

Present were: Anderson, Jeton, Brown, Batchelder, Boness, Baime, Ranalli

The meeting opened at 7 p.m.

Petition No.: 3932

Premises affected: 70 North Main St

Petitioner: Jeffco

Members: Jeton, Brown, Batchelder, Boness, Baime, Ranalli

There was a request to continue to 11/3/11. Batchelder made a motion to allow the continuance to 11/3/11. Baime seconded the motion & the Board voted to allow the continuance to 11/3/11.

Petition No.: 3947

Premises affected: 149R Haggetts Pond Rd

Petitioner: New Cingular

Members: Brown (Acting Chair), Batchelder (Acting Clerk), Boness, Baime

This is a continued public hearing originally opened 7/7/11, then continued to 8/4/11 to allow the applicant to submit the structural analysis of the existing tower. On 7/28/11 a request to continue to the 9/8/11 was received by New Cingular's agent, Michelle Pacheco, and the Board voted at its 8/4/11 meeting to continue the hearing to 9/8/11. On 9/8/11 the Board voted to continue the hearing to the 10/6/11 due to a lack of quorum. On 9/22/11 written consent to be heard by a 4-member board at the 10/6/11 meeting was submitted by Ms. Pacheco.

Mr. Dolan again represented the petitioner. He had reviewed the structural analysis prepared by Electronic Research, Inc. (ERI), dated 8/31/11. The ERI analysis finds that the structure will meet the minimum requirements of the ANSI/TIA-222-G Standard, Structural Standard for Antenna Supporting Structures and Antennas, for a 3 second wind gust speed of 100 MPH with no ice & 40 MPH with 1.0 inches of base ice. It was noted by Board member Boness that the report was signed and stamped by a Massachusetts-registered Mechanical Engineer, not a Structural Engineer as required. The Board voted to continue the public hearing to November 3, 2011, to allow the petitioner to obtain the proper certification.

Petition No.: 3953

Premises affected: 15 Railroad St

Petitioner: Connerton Realty

Members: Anderson, Brown, Batchelder, Baime, Ranalli

Alternates: Jeton, Boness

Dan Gillan appeared on behalf of the petitioner who is seeking to erect two attached signs for two businesses, Dan Gillan Photography & The Financial Advisors, LLC, both located on the premises. Both signs would exceed the maximum allowable sign area of 9 square feet. Both signs are proposed to be 40"x40" or 11 square feet. Graphic depictions of both proposed signs, as well as the brackets used to attach the signs were provided. Both signs' bottom edges will be 8' above grade and to the left of the entry ways of the respective business doors to ensure sufficient head height clearance for customers and pedestrians. There are currently existing signs for both businesses that will be removed if these new signs are approved. The Design Review Board reviewed the proposed signs and provided a letter of support. It stated that the signs were well proportioned and designed and that the minor increase in size would make it significantly easier for passersby to read the sign graphics. No members of the public came forward to speak for or against the proposal. The Board then voted unanimously to waive a viewing of the premises, to close the public hearing and to deliberate the matter. The chair designated Jeton & Boness to sit as alternates for the case.

The Board considered §5.2.10.3.d of the Zoning By-Laws that allows a larger sign by special permit if the sign does not exceed fifteen (15) square feet. Since the signs are within the fifteen square foot maximum, the Board agreed with the assessment of the Design Review Board that the signs were well designed, as well that both signs would be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the regulations of the Zoning By-Laws. The Board voted unanimously to grant a special permit under Article §5.2.10.3.d with the condition that the signs will be constructed and installed in substantial conformity with the plans and specifications provided. The Board then found that Article §5.2.10.3.b of the Zoning By-Laws is not applicable to the proposed project, and voted unanimously to deny the requested variance as moot. Ranalli will write the decision.

Petition No.: 3954**Premises affected: 70 Summer St****Petitioner: Licata / Gehr****Members: Anderson, Brown, Jeton, Batchelder, Baime, Jeton, Boness, Ranalli**

There was a request to withdraw without prejudice. Batchelder made a motion to continue to allow the withdrawal without prejudice. Baime seconded the motion & the Board voted to allow the withdrawal without prejudice.

Petition No.: 3955**Premises affected: 20 Enmore St****Petitioner: Grzywacz****Members: Brown (Acting Chair), Jeton (Acting Clerk), Baime, Ranalli**

The applicants represented themselves requesting a variance &/or a special permit to construct a 15'x24.3' addition that will not meet the front & side yard setback requirements. The plans provided by the applicant lack sufficient detail for the Board to make a decision. The detail that was absent included a certified plot plan and the specific setback distances of the proposed addition. The Board agreed to continue the public hearing until 11/3/11.

Petition No.: 3952**Premises affected: 30 Shattuck Rd****Petitioner: Hanover R.S. LP****Members: Anderson, Brown, Jeton, Baime, Boness**

An overview of the application for a Comprehensive Permit to construct 288 units of multi-family rental housing in five buildings on a 10.4-acre parcel of property located at 30 Shattuck Road in Andover was presented to the Board. The portion of the site to be developed is located entirely within the Industrial D District. A small portion of the site is located within the Single Residence C District, but there will be no development on of that portion of the site in connection with the project. A portion of the site is also within the Watershed Protection Overlay District. The site has 560 feet of frontage along Shattuck Road & is abutted by office uses to the north, east & south along Shattuck Road. Single family & multi-family residential uses exist along Brundrett Avenue & River Road to the west & northwest of the site (including Casco Crossing on River Road, a 96-unit rental development). Access & egress to the site will be from Shattuck Road to River Road, which in turn offers easy access to I-93. Existing sanitary sewer & water lines will serve the development. Comments were also received from Town staff in connection with an IDR held on 9/6/11. A site visit was scheduled for 10/23/11. The hearing was continued for additional discussion to 11/17/11.

Petition No.: 3956**Premises affected: 0 Lowell St / 0 Greenwood Rd****Petitioner: Andover Apts at Rolling Green****Members: Anderson, Brown, Jeton, Baime, Boness**

On 6/30/11, AA@RG, LLC (the "Applicant") submitted a Chapter 40B Project Eligibility application to the Massachusetts Housing Partnership (MHP) to develop mixed-income rental housing on a 47.9-acre parcel of land, consisting of one parcel known & numbered as 0 Lowell Street, as well as 0 Greenwood Road, all as shown on the Town of Andover Assessors Maps as Lots 6A & 14 on Map 151. MHP issued a Project Eligibility Letter on 9/13/11. The Property is located in the Single Residence C (SRC) zoning district & the Watershed Protection Overlay District (WPOD). It is bordered to the north by open space & wetlands in the SRC district; to the east by Greenwood Road in a Single Residence B (SRB) district; to the south by Lowell Street & a Limited Service (LS) district with an existing 191-unit multi-family rental development known as Windsor Green & an indoor recreation facility known as the Boston Sports Club; & to the west by Interstate Route 93. At present, the Property is used as a nine-hole golf course & conservation land, with access through easements in the LS district. The application included plans for 298 rental apartments, a 900-sq. ft. retail pad, and a 75,000 sq. ft. commercial storage facility on 45.3 +/- acres of the Site, as well as civil engineering, environmental, drainage and stormwater management, and traffic reports prepared by experts. The Board continued the hearing to 10/27/11 for additional discussion & testimony.

There being no other business, there was a motion to adjourn & a second. The Board voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting.