Pamela Armstrong, Chair of the Route 40 Study Committee, briefed the Planning Board on the Committee’s Final Report and Recommendations on June 26, 2019.

The briefing can be viewed at

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VoAQhTorkNs (Beginning Minute 11:17)

or

https://chelmsfordtv.org/watch/planboard/ (Beginning Minute 11:20)

or

https://archive.org/details/20190626planningboardgap.mpeg4 (Beginning Minute 10:05)

The following three documents are enclosed:

(1) Route 40 Study Committee Final Report & Recommendation
    (Note: The Report references a letter from the Chelmsford Water Department; The letter is from the North Chelmsford Water Department.)

(2) Route 40 Study Committee Report Summary briefing provided to the Planning Board on June 26, 2019.

(3) Talking Points for Route 40 Study Committee Report summary briefing in Item (2) above. These talking points were read by Pamela Armstrong during her presentation to the Planning Board.
Route 40 Study Committee Report Summary

June 26, 2019

Please see full report dated 6/26/19 for details
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Committee Meeting Schedule

• First Meeting September 27, 2018

• 16 total meetings

• Over 9 months

• External subject matter experts
Committee Mission Statement

“Review current zoning, consider the impact of the area, the neighborhoods, the local business and the Town of Chelmsford. Recommend the best use of the land for development considering changes in the future”
## Invited Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee / Position</th>
<th>Invited Guests</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Commission</td>
<td>Linda Prescott</td>
<td>10.5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinal Square Committee</td>
<td>Kenny Pantuso</td>
<td>10.5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Housing Authority</td>
<td>David Hedison</td>
<td>10.30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Advisory Committee</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>10.30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Town Manager</td>
<td>Michael McCall</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Commission</td>
<td>(Letter to Committee)</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Business Development</td>
<td>Lisa Marrone</td>
<td>11.29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td>Paul Cohen</td>
<td>11.29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Water Department</td>
<td>(Letter to Committee)</td>
<td>1.8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>3.5.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>3.12.19*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note at both of these meetings, Evan Belansky was present at the request of the committee as a subject matter expert.*
7 Alternate Zoning Options
• Alternate Zoning Option #1
  • North Side IA
  • North Side RC (200 Feet)
  • South Side RC

* Current Zoning

Considered pros and cons of current zoning as we discussed other alternates to determine whether zoning changes are needed.
• Alternate Zoning Option #2
  • North Side CC
  • South Side first 300 feet CC
  • South Side RM for the remainder

This option was based on what was presented to the public initially and the committee found no compelling advantage of CC. South Side RM creates a direct zoning conflict with existing and abutting properties.
• Alternate Zoning Option #3
  
• North Side IA
• North Side BAOD or Unique Overlay
• South Side RC

Extending IA to the street with a unique overlay allows more flexibility and control. Leaving the South Side RC avoids zoning creep and provides a buffer to abutting neighborhoods.
Extending IA to the street with a unique overlay allows more flexibility and control. Zone the South Side back to RB based on the current use of all single residences. This zoning avoids zoning creep and provides a buffer to abutting neighborhoods.
• Alternate Zoning Option #5
  • North Side CC
  • South Side RC or RB

No compelling advantage of CC. South Side RC / RB provides buffer and avoids zoning creep and zoning conflict.
• Alternate Zoning Option #6

• North Side IA
• South Side RM

Extending IA to the street allows more flexibility and increases the value of existing homes. South Side RM creates a direct zoning conflict with existing and abutting properties.
This option was based on what was presented to the public initially and the committee found no compelling advantage of CC. South Side CC creates a direct zoning conflict with existing and abutting properties.
CCCOD
Continuing Care Community Overlay District

- Age-in-place village
- Multi-Family zoned
- Balancing height dimensions
- Facilitated and independent living
- Complementary amenities & services

Overlay Benefits:
Allows multi-family and age-in-place residential development, increased density, reduced unit sizes, increased building heights in IA district, along with complementary commercial amenities and services.
Final Recommendation

- Leave the South Side zoned RC
- Zone the North Side all IA
- Create a Continuing Care Community Overlay District for the North Side
  (age-in-place community)
Current Zoning Vs. Recommendation

Current Zoning Map

Recommendation of Re-Zoning Area
In closing, the Route 40 Committee would like to thank the Town of Chelmsford and the Planning Board for the opportunity to research and discuss alternatives for the Route 40 Groton Road area.

Route 40 Committee
Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Donald Van Dyne, Pamela Armstrong, Nance Gillies, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Michael Walsh
First slide

- Good Evening, I'd like to Thank you the members of the Planning Board for putting together this committee and allowing us to give you this presentation tonight.
- For those here and watching at home who are not familiar with why The Committee was formed On August 29 2018, there was a public hearing to present a proposed zoning change to Route 40 and possible development from the Rt 3 ramps towards the Westford line, this public session proposed a change to CC or commercial zoning in that area. There was a public outcry and it was suggested a committee be formed to study this area and make a recommendation as to the future vision of this area and to recommended whether a zoning change is needed.

Second Slide

- The planning board recommended the committee have 1 selectman, 2 planning board members and 4 residents from the area to form the committee. (Read names) Since the committee was formed, one resident member was elected to the Planning board, Michael Walsh and one resident member was elected to the Board of Selectman, Virginia Crocker Timmins. Congratulations to both of them.
- NEXT SLIDE
- The committee first met on Sept 27, 2018 and continued to meet over a 9 month period, held 16 meetings, usually 2-3 hours in length, invited subject matter guests for input and welcomed the public to speak at every meeting.

Third Slide

Our first thought was to look at the area in question, understand it, and how our recommendations may affect homeowners and businesses in the area and in the Town of Chelmsford.

- To those in the audience and watching at home who may not be familiar with this area, We are discussing approx. 16 acres on the south side of Route 40 which abut single family residential neighborhoods and an easement by a utility company. And Approx. 51 acres on the North side of Route 40, comprising of single Family residential homes, a rock crushing facility, trucking company and land owned by the State.
- A little bit about Rt 40: Rt 40 is 10.5 miles in length, a state route running east to west, it connects Groton to North Chelmsford, Vinal Square. This route has existed since 1940. By my observation, This stretch of land crosses 6 brooks Martins Pond Brook, Cow Pond Brook, Keyes Brook, Snake Meadow Brook, Blue Brook and Gilson Brook. It passes 5 Ponds, Flushing Pond, Long Sought for Pond, Keyes Pond, Whitney Pond and Freeman Lake. You can find 2 horse farms, a cow farm and a forefathers cemetery“Wright Cemetary” as well as a castle “ Bancroft Castle”. You will find approx. 225 homes along Rt 40.
- As far as businesses, From Groton heading to Chelmsford, you will find a grandfathered service station at Dunstable Rd in Westford, further along a small plaza with a gas station, coffee shop
and a café. When you reach Russells Way in Westford you see the changes Westford has made on Rt 40, you will find only 2 story buildings that home offices, medical buildings, banks, when you reach Oak Hill, you will find a gas station/donut shop, continuing on you find one more small strip mall, housing 2 food shops and a hardware store under 2 stories in height. Continuing to Chelmsford, you drive over RR tracks, pass a marshland and residential property until you reach the corner store and then the VFW and senior center till you hit businesses at Vinal Square.

- This gives you an idea of the area we are discussing and the many attributes we are affecting with proposed changes along Rt 40, so thinking of the big picture, we went out of Chelmsford and then focused again on the town and the area.

- One of the first tasks of the committee we felt important was to create a mission statement, “why are we here?” Every member took this appointment very seriously, trying to keep our personal opinions at bay and to always look at the bigger picture. The town had asked us to really think out of the box as to what was the best use for this property.

Our mission statement became...

Fourth Slide

- To get a better understanding of the task given to us by the town, the committee made a list of who we thought might be stakeholders or people and groups within the town that may have facts or opinions about this area of town.
- We invited “read slide”
- Each invited guest had strong opinions and input for this committee, David Hedison presented a compelling case for the needs of seniors and aging in place situations for Chelmsford residents.
- All “detailed” meeting minutes about what each person presented to the committee are found at the end of the Final Report and Recommendation notebook for your reference.

Fifth Slide

- The next step the committee took was to look at current zoning and also write down all the possible options of zoning for this area, this became our “our seven alternate zoning options”. I will briefly go through the 7, but ask that you Refer to the Final Report and Recommendation and the Corresponding Minutes in your notebooks for additional details.

Next Slide

1. **Alternative 1** Do nothing and leave it as it is
2. **NOTE:** In 2011 The South side zoning changed at Town meeting to (RC) to allow 2 family residents it was previously RB, single family residence. This passed and since that time no one has created a 2 family residence.
3. The North Side is currently zoned RC first 200 ft back from street (two family residence) and IA (light industrial) the remainder of the property.

**The committee will continue to reference this current zoning as it looks at all options**

Sixth Slide

1. Alternative 2 North Side CC commercial for entire area and South Side CC commercial for the first 300 ft back from street and RM (2 family) for the remainder

2. This is the proposed zoning the town recommended at the Aug 2018 Public Hearing

   CC on the North side would allow grocery stores, the committee sited 5 grocery stores in proximity to this site and they considered the effect to the 3 existing grocery stores in Chelmsford. It also allows large brick and mortar retail, which could impact Drum Hill and the RT 110 plaza as well as businesses throughout Chelmsford. The committee sited many vacant buildings throughout Chelmsford and neighboring towns.(Westford 4 corners, Littleton new plaza, Chelmsford rt 129, the old CVS building and others downtown vacancies on rt 110. It was noted that many stores are also leaving Nashua Pheasant Lane Mall. Committee did not see changing zoning to CC as a viable option fearing this type development may directly impact other Chelmsford businesses, be underutilized and at some point create vacant and abandon buildings, whether in this area or causing other establishments in town to close. Economic indicators predict that brick and mortar will be replaced with online shopping as time goes on. The committee felt that IA was preferred from a traffic perspective and potential development options, based on the above observations and by traffic reports presented to the committee by Mike McCall. Just a Note, the traffic count on rt 40 prior to the truck traffic to begin in late 2019 from the asphalt plant is approx. 15,000 cars per day, in comparison to North Rd which is 45,000 cars per day.

   CC and RM on the South side were not preferred based on the proximity to abutting residential neighborhoods causing zoning conflict, lack of screening due to the clear cut of the utility land and the potential of zoning creep through to Main St, creating additional zoning conflict with more neighborhoods. Note: there was a 6-1 vote against this option.

   The committee, based on community input felt that zoning to CC could have a devastating impact on Vinal Square & Chelmsford businesses and any future development potential in Vinal Square.

Seventh Slide

1. Alternative 3 Leave the South Side as RC, which allows 2 families, 2 unit townhouses or duplex buildings. Avoid Zoning Conflict and zoning creep into abutting neighborhoods and current zoning set backs provide screening.

2. North Side Bring IA to the street, much like RT110 in Chelmsford near the Westlands

   o It was proposed that we CONSIDER an BAOD overlay(which town currently has in place for Rt 129)
The committee discussed the details of the overlay and noted that Westford has not
gone over 2 stories or a similar height limit and we may want to try to maintain
consistency with the adjacent section of Rt 40 in Westford through to Chelmsford.
that services needed on RT 40 would be less then those needed along Rt129 due to lack
of large commercial industry located on Rt 129
If current owner sells the 20 acres of land on North Side, it was suggested a campus
environment life science center could locate here

The committee felt there was a need to create a new overlay other than the BAOD for Rt 129 that would
service the potential development of Rt 40 into the future. Their thought was it should be based on the
needs of the town, heard through the presentations to the committee by all parties. Possibly a senior or
age in place community with supporting services.
More on the overlay later.

Eighth Slide
1. Alternative 4 Bring the South Side back to the previous zoning of RB single family residents as
there are no 2 family buildings there now. North Side IA(Same as Alternative 3 with the
overlay) that we just went over. The thought was to leave this RC as it is now.

Ninth Slide
1. Alternative 5 North Side CC commercial and leave the South Side RB or leave RC.
I explained these discussion in previous options that I just reviewed.

Tenth Slide
1. Alternative 6 South Side RM (multifamily dwellings) North Side IA with a new overlay
North side covered in previous discussions
South Side RM, creates a direct zoning conflict with existing and abutting properties. Some
members of the committee felt it could be overdeveloped, increase congestion, increase
vehicular traffic competing with the increased truck traffic to begin in later 2019 when the
asphalt plant opens, no natural buffer to existing residential neighborhoods due to clear cut
easement from utility company, may promote zoning creep into the Main St neighborhoods and
allowed heights would conflict with abutting zoning and would not create a tiered zoning
change through to the North side(more about this later). There was a 6-1 vote to consider
keeping this area zoned RC, more in lines with what is working on Rt 110 Westlands area while
maintaining the neighborhoods and character of Rt 40.

Eleventh Slide
1. Alternative 7 CC to the street on the North Side and CC South Sides
These discussions took place in parts of the former alternative plans
6-1 vote to not consider this alternative
Discussion on whether to consider leaving the first 200 ft on the North side RC and CC the remaining area. The downside would be that residents would have commercial in their back yards. Business would not have visibility from the street. No roadside improvements or landscaping from new CC development.

South side to remain residential RC or RB for protection against zoning conflict, creep zoning through to main st and to maintain consistency with abutting properties.

Those are the 7 possible zoning changes. More detail refer to the minutes.

Twelve Slide OVERLAY

- Initial discussion about whether to use the BAOD or create a new overlay for the North Side
- Committee felt that the BAOD was written for Rt 129 and did not apply fully with the existing Rt 40 area or future intent of the area. SHOD overlay
  - The creation of an overlay called the “Continuing Care Community Overlay District” CCCOD began. Evan Belansky came to a meeting to aid in the discussion for clarifications and continuity with existing zoning definitions and tables.
  - Purpose: To allow housing in an IA (industrial zoned area) “current zoning on the North Side” with complimentary services and amenities. (This is being considered based on the current 300 person waiting list for age related housing, that will only increase as residents of Chelmsford age and want to stay in town.)
  - This overlay would compliment the area, as the senior center is located on R40, Age related housing is nearby at Groton Rd, Smith St and Technology Dr. Medical facilities are located at technology Drive with Dr offices in Westford along Rt40, technology Dr and Drum Hill.

What does this overlay look like...Brief overview of some items incorporated in this overlay (Full detail can be found in the Final Report Notebook) Our vision is to

1. Allow Housing with increased density, lower living area per unit(Housing not allowed in an IA zone presently)
2. Facilitated and Independent living styles for seniors and non seniors in need
3. Size limits to eating establishments and services to 3000 sq ft.
4. Limit amenities so as to not conflict with Vinal square businesses
5. Allows for medical, financial, adult/child care facilities.
6. Restrict height to 3 stories for first 200 ft North of Rt 40 and up to 5 stories remaining north side. Allowing greater potential for needed increased housing units.
7. Tiered effect. To height restriction for the first 200 ft is compatible to the height of the south side rc zone, bringing a cohesive neighborhood character along rt 40 and a tiered height increase so as to not create abutting zoning conflict.
   - Single family, 2 family 2/3 story, 3 story, 5 story allows for buffering, landscaping for the transition
8. To encourage and allow open space considerations with development.
9. Allows a developer to create 2 family/duplexes on the South Side as part of a North Side project. Possibly independent living units abutting the current residential neighborhoods supporting the CCCOD on the North side.

Slide Twelve  Final Recommendation:

Leave the South Side RC, 2 family zoning
Bring IA to the street on the North Side
Approving a CCCOD (Continuing Care/Age in Place)overlay which enhances the use of approx 51 acres
Based on all the discussions and use tables, we feel this is the best use of the land now and for future growth, while maintaining the character of the current residential area and rt 40 the needs of the town while considering Vinal Square and Chelmsford businesses.

NEXT SLIDE compares current to recommendation.

IN CLOSING:
The committee wants to thank you for putting us together to review this area. We feel that we took painstaking care in being open minded, considerate of the neighbors and residents living in the area. And thought about the needs of the town. We considered a use of this area that would prevent it from being neglected, abandoned, a neighborhood destroyed, and a blight on the town in future years and would offer housing, services and amenities that could last into the near and foreseeable future. We felt that we took careful consideration of the abutting neighborhoods and made concessions to allow additional development to take place in a single zoned IA area.

**We would like to ask the planning board to be mindful, as they move forward with this zoning recommendation to a public hearing and hopefully to town meeting, that careful, considerate thought went into this recommendation. As a committee none of us have any financial or personal gain from what happens here. Full disclosure we have one committee member that does live within the area to be considered for rezoning and she has been voting in favor of all recommendations by this committee.

You will hear from many residents and non residents as to their thoughts on this section of Rt 40. Including Residents leaving this area, residents wanting to stay, Residents and non residents of Chelmsford, Planning board members & Town Officials. Again we ask you be mindful of their reasoning behind changing our recommendations. Are they considering what is best for the whole town, as we were tasked to do. Why they would feel they need to circumvent and override our Final Report. I only say this based on the input and content from the public input we continued to hear at our meetings. We looked at this as you asked us to, for the future development and vision for this area, not for what one developer wanted to use the land for. If a developer had never come to you prior to Aug 28, we do not feel you would be looking at this area now. We hope you consider the months, hours and the detail in gathering facts and
information that went into the report when making your final recommendation to town meeting.

I do have one request as Chairman of this committee to you Mister Chairman, is that the planning board reappoint the members of this committee through to the town meeting vote, in case questions are raised that we can answer as a standing committee. I would be happy to present this recommendation at town meeting if this is the recommendation you endorse. If the planning board wants the committee to reconvene to review any specific changes, we would be in place to do that.

I would like to thank all the members of the committee for their time given, their unbiased comments and thoughtful discussions and their commitment for doing the best they could for the Town of Chelmsford, for Rt 40 and for this committee. Virginia apologizes for not being here tonight she had a previous commitment.

Last Slide Any Questions from the board
Route 40 Study Committee
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Executive Summary
Executive Summary:

Committee Creation:
The Route 40 Study Committee was formed at the recommendation of the Planning Board from the August 29, 2018 public meeting. The first meeting of the committee was held on September 27, 2018. The committee had 16 meetings over a 9-month period.

Mission Statement:
Early in the process, the committee developed a mission statement to keep the meetings focused on a direction with keeping the best interest of the Town of Chelmsford in mind. The mission statement that was developed was a basis of alignment for the entire committee during all our meetings. The mission statement is:

“Review current zoning, consider the impact of the area, the neighborhoods, the local business and the Town of Chelmsford. Recommend the best use of the land for development considering changes in the future.”

Committee Recommendation:
The committee reviewed in detail 7 options of potential rezoning districts for both the north and south sides of Route 40 Groton Road. All seven options are discussed in detail in this report, see tab 6.

