values.

John Smolak, an attorney representing the applicant stated that they have coordinated their landscaping plans with their civil plans. The DPW has reviewed the plans and are satisfied. The plans have been adjusted for ADA compliance. He explained that in order to preserve their zoning rights, preliminary and definitive subdivision plans were filed with the Board. The subdivision plans created two lots and a roadway. Lot 1 is a buildable lot but they have no intention of building on it, and the Board can condition any approval that way.

Mr. Smolak noted that CSH had their first informal meeting with Town officials on this project on July 9, 2014. They have undertaken an extensive process of outreach and have shown a willingness to work with others to shape the project. The final plan reflects the character of the neighborhood, the Town and Andover architecture. He noted that the Elderly Housing Bylaw specifically places assisted living facilities in residential areas, and thoughtful restrictions can be put in place. The Zoning Bylaw categorizes assisted living as a residential use, not a commercial use. Mr. Smolak reviewed how this project meets or exceeds all of the dimensional requirements in the Bylaw. He noted that with the open space to be provided, the adjacent Collins Reservation could be doubled in size.

Mr. Smolak reviewed the special permit criteria and how the project meets all criteria. In regards to traffic he noted that the use is a low traffic generator adding minimal trips to both the a.m. and p.m. peaks. In regards to social and economic community needs, he stated that the dialogue has been too narrowly focused and noted the Board never inquires about vacancy rates when a proposed office building is before them. The applicant is reputable and has secured financing. This development fulfills an important community need of the desire for a variety of elderly housing and social programs for those served. In regards to an economic need, it is clear from

**139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street (cont'd):**

demographics provided by the RKG study and the Council on Aging Study that there has been a significant increase in seniors. The occupancy rate in local facilities is in excess of national rates. Mr. Smolak stated that the applicant has satisfied all of the criteria for both special permits that they are seeking as well as the subdivision criteria.

Ms. Knowles asked if the 10% grade on the driveway is okay. Ms. Byerley stated that the Board can make that determination during deliberations. The applicant is requesting the 10% grade as opposed to 8% because it will help with earth movement, and DMS's comment was for the Board to review the request.

Mark Bernardin of 140 Elm Street stated that voters of Andover also voted for Section 9.4 of the Bylaw and you cannot sweep the issue of need under the rug. This will harm to the character of the neighborhood and the entire Design Review Board wrote a letter to the Planning Board as to such. He added that the expert had to exclude Marland Place from her statistical analysis because the vacancy rate was so high. The expert confirmed that if you build this they will be able to market it to surrounding communities to fill the units, but this doesn't mean that the Town needs it.

Barbara Downs Morash representing her parents at 147 Elm Street noted that the needs report cited the bubble generation as people who would use this facility, as would parents of Andover residents. She stated that her parents are Andover residents and if she needed to she would bring them closer to her in New Hampshire, so the aging population of Andover would not be in this facility.

Lance Fromme of 23 Burton Farm Drive stated that the Council on Aging survey stated that assisted living residences are not requested.

Beth Puolo of 23 Johnson Road stated that a requirement of the permit is that it fit into the neighborhood, and just because people are living there, doesn't make it fit into the neighborhood. She stated that she would never allow a child today to walk or ride a bike to the Doherty or the library with the traffic conditions.

Greg Dicovitsky of 1 Cedar Road stated that as a father he is concerned about his kids going to and from school. He added that this is a risk to the investment of his home as his equity will be affected by traffic, noise and the character of the facility.

A resident of 700 Bulfinch Drive stated that this development clearly violates the Zoning Bylaw because it is in a single family area. Mr. Bergeron stated that this is an allowed use in the district. Mr. Lee stated that you need to consider the environmental impact of building a complex on a hill as well as noise and traffic issues.

Mary Chiodo of 21 Shipman Road stated that in 2014 assisted living was a 40 billion dollar industry and it is not residential. Mr. Bergeron stated that assisted living is a residential use.

**139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street (cont'd):**

Mike O'Connor of 18 Shipman Road stated that he has taken his kids to their bus stop for the last 11 years and the increase in traffic and speed on Elm Street over the years is incredible. The facility is not in the character of the neighborhood.

Lance Fromme of 23 Burton Farm Drive asked if the Town Engineer has signed off on all DPW items. Ms. Byerley stated that the Town Engineer has confirmed that he is satisfied.

