



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
RL
2022 JUL 12 AM 8:27

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-01-10

Time: 7:30 PM

Building:

Location: Remote Meeting - Zoom

Address:

Session:

Purpose: Remote Meeting

Version:

Attendees: Members: Pamela Adrian, Chair; Nick Safina, Heather Clish, John Weston, Catrina Meyer, Tony D'Arezzo -Associate

Members - Not Present:

Others Present: Community Development Director Julie Mercier, Staff Planner Andrew MacNichol, Dave Talbot, Mary Ellen O'Neill, Sarah Brukilacchio, Timothy Kirwan, Jonathan Barnes, Nancy Twomey, Nora Flynn, Liz Whitlam, Bernie Horn, Lorraine Willwerth, Angela Binda, Marianne Downing, Christine Lusk

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Andrew MacNichol

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Mr. Safina called the meeting to order at 7:43 PM.

Community Development Director Julie Mercier explained the protocols for tonight's meeting that is being held remotely. She presented the Zoom Meeting information to the public for those wishing to join. Ms. Mercier explained how the Zoom features work and how they will be managed. She added that RCTV is broadcasting and recording the meeting.

Continued Public Hearing, Zoning Bylaw Amendment for April 2022 Town Meeting Section 10.5 Downtown Smart Growth District Overlay (The 'DSGD')

Ms. Adrian opened the continued public hearing for a zoning bylaw amendment to Section 10.5 – Downtown Smart Growth District Overlay (DSGD). She asked Ms. Mercier if an update could be provided.

Ms. Mercier began by informing all that a number of CPDC members have provided comments on the amendments and the comments are included in the documents to be shown. She added that a number of residents also provided comments that will be insightful to the conversations. Mr. Safina suggested reviewing the entirety of the amendments in order to garner as much public comment as possible.

Ms. Mercier shared the document on-screen. She began by explaining the definitions proposed for amendment, which includes:

- The Downtown Smart Growth District Design Guidelines – the most current date should be added to the definition;
- Lot Coverage – to be added and discussed. A question within the document asks if parking areas and impervious area that is not building structure should account towards lot coverage calculations;
- Open Space – which can include green space, private amenity space and public spaces; and,
- Unreasonably Impair – is a definition required by the 40R statute;



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Safina and Mr. D'Arezzo suggested that parking areas and asphalt not count towards lot coverage requirements. They found such would differ from the definition within Section 2.0 of the Bylaw. It may too restrictive to include such and Mr. Safina found mitigating at-grade parking impacts is more feasible than mitigating building massing. Ms. Mary Ellen O'Neill agreed. Mr. Dave Talbot said it makes sense to exclude parking areas but asked that a lot not be allowed to be entirely building and parking. He suggested a percentage of a lot be required open space. Mr. Weston agreed but added that zoning is not always the best tool to create desired public spaces.

Ms. Meyer asked if there is an ongoing Open Space and Recreation Plan update. Ms. Mercier replied in the affirmative. Ms. Meyer suggested that language for development of pocket park and green spaces in the downtown be incorporated into the plan. Ms. Clish found the idea beneficial and asked to look into such. She agreed that zoning is not an ideal design tool but can help start a conversation around open space development.

Mr. Jonathan Barnes stated that he has additional comments on the 40R Bylaw that may detract from the Open Space conversation and will save for later. He asked if CPDC could require changes to open space and landscaping during their site plan review process. Mr. Weston replied in the affirmative but added that it does take a willing developer to create such amenities in a vibrant way. Mr. Safina found that if a developer did not meet the requirements of the site plan approval they would not be allowed to use such open areas. He continued that outdoor space may be more viable in differing locations and asking developers to contribute to such spaces may be more practical. Ms. Marianne Downing asked to review the proposed definitions related to Open Space.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked to review the existing lot coverages for approved 40R projects. He found that a number of approved projects are around 85% lot coverage so such restriction alone will not result in the desired type of open space. Ms. Mercier noted that examples such as the courtyard at Postmark Square accounts towards lot coverage. There are a number of examples similar to such.