The following is the final recommendation that the committee is submitting to the Planning Board:

South Side:
The recommendation for the South Side is to leave it zoned as RC – Residential C District-Medium Density general residence district

- RC would allow a proper transition between the North Side of Route 40 and the residential neighborhoods currently zoned RB that abut and surround the South Side area.
- Zoning conflict is avoided
- RC would allow any development of two-family housing such as town houses or duplexes to be built.
- RC zoning would not enable or encourage future zoning creep into the other neighborhoods. This is consistent with other parts of town, ie: Westlands and Route 110.
**North Side:**

The recommendation for the North Side is to zone the entire north side all IA and include a special overlay.

IA – Limited Industrial District, would be extended south from the current location which is 200 feet north of Route 40. The new zone of IA would extend all the way to the street. The overlay which would be custom for the Route 40 area would be friendly to assisted senior living. The overlay would also include other housing besides age in place housing, giving a potential developer and the community more flexibility on options that would be aligned with residential neighborhoods. The committee also decided that the overlay would have the buildings on the front side of Route 40 for 200 feet back to be height restricted to 2 stories. Then after 200 feet from the street the height on the north side of the lots to increase to 5 stories.

- Zoning conflict on the North Side will be cleared up.
- The senior housing shortage could be helped if this scenario is developed
- Current zoning of IA allowable uses is not too far off from the intent of the committee
- The Overlay will allow amenities to help with the overall vision of the North Side Development
- Multi-Family housing will also be allowed in the overlay to the North.

**Unique Overlay:**

The Committee reviewed many different versions of a custom overlay for the north side of route 40, to go along with the recommendation to rezone the north side IA. The name of the proposed overlay is:

**Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD)**

This overlay is being proposed to help create an age in place community. Please see the draft version of the Article in Tab 8 of the report.

In closing the Route 40 Committee would like to thank the Town of Chelmsford and the Planning Board for the opportunity to research and discuss different opportunities for the Route 40 Groton Road area.

Sincerely:

Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Donald Van Dyne, Pamela Armstrong, Nance Gilles, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Michael Walsh
Committee Members
Route 40 Committee Members

The following people have been appointed to be part of the Route 40 Study Committee after applying for the positions online through the town website in September of 2018. These positions are for a one-year period at the discretion of the Planning Board. Official start date by the Town Clerks Office was September 12, 2018.

Emily Antul  
Board of Selectmen

Nancy Araway  
Planning Board

Donald Van Dyne  
Planning Board

Pamela Armstrong  
Resident Member 1

Nance Gillies  
Resident Member 2

Virginia Crocker Timmins  
Resident Member 3

Michael Walsh  
Resident Member 4

Michael Raisbeck *  
Planning Board Chair (Participated in an ex officio capacity but did not vote)

*At the January 8, 2019 meeting it was noted that Michael Walsh was sworn in as a full member of the Planning Board. At this time Michael Raisbeck stepped down from sitting with the committee and was now attending in the public section.
Mission Statement
During the October 5, 2018, the committee thought it would be good to discuss ideas on what the mission of the committee would be. The following statement was agreed upon by all members of the Route 40 Study Committee. Please see the meeting minutes in tab 9.

“Review current zoning, consider the impact of the area, the neighborhoods, the local business and the Town of Chelmsford. Recommend the best use of the land for development considering changes in the future.”
List of Invited Guests
The Route 40 Committee in order to understand the vision of the Town of Chelmsford and its future needs, agreed to invite relevant town committee members and town officials to present their thoughts to the Committee.

Here is a list of all invited guests that presented in front of the Route 40 committee during our public meetings. Please refer to the meeting minutes of the meeting date in Tab #10 to see the detailed record of the conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee / Position</th>
<th>Invited Guests</th>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Commission</td>
<td>Linda Prescott</td>
<td>10.5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinal Square Committee</td>
<td>Kenny Pantuso</td>
<td>10.5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Housing Authority</td>
<td>David Hedison</td>
<td>10.30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Advisory Committee</td>
<td>John Edwards</td>
<td>10.30.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Town Manager</td>
<td>Michael McCall</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Commission</td>
<td>(Letter to Committee)</td>
<td>11.20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Business Development</td>
<td>Lisa Marrone</td>
<td>11.29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Manager</td>
<td>Paul Cohen</td>
<td>11.29.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford Water Department</td>
<td>(Letter to Committee)</td>
<td>1.8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>3.5.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>Evan Belansky</td>
<td>3.12.19 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note at both of these meetings, Evan Belansky was present at the request of the committee as a subject matter expert.
Current Zoning
Allowable Uses
Currently the Zoning District under discussion for the Route 40 Area per the Zoning Chapter 195 of the General code book is:

**Per 195-2 Establishment section:**

RC- Residential C District. These are medium-density general residence districts.

IA- Limited Industrial District. These are areas that are primarily used for office, research development, manufacturing and warehousing.

The current zoning for the north side of Route 40 west of Route 3:

RC for the first 200 feet from Route 40.

After the 200 RC District, IA is the remaining area north of Route 40 Groton Road.

The current zoning for the south side of Route 40 west of Route 3:

RC is the area south of Route 40.

Abutting the RC area on the south side of Route 40 is a neighborhood that Zoning District is

RB- Residential B District- These are low-density single-family residence districts.

In this document the “South Side” and the “North Side” refer to the lots in the tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres 16.67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>263 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>255 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Groton Road Off</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>23.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>249 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>245 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>237 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>235 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>231 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>227 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>225 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>223 Groton Road</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Doris Drive</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 Doris Drive</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 Ward Way</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>9.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Acres** 51.37
Currently Allowable Use Regulation per RC & IA Properties

Reference Use Regulation Schedule 195 Attachment 1 of General Laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RC – Residential C District (South &amp; North Side)</th>
<th>IA -Limited Industrial District (Northside)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwelling</td>
<td>Alzheimer’s Facility (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family Dwelling</td>
<td>Assisted Living (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion Dwelling</td>
<td>Independent Living (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding House Owner Occupied (BA)</td>
<td>Congregate Living (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding House Non-Owner Occupied (BA)</td>
<td>Accessory to residential Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory to residential uses</td>
<td>Exempt Uses (Family day care etc.) (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Uses (Family day care etc.)</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Facilities, except garages</td>
<td>Municipal Facilities, except garages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Services (BA)</td>
<td>Municipal Garage, storage or repair shops (BA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Non-Exempt Agricultural use</td>
<td>Essential Services (BA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Non-Exempt Farm stand</td>
<td>Hospital (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Home (PB)</td>
<td>Hospital Helipad accessory to Hospital (PB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Communications Facility (BA)</td>
<td>Commercial Non-Exempt Agricultural use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family day-care Home (nonexempt) BA</td>
<td>Commercial Non-Exempt Farm stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Clinic or Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing / convalescent or rehab Home (BA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral Home (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel or Hotel (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking garage / Structure (BA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical office or center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Clinic (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Commercial entertainment or recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Communications Facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairs, Carnivals and similar outdoor events (BA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day Care Home (Nonexempt) (BA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Photovoltaic Facility Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Marijuana Treatment Center (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Removal (BA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors Shop Outdoors (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Contractors Shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail sale of goods produced in premises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Storage (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking garage / Structure (PB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternate Zoning Options
Alternate Zoning Options

The following is a recap of the discussions that the committee has reviewed regarding the potential rezoning of the Route 40 Area. There were seven options reviewed by the committee. Each option considered the North and South Side.

When reviewing these options in detail, each member of the committee kept in mind the overall Mission Statement that was agreed upon on the October 5th, 2018 meeting. We are using what the Town of Chelmsford proposed for the zoning change last August as a reference which is in the appendix for review.

ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION
Discussion points on the seven alternatives identified at the December 11, 2018 are noted below. Where overlays were suggested, it was acknowledged that we can adopt existing overlays or create a unique overlay for this area. For the overlay discussion please refer to Tab 8.
**Alternative 1:** Do Nothing. Leave the South side RC and leave the North side a mix of RC and IA. The RC zoning on the North side is the first 200 feet.

- The Committee decided to consider this option in the context of discussing the other options.
Zoning Alternate 1

IA

RC

RB

State Owned Property

Route 40 Groton Road

Westford Town Line
Alternative 2: Re-zone according to the recommendations provided at the Meetings in August, which had full Commercial CC on the North Side, 300 feet of CC on the South side, and RM for the remainder of the South side.

- IA was preferred over CC from a traffic perspective
- There was a question about whether the residents’ would like a supermarket in the area which CC zoning would enable
- Most members felt this option is not viable or desired based on the town resident’s response in August.
- Most members did not see a compelling advantage of CC in this area.
- South side leave as RC vs. Change to RB or RM discussion and clarification points:
  - Recent data shows properties have sold and will sell at market value including a recent property sale on Groton Road, 4 lots from the highway. There was some discussion about market trends and values selling a little below asking price. General preference was to leave the south side residential.
  - RM zoning is 3 stories max above ground. If parking is at grade, that is the first story.
  - The area is currently functioning as RB; there are no two-family homes in the area.
Alternative 3: Leave the south side alone as RC. Modify the north side to be IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.

• Westford has not gone over two stories or a similar height limit. We would like to see a 2-story or height limit contiguous with Westford.
• BAOD Clarification – The BAOD was developed for the Route 129 area. If an overlay is required, we can modify this existing one or write a new one. Current trends are to provide amenities in business areas in order to get more industrial tenants. For example, many companies are no longer providing cafeterias.
• A concern was expressed that brick and mortar businesses will continue to be less popular in the future and that we will be creating more vacant space. Service oriented businesses (medical, etc.) like those on the Westford corridor of Route 40 might make more sense. There was an observation that we have had excess retail space in Chelmsford since the 1980s and that we are not filling existing spaces.
• Regarding retail restaurants and recreation – There was discussion about the level of services needed in this area being less than those in the Route 129 corridor.
• Industrial use: One view is that we have low intensity use industrial businesses on Route 40. Another view is there are already a lot of industrial businesses in other parts of Chelmsford and in Nashua. The question of whether we really need or can sustain more was raised. It appears that Tyngsboro may be struggling with similar attempts at Exit 34.
• If current owners sell, the 20 acres on the North Side might be amenable to something like a life sciences park with a campus environment enabled by an overlay. This is likely not feasible on Route 129 because of the number of high value properties that would have to be purchased. Businesses are being priced out of areas like Cambridge.
• The need was acknowledged for senior housing, nursing homes and memory care units.
• It was requested that if we have an overlay then we consider our vision for the area and be mindful that there have been and will likely be residents in this area for decades.
**Alternative 4:** Change the South side back to RB as it originally was; there are no two-family homes in this area. Make the North side all IA, possibly with a BAOD or unique overlay.

- The South side is still functioning as RB. After the 2011 Town Meeting vote to change it to RC to accommodate a resident who wanted to convert to a two-family, there were no two-family homes built.
- If the North side becomes all IA, the homes on the North side become pre-existing non-conforming and are grandfathered. Their current use has the right to remain until the homes get torn down and rebuilt, at which point the properties would be subject to the IA zoning.
- Because of regulations put in place in 1938, properties built prior to 1938 maintain their ability to expand to two family homes.
- Existing houses would not be affected. Houses built prior to 1938 could convert to two family with special permits.
Alternative 5: Change the North side to CC. Leave the South side RC or change the South side to RB.

- Covered by previous Alternatives discussions.
Westford Town Line

CC
North Side

RC or RB
South Side

RB
Current Zone
South Side

State Owned Property

Route 40 Groton Road

Zoning Alternate 5
Alternative 6: Make the South side RM. Make the North side IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.

- Covered by discussions above.
- Consensus of the committee was to leave South Side RC or move back to RB.
**Alternative 7: Change the zoning to CC on both the North and South sides.**

- Majority consensus not to zone either side CC.
- Recommendations are leaning toward keeping South side residential (RC or RB) and changing North Side to all IA with possible overlay, see tab 8.

- There was a question asked and clarification given about the downside of leaving the 200 feet of RC on the North side instead of making it all IA. Keeping the RC zone would eliminate the ability of businesses to have visibility at the road, do roadside landscaping, etc. Current homeowners will likely have property value appreciation by being in an IA zone because developers will pay premium for their properties.

- The consensus of the committee is to leave South Side RC or move back to RB.
Final
Recommendations
Final Recommendations

After careful review of all the alternate zoning options and understanding the needs of the Town of Chelmsford, the Route 40 Study Committee developed the following final recommendations and rationale.

- Do not change the South Side zoning. Leave the South Side zoned RC.
- Zone the entire North Side IA.
- Create a Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD) to enable an age-in-place community.

South Side:

The South Side of the Route 40 Groton road area in question involves 12 separate properties listed in Tab 5. Presently all of these properties are single family residences. The current zoning district for this area is RC. This is a medium-density general residence district.

In 2011, at the request of a property owner who lived on the South Side, Town Meeting approved changing the zoning from RB (single family) to RC (two-family) to allow this individual to build an in-law residence. The zoning was changed but the property owner who initiated this request never built the in-law residence. Currently the homes in the South Side RC zoning area are all single family residences. The total number of acres involved on the South Side is 16.67 acres.

Directly abutting the RC Zoned area to the south is a National Grid easement that is 100 feet wide with no trees in this area. This area abuts the neighborhoods to the south, which is zoned RB, single family residences.

On January 22, 2019, during our Committee meeting the Committee decided to split the conversation of the area into two different discussions. The South Side and the North Side. The Committee reviewed all the alternate zoning options presented in Tab 6 of this report. The committee decided against the rezoning of the South Side to CC, due to the zoning conflict that would be created and the desire to retain the residential character of the area. The committee then discussed RM, RC and RB options for the South Side. Considerations included transition zones between the North Side zoning developments and the South Side RB abutting lots. The committee considered the potential loss of appropriate buffering due to the National Grid easement on the South Side as discussed above. RM was also discussed as a possibility and the committee reviewed examples of RM abutting a RB zone in other parts of town.

The Committee's in-depth discussions about the alternatives during several meetings are documented in the meeting minutes in Section 9 of this report. On January 22, 2019 the Committee voted 6 to 1 in favor of leaving the RC Zone on the south side with the rationale including the following points:
• RC would allow a proper transition between the North Side of Route 40 and the residential neighborhoods currently zoned RB that abut and surround the South Side area.
• Zoning conflict is avoided
• RC would allow any development of two-family housing such as town houses to be built.
• RC zoning would not enable or encourage future zoning creep into the other neighborhoods

During the January 22, 2019 meeting, the Committee voted 6 to 1 to recommend the South Side be left as RC in order to create a transition buffer between the abutting RB lots on the South Side and the higher density utilization on the North Side.

North Side:
The North Side of Route 40 Groton road area in question involves 14 separate properties. There are two zones in the North Side. The first 300 feet from Route 40 is zoned RC and the area to the north of that is then zoned IA. The homes in the RC area are currently all single-family residences. The total number of acres involved in this area is 51.37 acres. Please refer to Tab 5 for the breakdown of properties.

The committee noted that there is currently a zoning conflict on the North Side. There are industrial businesses operating directly behind single family residences. Similar to the South Side, all the homes on the North Side are also single family and have not changed to two family. Traffic in and out of the IA district seems to be a concern for the residences living on the North Side. Traffic is a concern all over town. The traffic counts on Route 40 from recent vehicle traffic counts performed by the town, show the overall vehicle count per day on Route 40 is approximately 15,000 vehicles. In comparison to Route 4 North Road area, currently there are 45,000 vehicles daily. The Route 4 area is zoned RB, single family residential.
It is the decision of the committee to recommend zoning the entire north side all IA and include a special overlay. IA would be extended from its current border 300 feet north of Route 40, to the Route 40 line. This extension of the IA would enable businesses to implement street side landscaping and signage and would improve the value of existing homes. The overlay is customized for the North Side of Route 40 west of Route 3 and enables a senior living, age in place community with services and amenities suitable to that geographic region. The overlay would also include other housing besides age in place housing, giving a potential developer and the community more flexibility on options that would be aligned with residential neighborhoods. The committee also decided that the overlay would have the buildings on the front side of Route 40 for 200 feet to be height restricted to 2 stories. Then after 200 feet from the street the height on the north side of the lots could increase to 5 stories.

Please refer to the Meeting minutes of 2/5/19, 3/5/19, 3/12/19 and 4/11/19 to see the discussion regarding the development of the overlay. The committee voted 6 to 1 on the North Side on April 11, 2019.

- Zoning conflict on the North Side will be cleared up.
- The senior housing shortage could be helped if this scenario is developed
- Current zoning of IA allowable uses is not too far off from the intent of the committee
- The Overlay will allow amenities to help with the overall vision of the North Side Development
- Multi-Family housing will also be allowed in the overlay to the North.

Please refer to Tab 8 for the final overlay.
Unique Overlay

Continuing Care Community Overlay District

CCCOD
Overlay Discussion:

The Committee then discussed two options for the north side, acknowledging input we have received during this process about the dire need for senior housing in Chelmsford as well as the need for multi-family housing.

Option 1: Zone the North Side IA with an overlay. Example components of the overlay discussed were multi-family housing, anything required for senior housing not covered in the IA use tables, and size limited restaurants or retail.

Option 2: Zone the North Side RM with an overlay that would allow for things like medical, financial or other service businesses, limited size retail, or adult/child day care facilities.

During the March 5, 2019 meeting, there was a follow up to previous discussions about whether extending IA to the street on the North Side would enable construction of more road(s) for industrial large truck access to Route 40. Evan Belansky received input from Town Counsel that this would not be a concern. It would have to go before the Planning Board to be accepted and approved.

Evan Belansky clarified the set-back requirements in IA zones. IA allows for 4-story buildings with setbacks 40 feet front, 40 feet rear, and 30 feet side. RC zone setbacks are 20 feet front, 12 feet rear, and 30 feet side. The Committee discussed extending the IA zoning on the North Side to the street and expanding the overlay to include other housing besides age in place housing, giving a potential developer and the community more flexibility on options that would be aligned with residential neighborhoods.

After reviewing all the alternates / options and hearing the need by the Town for Senior housing. The committee on January 29, 2019 decided to look at the possibility of creating an overlay that would allow the North Side amenities to support Senior Housing Development.

The Committee began by reviewing draft language for a Senior Housing Overlay District (SHOD) on the north side of Route 40. Discussion included structure related parameters as well as amenities that would enhance, complement and be applicable to senior living facilities and the surrounding area.

The Committee then discussed the trades between having the underlying zoning be RM or IA. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend converting the North Side an all IA district.

- This would resolve the current zoning conflict on the North Side between the RC and the IA districts.

The overlay discussion then evolved over a couple of meetings into an overlay called Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD).
**AGE IN PLACE VILLAGE / CONTINUING CARE COMMUNITY OVERLAY:**
The Committee discussed in detail and then created a draft overlay for a Continuing Care Community Overlay District CCCOD on the North Side of Route 40 Groton Road. Evan Belansky attended one of the meetings to participate in the discussions.