Susan Donohue of 14 Shipman Road asked if there will be blasting. Paul Marchionda of Marchionda Associates, the applicant's engineer stated that from testing done onsite they do not anticipate a need for blasting, but they cannot guarantee it. Ms. Donahue asked if a permit is needed, will they just be issued a permit by the Town. Mr. Marchionda stated that they will have to get a blasting permit from the Fire Department. Ms. Donahue asked if the neighborhood has any recourse in regards to a blasting permit. Mr. Bergeron stated that conditions can be placed on any blasting for certain measures of safety to be put in place. Ms. Donahue asked if the Town has signed off on all of the earth removal slated for that site. Mr. Bergeron stated that the earth removal is under the Board's consideration right now.

On a motion by Mr. Chiozzi seconded by Ms. Duff the Board moved to close the public hearings for the Definitive Subdivision, Earth Movement Special Permit, and Special Permit for Elderly Housing for 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

It should be noted that after the discussion on 139-143 Elm Street and 26 Pine Street, Mr. Doherty returned to the meeting.

**459 River Road:**

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

Mark Mastroianni of Pulte Homes stated that the items carried over from the last meeting were earth movement, infrastructure and affordability. In regards to earth movement, he stated that the site is balanced in cuts vs. fill and showed such on an earth work exhibit. He noted that the plan is not final and they will update the plan after all reviews. Mr. Bergeron asked if the exported materials will be sent off site. Mr. Mastroianni stated that there will be a small amount of export of unusable peat matter, and there will be some structural import of materials not available onsite. Mr. Bergeron asked if the buildings have basements. Mr. Mastroianni stated that all of the buildings have full basements that are underground parking garages. All of the slopes, temporary and permanent will be stabilized. A soil erosion control plan has been submitted to the Board, and the land area disturbance is over one acre so they will need an NPDES General Permit and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Mr. Mastroianni noted that utilities are available along the frontage of River Road. In regards to sewer, gravity pipes will move flow to the rear of the site to a private sewer pumping station. The flow will then go through a force main to the front of the site and into the Tewksbury sewer system. He noted that this will require an Intermunicipal Agreement between Andover, Tewksbury and Lowell, which is currently being worked on. Mr. Mastroianni stated that the

**459 River Road (cont'd):**

Board of Health voted to support the sewer plan at their meeting last night, and they also met with the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Bergeron asked if they will have to meet with the Tewksbury Board of Health. Mr. Mastroianni stated that they do not, but they have met with Tewksbury Town officials. He added that the Board of Selectmen directed Town Counsel to work on the IMA document with Tewksbury and Lowell officials.

Mr. Mastroianni stated that there is an existing 12" water main in River Road which they will connect to with 8" pipes looping around the development. Flow tests have confirmed that there is plenty of flow available. As part of this development Pulte Homes will be extending a water main by 1,300 – 1,400 linear feet down River Road. Electric, cable and phone utilities are already in River Road as well as gas provided by Columbia Gas.

In regards to affordability, the Zoning Bylaw requires 15% of the project to be affordable. They have met with the Council on Aging, who feels strongly that there is a need for the affordable homes. Pulte is committed to building the 30 affordable homes. Mr. Bergeron asked if it would be a mix of housing. Mr. Mastroianni stated that zoning requires that the affordable units be interspersed among the garden style buildings. Mr. Doherty questioned how the resale would work on the affordable units. Mr. Materazzo stated that there is a deed rider for the affordability for those units, but added that it is sometimes hard to find qualified buyers. Mr. Bergeron asked how the Board can find more information on if providing the affordable units or the payment in lieu of makes more sense. Mr. Materazzo stated that he has been working with the Council on Aging on this. He explained that if on resale a qualified buyer cannot be found for the affordable unit within a certain period of time, the affordability expires and the unit can sell for market rate. The Town would then receive a one-time payment of the difference between the sales price and the affordable rate. Mr. Chiozzi noted that if the Town received the payment in lieu of instead of the units, the Town could use the money however it wants towards elderly housing. Ms. Duff agreed that the payment in lieu of is a really good option to have and that money would go into the Andover Housing Trust Fund. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Council on Aging is adamant that they want the units. Mr. Bergeron noted that he would like to continue the conversation with Pulte if they are open to either option. Mr. Mastroianni reiterated that they had made a commitment to the Council on Aging in regards to the units. Mr. Materazzo stated that he would circle back to the Council on Aging to see if they could come to a compromise.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Mastroianni if they had considered any solar elements in the design. Mr. Mastroianni stated that they had not because they feel the technology is too new, and it may cause aesthetic issues with buyers. Mr. Materazzo asked if they would consider designing the roof to be solar ready. Mr. Mastroianni stated that they hadn't considered that. Ms. Knowles stated that she thought most modern roofs were designed as solar-ready.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he wanted to Board to be kept in the loop on any discussions with the Council on Aging as well as discussions on the Intermunicipal Agreement. Ms. Knowles requested a scaled up version of the earthwork exhibit as she was having a hard time reading the key. Mr. Pouliot asked if Lowell and Tewksbury would ask for resident preference in the development in exchange for the IMA. Mr. Mastroianni stated that there would be no such requirement.