Ms. Sarah Brukilacchio stated that there are different numbers of lot coverage calculations that have been shown. Ms. Mercier replied the document includes recently approved projects that must still be verified. Ms. Meyer asked if the calculation is building coverage only or if they included open parking areas. Ms. Mercier answered that they are building coverage only and do not include at grade parking open to the sky. Ms. Adrian asked if items such as fences are included in such. Ms. Mercier stated only items considered as structures are included. Mr. Weston found fence square footage to be minimal but accessory buildings and sheds would count towards lot coverage. Mr. D'Arezzo stated that accessory structures were recently added to the definition but items such as swimming pools no longer do. Ms. Mercier stated such regulations can be found in Section 2.0 and 5.5 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Talbot stated that 84% lot coverage for 30 Haven sounds low. He questioned where the remaining 16% is located and asked if balconies are considered open space. Mr. Safina stated that looking at the GIS the property lines go beyond the building structure. Ms. Clish recalled some areas allowing for expanded outdoor dining. Mr. Safina stated the setbacks of the project may not result in usable open space but the calculation does not consider such. He continued that the proposed definitions and language must be used for conversation on how to develop in an appropriate way. Mr. Weston asked to share the GIS image on-screen. Ms. Mercier shared the image. He stated that areas such as the transformer pad and utility areas may not be included in the lot coverage calculation. Ms. Meyer echoed that it shows why lot coverage restrictions alone are not enough. Mr. Safina found the front of the building appropriate in design but agreed the rear of the building could use improvements.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Brukilacchio suggested a lower lot coverage requirement, such as 70%, in order to have developers request a waiver for anything over. She stated the conversation can then be steered by the Town and public to build the development wanted.

Ms. Mercier summarized the proposed open space definition included feedback given over the course of the year. Open space was separated into green space, public space and private amenity space. Ms. Mercier read the proposed definitions into the record. She explained that the public space definition was crafted to allow for outdoor dining areas, decorative surface treatments such as cobblestone, streetscape items and green space if accessible to the public. She stated that any future requirements on open space areas should look to require both at grade areas and private amenity space for the residents of a development.

Mr. Talbot found the number of different definitions to be to cumbersome. He stated that the development of open space at grade should to be the focus. It could be hardscape or green but it must be usable and required. He suggested if a 15% of lot area is to be required open space, at least 10% of such requirement should be at grade. Mr. Weston stated that such would then include sidewalks and additional hardscape. He found wider sidewalks beneficial but looking to include separate green space may have benefits.

Ms. Clish agreed that hardscape is not the only goal. She added that she has heard pathways and connections to existing and/or vibrant areas seems to be a separate goal. Mr. Talbot found the proposed language to allow for private only open spaces and questioned if that is desired. Ms. Mercier responded that further requirements would look to require a portion of open space at grade and to be publicly accessible. She stated if a density waiver is not sought Mr. Talbot's example may have merit and the Board may wish to look for language that would require by-right projects to develop at grade open space.

Ms. Clish asked what is meant by 'open to the public'. She found value in items such as streetscape and green elements that may not necessarily be public but enhances the area. Mr. Weston gave an example of the Latham Law Office which maintains a private garden but adds to the pedestrian atmosphere. Ms. Clish agreed and stated a balance is needed between minimum front setbacks that look to activate the sidewalk through vibrant commercial use and open space that may help with massing effect and greening of the areas. Mr. Safina agreed and found the Postmark Square courtyard a benefit even though it is not public. He stated that all options of open space should be used to leverage the desired style. Mr. Weston agreed and stated that a clear difference between public and private must be made.

