

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 p.m. Present were Chairman Zach Bergeron, members Vincent Chiozzi (arrived at 7:37 p.m.), Jay Doherty, Joan Duff, Ann Knowles and Associate Member Austin Simko; also present were Paul Materazzo, Director of Planning and Lisa Schwarz, Senior Planner.

Planning Session:**Shawsheen Village Neighborhood – Single Residence A1:**

Mr. Materazzo reviewed the history leading up to this potential Town Meeting article. This zoning change would keep the current SRA dimensional requirements in place, but limit the allowed uses in the district. This new zoning district, SRA-1, would now allow cluster development, but would prohibit certain uses such as senior housing.

Sean Higgins of 20 Liberty Street stated that the neighborhood's main concern is access into any new development. There are certain allowed uses that are traffic generators that the infrastructure of the neighborhood could not support. Mr. Higgins stated that Town Counsel felt that limiting the uses to single family detached housing may be challenged by the Attorney General, so they have opened it up to include cluster housing. The neighborhood agrees that leaving the dimensional requirements in place will limit the amount of houses to be built which is something that they would welcome. He asked the Board if they have any comments on this article or if they would be willing to cosponsor it.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Materazzo if a cluster development allows for the same number of units as a conventional development, but with a different arrangement of lots to allow for more open space. Mr. Materazzo stated that a cluster development allows for smaller lot sizes with 1/3 dedicated open space. This article allows for both single family cluster and multiple-family attached cluster. Ms. Knowles noted that with a cluster development you have the potential of creating the historic look and feel of the neighborhood. Mr. Materazzo added that a cluster development gives a developer more options and an ability to work with the neighborhood.

Paul Therkelsen of 11 Carlisle Street asked what uses would be eliminated and what would be allowed with this article. Mr. Materazzo stated that the new district would be more specific with the allowed uses, and uses like elderly housing and clubs would be eliminated.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there are other areas of Town with customized zoning to this scale. Mr. Materazzo stated that Doctor's Park would be one such area of Town. Ms. Knowles asked for confirmation that a club would not be allowed. John Nies of 27 Sutherland Street stated that they have pulled club out of the allowed uses. Ms. Knowles asked if non-profits would still be allowed. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Dover uses in Chapter 40A cannot be eliminated. Ms. Knowles asked what the difference is between a club and a non-profit. Mr. Materazzo stated that the Inspector of Buildings would interpret the definition. Members of the audience noted that a club could include a social and/or athletic club.

Ms. Knowles stated that she had hoped that the historical lot sizes would have been kept. She noted that they have to be realistic in allowing options for development. Mr. Higgins pointed out

that they would now be allowing cluster development. Mr. Materazzo stated that there are five allowed uses in this district: single family homes, multiple dwellings, Dover uses, conversions and cluster development.

Mr. Bergeron noted that with this zoning a developer could build homes of similar size and lot sizes with additional open space. Mr. Materazzo agreed. Mr. Simko asked if SRA-1 is a compromise between empowering developers and limiting density as it relates to traffic. Mr. Higgins stated that he was correct. Ms. Duff asked if they knew the difference in the number of lots if the lots were 10,000 s.f. versus 15,000 s.f. Mr. Materazzo stated that a cluster subdivision can only have the same number of lots as a conventional subdivision. Mr. Higgins stated that the Brickstone marketing plan showed 20-30 houses on 7,000 s.f. lots. He estimated 10-15 houses on 15,000 s.f. lots and Mr. Nies stated there would be about 20 houses on 10,000 s.f. lots. Mr. Chiozzi asked if this one parcel would be the only SRA-1 in Town. Mr. Bergeron stated that it encompasses the neighborhood, not just one parcel.

The Board discussed if they wanted to cosponsor the article. Ms. Knowles stated that it was her assumption that any rezoning would have smaller lots, but she may be able to support the article because of the cluster option. Mr. Higgins stated that originally they had heard that the neighborhood wanted smaller lots, but in talking with many people they found that wasn't accurate. Mr. Nies added that they didn't change the square footage because they didn't want to play with a bunch of numbers. Mr. Materazzo noted that the neighborhood is a mix of square footages. Mr. Higgins stated that this was more simplistic and the neighborhood was more comfortable leaving the numbers where they were. Mr. Chiozzi stated that frontage needs to be considered. A frontage of 115 ft equals 3 houses in a football field. He asked if anyone had actually done a layout. Mr. Materazzo stated that they had that information, but the neighborhood is more comfortable with the larger lots. Ms. Knowles noted that this SRA-1 is a replication of the Stirling Woods development. Mr. Materazzo stated that the neighborhood liaisons were clear that this is what they want to see.