**459 River Road (cont'd):**

Susan Stott of 30 Pasho Street noted that often the challenge with affordability with senior citizens is that they tend to be over the asset limit. She stated that Andover Community Trust is now in a position to be helpful with any lottery or monitoring and she hopes a conversation on that will take place.

Keith Saxon of 15 Wethersfield Drive asked if there is a space for recycling dumpsters and containers. Mr. Mastroianni pointed out the recycling enclosure area in the rear for bulk cardboard and the 10 yard dumpster for single stream recycling.

Nuala Boness of 4 Robinswood Way stated that she was under the impression that affordable units have to be in perpetuity, and she was not aware of any payment in lieu of option. She asked Mr. Materazzo to address that. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Bylaw allows for the Board to consider the payment in lieu of as an option. Sometimes this option is appropriate and sometimes it is not. The Council on Aging has opined that they would like the affordable units to be built at this facility. Mr. Bergeron added that these units are different in what the Board has recently seen in that they are for sale units, not rentals. IT can sometimes be difficult to sell the units based on the price they are able to be sold for and the population of people who can qualify to buy the unit. Ms. Boness stated that she thought Andover was trying to keep all affordable units in perpetuity because they are needed. She doesn't understand why a payment in lieu of would be considered. Ms. Duff stated that the discussion is not that the Town doesn't need the units, the discussion is around the Town being in a position of having flexibility. The COA stated that they want the units.

Regina Kelly of 4 Bateson Drive asked if everyone on the Board had read the UMass needs survey. She noted that the Council on Aging has stated that the aging in Town are more interested in these types of developments. She asked how the in lieu of fee is determined. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Housing Partnership Committee determined a formula for the payment of lieu. He added that a rental project is different than a for sale project.

James Tammaro of 143 Lovejoy Road asked if the affordability expires. Mr. Materazzo stated that rental projects are always affordable in perpetuity. If an eligible buyer cannot be found for a for sale affordable unit after a certain period of time, that unit can be sold for market rate and the difference between the affordable rate and the sold price goes to the Andover Housing Trust Fund.

Matt Mrva of Bohler Engineering, the applicant's landscape architect reviewed the new plan which is a reorganization that allows for communal greenspace in the center of the community. Buildings 1 and 2 were rotated and the clubhouse was moved to the center of the garden style buildings. This opens up the views from the buildings to the woods. Pocket parks were added to the plan that further connects the single family units to the parks. There will be 1.3 acres of landscaped open space linked to the residences beyond in all directions. The clubhouse is centrally located and the pocket parks will all have seating.

Mr. Bergeron asked where the existing Franciscan Center would have been located on the plan. Mr. Mrva pointed out its location on the plan in front of the buildings. Ms. Knowles stated that

**459 River Road (cont'd):**

she liked the central area that could be a community focus with everyone a little bit closer to the community center. Mr. Materazzo asked the Board if they all preferred this layout and the Board agreed that they did.

On a motion by Mr. Chiozzi seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to continue the public hearings on 459 River Road a Special Permit for Senior Residential Community Overlay District and Special Permit for Earth Movement to August 11, 2015 at 8:45 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

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

**254 Lowell Street:**

Mr. Bergeron opened the continued public hearing on 254 Lowell Street, a Special Permit for Elderly Housing. Mr. Materazzo stated that hearing was left open from the last meeting for further information on traffic from the Officer Edgerly and comments on the plan from the Design Review Board.