Mr. D'Arezzo found contiguous, ground level green space to be the goal whether it be public or private. Mr. Safina found that pockets of open areas can help mitigate massing and activate the area. Ms. Clish stated that public space may be more appropriately defined as 'Civic Space' in order to clarify that it may not necessarily be public use. Ms. Adrian suggested public spaces should still be explored. Mr. Safina found the three styles of open space appropriate and that the CPDC would consider how each is met on a given development. Ms. Mercier asked if specific requirements should be made for all. Mr. Safina found hard numbers to be difficult to determine but a requirement for such space or a payment in lieu option should be done. He found public and green space to be more desirable than the private amenity space but did not want to discount the benefit of such. Ms. Meyer agreed the definitions make sense and then requirements to be added later in the bylaw makes sense. She stated that private greenspace should also be allowed within the definition of private amenity space.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Downing stated that the open space area must be visible from the street. She asked if such language should be within the definitions. Ms. Downing continued that developers may abuse language such as decorative treatments or public art. She stated examples such as these must be separate from the building itself and gave an example of a muraled wall that may be considered art to check a box but does not result in valuable area. Mr. Safina found that the CPDC would discuss on any given project and is not required to approve projects seeking a waiver.

Ms. Lorraine Willwerth agreed that green space must be visible. She found that chances to provide street planters, street trees and more should be required. She stated that private greenspace that is visible is its own benefit to pedestrians who travel by. Ms. Angela Binda echoed the sentiments and found that the open space definition should separate the green, public and private spaces. She stated lot coverage is still a driving factor and a maximum should be set. Ms. Elizabeth Whitelam stated that flexibility is key going forward for developments where one style of open space may make more sense than another on any given lot. She stated walkability and creative design should be a goal which requires language that allows for differing options. Ms. Whitelam continued that both developers and retail tenants contribute to the development of open areas and the pedestrian atmosphere.

Ms. Clish suggested that the green space definition include potential connections and pathways. She added that private amenity space is important not only for building residents but to relieve pressure of existing open areas.

Ms. Mercier asked if requesting development pro forma is a desire by the CPDC when developments are seeking waivers. Ms. Clish asked if this is truly something that can be asked for and reviewed. Ms. Mercier answered that the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) stated such could be allowed for developments seeking a density waiver. She continued to explain that the process would be different for 40R developments than it would be for a 40B development which have limited profits allowed. Ms. Mercier found that a third-party consultant review would likely be needed and guidelines for such would need to be developed. Mr. D'Arezzo stated that the definition applies to the entire bylaw and not project by project. Ms. Mercier agreed with the comment and stated that DHCD will look to ensure that the zoning does not impair development. Mr. Safina stated that if DHCD approves the zoning language a developer should not be able to state such for their development. He continued that developers who claim such should be able to defend such claim. Mr. Safina suggested language stating that such may be asked for should be included somewhere in the bylaw. Mr. Barnes found that requested asks from the CPDC may add cost but it is not clear as to what is unreasonable or not.

Ms. Mercier shared the dimensional requirements table on the screen. She stated a number of ideas and concepts are included for discussion. She informed all that the dimensional requirements must allow projects to meet the minimum density of 20 units per acre, a number that is set by the State. She stated that affordable units are required on projects over 12 units, and if maintaining the required affordable unit percentage of the District and Town as a whole is desired, a minimum lot size requirement may help in order to receive projects over 12 units.

Ms. Mercier found creative language may allow for a development to pick and choose where required setbacks would be placed. She continued that this needs to be explored further and how it would work with existing setback requirements.

Ms. Mercier read a comment that asked if there are existing mechanisms for lots 4,000sf or smaller to be developed. She answered that such lots could not be developed under 40R due to lack of frontage but may be developable under the underlying Business-B Zone. Ms.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mercier read another comment that stated standard residential zoning uses a combination of setbacks and lot coverage maximums to ensure some open space on small lots. A third comment asked to look how to activate required setbacks with pathways or greenspace.

Mr. Talbot asked if lowering maximum building frontage should be explored. He expressed concern with a long amount of unbroken building plane. Ms. Brukilacchio asked where a 0' setback is allowed. Ms. Mercier stated that if a lot abuts a DSGD/Business-B zoned lot it can have a 0' setback. Ms. Brukilacchio stated that a setback must be required from residential properties and not residential zone alone.

Ms. Brukilacchio asked why some projects are not required to provide affordable units. Ms. Mercier answered that the minimum number to trigger such requirements was set by the State but was unsure how it was developed. Mr. Safina stated that 40R development allows for more design control. Ms. Mercier added that the threshold may be set because requiring affordable units on project less than 13 units may be unfeasible for a developer. She continued that it is unsure if the number can be changed but she can look for more information. Mr. Weston agreed and found that a minimum lot size may be beneficial to mitigate the concerns that come with smaller developments but also to ensure affordable units and viably sized commercial spaces.