Discussion points included:

- Making the purpose and intent stronger for the vision of an integrated, self-contained Age in Place Village or a Continuing Care Community with complementary amenities and services.
- How to assure that the language accommodates non-seniors (e.g. brain trauma victims) who might need a continuing care community. Facilitated and independent living as defined in our by-laws is for senior living only. Our by-laws do not define “senior”.
- Town Counsel would need to review for guidance on federal Fair Housing Act and use of age restricted language.
- The committee discussed in detail that they would like open space considerations for any such development.
- During the discussion the committee reviewed all of the property lots listed in the overlay, subdivision road implications where the overlay is applied to an RC zoned lot, and assuring we have all lots intended to be included identified.
- Developer(s) considerations. The vision is sound. The vision is a master planned development, but different developers could participate at different times. A segmented market strategy does not guarantee that the result will be integrated.
- The committee also discussed whether a developer would build multi-story mixed-use buildings because the zoning with the overlay allows them.
- Balancing dimensional flexibilities with things like height and set-back requirements.
- The committee then considered a developer could build duplexes on the south side RC zone aligning with the continuing care strategy on the North Side.

*The following Articles were drafted to enable the Continuing Care Community Overlay District, which is part of Committee's recommendation for the North Side:*
Town Meeting Article x1 – Revise Zoning of Area along Rt. 40

To revise the zoning of properties directly abutting and north of Rt. 40 and west of Rt. 3, from RC to IA, to include properties identified by Book and Lot as 10-22-1, 16-22-1, 16-22-2, 17-22-1, 17-22-2, 17-22-3, 17-22-4, 17-22-5, 17-22-6, 17-84-1, 17-84-2, 17-84-3, 17-84-4, 17-84-5, 17-84-6.

Town Meeting Article x2 – Create new Zoning Continuing Care Community Overlay District

To create a new overlay district focused on elder housing and continuing care services, as follows:

Zoning Article XXV – Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD)

§ 195-148 Establishment of overlay district
The Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD) addresses changing Town and regional market conditions, specifically the need to provide housing opportunities to the growing population of senior citizens. The CCCOD defines the framework for an Aging-in-Place Community that provides individual and multi-family housing opportunities, facilitated and independent senior living facilities, and graduated healthcare support service, with readily available Personal Care Services.

Plans submitted under the CCCOD are required to meet these basic requirements and objectives:

A. Promotes orderly, effective and quality development and redevelopment;
B. Provides housing opportunities that will be compatible and complementary with the surrounding area;
C. Enhances the aesthetic qualities and characteristics of the area, such as architectural style, streetscape character, open space, connectivity, and overall setting in a manner that protects and enhances the value of surrounding real property; and
D. Does not disturb residential neighborhoods or detract from the appearance of the Town and results in the maintenance of a balance and workable relationship between the existing area and use, the new utilization and adjacent residential neighborhoods.

§ 195-149 Establishment of overlay district
The location and boundaries of this overlay district are hereby established and made part of this bylaw as shown on the Continuing Care Community Overlay District Map, dated mm/dd/yyyy. [1]

[1]
Editor’s Note: Said map is on file in the Town offices.

§ 195-150 Use regulations.
A. The existing use Regulation Schedule (Chapter 195, Attachment 1) shall be applicable within the underlying zoning districts.
B. Within the overlay the following uses are permitted by right:
   (a) Attached and detached Independent Senior Living Facilities up to a density of 20 units per acre; Facilitated living facilities (law Article XVII), and (exempt and nonexempt) Adult Day Care facilities.
   (b) Nursing/convalescent facilities.
   (c) Restaurants no larger than 3000 sq. ft. (drive-throughs are not permitted)
   (d) Medical Offices, Clinics and Centers
   (e) Parking garages / structures as an accessory use / structure only.
C. The following are permitted by special permit:
   (a) Commercial Uses supporting the purpose of the CCCOD and not exceeding 2000 square feet, including:
i. Personal Care Services, such as but not restricted to barber, salon, laundry/dry cleaner, financial services agency, and pharmaceutical supplies

ii. Pharmacy and Banks; (drive-throughs are permitted).

iii. Retail stores and services

(b) Reduction of residential unit size in multifamily housing dwellings limited to 55 and over occupancy, below the limits established in ss 195-113 Residential Uses.

(c) Independent Senior Living Facility density in excess of 20 units per acre, subject to ss 195-63 Density Bonus for affordable housing, excepting that in the CCCOD, one unit for each 5 units set aside for Affordable Housing may be permitted.

(d) Buildings that exceed the height of the underlying zoning district, as provided in ss195-152.

(e) Maximum Building Coverage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be increased by up to 50% above that required by the underlying Zoning District, for 55 and over housing, facilitated and independent senior living facilities, and graduated healthcare support services.

§ 195-151 Special provisions for all CCCOD.
A. Parking garages / structures shall not be counted towards the floor area ratio.
B. New construction of Restaurants, Banks, Pharmacies, Personal Care Services and other Retail and Services (law 195-150 B 3-5 and C2) shall not be single tenant free standing structures.
C. All new construction shall maintain a minimum of 20% landscaped area on the lot.
D. Except as specifically defined in Article XXV, the dimensional standards of the underlying zoning district shall apply.

§ 195-152 Special provisions for CCCOD implementation in specific areas.
A. Building height. For lots in the IA District north of Rt. 40, buildings that are set back from Rt. 40 by more than 200 feet may be up to 5 stories tall and 60 feet high.
B. For lots in the IA District north of Rt. 40, new construction in the 200 feet adjacent to Rt. 40 shall not exceed 3 stories and 35 feet in average height above ground level.

§ 195-153 Applicability of CCCOD to overlay district.
A. All provisions in Article XXV shall have precedence over other sections of the Zoning Bylaw.
B. The Requirements detailed in Article XXV – Continuing Care Community Overlay District are intended to modify the basic requirements of the district to which they are applied. Unless otherwise stated in this Article, exceptions and modifications provided by any other Overlay District are not intended to be combined with the application of the CCCOD.

Town Meeting Article x3 – Apply Overlay Zoning to Area along Rt. 40

To apply the new Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD), zoning by- law Article XXV, to the area north of Route 40 and west of Route 3, to include properties identified by Book and Lot as 10-22-1, 16-22-1, 16-22-2, 17-22-1, 17-22-2, 17-22-3, 17-22-4, 17-22-5, 17-22-6, 17-84-1, 17-84-2, 17-84-3, 17-84-4, 17-84-5, 17-84-6
Meeting Minutes
Town of Chelmsford Route 40 Study Committee

Meeting Minutes: September 27, 2018

Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Donald Van Dyne, Michael Raisbeck

Michael Raisbeck called the meeting to Order at 7:00pm.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

This was an organizational meeting for the Route 40 Study Committee. The Committee members introduced themselves and elected a chairperson:

- Pamela Armstrong, Resident member. Elected Chairperson.
- Nancy Araway, Planning Board representative.
- Donald Van Dyne, Planning Board representative.
- Emily Antul, Board of Selectmen representative
- Nance Gilles, Resident Member.
- Michael Walsh, Resident Member.
- Virginia Crocker Timmins, Resident Member.
- Michael Raisbeck, Planning Board Chair, plans to participate in an ex officio capacity but will not vote.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

The members discussed elements of a Committee mission statement. Pam Armstrong will draft a mission statement based on these discussions.

Nancy Araway provided a basic orientation of current zoning by-law use tables to the Committee Members. Some specific education comments included:

- Sr. Living can be built in IA (Light Industry) zone. That would not require any zoning change on the North side of Groton Rd.
- Any zoning recommendations would not include specific set-backs, but the Planning Board can request that on a project by project basis.
- The Committee discussed having a map available that shows the re-zoning proposed area including which homes are owned by residents who do not want to move.

The Committee will ask Mike McCall, Assistant Town Manager, for the results of a recent NMCOG traffic study in the Groton Road West area.

The Committee will invite the Vinal Square Strategic Action Committee, the Housing Advisory Board, and the Historical Commission to the next meeting. While it is possible that home(s) in the proposed area are 75 years older or more, there are other criteria that would deem a structure of historical interest.

PUBLIC INPUT

Marie Burnham, 255 Groton Road: Offered perspective regarding the citizen’s history of the area with respect to the Newport Materials Asphalt Plant efforts as well as perspectives from a resident who intends to continue living in her current home.

Kim Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane: Asked about considerations given to infrastructure impacts like water and sewer. Planning Board members clarified that studies regarding infrastructure are not required until there is a specific project proposal to review, however leadership from any of these departments can be invited to share their perspectives.

Joseph Tierney, Vinal Square Strategic Action Plan Committee: Would like participation from and/or an opportunity for the Vinal Square committee to weigh into this process.

NEXT MEETINGS: The next two meeting dates are Friday Oct 5th and Tuesday Oct 30th, both at 7:00 pm.
Meeting opened at 7:00 PM
Members Present: Mike Walsh, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Mike Reisback, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Virginia Crocker-Timmins, Pamela Armstrong

7:05 Historic Commission Linda Prescott, gave brief overview of demolition bylaw. Any building over 75 years old is researched for historical significance. This takes approx. 3 months for information gathering then a hearing is scheduled. Committee has up to 1 year to render a decision. There are 10 homes in this area over 75 years old. There is a Sears and Roebuck Kit house in this area. If buildings are destroyed without permission a fine up to 45,000 can be issued.

7:15 Kenny Pantuso of the Vinal Square Committee spoke of the revitalization of the Vinal Square area. The committee is working on addition of planters, Signage, building facades, looking for uniformity to area.

Nan spoke on CEIOD and BAOD overlays and explained guidelines.

Members of the committee discussed thoughts on what we should be considering, they include...
- Reviewing current zoning
- Impact on neighborhood and surrounding areas
- Considering adoption of new zoning for future changes to area
- Keep current zoning on South side of Rt 40, change zoning on North side of Rt 40
- Would this be considered “Creep Zoning” from Westford
- Consider residents that want to stay and those that want to go
- Try to anticipate what could be done there
- For those you stay, what may be built around them
- Consider the abutting neighbors and how changes can affect them and their property values
- What is the best and highest use of the land
- What is the best use of the land for the North Chelmsford neighbors
- Economic development opportunities
- Is this a good area for future housing or retail and office or both

Mission Statement “Review Current Zoning, Consider the impact of the area, the neighborhoods, the local business and the Town of Chelmsford, recommend the best use of the land for development considering changes in the future.”

Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday October 30, 2018 7:00 PM.
Meeting called to Order 7:00 P.M.
Members Present:
   Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Mike Raisbeck, Donald Van Dyne, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Pamela Armstrong

Donald motioned for minutes to be approved with changes. Nance seconded. Unanimous.

David Hedison, Chelmsford Housing Authority spoke about housing needs in Chelmsford. Waiting lists for housing for 60-110 year olds & subsidized housing 5-7 years. The state is not building any more subsidized housing facilities. Other forms of housing for seniors include affordable housing, assisted living, independent living including residences with full kitchens (similar to Brookhaven in Lexington), and garden style living residences. The different types of housing serve the needs of seniors on the full spectrum of those who need funding assistance to those who are more affluent and want private pay options. Residents in Chelmsford want to stay and age in Chelmsford; housing is not available.

John Edwards, Housing Advisory Committee spoke on inclusionary housing, overlays for a housing component and affordable units or payment in lieu of. He expressed a need for additional affordable housing in Chelmsford. A document was shared. Attached herein.

A suggestion was business amenities with a housing component for ease of access to services.

A request to contact the conservation commission, Economic Development, and ask Mike McCall to review traffic study at a November meeting.

A request to see if we can get a copy of the air quality reports from Westford, a copy of the entire area in questions map with what has been sold or is under agreement.

A report was shared about the recent sales price of homes bought by Northstar as well as others and the attributes of RT 40 from Groton Road to Vinal Square. Also a document showing average sales prices in Chelmsford from April-October 2018. The observation was that houses are selling at market value in this region, indicating it is still a desirable place to live. Attached herein.

Future meeting dates November 20th and November 29th 7:00 P.M.
Committee agreed to allow public comment at end of the meeting

- Kim Bennett 25 Lovett Lane asked that Conservation be invited for input. Kim also reminded the committee that Gerry Hall had suggested zoning that would allow energy farm development from which both the town and a developer could benefit.
- Glen Diggs 220 Wellman asked for Commercial Broker input

A suggestion to get input from North Chelmsford for Water and Chelmsford Sewer for capacity

Action items:

1. Check with Paul Cohen to see if we can get access to Westford's air quality study reports – Emily

2. Provide a map of the area that shows the following – Nancy, Don
   - Properties owned by Northstar
   - Properties under agreement with Northstar
   - Properties that are >75 years old
   - Properties that are close to 1 acre or larger

3. Contact Mike McCall to ask him to report on the traffic study at one of the November meetings – Virginia

4. Contact Evan Belansky / Economic Development to ask him to brief the committee at one of the November meetings – Donald

5. Contact the Conservation Commission, North Chelmsford Water District, and Chelmsford Sewer to address the committee at one of the November meetings – Pam

Motion by Virginia to adjourn. Seconded by Donald. Unanimous.
Housing Advisory Board testimony to the Route 40 Study Committee

Observation 1: Chelmsford is old and getting older.

Percentage of population age 65 and above (source: US Census Bureau):
2000: 13.0%
2010: 16.2%
2016: 17.9%

According to the Town of Chelmsford 2017 Annual Report:
Senior Population projections: the 60+ age group is projected to be 30% of Chelmsford’s population by the year 2020. This will mean over 10,000 seniors will live in town. (Source: Senior Center - Council on Aging & Elder Services)

Of the 32 communities that surround Chelmsford, only 1—Concord, has a greater percentage of 65 plus residents (4 communities have virtually the same percentage as us).

Nationwide, the Census Bureau projects the age 65+ population will double by 2050.

Observation 2: Many households in Chelmsford are housing burdened.

Note: housing burdened is defined as a household that spends more than 30% of their gross income on household expenses (i.e., mortgage/rent, property taxes, utilities, insurance).

25% of Chelmsford homeowners (almost 3,000) are housing burdened
46% of Chelmsford renter households (about 1,000) are housing burdened
(Source: US Census Bureau 2012-2016 American Community Survey)

That is why it is important that Chelmsford’s zoning strategy includes the Inclusionary Housing provisions. That is the only way to make sure new housing developments provide for production of truly affordable housing units.

According to older—no longer available census data, the status of housing burdened falls disproportionately on older households. For example, 2000 Census data had 61% of Chelmsford households aged 75 and older being housing burdened.

Observation 3: Observations 1 and 2 are reflected in Chelmsford Housing Authority (CHA) waiting lists.

Estimated wait list time for elderly residents—public housing (state-based):
Emergency wait list: 6 months to 1 year
Resident and Veteran: 3 to 5 years
Non-resident Veteran: 4 to 5 years
Resident: 5 to 8 years
Non-resident: 8 or more years
Note: estimated wait times for Federal programs at specific housing developments generally are 5 years or more. 
Note: wait list are also very long for non-elderly households.

Observation 4: The market need for senior living housing and services has been identified.

The Chelmsford Housing Authority commissioned a study—*Market Opportunities Assessment For Senior Living in Chelmsford Massachusetts*. As stated in the report that was produced: "This market assessment is focused on evaluating potential opportunities for the various levels of senior living care, including independent living, assisted living, and assisted living memory care within the defined market. This includes a thorough analysis of the external dynamics impacting the proposed property, including the market and its demographics, competition, supply and demand, and other outside dynamics that have an affect on the market and the broader industry in general."

Highlights of this report include:
- "Overall, the competitive marketplace in the market area is sparse for independent living, well-developed for assisted living and dementia care services, and over-saturated for skilled nursing care."
- There is demand for "perhaps 130 to 180" independent living units.
- While "the market for assisted living care is very well-developed and competitive" the report does offer support for other ways to provided assisted living care on-site.
- While "the competitive market for dementia care is fairly well-developed" the report notes there is "still an un served dementia care need in the market." (According to the Senior Center, 13 percent of Chelmsford seniors require dementia care.)

Upon consideration of the report, and a presentation by the CHA, the *UMass-Lowell West Campus Planning Committee* came to the overall conclusion that "there is an opportunity to develop an integrated senior living community providing at least a partial continuum of care" at the proposed site. In other words, the market assessment, and the planning committee, supported the ideas presented by the CHA.

Observation 5: What happens in Chelmsford may not stay in Chelmsford.

Demographic projections aside, as Chelmsford residents age, many would like to or need to downsize, or "age in place." Housing in Chelmsford is expensive, opportunities for downsizing are limited, and some services for senior living are not adequately supplied. Seniors on fixed incomes (and others) are finding it difficult to stay in the community they have called home for years (or decades). Demographic and housing-market trends mean the situation will only get worse.

The projections for the size of Chelmsford's 65-plus community may prove to be overly optimistic if current residents approaching their "golden years" cannot stay.
Home Sales Report

Route 40 from Groton Center to VinalSquare

Route 40 is a 10.5-mile (16.9 km) east-west state route located in northeastern Massachusetts, entirely within Middlesex County. The short highway connects Groton and Chelmsford. Its western end is at an intersection with Massachusetts Route 119 and Massachusetts Route 225 in Groton, and its eastern end is at Route 3A in North Chelmsford. The route has existed since the late 1940's.

This stretch of land crosses 6 brooks...Martins Pond Brook, Cow Pond Brook, Keyes Brook, Snake meadow Brook, Blue Brook, and Gilson Brook. It passes 5 Ponds Flushing Pond, Long Sought For Pond, Keyes Pond, Whitney Pond and Freeman Lake. 2 Horse Farms(Scarlett Hill) and a Cow Farm and a forefathers cemetary Wright Cemetary and a Castle,Bancroft Castle.

225 homes approx. that have no problem living on Groton Rd. Up to Rt 3 We could impact the lives of all of those residents by increasing traffic on all of Rt 40. The potential of litter and air pollution, sound and light pollution, increasing run off to any of the ponds and brooks not immediately evident by a local area study.

At Dunstable Rd there is a service station,in Westford small plaza with a filling station,Dunkin Donuts,Breakfast cafe, nothing till you get to Russele Way in Westford where it is only 2 story buildings, office, banks, small businesses, Gas station, DD at Oak hill. Another small 1 story plaza with food and a hardware store. Then RR tracks, marsh land and residential property till you reach the corner store and then the VFW and senior center.

Northstar Realty has purchased

225 Groton Rd $428,000
227 Groton Rd $425,000
231 Groton Rd $439,000
235 Groton Rd 168,000
249 Groton Rd 400,000
250 Groton Rd 379,900

Average sales price of a single family home in Chelmsford is $431,000, median price is $452,000

On Groton Rd New Construction sold for $679,000 & $680,000
Westford on Groton Rd Under Agreement of $865,000 on the market 745,000
Recent sales in Westford 599,000 - 505,000 - 510,000
Chelmsford Groton Rd Under Agreement 439,000, on market 499,000
### Total Sold Market Statistics

**Report Run:** 10/28/2018 6:58:05 PM  
**Property Type(s):** SF  
**Status:** SLD  
**Start Date:** 4/28/2018  
**End Date:** 10/28/2018  
**Town:** Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th># of Listings</th>
<th>Avg. Days on Market</th>
<th>Avg. Days to Offer</th>
<th>Average Sale Price</th>
<th>Average List Price</th>
<th>SP:LP Ratio</th>
<th>Average Orig Price</th>
<th>SP:OP Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$49,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$99,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$149,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000-$199,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000-$249,999</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$245,000</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>$251,200</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000-$299,999</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$277,500</td>
<td>$286,767</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$293,433</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000-$349,999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$326,291</td>
<td>$336,738</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>$351,014</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350,000-$399,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$378,786</td>
<td>$377,310</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$379,127</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000-$449,999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$424,134</td>
<td>$417,110</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$418,717</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$450,000-$499,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$477,004</td>
<td>$471,268</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$474,661</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000-$599,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$539,190</td>
<td>$526,280</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$531,426</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,000-$699,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$647,714</td>
<td>$655,968</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$658,650</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$700,000-$799,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$736,067</td>
<td>$738,117</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$744,650</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,000-$899,999</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$819,950</td>
<td>$789,900</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$789,900</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$900,000-$999,999</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$947,944</td>
<td>$947,894</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$947,894</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000-$1,499,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000-$1,999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000-$2,499,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000-$2,999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000-$3,999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000,000-$4,999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000-$9,999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000,000-$999,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Properties:** 190  
**Avg. 33**  
**Avg. 21**  
**$481,646**  
**$478,567**  
**101**  
**$482,461**  
**100**

**Lowest Price:** $240,000  
**Highest Price:** $995,888  
**Average Price:** $481,646  
**Median Price:** $452,113  
**Total Market Volume:** $91,512,666

https://h3a.mlsinshare/results.asp
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Meeting called to Order at 7:00pm

Members Present:
Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Mike Raisbeck,
Donald Van Dyne, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Pamela Armstrong

Attachments:
(1) Route 40 Study Committee Traffic Presentation given by
Assistant Town Manager Michael McCall

(2) Supporting Material from Evan Belansky, Community Development Director
- Conservation Commission Memo dated 11/20/2018 regarding Wetlands
- Groton Road Property Under Control Dated 8/21/2018

Donald motioned for the minutes to be approved with Virginia’s emailed changes. Emily seconded. All were in favor.

**TRAFFIC STUDY – MICHAEL MCCALL**

Mike McCall, Assistant Town Manager, provided a summary of a recent traffic study he commissioned; reference Attachment (1). Discussion points included:

- The graph showing the traffic counts West of Route 3, East of Route 3, and Near Vinal Square represents the highest volume 24-hour cycle during the study.

- There is a slide Entitled “2015 Traffic Distribution” showing the number of Vehicles and Heavy Vehicles counted in a 2015 study. The 2018 companion data, which was inadvertently omitted from the package, would show an increase in Heavy Vehicles of approximately 10%.

- Other traffic studies in North Chelmsford have been and will be done to address concerns from residents on Groton Road/Swain Road/Dunstable road about truck traffic including that attributed to the quarries and the asphalt plant.

- Mike reviewed the slides about the Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) criteria for Heavy Truck Exclusions in MA and options considered for North Chelmsford which includes having alternate routes that meet certain conditions. The process would be for the Board of Selectmen to apply for the exclusion through the DOT with the second course of action to file a Home Rule Petition through the MA Legislature.
  - One possible alternative route would be Ledge Road to Dunstable Road to Route 3 Exit 34. A telephone pole and a sharp curve at the intersection of Ledge Road and Dunstable road would likely warrant modification to the intersection to make it viable for truck passage.

- The restriction precluding trucks exiting the Asphalt plant from turning on Route 40 West into Westford was part of the lawsuit settlement. Evan Belansky clarified that a developer cannot legally expand asphalt operations into Chelmsford. A developer could pursue access roads if it owned connecting properties to the next town, but it would be up to the town to approve.

Nancy Araway requested that Mike McCall determine if information exists about traffic at the various interchanges in town to provide to the Planning Board for its use.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE - EVAN BELANSKY

The committee invited Evan Belansky, Community Development Director, to provide his perspective.

Evan provided Attachment (2) which includes:

- A letter from the Conservation Commission clarifying the location of wetlands in the regions of interest, which are on the north side of Groton Road. The Conservation Commission would get involved when a specific development project is presented for evaluation. Pam Armstrong received a similar email communication from the Conservation Commission.

- Property under NorthStar developer control as of 8/21/2018

Evan offered the following perspectives, which he caveated represent his professional views and are not necessarily representative of any town government position.

- He believes the optimal approach from an Economic Development standpoint is what was presented in August 2018.

- Existing conditions for the region under consideration are:
  - ¼ mile compact area, 30 acres North, 15 acres South (equivalent to Drum Hill Walmart Plaza)
  - Split zoned - Industrial on North with heavy industrial activities. Viewed current industrial sites assessed value and aesthetics as lower quality compared to other industrial sites. South is RC two family with back acreage. From a planner perspective, split zoning conflicts are not recommended. There are areas in town where split zoning conflicts are growing more severe.
  - Groton Road has a state route number but is fully managed and controlled by Chelmsford.
  - Other interchanges have higher traffic volumes.

- There is a need for Senior Housing in Chelmsford. As seniors in our increasing aging population downsize, many do not want 40B housing; they want age restricted active adult living without a specific stigma. Feels any multifamily housing should include an affordability component.

- Consider Chelmsford Street and Center Village coexisting when thinking about Vinal Square impacts.

- Does not believe any of the properties that are >75 years old would be deemed historic.

- Expect that the Groton Road area will be viewed as an underutilized opportunity when the Planning Board updates the Master Plan.

- Consider that concerns about impacts resulting from zoning or specific proposals will not necessarily be eliminated but can be mitigated.

- A quick-look fiscal analysis methodology is to determine what can be accomplished by eliminating 20% or 10% of a total area to maximize use, build roads, create smaller lots, etc. For the South side of Groton Road:
  - 20% area reduction allows for 26 duplexes
  - 10% area reduction allows for 29 duplexes
  - Statistically, duplexes typically house 1-2 children that would enter the school system. Senior housing would have no children.

Discussion points with and questions from the Committee included:

- To date, not many people have taken advantage of overlays the town has already put in place. Some residents are resistant to Economic Development. There are vacant buildings that are not being utilized. Vacancy rates in Chelmsford are not atypical. Most vacancies are related to the property owners and the owner's unique circumstances, not to market conditions.

- The Economic Development Commission is looking at why there are vacant commercial properties. Many commercial industrial properties are owner occupied and mortgage free. Long term owners are taking depreciation on the properties, while new owners would invest in the properties to get higher paying tenants.

- An overlay cannot legally restrict development to only senior housing.
• There was a question about whether zoning could restrict heights of buildings and whether a 40B development could override height restrictions. If the town chooses to rezone with an overlay, there is a low probability that a developer would propose a 40B. An overlay generally means that the town wants to facilitate the intended outcome of the overlay.

• Where lots are not contiguously owned by a developer, any development project changes will morph over years (could be decades) mixed in with existing residential owners.

• Planning Board observation is that a very high percentage of the plans coming to the Planning Board are using overlays, but they have not yet sparked a lot of new investment. The Route 129 overlay has given the Planning Board more negotiation leverage than they would have had otherwise.

OTHER COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Pam Armstrong read excerpts from a Conservation Committee email stating that their involvement is driven by specific projects.

Water, Sewer: Give them an opportunity to weigh in if they want to. Pam action.

Invite Paul Cohen to provide his perspective. Pam action.

Regarding previous suggestion during Public Input from Glenn Diggs to get commercial broker perspective: There was discussion about whether such a presentation would be too biased and more of a marketing presentation. As alternatives, Don will ask Lisa Marrone if there is access to existing marketing reports and Nancy Araway will check for a Commercial and Industrial Property Report.

Action Item status is at the end of this report.

PUBLIC INPUT

Gerry Hall, 34 Lovett Lane: Clarification that the Master Plan is not legally binding. It provides analysis and recommendations.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Question regarding RM zoning vs. an Overlay. Would RM be “by right” fewer dwellings per unit than zoning with an overlay? Does an overlay constitute higher density development?

Answer: By Right has specific parameters (e.g. RM is 24 units). Overlays tend to be a one-time assessment for a given area. We can create our own overlay. Nothing in an overlay is “by right”.

Kimberly Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane:

• Asked about Tax Classification Committee efforts and relevance. Emily Antul clarified that the Board of Selectmen has not made a decision. The Tax Classification Committee provided a report available on the town web site. Within the report there is a chart that shows revenue as a function of tax rates.

• Input regarding E. Belansky need for senior housing, perhaps affordable: If the commercial buildings on Technology Drive are not leasing, the town might consider them for senior housing co-located near other senior housing developments. Discussion about whether owners are selling and whether there are wetland complications in that area.

Nancy Loiselle: Main Street: Asked for clarification on who owns the areas on the map to which E. Belansky referred as lower value, lower quality industrial properties. Answer: JP Rivard and Ronald J. Loiselle Inc.

ADJOURN: Donald motioned to adjourn at 8:58pm. Emily seconded. All were in favor.

Next two meetings are November 29th and December 11th at 7:00pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>N. Araway</td>
<td>Provide a summary of:</td>
<td>Distributed 11/20/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Properties owned by Northstar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Properties under agreement with Northstar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Properties that are &gt;75 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Properties that are close to 1 acre or larger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>D. Van Dyne, N. Araway</td>
<td>Investigate availability of relevant reports that would give unbiased commercial broker perspective as follow up to previous public input suggestion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Follow up from Oct 30 discussion. Give Water District and Sewer opportunity to provide input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Invite Paul Cohen to address the Committee (E. Belansky suggestion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Contact Conservation Commission, to address the committee at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed, Conservation Commission -written communication in support of 11/20 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>E. Antul</td>
<td>Check with Paul Cohen to see if we can get access to Westford's air quality study reports.</td>
<td>Closed. P. Cohen or M. McCall would need to submit public record request. May need to go through Board of Selectmen. Outside of this committee scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>V. Timmins</td>
<td>Contact Mike McCall to ask him to report on the traffic study at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>D. Van Dyne</td>
<td>Contact Evan Belansky to ask him to brief the committee at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 40 Study Committee Traffic Presentation

ASSISTANT TOWN MANAGER MICHAEL McCALL
TRAFFIC COUNT LOCATIONS

Westford Line

East of Rt. 3

Vinal Square
DAILY TRAFFIC VOLUME
2015 TRAFFIC DISTRIBUTION

Westford Line: 13,705 vehicles, 973 heavy vehicles
East of Rt. 3: 8,100 vehicles, 373 heavy vehicles
Vinal Sq.: 6,500 vehicles, 195 heavy vehicles
Heavy Truck Exclusion

A truck exclusion from a municipal way may be authorized provided a suitable alternate route is available. The alternate route shall have an effective width and pavement structure which can safely accommodate the additional truck traffic. In addition the alternate route must meet one of the following conditions:

(1) Lie wholly within the community making application,
(2) Lie partially in an adjacent community but only on State Highway, or
(3) Lie partially in an adjacent community but have the adjacent community’s written approval.

Numbered routes are ineligible for heavy commercial vehicle exclusions, per Board of Commissioners, November 22, 1995.

* From the MUTCD
Heavy Truck Exclusion

An engineering study, as outlined in the Data requested below, must be made. In addition, one or more of the following may be sufficient justification for truck exclusion:

1. Warrants

   A. A volume of heavy commercial vehicles, which usually is in the range of five (5) to eight (8) percent, reduces the utilization of the facility and is cause for a substantial reduction in capacity or safety.

   B. The condition of the pavement structure of the route to be excluded indicates that further repeated heavy wheel loads will result in severe deterioration of the roadway. (subject to Department review)

   C. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in certain instances where land use is primarily residential in nature and a municipality has requested exclusion only during hours of darkness, a specific night exclusion may be granted.

* From the MUTCD
Alternate Routes
Ledge Road
Ledge Road
QUESTIONS
November 20, 2018

To: Route 40 Study Committee
From: Katie Guertin, Conservation Agent/Planner

Re: Wetland Jurisdictional Areas

After reviewing the most up-to-date GIS mapping data available, the area to the south of Route 40 does not appear to contain any wetland resource areas or buffer zones. A Conservation Commission review for any proposed work on the south side is unlikely. The area to the north of Route 40, along the rear of 1 Ward Way, contains bordering vegetated wetlands and a perennial stream, which is a tributary to Deep Brook. There is no regulatory flood zone or protected habitat along the stream or within the wetland resource areas. The area is subject to the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, the Chelmsford Wetlands Bylaw and the Rivers Protection Act. Any proposed work that will fill, dredge, alter or remove within this area will require permitting from the Conservation Commission. Work within this area will fall under redevelopment standards, as the area is currently heavily disturbed. If/when a definitive plan is proposed for the north side, the Conservation Commission will most likely be involved in the review process.
Property Under Control (8/21/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(South Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 S 4th Street</td>
<td>23-14-12</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-14-13</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-14-09</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220 Green Road</td>
<td>23-03-01</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Green Road</td>
<td>23-03-01</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Green Road</td>
<td>23-02-01</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Green Road</td>
<td>23-01-04</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 Green Road</td>
<td>23-00-07</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 Green Road</td>
<td>23-12-01</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(North Side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 Green Road</td>
<td>17-46-02</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 Green Road</td>
<td>17-46-04</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Green Road</td>
<td>17-46-04</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 Green Road</td>
<td>17-46-03</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 Green Road</td>
<td>17-22-02</td>
<td>Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Green Road</td>
<td>10-02-02</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260 Green Road</td>
<td>10-12-01</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting called to Order at 7:03pm and chaired by Mike Raisbeck in Pam Armstrong’s absence.

Members Present: Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Emily Antul, Mike Raisbeck, Donald Van Dyne, Virginia Crocker Timmins,
Members Absent: Pamela Armstrong, Nancy Araway

Attachments:
(1) Route 40 Business Development Perspective given by
Lisa Marrone, Director of Business Development, Town of Chelmsford

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE - LISA MARRONE

Lisa Marrone presented the attached briefing showing metrics such as Available Space in Chelmsford and surrounding towns. Discussion Points included:

- Lisa’s focus is in retail, commercial and industrial. She did not consider residential.
- Slide “Business Development Perspective Route 40 – Route 3”: Clarified content is a generalization based on professional experience. The statements made are not based on resident input.
- The information presented is from CoStar data. Terminology clarifications:
  - Vacancy Rate: Physical empty space
  - Available: Currently occupied, advertised as available or lease ending
  - Flex Space: Could be industrial or commercial; not residential

TOWN MANAGER PERSPECTIVE – PAUL COHEN

The committee invited Mr. Cohen to provide his perspective. Mr. Cohen offered the following for consideration:

- The Asphalt plant and Mr. Cox’s property initiatives have, in his opinion, made the area less suitable for residential development. The area could be a gateway for the Westford/Groton corridor and commercial opportunities.
- Route 40 has been in existence longer than any residences on it. Change in the area should not be a surprise to residents or abutters. This is the last interchange in Chelmsford to be developed.
- Examples in town: Route 129 update to 1980’s zoning (which expect will require more modification at Spring Town Meeting), Princeton Properties, Chelmsford Center behind Brickhouse, and the Chelmsford Mall area toward Golden Cove where the marrying of residential and commercial is not optimal.
- The town manager’s office repeatedly told Mr. Cox that he could not connect to residential properties with a roadway. Mr. Cox had multiple iterations of who might occupy commercial spaces.
- The town manager’s office is visited regularly by people who want the ability to float ideas for development in town off the record. Once they understood that Mr. Cox’s desires were progressing and maturing, they brought the rezoning considerations forward.
- Housing brings people who bring services and need services. Chelmsford student costs are approximately $18K+ for vocational enrollment and $15K+ per public school student. The Chelmsford Housing Authority often advocates for transitional housing for seniors who could stay within close proximity as the level of their care needs increase.

Committee Q&A with Mr. Cohen:
- Q: Citing concern with project issues Mr. Cox had in other towns which are described in the public domain, who is responsible to act if a developer does not approach the development(s) in a responsible
manner?
A: Code Enforcement is the Town's role and they take it seriously.

- Q: The area under consideration is not contiguous and includes residents who want to stay as residents for a long time. Transitional zoning and mixing of residential and commercial could exist for decades. Is that of concern to the town?
A: It is the choice of the property owner or his/her heirs to sell or not sell. Believe the quality of life in that region will get worse as the asphalt plant becomes operational. Town intentionally focused on West side of Route 3 to preserve the character on the East side. Reality may be that the best path forward does not satisfy everyone.

- Q: Have we had residential re-zoning this large in Chelmsford? Route 4 has more traffic than this area of Route 40 and successfully hosts residential neighborhoods.
A: No, we haven't. This is a one-off and is a unique situation. If do nothing, it will likely be a less desirable area.

OTHER COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Minutes from 11/20/2018: Request made to approve the November 20th minutes at the next meeting when we have more members present.

Action item status is at the end of this report.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Sue Olsen, 140 Groton Road: Asked Mr. Cohen if there is any way around the agreement that Westford has with the asphalt plant to send truck traffic east toward Chelmsford. The Town knows of no alternatives to address this.

Jeff Gillies, 248 Groton Road: Trucks and cars from Chelmsford and Westford all vying to get on Route 3 result in the traffic coming to a dead stop. Traffic is going to back up.

- Gerry Hall, 34 Lovett Lane:
  - Regarding Lisa Marrone's statements about why people want to live near an interchange. Don't forget that many of us like the rural area we live in. The Community has already stated that.
  - Asked if the state-owned land in the region could be a truck stop with traffic rerouted there. Answer was that this has been Overcome by Events, as no one wanted a truck stop.

Kim Bennet, 25 Lovett Lane:

- While development can be good, respectfully the Route 40 region has not been Lisa's focus. An alternative perspective is that the data shows that the region IS desirable for residential living and that current residents or developers like Mr. Cox could make money on residential properties.
  - One couple who moved in approximately 2 years ago bought their home as-is.
  - Another home recently sold for around $600K.
  - We are about to face an economic recession with interest rates rising. The real estate industry does not have a lot of houses on the market. Cox or other residents could spruce up their homes, remodel, or put in new homes that would likely sell at market value or better.

- Requested that the Committee and the Town not be dismissive about the painful loss of homes or neighborhood environments for people who want to live there when there is an opportunity for residents to spruce up their homes and sell them without help of a developer.

- Was among many Chelmsford residents who attended the Westford asphalt plant hearings. There were assurances that a modern asphalt plant will be high-tech with low odor and low emissions to have minimal impact on residents in the region.
• There is a lack of comfort about what the town can and cannot control. As example, cited research of Burton Lane resident on zoning behind property before buying the home, and the fact that the zoning was incorrect in the town records. Residents were educated on the zoning prior to buying their homes.

• The current IA zoning on the North side of Route 40 already allows for many options in terms of development.

• A reminder that it is not just the Route 40 residents and abutters who are concerned about the zoning and development in the region. At least 500 people across the whole town signed the letter of concern.

• If businesses in Vinal Square move to a new area of development on Route 40, that affects the revitalization of Vinal Square, as it means more vacant property(s) in Vinal Square.

Mike Raisbeck asked Lisa Marrone what the likelihood that Route 40 impacts business uses and occupancies in Vinal Square. Unknown at this time. Mike recalled that the comparison to Center Village and Route 110 businesses co-existing brought up at the last Committee meeting. Virginia Timmins stated that several residents have conveyed they do not believe this is a valid comparison. Chelmsford Center benefits from having two interchanges (Route 3 and Route 495) as well as the Route 129, Route 110, and Route 4 major roads passing through the center.

Joe Tierney, 3 Grant Street and Chair of the Vinal Square Master Plan Committee: Recognizes that planning and trying to improve the infrastructure is an evolutionary process. Move forward but consider everyone and all the stakeholders in the zoning recommendations.

Nancy Loiselle, 139 Main Street:

• Asked Mr. Cohen what qualifications Mr. Belansky has to give an opinion on the quality of the industrial buildings on Route 40 (reference meeting 11/20/2018). The Doris drive building was built in 1986 and the Loiselle’s are the highest tax payers on Route 40. Mike Raisbeck stated that he believed Mr. Belansky was using “term of art” language.

• Not against positive change in Chelmsford. Owns a big portion of the land in the region of interest is not selling.

Mike Walsh asked Ms. Marrone and Mr. Cohen for clarification on the Route 129 efforts. Specifically, the developers are all private property owners and there are multiple developers. Chelmsford is in the initial phases of a site readiness grant and is conducting an in-depth inventory of owners as well as tenants. Extensive outreach ongoing to local businesses to understand what is needed to attract and retain them.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane:

• Reminded the committee that the National Grid easement needs to be considered if there are any changes to the south side. If the National Grid easement is used in the buffer calculation, then there is likely no real landscape buffer. If it is not used, then other acreage needs to provide the buffer.

• In the Master Plan 2010, the discussion about zoning and inconsistencies was with respect to the North side of Route 40, not the South side. There are many locations in Chelmsford where front-to-front zoning is used to address inconsistencies. Mike Raisebeck stated that a consideration might be to try to create transitional zoning and use overlays to try to manage it.

• Questioned the logic that the area is not desirable for residential living today, but with rezoning one of the main considerations is residential living, whether single or multi-family. The current IA zoning already facilitates independent senior living facilities.

• Regarding traffic – Upon reviewing NMCOG and MS2 data, the numbers do not seem to be as bad as the assertions. The data shows that the traffic situation has been somewhat stable over the last several years.

**ADJOURN:** Emily motioned to adjourn at 8:57pm. Nance seconded. All were in favor.

Next meeting is December 11th at 7:00pm.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10/30/2018 | N. Araway      | Provide a summary of:  
- Properties owned by Northstar  
- Properties under agreement with Northstar  
- Properties that are >75 years old  
- Properties that are close to 1 acre or larger | Distributed 11/20/2018; Put as agenda item at future meeting.                                                    |
| 11/20/2018 | D. Van Dyne, N. Araway | Investigate availability of relevant reports that would give unbiased commercial broker perspective as follow up to previous public input suggestion. |                                                                      |
| 11/20/2018 | P. Armstrong   | Follow up from Oct 30 discussion. Give Water District and Sewer opportunity to provide input.                     |                                                                      |
| 10/30/2018 | P. Armstrong   | Contact Conservation Commission, to address the committee at one of the November meetings.                        | Closed. Conservation Commission - written communication in support of 11/20 meeting.                               |
| 10/30/2018 | E. Antul       | Check with Paul Cohen to see if we can get access to Westford’s air quality study reports.                        | Closed. P. Cohen or M. McCall would need to submit public record request. May need to go through Board of Selectmen. Outside of this committee scope. |
| 10/30/2018 | V. Timmins     | Contact Mike McCall to ask him to report on the traffic study at one of the November meetings.                     | Closed.                                                                      |
| 10/30/2018 | D. Van Dyne    | Contact Evan Belinsky to ask him to brief the committee at one of the November meetings                             | Closed.                                                                      |
| 11/20/2018 | P. Armstrong   | Invite Paul Cohen to address the Committee (E. Belinsky suggestion)                                              | Closed. Mr. Cohen addressed the Committee on 11/29/2018.                                                            |
Route 40

Business Development Perspective

Lisa Marrone
Town of Chelmsford
November 2018
Business Development Perspective
Route 40 - Route 3

- Highway Interchange
  - Tendency to Predicate Development
  - Population of Consumers Demand Conveniences
  - Route 40 is not Comparable to Other Interchanges such as; Drum Hill or Rt 129
  - Investors and Developers are continually seeking opportunities particularly near highway access and high traffic volume
- Clusters are becoming prevalent
  - 3rd Ave. in Burlington
  - Cornerstone Square in Westford
  - Thorndike Exchange in Lowell
- Market Demand for Available Space
- Economic Development
Available Space / Market Demand

- Retail / Industrial & Flex
  - Chelmsford
  - Billerica
  - Littleton
  - Lowell
  - Bedford
## Available Retail Space

### Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>23,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>23,497</td>
<td>37,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>11,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>12,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Billerica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$14.58</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>20,499</td>
<td>43,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>54,798</td>
<td>53,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>17,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>7,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>1,430,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (ML)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Vacancy Rate

**Chelmsford**

- **Survey:** 6%
- **5-Year Avg:** 6%

**Billerica**

- **Survey:** 6%
- **5-Year Avg:** 6%
### Available Retail Space

#### Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>23,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>23,467</td>
<td>37,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>1,430,533</td>
<td>1,493,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Price Per SF</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (MIL)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vacancy Rate

- **6%**

#### Littleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$41.77</td>
<td>$40.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>28,750</td>
<td>36,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>40,341</td>
<td>64,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>122,671</td>
<td>80,827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>551,468</td>
<td>597,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>51,259</td>
<td>105,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>$143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (MIL)</td>
<td>$50.6</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vacancy Rate

- **15%**
Available Retail Space

Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>23,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>23,487</td>
<td>37,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>5-Year Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>12,874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>1,430,533</td>
<td>1,493,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (Mill.)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$15.62</td>
<td>$12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>95,454</td>
<td>90,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>110,569</td>
<td>125,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>23,657</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>5-Year Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>-41,093</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>3,311,233</td>
<td>3,794,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>9,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>$94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (Mill.)</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacancy Rate

Available Retail Space
Available Retail Space

Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$18.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>23,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>23,487</td>
<td>37,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>12,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bedford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNN Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$41.22</td>
<td>$31.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>57,540</td>
<td>17,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>70,724</td>
<td>33,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>-1,173</td>
<td>2,431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>1,430,533</td>
<td>1,403,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>$194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (Mil.)</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>753,097</td>
<td>725,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>46,830</td>
<td>16,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$834</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (Mil.)</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Available Industrial / Flex Space

## Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availibility</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>122,003</td>
<td>100,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>143,746</td>
<td>270,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>6,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand

- Survey: 47,239
- 5-Year Avg: -15,679

## Billerica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>$8.89</td>
<td>$8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>527,983</td>
<td>502,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>706,788</td>
<td>918,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>106,350</td>
<td>110,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Demand

- Survey: -125,551
- 5-Year Avg: 12,327

## Vacancy Rate

### Chelmsford

- 10%

### Billerica

- 10%

### Inventory

- Existing Buildings: 162
- Existing SF: 8,342,434
- 12 Mo. Const. Starts: 0
- Under Construction: 0
- 12 Mo. Deliveries: 0

### Sales

- Sale Price Per SF: $75
- Asking Price Per SF: $98
- Sales Volume (MIL): $23

### Vacancy Rate

- 5%

# Available Industrial / Flex Space

## Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td>$9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>122,033</td>
<td>188,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>143,746</td>
<td>270,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>6,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>47,239</td>
<td>-15,676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Littleton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
<td>$9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>51,932</td>
<td>174,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>245,734</td>
<td>353,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>110,241</td>
<td>33,466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>3,424,438</td>
<td>3,435,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>10,550</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Past Year</td>
<td>5-Year Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (Mill.)</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Vacancy Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available Industrial / Flex Space

Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$9.30</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>122,063</td>
<td>188,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>143,746</td>
<td>270,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>6,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>47,219</td>
<td>-15,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>3,424,438</td>
<td>3,435,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>10,569</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Past Year</td>
<td>5-Year Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (ML)</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lowell

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>$5.52</td>
<td>$5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>305,086</td>
<td>519,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>733,599</td>
<td>855,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>276,808</td>
<td>210,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Absorption SF</td>
<td>54,188</td>
<td>121,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Buildings</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing SF</td>
<td>5,638,923</td>
<td>5,822,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Const. Starts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Mo. Deliveries</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Past Year</td>
<td>5-Year Avg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price Per SF</td>
<td>$29</td>
<td>$29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking Price Per SF</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Volume (ML)</td>
<td>$4.4</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Available Industrial / Flex Space

### Chelmsford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>59.33</td>
<td>60.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>122,093</td>
<td>188,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>143,745</td>
<td>270,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>4.049</td>
<td>6.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>12 M. Absorption SF</td>
<td>-15,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bedford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>5-Year Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>514.32</td>
<td>512.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Per SF</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant SF</td>
<td>210,365</td>
<td>240,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Rate</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available SF</td>
<td>436,056</td>
<td>504,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublet SF</td>
<td>265,658</td>
<td>195,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months on Market</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>12 M. Absorption SF</td>
<td>-3,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparisons

Available Retail Space

- Chelmsford: 1.6%
- Billerica: 4.2%
- Littleton: 4.7%
- Lowell: 3.1%
- Bedford: 9.4%

Available Industrial Flex Space

- Chelmsford: 4.2%
- Billerica: 8.5%
- Littleton: 9.8%
- Lowell: 12.6%
- Bedford: 13.2%
Economic Development Factors

- Site Finders - General Primary Factors
  - Access to Talented Workforce
    - Pipeline of seasoned and skilled labor pool
    - Continual learning
    - Longevity
  - Multiple Transportation Routes
  - Location Location Location
  - Amenities
    - Shopping Conveniences
    - Services and Resources
    - Restaurants
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins Nance Gillies, Mike Raisbeck, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh
Members Absent: None

Attachment: (1) Route 40 Properties Data Received from Nancy Araway on November 20, 2018

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:01 pm.

ROUTE 40 PROPERTIES REPORT
The Committee reviewed the data in Attachment (1).

- It was noted that there appear to be errors in the Assessor’s Data Base (Column 4) that do not reconcile with the Zoning vote at the Fall 2011 Town Meeting (Column 5)
- In general, about 60% of a property valuation is in the land.
- Properties that are greater than 75 years old (built prior to 1943) are candidates for demolition delay. Speculation is that a delay in this area of town would be unlikely as there are currently no known historically significant properties.
- RC allows 2-family or 1-family on a ½ acre lot. RC does not allow senior living, but IA does under special permit.

ZONING BY-LAWS USE TABLES
The Committee Reviewed the Use Regulation Tables in By-Laws Chapter 195 (Zoning), Attachment 1. Clarification points made included:

- With IA alone, cannot build single family, two family, or multi family. Exception is if apply BAOD to IA which allows multi-family in an industrial area.
- Facilitated senior and independent living requires a full and comprehensive plan.
- Section B Exempt Uses – Many state mandated exemptions are allowed anywhere regardless of zoning such as schools, churches, municipals in 40A.
- Section D Commercial –
  - Line 1 Nonexempt Agricultural – Allows farming that is not part of farming exemptions (e.g. horticulture lab, tissue lab)
  - Line 35/36 Marijuana facilities – Chelmsford has a separate by-law that puts a temporary moratorium on any marijuana facilities (195-8.5).
- Section E Industrial
  - Line 9 Transport Terminal – Example is heavy transport such as offloading from one 18-wheeler to another
  - No gas station, convenience store, car wash, or restaurants unless apply an overlay such as the BAOD. A hotel can have a restaurant inside.
- The CEIOD overlay does not add usages to IA and does not take any away. The purpose is to provide developer incentives in return for doing higher grade development which may include architecture, landscaping, and more comprehensive parking and transportation management.
• The BAOD overlay adds amenity usages for industrial zoning and was specifically developed for the Route 129 area. It also allows multi family housing. Approval at a town meeting vote would be required to apply it to other areas.

• A unique overlay could be created for the Route 40 area just as unique overlays were created for Route 129 and Village Center.

**PATH FORWARD DISCUSSION**

The Committee agreed to evaluate multiple options toward formulating final recommendations.

There was discussion about being cautious not to set a precedent that any single developer who wants to buy a property can effect a major rezoning and to be sure we take a balanced view.

Although the zoning is not project specific, if this Committee has a vision for how they would like to see the area used in the future, we will document it. Mike Raisbeck stated that he felt such inputs would be important to the next iteration of the town’s Master Plan.

Mike Walsh requested that Planning Board members and others take the initiative to share their expertise during this process without being prompted in recognition that individuals may not know what they don’t know.

**PUBLIC INPUT SESSION #1**

Kim Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane:

• Asked if we would be getting input from Water and Sewer. Pam Armstrong has an action to give both of these organizations an opportunity to provide input.

• Asked if we would be getting input from Fire or Police. A couple of Committee members clarified that zoning decisions are not made based on municipalities. Although they may be impacted by a specific project, it would be addressed during the discussions on that project. Fire, police and school systems are expected to step up to meet requirements for a given project plan that is approved.

Scott Rummel, 24 Lovett Lane:

• Initiated discussion with Committee and planning board members about the number of people who were involved in this effort before it surfaced with the residents or Planning Board. There was discussion about whether the Committee could provide procedural recommendations to the Planning Board or whether the Planning Board to establish ways to improve the process in the future without prohibiting free trade of property.

• Planning Board members also clarified that the area as it stands will not meet requirements for a 40R. A 40R has to attach to a commercial district.

**ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER**

The Committee identified seven alternatives to evaluate in more detail at future meetings. Where overlays were suggested, it was acknowledged that we can adopt existing overlays or create a unique overlay for this area.

1. Do Nothing. Leave the South side RC and leave the North side a mix of RC and IA. The RC zoning on the North side is the first 200 feet. There was some discussion about how much is already allowed to be developed with the current zoning.

2. Re-zone according to the recommendations provided at the Meetings in August, which had full Commercial CC on the North Side, 300 feet of CC on the South side, and RM for the remainder of the South side. The vote was 6-1 against keeping this option with Mike Raisbeck abstaining from voting. The end decision was that we will discuss it along with the others.

3. Leave the South side alone as RC. Modify the North side to be IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.
4. Change the South side back to RB as it originally was; there are no two-family homes in this area. Make the North side all IA, possibly with a BAOD or unique overlay. Existing houses would not be affected. Houses built prior to 1938 could convert to two family with special permits.

5. Change the North side to CC and either leave the South side RC or change the South side to RB. It was noted this configuration would increase the possibilities for a 40R development, which can be done within a half mile of a CC zone.

6. Make the South side RM. This would allow for a 90-unit development with a 3 story height limitation. Make the North side IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.

7. Change the zoning to CC on both the North and South sides.

Other discussion points:

- Consider restricting height limits to two stories. This could be done with a unique overlay or in a modified BAOD. It was noted that in Westford’s major commercial district(s) they are consistent with number of stories and with architectural styles. The higher the buildings, the more they will affect existing homes with things like light disturbances.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION #2

Scott Rummel, 24 Lovett Lane: Asked for clarification on the BAOD vice creating a new unique overlay. Committee members stated that the BAOD can be tailored, we can adopt characteristics of it, or we can create a new one.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Reminded committee that there is a 20% density requirement on inclusionary housing in RM zones. Any new construction over 4 units is required to include inclusionary low-income housing or make a payment in lieu of constructing affordable housing.

MEETING MINUTES

- Minutes November 11, 2019: Donald Van Dyne motioned to approve. Nancy Araway seconded. All in favor.

- Minutes November 29, 2018: Donald Van Dyne motioned to approve. Mike Walsh seconded. Pam Armstrong and Nancy Araway abstained. All others in favor.

NEXT MEETING(S): January 8, 2019 at 7:00pm and January 22, 2019 at 7:00pm.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT:

Donald Van Dyne motioned to adjourn at 8:55pm. Emily Antul seconded. All in favor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Follow up from Oct 30 discussion. Give Water District and Sewer opportunity to provide input.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>D. Van Dyne, N. Araway</td>
<td>Investigate availability of relevant reports that would give unbiased commercial broker perspective as follow up to previous public input suggestion.</td>
<td>Closed. No reports found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Contact Conservation Commission, to address the committee at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed. Conservation Commission -written communication in support of 11/20 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>E. Antul</td>
<td>Check with Paul Cohen to see if we can get access to Westford’s air quality study reports.</td>
<td>Closed. P. Cohen or M. McCall would need to submit public record request. May need to go through Board of Selectmen. Outside of this committee scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>V. Timmins</td>
<td>Contact Mike McCall to ask him to report on the traffic study at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2018</td>
<td>D. Van Dyne</td>
<td>Contact Evan Belansky to ask him to brief the committee at one of the November meetings.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Invite Paul Cohen to address the Committee (E. Belansky suggestion)</td>
<td>Closed. Mr. Cohen addressed the Committee on 11/29/2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town of Chelmsford  
Route 40 Study Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
January 8, 2019  

Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh  
Members Absent: None  

Attachment: (1) Chelmsford Water Department Inputs  

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:00pm.  

COMMITTEE ADVISORY PARTICIPATION CHANGE:  
Mike Walsh originally joined the Committee as a resident representative. Nancy Araway and Donald Van Dyne are the appointed Planning Board members with Mike Raisbeck originally attending in an advisory capacity. Since the Committee’s last meeting, Mr. Walsh was sworn in to fill an open seat on the Planning Board. To keep the number of Planning Board members to three such that the Committee meetings do not constitute a public meeting of the Planning Board subject to the open meeting law, Mike Raisbeck withdrew from participating in the Committee discussions.  

MEETING MINUTES  
After clarification on a Committee member’s intent, the December 11, 2018 minutes were amended to include a 7th option which was all CC on both the North and South sides. Mike Walsh made a motion to accept the minutes as amended. Nancy Araway seconded. All others in favor.  

WATER DEPARTMENT INPUTS  
The Committee members reviewed Attachment (1). Chelmsford buys its sewer output from Lowell. Any change in water usage must meet state regulations. The water department review of proposed projects to assess compliance with the regulations is funded by the applicant.  

TOWN ZONING RECORDS  
The Committee addressed apparent discrepancies in the town’s official zoning records and discussed clarifying questions related to the accuracy of the assessors’ maps for the region of town we are reviewing.  

ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSION  
Discussion points on the seven alternatives identified at the last meeting on December 11, 2018 are noted below. Where overlays were suggested, it was acknowledged that we can adopt existing overlays or create a unique overlay for this area.  

Alternative 1: Do Nothing. Leave the South side RC and leave the North side a mix of RC and IA. The RC zoning on the North side is the first 200 feet.  
• The Committee decided to consider this option in the context of discussing the other options.  

Alternative 2: Re-zone according to the recommendations provided at the Meetings in August, which had full Commercial CC on the North Side, 300 feet of CC on the South side, and RM for the remainder of the South side.  
• IA was preferred over CC from a traffic perspective.  
• There was a question about whether the residents would like a supermarket in this area which CC zoning would enable. The sentiment was that there are enough supermarket options nearby.  
• Most members felt this option is not viable or desired based on the town residents’ response in August.  
• Most members did not see a compelling advantage of CC in this area.
South side leave as RC vs. change to RB or RM discussion and clarification points:
- RM zoning is 3 stories max above ground. If parking is at grade, that is the first story.
- Recent data shows properties have sold and will sell at market value including a recent property sale on Groton Road 4 lots from the highway. There was some discussion about market trends and values selling a little below asking price. General preference was to leave the South side residential.
- The area is currently functioning as RB; there are no two-family homes in the area.

**Alternative 3:** Leave the South side alone as RC. Modify the North side to be IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.

- Westford has not gone over two stories or a similar height limit. We would like to see a 2-story or height limit contiguous with Westford.
- BAOD Clarification – The BAOD was developed for the Route 129 area. If an overlay is required, we can modify this existing one or write a new one. Current trends are to provide amenities in business areas in order to get more industrial tenants. For example, many companies are no longer providing cafeterias.
- A concern was expressed that brick and mortar businesses will continue to be less popular in the future and that we will be creating more vacant space. Service oriented businesses (medical, etc.) like those on the Westford corridor of Route 40 might make more sense. There was an observation that we have had excess retail space in Chelmsford since the 1980s and that we are not filling existing spaces.
- Regarding retail restaurants and recreation – There was discussion about the level of services needed in this area being less than those in the Route 129 corridor.
- Industrial use: One view is that we have low intensity use industrial businesses on Route 40. Another view is there are already a lot of industrial businesses in other parts of Chelmsford and in Nashua. The question of whether we really need or can sustain more was raised. It appears that Tyngsboro may be struggling with similar attempts at Exit 34.
- If current owners sell, the 20 acres on the North Side might be amenable to something like a life sciences park with a campus environment enabled by an overlay. This is likely not feasible on Route 129 because of the number of high value properties that would have to be purchased. Businesses are being priced out of areas like Cambridge.
- The need was acknowledged for senior housing, nursing homes and memory care units.
- It was requested that if we have an overlay then we consider our vision for the area and be mindful that there have been and will likely be residents in this area for decades.

**Alternative 4:** Change the South side back to RB as it originally was; there are no two-family homes in this area. Make the North side all IA, possibly with a BAOD or unique overlay. Existing houses would not be affected. Houses built prior to 1938 could convert to two family with special permits.

- The South side is still functioning as RB. After the 2011 Town Meeting vote to change it to RC to accommodate a resident who wanted to convert to a two-family, there were no two-family homes built.
- If the North side becomes all IA, the homes on the North side become pre-existing non-conforming and are grandfathered. Their current use has the right to remain until the homes get torn down and rebuilt, at which point the properties would be subject to the IA zoning.
- Because of regulations put in place in 1938, properties built prior to 1938 maintain their ability to expand to two family homes.

**Alternative 5:** Change the North side to CC. Leave the South side RC or change the South side to RB.

- Covered by discussions above.

**Alternative 6:** Make the South side RM. Make the North side IA with a BAOD or unique overlay.

- Covered by discussions above. Consensus to leave South Side RC or move back to RB.
Alternative 7: Change the zoning to CC on both the North and South sides.

- Covered by discussions above. Majority consensus not to zone either side CC.

General Reflections after Options discussions:

- Recommendations are leaning toward keeping South side residential (RC or RB) and changing North Side to all IA with possible overlay. The Committee will discuss this in more detail at the next meeting.

- There was a question asked and clarification given about the downside of leaving the 200 feet of RC on the North side instead of making it all IA. Keeping the RC zone would eliminate the ability of businesses to have visibility at the road, do roadside landscaping, etc. Current homeowners will likely have property value appreciation by being in an IA zone because developers will pay premium for their properties.

- There was a question about whether zoning changes can be written with an effective date delay. Planning Board members experience is that there is no benefit to doing that and it cannot be implemented. It creates a burden on a property with the banks if owner conveys the property.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Scott Rummel, 24 Lovett Lane: Suggested the Committee perform economic analysis to evaluate town revenue impacts. On the South side, consider the difference in revenue with single family housing (RB) vs. duplexes (RC). On the north side, assess the real economic benefit to all IA and adding professional services such as food and laundry. If there is minimal revenue increase, then it might make more sense to leave it the way it is.

Kim Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane: Suggested the Committee consider the impact to home values on they South side by making the North side all IA.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Heard that someone wanted to put in a motorcycle shop in this area. Requested that zoning recommendations do not allow motor vehicle businesses. Also referenced an earlier comment about duplexes being starter homes with a caution about thinking about them that way. As one example, Dunstable Road duplexes are selling for over $500K.

Jeff Gilles, 248 Groton Road: Asked for clarification on duplex per acre density. The answer is that one can build 4 units or 2 duplex buildings per acre. Two-family housing is ½ acre lot zoning.

OTHER DISCUSSION:

Consider any set-back requirements desired on South side whether single family or duplex. The National Grid easement/clearing takes up 80 feet of set-back.

One should not expect instant gratification. Vinal Square and Central Square were zoned to allow residents above commercial first floor businesses several years ago and little has changed yet. Little has happened with the implementation of the Route 129 overlay.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: Mike Walsh motioned to adjourn at 8:52pm. Nance Gillies seconded. All in favor.

NEXT MEETING: January 22, 2019 at 7:00pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2018</td>
<td>P. Armstrong</td>
<td>Follow up from Oct 30 discussion. Give Water District and Sewer opportunity to provide input.</td>
<td>Closed 1/8/2019 with Committee reviewing inputs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1: Chelmsford Water Department Inputs

Chelmsford Water Department Bruce Harper

Water impact supply study would have to be done  Hydraulic study would have to be done
Fire Flows studies need to be done

Due to the elevation, you would have to add to the Scotty Hollow/Kelshill 15" main and extend it to
Westford line otherwise you would have low flow bad pressure

State regulates how much water you can output, regardless of how much you have
It effects neighboring communities as they all pull from the underground supply feeds

Cox had already approached Water Dept for studies, but they were discontinued, when brakes were put
on project (They talked about a 99, longhorn, veterans housing, 6 story hotel and or apt building, retail
space and a whole foods if they could by adjoining land)

Sewerage - there was a moratorium on new sewer output for a short time
Many projects have to reuse/reclaim water
Ie: the water department has to put gray water into the treatment plant for reuse

U Mass building more in Lowell which will take more of the sewer output allowed
Could be projects that are built before this one
Town of Chelmsford  
Route 40 Study Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
January 22, 2019

Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh  
Members Absent: None

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:02pm.

OPENING COMMENTS:

The Committee discussed timing and requirements for getting recommendations submitted to the Planning Board in time to process them for Spring Town Meeting Warrant Articles.

Mike Walsh stated that town officials attending the last Vinal Square/North Village Committee meeting suggested that the North Village Committee and the Route 40 Study Committees might consider a joint collaborative meeting. The majority of the Committee members did not feel this was warranted at that time and that it would be unconventional relative to public meeting process and committee charters. The Route 40 Study Committee previously invited the Vinal Square/North Village Committees to present their inputs and they have been welcomed as part of the open meeting and public input sessions process.

Virginia Timmins stated that a resident requested we understand whether changing the north side to all IA will impact concessions that Westford's Newport Materials made for the asphalt plant in consideration of nearby residential areas. Emily Antul offered to follow up with Attorney Haverty.

SOUTH SIDE OF ROUTE 40 DISCUSSION

The Committee discussed RM, RC and RB options for the south side. Considerations included transition zones between the north side zoning/developments and the south side RB abutting lots, potential loss of appropriate buffering due to the power company easement on the south side, whether RM would better position for future development, and examples of RM next to RB in other parts of town.

Nancy Araway motioned that the Committee recommend the south side be left as RC in order to create a transition buffer between the abutting RB lots on the south side and the higher density utilization on the north side. Nance Gillies seconded. Motion carried 6 in favor, 1 against.

Nancy Araway will develop strawman recommended language for the south side for further review.

NORTH SIDE OF ROUTE 40 DISCUSSION

The Committee discussed two options, acknowledging input we have received during this process about the dire need for senior housing in Chelmsford as well as the need for multi-family housing.

Option 1: Zone the north side IA with an overlay and request legal input on the asphalt plant concessions. Example components of the overlay discussed were multi-family housing, anything required for senior housing not covered in the IA use tables, and size limited restaurants or retail.

Option 2: Zone the north side RM with an overlay that would allow for things like medical, financial or other services businesses, limited size retail, or adult/child day care facilities.

Nancy Araway will develop strawman recommended language for the north side options for further review.
PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Kim Bennet, 25 Lovett Lane: Suggested the Committee have clarity on whether housing desired is senior housing, multi-family housing or both.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Asked if either of the options for the north side would affect existing businesses if they want to renovate or add on to their facilities. Suggested we consider addressing this scenario in the overlay language or new zoning language exceptions as appropriate.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: Emily Antul motioned to adjourn at 9:30pm. Nance Gillies seconded. All in favor.

NEXT MEETING: January 29, 2019 at 7:00pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>E. Antul</td>
<td>Request inputs from Attorney Haverty on whether zoning the North Side all IA affects Westford Asphalt plant concessions made in consideration of residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>N. Araway</td>
<td>Draft strawman zoning language options for further discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh
Members Absent: None

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:02pm.

OVERLAY:
The Committee reviewed draft language for a Senior Housing Overlay District (SHOD) on the north side of Route 40. Discussion included structure related parameters as well as amenities that would enhance, complement and be applicable to senior living facilities and the surrounding area.

Nancy Araway will incorporate changes to be reviewed at the next meeting. We will also invite input from Evan Belansky on the document draft.

UNDERLYING ZONING:
The Committee discussed the trades between having the underlying zoning be RM or IA.

Nancy Araway motioned to recommend converting the north side to IA contingent on legal input regarding any implications to the Newport Materials asphalt plant concessions that were made in recognition of the residential neighborhoods in the region. Nance Gillies seconded. All were in favor.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Richard Stander, 153 Turnpike Road: Stated that if the landscape of this area of Route 40 was going to change significantly with significant increases in traffic, then he would like the town to work with the state to consider a full cloverleaf interchange off of Route 3. This approach would eliminate the need for traffic light like we have at the Route 110 and Route 129 interchanges. Clarification was provided that the Committee’s recommendations are such that we do not expect significant traffic increase. There was also clarifying discussion about this geographic region not being compatible with the requirements for clover leaf interchanges.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Requested confirmation that the recommended changes in development would not preclude any Route 40 residents from staying in their homes.

Jeff Gillies, 248 Groton Road: Asked whether it would be possible for Newport Materials to construct an additional roadway in if the underlying zoning was IA. Planning Board experts stated that our by-laws would not allow this. Asphalt operations are not permitted in IA zoning and access roads may be built only for what is permitted in the zone.

Scott Rummel, 24 Lovett Lane: Asked about by-rite developments under IA, benefits of extending IA to the street level and what could be rebuilt on an existing footprint. The Committee referenced previous deliberations about residents being able to continue living there, benefit to businesses for roadside signage and landscaping, and resident property values likely increasing.

Wenlan Lu, NorthStar Realty: Asked if the Committee would consider recommending the Senior Housing overlay on the south side with no retail amenities. The Committee explained the rationale during past deliberations including the unique aspect of the electrical company easement and insufficient buffers.

Mike Walsh asked a north side Groton Road resident for input on the Committee’s direction. The resident is not sure yet if in favor of the recommendations and expressed concern about being sure we are not enabling further asphalt plant issues.
There was some discussion about the Master Plan, which acknowledged zoning conflicts only on the north side.

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:22pm.

**NEXT MEETING:** February 5, 2019 at 7:00pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>E. Antul</td>
<td>Request inputs from Attorney Haverty on whether zoning the North Side all IA affects Westford Asphalt plant concessions made in consideration of residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>N. Araway</td>
<td>Draft strawman zoning language options for further discussion</td>
<td>Closed 1/29/2019.0Sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh
Members Absent: None

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:01pm.

MINUTES: Mike Walsh motioned to approve the January 29, 2019 minutes. Nancy Araway seconded. All others present were in favor. Emily Antul arrived late to the meeting and did not participate in the vote to approve the minutes.

AGE IN PLACE VILLAGE / CONTINUING CARE COMMUNITY OVERLAY:

The Committee reviewed the next revision of the draft language for a Continuing Care Community Overlay District on the north side of Route 40. Evan Belansky attended the meeting to facilitate review and understanding of his comments to the draft.

Discussion points included

- Making the purpose and intent stronger for the vision of an integrated, self-contained Age in Place Village or a Continuing Care Community with complementary amenities and services.
- How to assure that the language accommodates non-seniors (e.g. brain trauma victims) who might need a continuing care community. Facilitated and independent living as defined in our by-laws is for senior living only. Our by-laws do not define "senior".
- Town Counsel review for guidance on federal Fair Housing Act and use of age restricted language.
- Open space considerations.
- Review of lots listed in the overlay, subdivision road implications where the overlay is applied to an RC zoned lot, and assuring we have all lots intended to be included Identified.
- Developer(s) considerations.
  - The vision is sound. The vision is a master planned development, but different developers could participate at different times. A segmented market strategy does not guarantee that the end result will be integrated.
  - Whether a developer would build multi-story mixed-use buildings because the zoning allows them.
  - Balancing dimensional flexibilities with things like height and set-back requirements.
  - One could consider duplexes in the south side RC zone aligned with the continuing care strategy

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Jeff Gilles, 248 Groton Road: Suggested one consideration might be to stop the overlay at Doris Drive

Kim Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane: Consider involving subject matter experts in senior housing.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: The underlying zoning plus the overlay incorporates some of the CIEOD bonuses but not all of them. Usage is not the main concern. The fundamental issue is about density and setbacks. Residents do not want anything as big on the south side as we are considering on the north side.
Wenlan Lu, NorthStar Realty: Asked why the Committee is not recommending an overlay on the south side. The Committee reviewed the previous rationale discussed in meetings up to and including the January 22nd vote to leave the south side as RC to ensure a transition buffer between the abutting RB lots and the higher density utilization on the north side. Ms. Lu stated that if the south side is left as RC, she will plan duplexes with building placements all the way back to the National Grid easement. She has calculated that 19 duplexes could be built on the south side. If senior housing is allowed on the south side, she would consider a 2-3 story development with a buffer zone before the easement.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:42pm.

NEXT MEETING: March 5, 2019 at 7:00pm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Assigned</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/22/2019</td>
<td>E. Antul</td>
<td>Request inputs from Attorney Haverty on whether zoning the North Side all IA affects Westford Asphalt plant concessions made in consideration of residential areas.</td>
<td>Closed 2/5/2019. Westford Asphalt plant settlement did not include anything for Chelmsford. The concessions made were for Westford residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Donald Van Dyne, Mike Walsh
Members Absent: None

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 6:58pm.

MINUTES: The Committee unanimously approved the February 6, 2019 minutes.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Evan Belansky, Community Development Director, attended the meeting in the public section and was asked to provide subject matter expertise when needed.

Pam Armstrong stated that she was aware of communications from which she interpreted that some in the public thought the Committee was reverting back to the original zoning proposals revealed in August 2018. Pam clarified that the Committee is not doing that. The Committee is developing new recommendations based on the research conducted and inputs it has requested or received over the last several months.

Pam Armstrong met with David Hedison from the Chelmsford Housing Authority to discuss the current vision for an Age in Place / Continuing Care Community Village on Groton Road. There is a vision for the UMass West Campus for specialized senior living (assisted living, memory care, etc.). Evan clarified that there is not zoning in place yet for the UMass West area to accommodate specialized senior living and that historically the Housing Authority would create such a development in partnership with a developer. There was discussion about whether or not there would still be a demand for assisted senior living if such a development is created on the UMass West land. Independent 55+ living in the Groton Road area would be a complement to assisted living.

NORTH SIDE CONTINUED DISCUSSIONS

There was a follow up to previous discussions about whether extending IA to the street on the North Side would enable construction of more road(s) for industrial large truck access to Route 40. Evan received input from Town Counsel that this would not be a concern. It would have to go before the Planning Board to be accepted and approved. Most private developments in town are proposed with private roads.

Evan clarified the set-back requirements in IA zones. IA allows 4-story buildings with set-backs 40 feet front, 40 feet rear, and 30 feet side. RC zone set backs are 20 feet front, 12 feet rear, and 30 feet side.

The Committee discussed extending the IA zoning on the north side to the street and expanding the overlay to include other housing besides age in place housing, giving a potential developer and the community more flexibility on options that would be aligned with residential neighborhoods. The Committee also discussed reducing the overlay set-back for 5 story buildings to 200 feet.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Process clarification: Mike Raisbeck, Planning Board Chair, was in the public section and offered clarification on the process. The Committee recommendation report will go to the Planning Board. When the Planning Board is ready to act on any rezoning recommendations they will hold a public hearing. If it is approved by the Planning Board, it then goes to the next town meeting.

Kim Bennett, 25 Lovett Lane: Asked about town infrastructure ramifications for multifamily housing. The due diligence for this would be done as part of a specific project proposal.

Doug Gordon, Rumney NH: Asked for clarification on previous south side deliberations. Mr. Gordon’s wife owns four acres on the south side that are land locked without access roads.
Roger Power, 258 Groton Road: Asked for clarification on previous south side deliberations.

Wenlan Lu, NorthStar Realty: Stated that if the south side was changed to allow multi-family there would be a sufficient buffer even with the National Grid easement. If the south side were changed to multi-family, they could support it with neighborhood commercial on the north side. She is concerned about the appeal of having residential on the north side with traffic noise and industrial zoning.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane:
- Not pleased in to hear that Planning Board member(s) are opening discussion for the south side in the future after all of the research and work the Committee has done to reach their recommendations.
- Asked if a developer could apply both the CEIOD and the new overlay. Answer is "yes".
- Asked if residents on the south side who wanted to sell now could get market value for their homes. Pam Armstrong stated that her previous research showed they could. Donald Van Dyne did an MLS quick look in real time during the meeting and stated it might be a little below market value.

Dan Castellano, 245 Groton Road: Cited traffic volume increases in last three years. Mike Walsh asked if Mr. Castellano felt comfortable with the Committee’s vision for the North side and Mr. Castellano stated that he did.

Joseph P. Rivard, Dunstable, MA and Owner of 1 Ward Way business: Stated that he and his son intend to relocate his business. Identified safety concerns with potential collisions between cars and trailers as well as blinding sun when traveling west during late afternoon sunset hours.

Andrea Gauntlet, 264 Groton Road: Concerned about value of her home since the asphalt plant approval and noise.

Katie Sapp, 263 Groton Road: Her plot abuts the asphalt plant and she would like an opportunity to sell her home.

Pam Armstrong gave an example regarding the four new condo complexes near the Littleton Road asphalt plant. These homes sold before they were built.

Nancy Araway gave an example regarding the residential area on Route 110 where there is a lot of truck traffic. Triple glazed windows are used on home(s) for noise reduction. The residents who live there want to be there for the convenience of the area.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:06pm.

NEXT MEETING: March 12, 2019 at 6:00pm. Focus is to review Overlay language.
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh
Members Absent: Donald Van Dyne

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 6:10 pm.

MINUTES: Emily Antul motioned to approve the March 5, 2019 minutes. Nance Gillies seconded. All in favor.

Evan Belansky, Community Development Director, attended the meeting in the public section and provided subject matter expertise.

OPENING DISCUSSION:

Pam Armstrong asked the public in attendance to identify any issues they had with the North Side overlay approach.

- Nancy Loiselle, 7 Doris Drive business address: Nancy and her husband feel that the underlying IA zoning on the north side is acceptable. If condos or apartment buildings are built, they would want to have fences installed to prevent children or other individuals from unintentionally coming into the business lot.

- Andrea Gauntlet, 204 Groton Road: Lives on the South Side. Stated that her home is valued at $280K and, if the south side is rezoned, she knows she will be offered more money for her home.
  - Evan Belansky offered that he had advised residents who came to him requesting rezoning of the south side to wait for the Committee recommendations to go to the Planning Board and to then take their request through the Planning Board process.
  - Pam Armstrong suggested that residents ensure they have the correct information about market value of their homes under the existing zoning. A rough estimate example offered is that if someone sold their home on an RC lot in this area for $250-350K with connection to town sewer lines the market value of a new home built on the lot would likely be $350-400K.
  - Pam Armstrong asked how Ms. Gauntlet would like the south side rezoned. Ms. Gauntlet replied that she would like it rezoned to increase her property value for selling her home. Pam Armstrong and Committee members clarified that the Committee's role is not to establish a recommendation that will give residents who want to leave the most money for their homes, but to establish recommendations with the residents and businesses in the area who will be there at the outcome in mind and with consideration to town-wide stakeholder inputs.
  - Evan Belansky offered that, if changes were to be made to the South side in the future, they would need to be customized for South Side considerations (duplex vs. multi-family such as a "mini Scotty Hollow", abutting neighborhoods, available land area, electrical company easements, etc.).
  - Committee members reminded the attendees that the major reasons for not changing the South Side zoning included ensuring adequate buffering to other neighborhoods and ensuring that we are not enabling creep into other neighborhoods in North Chelmsford over the years that would fundamentally change the character of that section of town in a manner counter to why people have chosen to live there.
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:
The Committee stepped through the current draft of the recommended Overlay. Some major comments not inclusive of the total line-by-line review included:

- Whether the article should be split into multiple articles. One example addressed was to keep the Zoning Area identification separate from the Overlay District parameters description. Zoning areas include all the North Side lots.
- Strengthen clarity that when using the Continuing Care Community Overlay District (CCCOD) overlay, no other overlays can be applied.
- Reconciling "Independent Senior Living" (not defined) with "Facilitated and Independent Senior Living" as defined in the by-laws and adjusting specific line items accordingly.
- Moving personal care services to the Special Permit section and removing special permitting of retail stores and services not in support of the Senior population.
- Validating the recommended minimum percentage of area to remain as landscaped green area.
- Removing the minimum height requirement for new construction.
- Addressing the setback requirements for buildings 3 stories and 5 stories in height.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION
Doug Gordon, 2798 Rumney Route 25, Rumney NH (wife owns four acres on the south side that are land locked without access roads): Asked what happens to "the gas station" on the south side if the south side is "taken out" of the rezoning. The Committee explained that the south is not being "taken out" of anything, to the Committee’s knowledge there was never a gas station under consideration and the south side recommendations were formulated after a review of several options in prior months.

Tammy Arena, 3 Burton Lane: Asked Emily Antul to provide clarification on the recent report made to the Board of Selectmen by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation regarding traffic volumes and routing in North Chelmsford including Ledge Road and Swain Road. More information can be found in the video and meeting minutes for the BOS Meeting on March 11, 2019.

Wenlan Lu, NorthStar Realty: Requested that the committee remove the language about "retail focused on the Senior Population" and leave it as stated with size restrictions and other parameters. The rationale is that defining what retail for the senior population means is not clear. The Committee agreed with Ms. Lu’s request.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:38pm.

NEXT MEETING: Initially planned April 3, 2019 at 7:00pm during this meeting. Subsequently rescheduled to April 11, 2019. Focus is to review next revision of Overlay language and outline for Final Report.
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Donald Van Dyne
Members Absent: None
Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:00pm.

MINUTES: Mike Walsh motioned to approve the March 12, 2019 minutes. Nancy Araway seconded. Donald Van Dyne abstained. Emily Antul was absent for the vote. All others in favor.

REVIEW OF DRAFT ARTICLES:
The Committee reviewed the next revision of the draft Town Meeting Articles. Discussion points included:

Article x1 – Revise Zoning of Area along Rt. 40:
- Correct typo. Lot 18-84-4 should be 17-84-4.

Article x2 – Apply Overlay Zoning to Area along Rt. 40:
- Correct typo. Lot 18-84-4 should be 17-84-4.

Article XXV – Continuing Care Community Overlay District:
- 195-148 Paragraph 2: Delete “The CCCOD can be applied as an overly to any zoning district”. This overlay was developed specifically with the demographics and characteristics of the north side of Groton Road west of Route 3 in mind. Application to other areas in town may require judicious modifications and tailoring.
- 195-150 Paragraph B-(2): Change language “Nursing/convalescent or rehabilitation homes” to “Nursing/convalescent homes”. Check with town counsel on whether the language can take exception to substance abuse rehabilitation facilities, and if so, change the exception language from “drug rehabilitation” to “excepting substance abuse rehabilitation facilities”.
- 195-150 Paragraph C-(1): Change “Commercial uses not exceeding 2000 square feet including;” to delete the word “commercial” and instead state “Uses supporting the CCCOD Overlay District not exceeding 2000 square feet including;”.
- 195-150 Paragraph C-(1)-(c): Change to “Retail stores and services”, deleting “not focused on sales to the Senior population, under 1500 square feet”. The intent is retail stores and services “supporting the CCCOD Overlay District” as stated in the introduction C-(1).
- 195-150 Paragraph C-(2): Delete this paragraph in its entirety. It is now covered by the last article.
- 195-150 Paragraph C-(3): Change “...limited to Senior Citizen (over 55) occupancy...” to “...limited to 55 and over occupancy...”.
- 195-150 Paragraph C-(5): “Maximum building coverage and floor area ratio may be increased by up to 50% above that required by the underlying Zoning District.” Change this such that the 50% floor area ratio increase excludes retail and services and includes only residential living and nursing facilities. Specifically, it includes the housing defined in 194-48 Paragraph 1.
o Note: While this change is to be incorporated in the final Committee recommendations, Donald Van Dyne and Nancy Araway requested that the minutes reflect their desire to apply the 50% floor area ratio to commercial businesses in addition to residential. The majority decision of the committee to restrict the 50% floor area ratio increase to only residential facilities was made with the intent to minimize overdevelopment of commercial spaces and to eliminate provisions that would encourage development of strip malls.

- 195-151 Paragraph B: Delete this paragraph requiring new construction to be a minimum of 2 actively used stories high. The Committee decided that building height should be left to judicious choices considering aesthetics and market demand for uses.

**Article x3 – Modify the CEIOD overlay to permit multifamily residential use in IA Districts:**

- Enabling embedded housing in industrial areas is not part of this Committee's discussions or recommendations. Delete from this document and work as separate recommendation outside of the Committee if desired.

Emily Antul motioned to endorse the Articles recommendations with the changes incorporated. Mike Walsh seconded. All others were in favor.

Donald Van Dyne requested that the minutes request his desire to zone this area of Route 40 Commercial.

**FINAL REPORT DRAFT OUTLINE:**

Mike Walsh distributed a draft outline for the Final Report. The committee provided input to the outline which included:

- Moving the order of some sections such that the first three sections are Executive Overview, The Town's August recommended change, and Members of the Committee.
- Section covering Recommended Zoning Change by the Town August 2018:
  - Address 2 Meetings in August – Planning Board Public Meeting on August 8th and the Public Hearing, which was 2 sessions long on August 22nd and August 29th.
  - Include establishment of Committee as outcome from Public Hearing.
- The intent is to provide bound copies of the report to the Planning Board in addition to accommodating the Planning Board's request to conduct a PowerPoint presentation.

**PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

No one provided public input at this meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 8:10pm.

**NEXT MEETING:** Initially planned May 9, 2019 at 7:00pm during this meeting. Subsequently rescheduled to May 28, 2019.
Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:03pm.

Attachments: (1) Draft Route 40 Study Committee Final Report Dated May 28, 2019

MINUTES:

- Emily Antul motioned to approve the April 11, 2019 meeting minutes. Nance Gillies seconded. All others were in favor.
- The September 27, 2018 minutes were reviewed with two amendments requested: (1) Include Emily Antul in the list of Committee members as the Board of Selectman representative; and (2) Correct the spelling of “Bennett”. Emily Antul motioned to approve the minutes as amended. Nancy Araway seconded. All others were in favor.

REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT:

The Committee reviewed the first draft of the Final Report. Suggested revisions included the following:

- Appendix:
  - Move the August 2018 Planning Board meeting materials to an appendix.
  - The draft Planning Board materials Appendix includes the Planning Board Public Hearing materials from the 2018 Public Hearing held on August 22 & 29, 2018. Add the material from the August 8, 2018 Planning Board Work Session to this appendix or as a separate appendix.
  - Add the map that was included in the work session / public hearing notice mailed to residents.
  - Add an introduction to the Appendix
- Move the Committee members section to be before the Mission Statement section.
- Committee Members – Invited Guests list: Clarify that Evan Belansky attended as a subject matter expert resource during the March 5 &12, 2019 meetings.
- Define the “South Side” and the “North Side” as part of the introduction to the Tables in “Current Zoning Allowable Uses”. Check the rest of the document for consistency in using “South Side” and “North Side” terminology.
- Maps – Clarifying edits throughout the document to the maps that will better highlight areas of interest and show context.
- Alternate Zoning Options
  - State that the point of reference / point of departure for the Committee was what the town presented at the Planning Board August 2018 meetings.
  - Check the rationale bullets for these options to make sure the correct bullets were pulled from the minutes; some appear to mis-matched. Review to make sure the language is not unique to the context of the minutes.
  - Review / modify the prose for chronology order.
  - Review the last four pages of this section for what language should be moved to either the Overlay or the Final Recommendation section.
• Overlay
  o Move this section before the Final Recommendation section and make the Final Recommendation section the last section before the Appendices.
  o Correct the numbering/lettering sequences.
  o Clarify headings and text as needed to identify what is a “Town Meeting Article” and what is a “Zoning By-Law” article.
  o Delete “Town Meeting Article x3 – Modify the CEIOD overlay to permit multifamily residential use in IA districts”. Rationale from last meeting that this is not a Committee recommendation and would be a separate Planning Board effort if pursued.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Katie Enright from Howard Stein Hudson: Ms. Enright stated that she has been hired by NorthStar Realty / Wenlan Lu to provide civil engineering services. Ms. Enright requested a copy of the draft report that the Committee reviewed during this meeting and was given an extra paper copy of the report.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:25pm.

NEXT MEETING: June 4, 2019
Members Present: Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Nancy Araway, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh, Donald Van Dyne
Members Absent: None

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:03pm.

Attachments: (1) Draft Route 40 Study Committee Final Report Dated June 4, 2019

MINUTES:

- Emily Antul motioned to approve the May 28, 2019 meeting minutes. Nance Gillies seconded. All others were in favor.

REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT:
The Committee reviewed the next Draft of the Final Report provided in Attachment (1). Comments included:

- Several editorial revisions throughout the document.
- Alternate Zoning Options Tab
  - State that the point of reference / point of departure for the Committee was what the town presented at the Planning Board August 2018 meetings.
  - Check the rationale bullets for these options to make sure the correct bullets were pulled from the minutes; some appear to mis-matched. Review to make sure the language is not unique to the context of the minutes.
  - Review / modify the prose for chronology order.
  - Reviewed the last page(s) of this section for what language should be moved to either the Overlay or the Final Recommendation section.
  - Formatting – for each alternative, put the text introduction and the corresponding discussion bullet points on the left page and the corresponding map on the right facing page.
- Executive Summary – The Committee discussed the content to be included in the Executive Summary when it is created.

FINAL REPORT PRESENTATION
The Committee discussed the content to be included in the Presentation for the Planning Board when it is created.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION
There was no public input provided at this meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 8:52pm.

NEXT MEETING: June 18, 2019
Members Present:
- Pamela Armstrong, Emily Antul, Virginia Crocker Timmins, Nance Gillies, Mike Walsh
- Nancy Araway arrived at 8:45pm

Members Absent: Donald Van Dyne

Pam Armstrong called the meeting to Order at 7:07pm.

Attachments:  (1) Draft Route 40 Study Committee Final Report Dated June 18, 2019  
(2) Draft Route 40 Study Committee Presentation for Planning Board Dated June 18, 2019

MINUTES:
- Nance Gillies motioned to approve the June 4, 2019 meeting minutes. Emily Antul seconded. All others were in favor.

REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT:
The Committee reviewed the next Draft of the Final Report provided in Attachment (1). Comments included:
- Editorial modifications
- Corrections to some of the maps
- Checking the Minutes section to make sure the amended version of the 9/27/18 minutes is included.

FINAL REPORT PRESENTATION
The Committee reviewed the Draft of the presentation for the Planning Board provided in Attachment (2). Comments included:
- Editorial modifications
- Corrections to some of the maps
- Content additions and adjustments

Current plans are to provide the presentation at the June 26, 2019 Planning Board meeting.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION
Wenlan Lu, NorthStar Realty: Asked when the final presentation would be available. The Committee deferred to the Planning Board. Virginia Timmins will request that the Clerk’s office post the final presentation with the rest of the Committee materials posted on the Town’s Agenda Center web site page after the presentation is given to the Planning Board.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 9:03pm. Nance Gillies motioned for adjournment. Emily Antul seconded. All in favor.

NEXT MEETING: There is not another Route 40 Study Committee meeting planned at this time.
Appendix

Town of Chelmsford

Proposed Zoning Change

August 2018
July 26, 2018

RE: Proposed Re-zoning of Properties located along Groton Road

Dear Chelmsford Property Owner:

We are writing to you as Town records indicate that you either own property along Groton Road, between Route 3 and the Westford town line or property that abuts property along Groton or in close proximity.

Per the map on the back side of this letter, the lots located on/off Groton Road, from the Route 3 interchange to the Westford Town line are proposed to be rezoned. The northern side of Groton Road is proposed to be rezoned from IA Limited Industrial to CC Shopping Center and the southerly side of Gorton Road is proposed to be split zoned between CC Shopping Center and RM Residential Multifamily. The second step of this re-zoning process would be to adopted a zoning overlay for purposes of permitting and regulating the newly created commercial and multifamily zoned area as defined in the proposed Overlay District map.

In addition to the attached map, the Town Website has a link to the powerpoint explaining why the town is interested in pursuing a re-zoning and the proposed draft zoning bylaw.

www.townofchelmsford.us
“Route 40 West – Rezoning”

There will be several opportunities for interested parties to attend a Planning Board meeting to learn more about the proposed re-zoning, ask questions and provide comment. The first date will be a public meeting and the second date will be the legally required public hearing.

WEDNESDAY August 8th
7-8 PM
Town Offices

In accordance with the Massachusetts State Zoning Act, the Chelmsford Planning Board will be holding a public hearing on this matter.

WEDNESDAY August 22
7:00 PM
TOWN OFFICES
50 BILLERICA ROAD

If you have questions or need additional information please contact Evan Belansky, Community Development Director at 978-244-3341 or email at ebelansky@townofchelmsford.us

Evan Belansky
Community Development Director
BY THE NUMBERS

Labor Force (2016): 18,721
Unemployment Rate (2016): 2.4%
DOR Income Per Capita (2015): $51,862
Residential Tax Rate: $17.96
Commercial Tax Rate: $17.96
Average Assessed Value of Single Family $399,518
Average Single Family Tax Bill $7,175
Student Population (K-12): 5,000+
Schools: 1 HS; 2 Mid; 4 Elem.
UNIQUELY POSITIONED AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE

- At the intersection of two major highways
- 6 Off Ramps
- Convenient Economic Centers
- In the heart of the Route 3 Corridor
- 10 miles from Route 128; 10 miles from the New Hampshire border
Route 3 - Exits 33 & 34
Route 3 - Exits 33 & 34
DISTANCES

1.5 miles to Vinal Square
3 miles to Drum Hill Plaza
5 miles to East Gate Plaza
5 miles to Chelmsford Center
6.5 miles to Westford Four Corners
7 miles to Pheasant Lane Mall / Daniel Webster Hwy
# Current Tax Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 WARD WY</td>
<td>17-22-1</td>
<td>$1,957,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-5</td>
<td>$186,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-2</td>
<td>$351,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-6</td>
<td>$232,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-4</td>
<td>$282,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-3</td>
<td>$393,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-1</td>
<td>$241,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-1</td>
<td>$356,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-3</td>
<td>$297,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-5</td>
<td>$245,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-5</td>
<td>$328,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-51</td>
<td>$431,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-4</td>
<td>$314,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-6</td>
<td>$305,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-6</td>
<td>$337,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-7</td>
<td>$406,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 GROTON RD</td>
<td>16-22-2</td>
<td>$320,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-8</td>
<td>$254,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 GROTON RD</td>
<td>22-92-1</td>
<td>$469,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 GROTON RD</td>
<td>22-92-2</td>
<td>$277,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 DORIS DR</td>
<td>17-22-2</td>
<td>$2,218,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS DR</td>
<td>16-22-1</td>
<td>$329,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-2</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-4</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$10,575,000
## Potential Tax Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 LITTLETON RD</td>
<td>84-337-2</td>
<td>RETAIL w/ RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$1,699,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-101-9</td>
<td>GAS STATION w/ CONV. STORE</td>
<td>$1,268,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 NORTH RD</td>
<td>73-315-3</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL BLDG</td>
<td>$1,872,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>32-101-3</td>
<td>RETAIL w/ RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$2,594,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 MILL RD</td>
<td>97-328-9</td>
<td>108 UNIT APT. BLDG</td>
<td>$15,929,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-101-4</td>
<td>FAST FOOD RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$1,178,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 BOSTON RD</td>
<td>84-334-18</td>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>$3,329,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 RESEARCH PL</td>
<td>32-101-2</td>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>$5,041,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-109-2</td>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>$819,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 CHELMSFORD ST</td>
<td>53-201-1</td>
<td>SHOPPING PLAZA</td>
<td>$8,041,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,773,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLE ?? To see if the Town will vote to amend the Town Code, Chapter 195, “Zoning Bylaw”, for purposes of adopting a new section ARTICLE XXV, “Route 40 Groton Road Mixed Use Redevelopment Overlay District” as follows:

195-???? Purpose and Intent
The Route 40 Groton Road Overlay District is intended to achieve the following strategic goals and objectives:

(1) Maximize the redevelopment potential of this existing underutilized highway interchange and state numbered route.

(2) address changing Town and regional market conditions, specifically the desire by residents, to have local access to goods and services, and housing;

(3) create a new mixed use area that capitalizes on its location at a highway interchange, proximity to an underserved residential population to provide access to commercial amenities and provide new opportunities for housing

(4) promote orderly, effective and quality development and redevelopment

(5) provide housing opportunities that will be compatible and complementary;

195-??? Establishment of Overlay District
The location and boundaries of this overlay district are hereby established and made part of this bylaw as shown on the Route 40 Groton Road Overlay District Map, dated ??????

195-?? Use Regulations
The existing use Regulation Schedule (Chapter 195, Attachment 1) shall be applicable within the underlying zoning district.

A. Within the CC- Shopping Center sub-district the following additional uses are permitted by special permit

1. Self-storage mini warehouse (only north side of Groton Road)

2. Multi-family and senior housing per B (only south side of Groton Road)

B. Within the RM-Multi-family sub-district the only uses permitted are multi-family, A.3 of the Use Regulations Schedule and senior housing including Facilitated and independent living facilities, Alzheimer’s facilities, assisting living facility, independent living and congregate living, A.8.a.b.c.and d of the Use Regulations Schedule. All of the above shall be subject to Article XXIII as applicable.
Special Provisions

A. The total number of housing units approved within the overlay shall not exceed more than 300 units of which no more than 20 units shall be non-senior housing.

B. For purposes of Multi-family and Senior Housing, the following dimensional table shall apply. Further relief may be provided per section 195-113, A-D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensional Requirements</th>
<th>Minimum Lot Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (x 1,000 square feet)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (feet)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth (feet)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage (feet)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Yard Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front (feet) (3)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (feet)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear (feet)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right (up to)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit (up to)</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (feet)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by By-Right (up to)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In CEIODs by Special Permit (up to)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Within the RM sub-district, no building shall be located closer than 100 ft from abutting RB zoned properties.
D. Within the RM sub-district, no parking areas or driveways / access ways shall be located closer than 50 ft from abutting RB zoned properties.

195-?? Applicability of the CEIOD to the Overlay District

A. Article XXI, The Community Enhancement and Investment Overlay District (CEIOD), shall apply to projects
B. All provisions in Article XXI shall have precedence over other sections of the Zoning Bylaw, including but not limited to Article XII, Multifamily Dwellings, and Article XVII, Facilitated and Independent Senior Living facilities"
PLANNING BOARD
Notice of Public Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, August 22, 2018
TIME: 6:30 pm
PLACE: Town Offices
ADDRESS: 50 Billerica Road
ROOM: 204

AGENDA
6:30 Meeting Call to Order

Administrative:
278-282 Mill Road – proposed re-zoning on the BAOD Map

Continued Public Hearings:

152 Turnpike Road, JIN Realty Trust - is seeking BAOD / CEIOD applicability finding for the property at 152 Turnpike Road, a 15 unit rental development which will create 12 market rate units and 3 affordable units. All units will count towards the Subsidized Housing Inventory

197 Billerica Road, Kinloch Investments, LLC, Review Decision and Vote to accept wording for construction of two (2) commercial / retail buildings totaling 12,845 sq. ft., 132 parking spaces and associated site improvements. The site is located in the IA – Limited Industrial District and consists of approximately 2.19 acres as shown on Assessors Map 86 Block 238 Lot 1. The applicant requests approval under Article XXIV, Business Amenity Overlay District” and Article XXI, Community Enhancement and Investment Overlay District (CEIOD) and associated Special Permits per section 195-114.B, 195-115.B, 195-116.B, 195-74 and any other permit relief as may be required under the Chelmsford Zoning Bylaw to allow the proposed use/project.
http://www.townofchelmsford.us/DocumentCenter/View/9055/197-Billerica-Road-Site-Plan-Stamped-revised

Meeting to be recessed and re-opened at Chelmsford Center for the Arts
1A North Road, Chelmsford, Ma 01824
Approximately 7:15pm

New Public Hearings:

Public Hearing pursuant to G. L. c. 40A, s. 5, on Wednesday, August 22, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Offices located at 50 Billerica Road, Chelmsford, MA 01824 for purposes of receiving public comment to amend The Town Code, Chapter 195, “Zoning Bylaw” as follows:

1. Section 195-3, “Official Zoning Map” by rezoning the underlying from a “IA” Limited Industrial to “CC” Shopping Center, fourteen parcels of land, located on / off of Groton Road, which parcels are shown as Assessors’ Map Block and Lots as follows, 16-22-1, 16-22-2, 17-22-1, 17-22-2, 17-22-4, 17-22-5, 17-22-6, 17-84-1, 17-84-2, 17-84-3, 17-84-4, 17-84-5, 17-84-6 and a portion of parcel owned by the State, and re-zoning from “RC” Residential to split zoned as “CC” Shopping Center and “RM” Residential Multifamily, twelve parcels of land on Groton Road, shown as 22-92-1, 22-92-2, 23-92-1, 23-92-2, 23-92-3, 23-92-4, 23-92-5, 23-92-6, 23-92-7, 23-92-8, 23-92-9 and 23-92-51, as shown on the
rezoning map dated July 25, 2018. To adopt a new zoning bylaw, Article XXV, “Groton Road West Mixed Use Overlay District” for purposes of permitting and regulating a newly created commercial and multifamily zoned area as defined in the proposed Overlay District map dated July 25, 2018.

2. To adopt a new and or revised definition of a “Sign”, Article XX, “Terminology” sub-section (1) related to the display of flags on commercial properties.

3. To revise and / or delete sub-section E., “Animals accessory to Dwellings” of section 195-6, “Accessory Uses”, related to the minimum lot size required and associated requirements for the keeping of livestock (small animals, chickens) on a lot.

4. To adopt a new zoning bylaw, Article XXVI, “Historical Preservation and Reuse”, for purposes of providing zoning options and regulations for the preservation and reuse of historical structures.

5. To revise the definition of “Dwelling”, Article XX, “Terminology”, specifically to revise the definition of a multifamily dwelling.

New Business
Meeting Minutes — TBD
Next Meeting — September 12, 2018
Old Business
Committee Reports
Executive Session. (No ES anticipated)

***This agenda has been prepared in advance and represents a listing of topics that the Chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting. However, it does not necessarily include all matters which may be taken up at this meeting***
PLANNING BOARD
Notice of Public Meeting

DATE: Wednesday, August 29, 2018
TIME: 6:30 pm
PLACE: Chelmsford High School
ADDRESS: 200 Richardson Road

Performing Arts Center - PAC
AGENDA
6:30 Meeting Call to Order

Continued Public Hearings

Public Hearing pursuant to G. L. c. 40A, s. 5, on Wednesday, August 22, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Offices located at 50 Billerica Road, Chelmsford, MA 01824 for purposes of receiving public comment to amend The Town Code, Chapter 195, “Zoning Bylaw” as follows:


PowerPoint from 8-22-2018 Meeting at the CCA
http://www.townofchelmsford.us/DocumentCenter/View/9091/Warrant-Articles---Powerpoint-PB_Meeting_08222018-Final

2. To adopt a new and or revised definition of a “Sign”, Article XX, “Terminology” sub-section (1) related to the display of flags on commercial properties.
3. To revise and / or delete sub-section E., “Animals accessory to Dwellings” of section 195-6, “Accessory Uses”, related to the minimum lot size required and associated requirements for the keeping of livestock (small animals, chickens) on a lot.
4. To adopt a new zoning bylaw, Article XXVI, “Historical Preservation and Reuse”, for purposes of providing zoning options and regulations for the preservation and reuse of historical structures.
5. To revise the definition of “Dwelling”, Article XX, “Terminology”, specifically to revise the definition of a multifamily dwelling.

New Business
Next Meeting — September 12, 2018
Old Business
Committee Reports
Executive Session. (No ES anticipated)

***This agenda has been prepared in advance and represents a listing of topics that the Chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting. However, it does not necessarily include all matters which may be taken up at this meeting***
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Route 40 Re-Zoning

OPENING STATEMENT

BY

SELECTMAN GLENN DIGGS, CHAIRMAN

CHELMSFORD BOARD OF SELECTMEN
Route 40 Re-zoning

- WHY IN THE TOWN’S BEST INTEREST?
- WHY NOW?
Route 40 Re-zoning

WHY IN THE TOWN’S BEST INTEREST?

- Ensuring the Highest and Best Use of our resources
- Amenities for the Residents
- Maximize Revenues by encouraging Economic Investment
Existing land use conflicts (RC vs. IA)
Route 40 Re-zoning

2009

“The Route 3/Route 40 Interchange area has the potential to host a major new commercial or mixed-use development. Superior highway access will help to minimize traffic congestion and maximize growth in the community’s commercial tax base.”

Chelmsford Economic Development Plan p. 60
Route 40 Re-zoning

2010

"The Route 3/Route 40 Interchange area has undeveloped, industrially zoned land adjacent to the Westford border north of Groton Road (Route 40) and adjacent to the Route 3/Route 40 interchange. Within the Land Use and Zoning section, the zoning and land use conflicts along the Route 40 corridor between Route 3 and the Westford town line are identified. It is recommended that the town revise the zoning in the area and use transitional zoning as a means to reduce these conflicts." Chelmsford Master Plan Executive Summary p22.
WHY IN THE BEST INTEREST?

- Best interest for the Town
  - Good Town-Controlled Process:
    - Pro-active
    - Community driven
    - Timely resolution
    - Residents (protection)
    - Outcomes (more predictable)
- Acknowledge private development interest
- Avoid Private petition
WHAT HAS CHANGED?

- Traffic (Present & Future)
- Trucks
- Asphalt Plant
- Continued Growth in Westford
- Potential future development of Westford Fletcher Quarry
- Developer acquisition and control of real property
2015 Traffic Distribution

- Westford Line: 13705 vehicles, 973 heavy vehicles
- East of Rt. 3: 8100 vehicles, 373 heavy vehicles
- Vinal Sq.: 6500 vehicles, 195 heavy vehicles

Legend:
- Red: Vehicles
- Green: Heavy Vehicles
## Property Under Control (8/21/18)

### Property Address | Parcel ID | Status
--- | --- | ---
77 Main Stree | 23-80-12 | Owned
 | 23-82-11 | Owned
 | 23-82-6 | Owned
236 Groton Road | 23-90-1 | Owned
240 Groton Road | 23-90-3 | Under Agreement
245 Groton Road | 17-92-3 | Under Agreement
250 Groton Road | 23-92-6 | Under Agreement
250 Groton Road | 23-92-7 | Under Agreement
266 Groton Road | 22-80-3 | Under Agreement

### Property Address (North Side)

--- | --- | ---
225 Groton Road | 17-84-2 | Under Agreement
227 Groton Road | 17-84-6 | Owned
231 Groton Road | 17-84-4 | Owned
235 Groton Road | 17-84-5 | Under Agreement
249 Groton Road | 17-22-4 | Owned
263 Groton Road | 16-22-2 | Under Agreement
264 Groton Road | 23-92-8 | Under Agreement
1. Staff meets with interested parties (developers, investors, property owners, etc..)
2. Preliminary Conversations
3. Staff answers questions, provides guidance/advise
4. Very high number of “conversations” never lead to further discussions
5. Staff always has the best interest of the Town in mind (process/outcomes)
HOW WE GOT HERE

- Jan-16: Mr. Cox expressed interest in Rt. 129
- Jul-16: Mr. Cox expressed interest in 40R only project (south side)
- Jan-17: 1st formal meeting with Town to discuss 40R
- Jul-17: Follow up meeting, Project update presented
- Jan-18: Formal meeting with Town to discuss retail concept
- Jul-18: BOS adopt Groton Road rezoning as a goal
- Dec-18: Town Meeting
- PB presented PP and 1st draft
- Town Manager requests PB initiate zoning review
HOW WE GOT HERE

- Early 2016 - Mr. Cox expressed interest in Rt. 129
- July 2016 - Mr. Cox expressed interest in 40R only project (south side)
- Dec 2016 - Mr. Cox expressed expanded project (both sides)
- June 2017 - 1st formal meeting with Town to discuss 40R
  - Town suggested no access to Main Street
  - Discussed potential development of both sides of Route 40
- Oct 2017 - follow up meeting - Project update presented
  - Town suggested no access to Main Street
  - Town expressed interest in looking at both sides of Route 40
  - Expressed desire for less housing & more commercial (mix of uses )
- April 2018 - formal meeting with Town
  - Mr. Cox presented concept plans for first time
  - Mr. Cox presented list of properties under “control”
  - Town Manager determines likelihood that redevelopment project may occur and decides to initiate community driven zoning process
- June 2018 - BOS adopt Groton Road re-zoning as a goal
- July 2018 - Town Manager requests PB initiate zoning review
- July 2018 - PB presented PP and 1st draft of zoning
1. Concept Plan  - 40R only
2. Concept Plan  - Mixed use
3. Concept Architectural Drawings
4. Property Under Control 04/18/18
5. Fiscal Impact
6. Traffic Impact
7. Concept Plan  - 08/13/18
8. “New” Concept Plan  - 08/21/18
9. Property Under Control  - 08/21/18
## Property Under Control (8/21/18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Property Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(South Side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-4-12</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>77 Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-8-11</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>245 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-9-4</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>246 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-0-4</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>247 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-9-7</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>248 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>249 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(North Side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-4-2</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>251 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-8-6</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>252 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-9-4</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>253 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>254 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>255 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>256 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>257 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>258 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>259 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>260 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>261 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>262 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>263 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-3-1</td>
<td>Under Agreement</td>
<td>264 Grove Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Map Image of Property Boundaries]
ZONING GOALS & STRATEGY

- Proper Zoning Create Value
  - Multi-Family plays a role in creating value
  - Multi-Family attracts higher quality/value restaurants
  - Mixed Use creates higher assessed values

- Create Attractive Community Gateway

- Mixed Use reduces Traffic

- Multi-Family provides opportunities for Senior Housing

- Avoid/minimize potential for highway/interchange development
Alternative Zoning Scenarios

- North side of Route 40 (only) rezoned to Commercial
- South side of Route 40
  - No Change - leave “as is” - (RC)
  - Rezone only a portion to Commercial
  - Split zone to include Commercial and Residential (RM)
  - Split zone to include Commercial and Residential (RC)
- Rezone underlying districts
- Rezone via overlay district
- Rezone via combination of underlying and overlay districts
Suggested Alternative Zoning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 WARD WY</td>
<td>17-22-1</td>
<td>$1,957,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-5</td>
<td>$186,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-2</td>
<td>$351,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-6</td>
<td>$232,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-4</td>
<td>$282,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-3</td>
<td>$393,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-1</td>
<td>$241,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-84-1</td>
<td>$356,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-3</td>
<td>$297,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-5</td>
<td>$245,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-5</td>
<td>$328,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-51</td>
<td>$431,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-4</td>
<td>$314,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-6</td>
<td>$305,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255 GROTON RD</td>
<td>17-22-6</td>
<td>$337,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-7</td>
<td>$406,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263 GROTON RD</td>
<td>16-22-2</td>
<td>$320,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-8</td>
<td>$254,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266 GROTON RD</td>
<td>22-92-1</td>
<td>$469,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 GROTON RD</td>
<td>22-92-2</td>
<td>$277,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 DORIS DR</td>
<td>17-22-2</td>
<td>$2,218,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORIS DR</td>
<td>16-22-1</td>
<td>$329,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-2</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROTON RD</td>
<td>23-92-4</td>
<td>$12,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$10,575,000

Area consists of **44.32 Acres** generates just under than **$190K** in tax revenue
** HYPOTHETICAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 LITTLETON RD</td>
<td>84-337-2</td>
<td>RETAIL w/ RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$1,699,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-101-9</td>
<td>GAS STATION w/ CONV. STORE</td>
<td>$1,268,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 NORTH RD</td>
<td>73-315-3</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL BLDG</td>
<td>$1,872,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>32-101-3</td>
<td>RETAIL w/ RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$2,594,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276 MILL RD</td>
<td>97-328-9</td>
<td>108 UNIT APT. BLDG</td>
<td>$15,929,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-101-4</td>
<td>FAST FOOD RESTAURANT</td>
<td>$1,178,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 BOSTON RD</td>
<td>84-334-18</td>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>$3,329,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 RESEARCH PL</td>
<td>32-101-2</td>
<td>HOTEL</td>
<td>$5,041,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 DRUM HILL RD</td>
<td>27-109-2</td>
<td>BANK</td>
<td>$819,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299 CHELMSFORD ST</td>
<td>53-201-1</td>
<td>SHOPPING PLAZA</td>
<td>$8,041,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential for over a $1 million in revenue property taxes, permits fees, Meals tax, motor vehicle excise tax, and, if applicable, hotel tax.
Next Steps

- Planning Board: Public Hearing
- Process
- BOS signs warrant September 10th
- FinCom review
- Town Meeting
Any and all development requires Planning Board public hearings
  - All abutters within 300ft are notified
Fully engineered civil & environmental plans are submitted
Full traffic studies are submitted
Town Departments conduct full review of submissions
Third Party peer review as determined by Planning Board
All projects are required to mitigate additional impacts
All mitigation costs are funded by the developer
IF WE DO NOTHING

- Current Zoning
  - RC and IA
- Exemptions
  - Religious
  - Educational
- Other permitted uses
  - L.I.P.
QUESTIONS