Mr. Doherty noted that Officer Edgerly sent an email to the Board in which he stated he doesn't see a problem with the traffic. Mr. Doherty noted that Officer Edgerly mentioned during an IDR that senior reaction time was slower, but he has stated that he doesn't see that as a problem at this location. Officer Edgerly also checked with area towns that have these types of communities, and they haven't had any problems with them. Mr. Doherty added that Officer Edgerly stated that drivers age 16-20 are more careless than senior drivers. Mr. Doherty reiterated that Officer Edgerly sent a very extensive email answering his and Mr. Pouliot's concerns and he felt Officer Edgerly did not have a problem with this community. Mr. Pouliot stated that he took it differently and thinks Officer Edgerly is not in favor of it. Mr. Pouliot stated that Officer Edgerly used anecdotal, non-scientific data. Mr. Pouliot stated that he is concerned that combining slower reaction time with speeding kids will cause an accident. Mr. Pouliot stated that Officer Edgerly is proposing mitigation, he is not fine with it or signing off on it. Mr. Pouliot stated that adding street signs and changing roadways will affect the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Materazzo stated that in regards to requests for a crosswalk across Lowell Street at the site, it would not be appropriate because there is no safe haven sidewalk to cross to. He noted that it is up to the Board if they would like to condition sidewalks or signage across the frontage of the property. Mr. Doherty noted that the blinking yellow signs may not be popular but it is working at Phillips Academy. Mr. Materazzo stated that Officer Edgerly would support that if the Board conditioned it. Mr. Bergeron noted that there is an existing condition and if this project can improve that situation it should be considered. Mr. Chiozzi asked if it would be a data collector sign and Mr. Materazzo told him that he was correct. Ms. Knowles stated that an LED crossing system would be appropriate for this area. Mr. Materazzo reiterated that a safe haven would have to be put in place. Ms. Knowles questioned if there was anything of note for the residents of the development to cross to such as open space area. Mr. Materazzo stated that her question was something that could be taken up during deliberations.

**254 Lowell Street (cont'd):**

Mr. Materazzo noted that he received a report back from the Design Review Board. Ted Tye of National Development stated that they were before the design review Board the previous night. The DRB gave 8 suggestions for the plan, of which they agreed with 6. They are willing to 1. Vary the sizes of gables and dormers. 2. Limit the number of windows in gables to two or three. 3. Not use continuous shed dormers between the gables. 4. Incorporate functional porches that will have a depth to fit a wheelchair. 5. Visually link the entry to other design elements such as porch roofs and gables. 6. Use chimneys to break up the roof lines. They are not willing to ensure the widths of the gables are residential in scale because this is too subjective, or bring elements of the roofline down to the first floor eaves because this would limit the number of units.

Mr. Doherty asked if they would have renderings available for the next meeting. Mr. Tye stated that they could or they could have all of these incorporated into the final design.

Chet Lyons of 10 Wild Rose Drive stated that there was recently an accident in the area involving an 84 year old driver getting t-boned pulling out of the Bible Church. This development would bring 100 elderly drivers with it. Mr. Lyons stated that he is very concerned about the safety aspect and it is hard to find a worse place that this could be located.

Daniel Chen of 7 Windemere Drive stated that he leaves Windemere at 8 a.m. and sometimes he was to wait behind a bus. He can only see 10-20 feet looking left to pull out. At 6 p.m. the construction slows down traffic. Adding signs will make traffic even worse and he is concerned for kids getting off of a bus.

James Tammaro of 143 Lovejoy Road stated that he did a crash analysis from information available on the Massachusetts Crash Portal. From 2007-2013, .02% of accidents on Route 133 occurred at the intersection of Windemere, with 17% of accidents occurring between Lovejoy and Shawsheen. He added that 5% of the accidents involved drivers between the ages of 16-20. He stated that the peak number of cars coming onto the road was noted as 7 in the traffic report but he feels it is actually 20. A more comprehensive study of the corridor needs to take place, and the traffic peer reviewer stated that you wouldn't know unless you did the study. Mr. Tammaro stated that he and others reviewed the remand order and it does not legally limit the scope of discussion to the five items. He asked that people be able to speak to the other items, and he wants a comprehensive study of the corridor. Mr. Pouliot asked Mr. Materazzo to get clarity from Town Counsel that the Board is limited to discussing the five items.

Heather Lauten of 243 Lowell Street stated that the traffic study used deficient use codes from the ITE Manual. She stated that the traffic study used the use codes 254 and 252 for Assisted Living and Adult Housing instead of the use code for Congregate Care. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Materazzo to consult with the peer reviewer on the use codes.

Mr. Tye asked the Board what he should provide for the next meeting. Mr. Chiozzi stated that he would like to see elevations and Mr. Doherty stated that he would like to see renderings. Mr. Tye stated that he would provide elevations and renderings of all sides of the building.

**254 Lowell Street (cont'd):**

On a motion by Mr. Pouliot seconded by Mr. Doherty, the Board continued the public hearing on 254 Lowell Street to July 28, 2015 at 8:00 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (5-0).

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.