Mr. Barnes stated that revisions are needed to help development be done in a style that fits the characteristics of the residential areas around the district. He found stronger language allowing for more control by CPDC needed. Mr. Barnes suggested that the definition of Transition Areas found within the Design Guidelines also be included in the zoning. These transitional areas could require additional/different requirements for setbacks, step-backs, height limits and architectural design. Ms. Mercier asked if such requirements would be placed in the table. Mr. Barnes answered that a footnote could reference the requirements. He added that language could also be added to ZBL Section 10.5.2.

Mr. D'Arezzo found that a minimum lot size of 4,000sf not appropriate as existing lots that size or less are only found on Green Street. He stated he would not want to restrict only these lots as it may not be fair to the owners. Ms. Mercier stated that these lots can be developed under Business-B but not 40R because they do not meet current minimum frontage requirements. She continued that a higher minimum lot size can be discussed. Mr. Weston suggested a minimum lot size of 6,000sf. He added that required setbacks being flexible in location is a benefit and asked to explore further. Mr. Weston continued that larger front setbacks can be beneficial for landscaping but may also result in circulation/parking uses and pushing the building closer to residential properties in the rear. He stated that the latter is not a desired style of development and cautioned raising the maximum front setback. Ms. Mercier agreed and stated the idea was put out in order to discuss the feeling of 'tunneling' in the downtown due to building massing's.

Ms. Willwerth asked if any approved developments have been built on lots between 4,000sf and 6,000sf. Ms. Mercier answered that the 18 Woburn Street, 531 Main Street and 14 Chapin Avenue developments fall within such lot size range. Ms. Willwerth stated that she does not want to restrict any owners from developing as other projects have.

Ms. Mercier asked if maximum building frontage requirements needed more discussion. Mr. Talbot stated that the idea is not as needed as others. Mr. Safina added that design guideline language addressed length of building plane.

Ms. Clish asked to discuss the concept of required setbacks to residential properties more. Ms. Willwerth stated that while she has been impacted by the lack of setback requirements from residential properties such she did not want to restrict current residential owners from



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

developing in the same way as others have. Mr. Weston added that residential property is not clearly defined and agreed that development within the district should be equitable. Ms. Binda stated a minimum lot size should be required in order to slow the pace of development.

Ms. Mercier found that language for limits on amount of Office and Institutional uses should be re-explored. She continued that ground floors provide more than just commercial uses by placing parking and residential components at grade. She stated that Office and Institutional uses do not want to be prohibited but are less desirable on primary street fronting commercial façades. She stated language is proposed limiting 33% of total commercial space to Office and Institutional uses instead of just ground floor uses. This language could also be waived if it made sense on a development. Ms. Clish found this change to make sense. Mr. Weston agreed.

Mr. D'Arezzo stated that getting as much commercial space as possible is a goal. He stated if a developer demolishes a commercial building they should be required to provide at least the same amount. Mr. Weston agreed with the concept but questioned if it is practical to develop. Ms. Clish asked if commercial square-footage requirements can be required. Ms. Mercier stated that higher density tiers can require additional commercial space but higher densities do take away area from these desired used/spaces. Mr. D'Arezzo questioned if a minimum amount can be required. Ms. Mercier stated such may be appropriate under Section 10.5.7 *Mixed Use Development*. Mr. Weston cautioned minimum requirements as it may incentive residential only developments. Mr. D'Arezzo replied residential only developments cannot build four-story buildings. Ms. Mercier agreed though it seems three-story of residential is the outcome regardless but the required parking is provided at ground floor in a mixed-use development, with a token amount of commercial space.

Ms. Clish questioned if requiring 25% of ground floor area be dedicated to commercial use is feasible or not. Mr. D'Arezzo stated the square footage minimums may result in larger commercial areas. He stated that it could be met by ground floor uses and/or offices above. Mr. Weston recalled that the South Main Street mixed-use requirements showed that a 25% requirement is too stringent. He agreed that more commercial space is needed.