Mr. Bergeron asked if by not co-sponsoring the article, the Board does not support it. Ms. Schwarz stated that the Board can support the article at Town Meeting without co-sponsoring it. Mr. Bergeron noted that he wouldn't want the Planning Board not co-sponsoring the article to make it a detriment. He asked if every stone had been overturned to make this work. Mr. Materazzo stated that they have pushed the neighborhood for alternatives and they have come up with the best thing for them. Mr. Higgins agreed.

Ms. Knowles asked if Town Counsel was okay with this and Mr. Materazzo stated that he is reviewing the article. Mr. Doherty stated that he would not want to co-sponsor the article unless the Board was unanimous. Mr. Simko stated that the questions of use and dimensions resolves the balance between limiting development and allowing development. He questioned what the goals and the spirit are behind this article.

Mr. Higgins stated that it seems like the Board is hesitant because initially people wanted smaller lots. He noted that if the current zoning remains in place, they can't come in with a development with smaller lots. The neighborhood does not want to leave it up to a developer to do whatever they want. The main issue is access and the neighborhood is trying to be involved.

Mr. Doherty stated that he can understand the neighborhood wanting to restrict certain types of traffic and he can support that. Ms. Knowles agreed that there is a funny access to the neighborhood. Mr. Bergeron noted that this can be done now minus some uses and it is consensus driven. It won't have the Shawsheen feel but it can't right now anyway. Mr. Chiozzi stated that he is uncomfortable sponsoring the article with traffic being a reason for the zoning change. Mr. Materazzo stated that to co-sponsor the article, the joint message has to be clear. Mr. Chiozzi stated that he is comfortable supporting the article but not sponsoring it. The other members of the Board agreed.

In-town Independent Living Overlay District:

Ms. Schwarz updated the Board on the Council on Aging sponsored article for an In-town Independent Living Overlay District. She noted that the COA conducted a survey of residents age 55+ last year and they are trying to implement some of the recommendations of the survey. This article addresses a want for independent in-town living through an overlay district. The overlay district is a radius within a mile of Route 28/Main Street from Interstate 495 to Phillips Academy. Mr. Chiozzi asked if the zoning district is SRC and Ms. Schwarz stated that it is SRA and SRB.

Mr. Schwarz reviewed the housing options. The bylaw would allow for conversions without an age restriction on the home. Currently the zoning bylaw restricts conversions to homes built before 1941. New construction would be cottage style single family homes with a square footage restriction. This adds the ability to build an independent senior living unit on a non-conforming lot. There is a 5-year sunset clause in the bylaw causing to expire after 5 years if Town Meeting does not renew it. The bylaw includes a cap of 100 units total to be built with no more than 30 units on a 10 acre lot, as well as Design Review Board parameters. A public forum will be held on January 26th at the library, the DRB will be reviewing the article and Town Counsel has already reviewed it.

Mr. Bergeron noted that age restricted independent housing sounds tough knowing that no one under age 55 will ever be able to buy these units. Mr. Chiozzi added that there are not many lots in the designated area that fit these parameters. Ms. Schwarz stated that there are some larger lots that could be sold in the future. Mr. Chiozzi noted that the real estate in that area of Town is very expensive. He added that all of the services are in the center of Town, but all of the available land is on the outskirts. Mr. Doherty considered the overlay area to be very large and not all in-town. Mr. Bergeron questioned if this is attainable based on economics.

Ms. Duff asked if other Towns have put their bylaws into practice. Ms. Schwarz stated that other towns have, but they are different types of towns with different makeup. Mr. Doherty stated that he thought the area would be more focused on downtown and he doesn't consider this to be downtown. Ms. Knowles stated that she wants more information on the non-conforming lots because she is concerned about density. Ms. Schwarz noted that there is a requirement of between 10,000 and 15,000 s.f. on a nonconforming lot. The zoning bylaw currently only allows affordable homes to be built, or a historic home to be moved to a non-conforming lot, so there may be nonconforming lots available. She added that an example would be an affordable home that was built on an 11,000 s.f. lot on Cheever Circle. Ms. Knowles asked if they would only be

building single family homes. Ms. Schwarz stated that the bylaw allows only 1 unit per 10,000 s.f. of land. Mr. Chiozzi offered that something like this has to be built vertical, because you can't put three dwellings on a 30,000 s.f. lot. Ms. Schwarz agreed, however one floor living is more accessible. Mr. Chiozzi added that a previous article to allow accessory dwellings did not pass at Town Meeting. Ms. Schwarz stated that if the article doesn't represent the wants of the demographic then it should not pass.

254 South Main Street:

Mr. Bergeron opened the continued public meeting for 254 South Main Street, a Site Plan Review Dover Use. Mr. Materazzo stated that the applicants for 254 South Main Street have requested that the Board continue the meeting without discussion.

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board continued the public meeting on 254 South Main Street without discussion to February 9, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

1 Burt Road:

Mr. Bergeron opened the public hearing for 1 Burt Road, Pfizer, a Special Permit for Major Non-Residential Project.

Gil Stevens representing Pfizer reviewed their Andover campus operations which is a full scale biotechnology facility. Pfizer is an OSHA Voluntary Protection Program Star Work Site and operates a significant community outreach program.

Mr. Stevens reviewed the Pfizer campus and abutting areas. He showed the Site Master Plan that was commissioned in 1989 and revised in 2009. In 1989 the road was relocated and all of the utilities were put in place to accommodate up to 1,000,000 s.f. of building. Mr. Stevens reviewed the current buildings onsite and their operations.

Mr. Stevens stated that this clinical manufacturing facility will be a flexible small scale facility leveraging the existing underground core utilities. This facility will create 75 new positions, two thirds of which will be manufacturing and one third technical. They anticipate to be fully operational by January 2019. Mr. Stevens noted that the building is outside of the wetland buffer zone and they will be going before Conservation on January 19th for a Notice of Intent. Mr. Chiozzi asked if the storm drainage is subsurface. Dennis Collins the architect on the project stated that it leverages the existing detention basin and ties into the existing infrastructure that drains over to the pond. Mr. Chiozzi asked what the area marked storm detention is on the plan. Mr. Collins stated that the storm detention shown on the plan is an underground holding tank that comes back into the detention pond, a recharge area.

Mr. Collins described the proposed Building E of the campus as a 170,000 s.f., 5 story building with a height of 77.6 ft. to the roofline. All utilities will come from existing facilities onsite with power, steam and chilled water coming from an existing plant in Building B across the top level of the connecting pedestrian bridge to Buildings B and F. The stormwater and sewer connections come back into the existing facility for a pH adjustment for the sanitary sewer and then it is discharged back through the existing connections. This building will add an additional

10% to the current use and discharge for water and sewer. The square footage of this building is less than what was originally planned for in the Master Plan. Pfizer is still retaining the ability to build the other structures planned for the site. Mr. Bergeron asked what the height of Building B is and Mr. Collins stated that it is essentially the same height as the proposed building, just under 80 feet. Mr. Collins noted that the Master Plan calls for turning what is now the back of the campus to the main entrance of the campus. This building is being sited to allow for a small expansion in the future adding a security checkpoint to the building and give a new main entrance to the site. The ground floor of the building will be supportive office functions, mechanical, small warehousing and receiving. The second floor is main production and process. The third floor is mechanical. The fourth floor is another production level and the fifth floor is mechanical.

Mr. Collins showed renderings of the building from all sides. The building will be a precast concrete panel using a rain screen technology with metal stud insulation exterior. A fairly large portion of the building will be glass providing views out to the west. The connecting bridge is at the second level and connects to Buildings F and B. Existing fire lanes will remain and be maintained. There will be a small amount of warehousing for operations at this building only. There will be no change in truck traffic to the site from the operations of this building. This building will employ an additional 75 people working 3 shifts. Parking regulations require 205 parking spaces and they have an additional 100 spaces over that number.

Mr. Collins stated that construction traffic would access the site by Route 93/Ballardvale Street/Lowell Junction Road. Mr. Chiozzi asked if they will lose parking spaces during construction. Mr. Collins stated that the south lot will be lost during construction but it is lightly used and it shouldn't be an issue. Mr. Chiozzi noted that the Master Plan calls for another garage to be built. Mr. Collins stated that there are two other buildings on the Master Plan, an office/lab building and a major production facility that if built would require an additional garage. Mr. Chiozzi asked if all of the construction deliveries would come from Route 125 and not from the neighborhood. Mr. Collins stated that contracts would be written with deliveries coming from the 125 exit off of Route 93.

Ms. Knowles asked if they intend to take the under used parking area offline after construction and turn it into greenspace. Mr. Collins stated that it would revert back to parking. Ms. Knowles questioned if they need that parking. Mr. Collins stated that they will need the parking based on their full time employees.

Ms. Schwarz reviewed the comments received at the IDR. The Fire Department is satisfied with the design. The Health Department reviewed the plans and stated the sewer connection will be reviewed prior to the issuance of the building permit. The DPW had minor comments. The Inspector of Building stated that all zoning requirements have been met. Conservation is facilitating a stormwater peer review.

Ms. Schwarz stated that this building will take up 1.8% of the site. Adding 75 jobs over three shifts to a facility that at one time had 900 more employees than it does today does not trigger any traffic concerns with the Safety Officer. Mr. Chiozzi asked if they should wait for a Conservation decision because it may affect the overall plan. Ms. Schwarz noted that if they

don't get Conservation approval they cannot move forward with the project. Mr. Materazzo added that if the project substantially changes they would have to come back to the Board for a modification.

Mr. Chiozzi noted that the last decision for Pfizer was very sensitive to the neighborhood to the north in regards to traffic. He requested that the same language be put in to any decision. He noted that if a 200,000 or 300,000 s.f. office space was added in the future, that would be the time to revisit the traffic. Mr. Simko asked if the GMP Production Suites are a new use for this campus. Mr. Stevens stated that it is a new function coming to the site. Mr. Simko asked if that use will have an impact on traffic. Mr. Stevens clarified that it is an existing use on campus that is being intensified. Mr. Bergeron asked if this use will lead to retrofitting other areas in existing buildings. Mr. Stevens stated that it will not. He added that the existing manufacturing space is full and they also do contract manufacturing with other companies to fill their capacity and keep their people engaged. Approximately 90% of the raw clinical manufacturing materials are identical.

Richard Nill of 9 Haskell Road stated that he is a resident and a Pfizer employee and he strongly recommends this project because it is good for both Pfizer and the Town.

On a motion by Ms. Duff seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to continue the public hearing for a Special Permit for Major Non-Residential Project for the Pfizer addition until January 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

Other Business:

Pine Forest Park Performance Guarantee:

Mr. Materazzo informed the Board that there is a memo dated December 30, 2015 from Town Planner Jacki Byerley recommending the Board reduce the performance guarantee held for Pine Forest Park from \$87,300 to \$67,300 based on memo from the Department of Public Works.

On a motion by Mr. Chiozzi seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board moved to approve the reduction of the performance guarantee to secure the proper construction and the completion of the services and ways to \$67,300 as recommended by the Department of Municipal Services in a memo dated December 4, 2015. **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

Meeting Minutes:

On a motion by Ms. Knowles seconded by Mr. Doherty the Board approved the meeting minutes of July 14, 2015, July 21, 2015, July 28, 2015 and August 11, 2015 **Vote:** Unanimous (6-0).

Planning Session:

Table of Use – Restaurants:

Mr. Materazzo stated that the intention of this proposed warrant article is to make it easier for restaurants to locate to the downtown. It would allow for sit down and fast food restaurants to be a by right use in the downtown. The Site Plan Review and Special Permit process would still be

in place for new construction and backfill would be by right. Mr. Materazzo stated that the EDC and the Zoning Board Chair agree that this is a good Phase I of a comprehensive review.

Mr. Bergeron questioned if the Board should be cosponsoring an article that isn't in their jurisdiction. Mr. Materazzo stated that the EDC could sponsor this article with the Planning Board supporting it at Town Meeting. Ms. Knowles stated that the Board cosponsoring it can make it look stronger. Mr. Bergeron stated that the article is strong, but he doesn't feel it is for the Planning Board to say that this is something that the Town should do.

Other Business:

Community Garden:

Ms. Knowles informed the Board that in early December the Andover Community Garden was approved. It will be located on High Plain Road across from the dog park, and will open in the spring. Final issues are currently being worked out such as getting water to the site. There will be approximately 40 plots available to residents through a lottery process.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m.