Mr. Safina stated that the residential densities are taking away from commercial area because of the required parking for the units, which is typically found at grade. He stated that the Postmark Square commercial percentage may seem low but the spaces are unique and desirable. He added that outdoor commercial spaces should be included in the total commercial square footage. Mr. D'Arezzo agreed and stated it could help meet both commercial and open space requirements. Mr. Safina found 25% of total gross area may be more feasible than 25% of ground floor. He reiterated that better parking strategies are needed for such to be met. Mr. Weston commented that it may not be possible due to the downtown geography. Mr. Safina agreed such can be a constraint more so than south Main Street.

Ms. Meyer commented that creative parking solutions should not include surface lots. Shared parking agreements or going underground is preferred. Ms. Mercier stated that some areas of downtown have a high-water table which raises costs. Mr. Safina stated it raises construction costs but not maintenance. Ms. Meyer stated she was more comfortable with requiring 15% commercial area in order to not be overly restrictive. Mr. Weston added that most underground parking also requires access from the ground floor. Ms. Mercier stated that DHCD may also find requiring too much commercial restrictive.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weston asked if the new MBTA multi-family housing and zoning requirements are being considered. Ms. Mercier replied in the affirmative and added that staff is attending a training this Wednesday. Mr. Weston cautioned how such may affect the DSGD zoning requirements.

Ms. Clish stated that minimum commercial requirements will at minimum prompt an effort and discussion on such, especially if a waiver from such is sought. Ms. Mercier suggested a commercial requirement of 12.5%, or 1/8 of the total building.

Mr. Talbot provided comments from Mr. Phil Esposito. He stated that Mr. Esposito was concerned with residential densities being allowed and cautioned that some units are being used as short-term rentals.

Ms. Mercier summarized the goals that have been established through discussion. Goals included:

- Open space and connectivity development;
- Quality commercial space development;
- Parking in excess of minimum requirements, whether for commercial or residential use;
- High performance energy efficiency/sustainable technology and design;
- Historic preservation; and,
- Deeper or broader affordability;

Mr. D'Arezzo commented that it must be made clear that meeting suggested tier requirements will not automatically result in the granting of the waiver. Ms. Mercier shared language on-screen addressing such concern. The language is located in proposed section 10.5.12.1.

Ms. Mercier reviewed the language provided in the tier system. The system asks for public benefits in relation to requested density waivers.

Tier One, proposed at 21-40 units per acre, included language for open space development, commercial minimums, excess parking and historic preservation. Ms. Mercier informed all that some requirements must be permissible to residential only developments.

Tier Two, proposed at 41-60 units per acre, requirements would ensure a new category of development not chosen in Tier One be met. Categories include open space, commercial space and parking.

Ms. Mercier stated a concern of the proposed tier requirements is that density may be similar on lots of vastly different sizes. She gave an example that the Postmark Square development, a 42,000sf lot, would have resulted in the same open space requirements as the Chronicle development, which is being developed on a 5,700sf lot.

Tier Three, proposed at 61-80 units per acre, would ensure a third category of public benefits is developed. The tier again included open space, commercial space and parking as categories but added sustainable infrastructure as a new choice. She stated that a majority of previously approved projects would have fallen in this tier.

Tier Four, proposed at over 80 units per acre, asks for difficult to reach requirements such as housing existing tenants during construction, maintaining existing commercial tenants, or deeper and broader affordability.

Mr. Talbot commented that requirements of shared parking may be hard to enforce for the lifespan of these buildings. He stated the same concern for housing existing commercial



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

tenants. He agreed that energy efficiency not be required in zoning as it is a state requirement.

Mr. Talbot suggested that Tier Three relate directly to more affordable housing. He stated additional housing at 50% of the Area Median Income would be an immense public benefit. He added that a payment in lieu for open space development also be considered.

Ms. Meyer found the parking requirements within the tiered system to be concerning. She stated the goals of smart growth zoning incentivizes residential and commercial density around public transit. She found requiring parking in excess of minimum defeats the desired goals of walkability and alternative transit. Ms. Meyer continued that parking studies done in Town seem to show that the number of spaces is not the issue but instead issues revolve around regulations and utilization. She added that if public parking is a desired benefit that is one thing but it should not be excess parking provided privately to commercial or residential tenants.

Mr. Bernard Horn stated that tenants of the Postmark Square development have stated that there is not enough parking provided on-site for their needs. Mr. Horn stated parking requirements should be increased. Mr. Safina stated that buying a unit with less than needed parking spaces is a personal issue. Mr. Weston stated that the Postmark parking issue is an outlier of the 40R developments. He added that the issue is conflated with the re-enforcement of no overnight parking. Mr. Weston found a known parking issue to be employees of businesses throughout the downtown taking prime spots for large portions of the day. Mr. Weston went on to say that more discussion is needed on how commercial parking, both for customers and employees, is to be managed.

Ms. Meyer suggested reviewing minimum parking requirements language before tiered language that could require additional private parking. Ms. Brukilacchio asked if Ms. Meyer had recommendation on minimum requirements. Ms. Meyer replied that the section of the bylaw was skipped in favor of jumping to the tiered language. She stated baseline studies exist for commercial uses and should be discussed further. Ms. Clish recommended removing the 'residential' wording from the goal's language.

Ms. Brukilacchio stated a number of municipalities require parking in excess of 1.25 spaces per unit. She asked how this number came to be. Ms. Mercier stated it was put in in 2009 when the original zoning passed. Mr. D'Arezzo recalled that more frequent transit was available than present day. Ms. Adrian questioned if that is due to the covid-19 pandemic or not. Mr. D'Arezzo stated he is not sure; a number of cuts were made prior to such. Ms. Meyer added that most covid-19 cutbacks have been removed.

Ms. Mercier shared data on found 40R parking utilization. She agreed that Postmark is an outlier, though there has been additional overnight parking found in the surrounding downtown area. Ms. Mercier also agreed that the enforcement of the overnight parking ban has resulted in complaints. The data compiled shows an average of 1.11 cars per space and a median of 1.24. The data also reflects ownership projects maintaining more cars than rental projects which may show a relationship.

Ms. Brukilacchio stated more guest parking is needed for residents which may be accomplished by a 1.5 space per unit requirement. She added that waivers should not be granted for compact space sizes or for the amount of compact spaces granted.

Mr. Weston stated that additional parking requirements on top of new open space requirements may result in limited development. He found the lot sizes to be constraining to fit all in one. Mr. Horn stated developers will adjust and find ways to maintain profits despite



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

new requirements. Land values may reduce if profitability is not as great. Mr. Safina stated that developers have insisted unit reduction is not profitable.

Ms. Binda commented that the tier requirements be high level and clear. She found a number of the goals expressed to be a given and should not be justification for waiver requests. Ms. Binda suggested capping density at 60 units per acre.

Mr. Barnes stated that the design guideline language in Section 7.5 requires historic architectural preservation/design and Reading Historical Commission approval. Thus, he found historic preservation unneeded as a goal/waiver justification. Mr. Barnes shared language which he found would strengthen CPDC authority. He asked if documents can be shared for which he can provide comments on. Ms. Mercier confirmed.

Ms. Adrian found the tier system to be easy to follow and not overly restrictive. Mr. D'Arezzo suggested new numbers for the tiered system. He suggested Tier One be 21-25 units per acre and Tier Two max at 40 units per acre as that is double the minimum. This would then allow Tier Three to be focused on large density proposals of 41 to 80 units per acre.

Mr. Safina agreed that the currently proposed Tiers are too broad. A project at 60 units per acre will result in just two requirements which won't have a significant impact. He suggested limited tier sizes or requiring more items to be met. Ms. Mercier cautioned that too many requirements may result in limited development. Mr. Weston found the desired sweet spot to be 20-40 units per acre and having a jump in requirements for those over such. Once above a certain limit the externalities must be mitigated and strong public benefits received. Mr. Weston questioned if that threshold is around 60 units per acre. Mr. Safina felt that a 60 unit per acre development to be of decent size and one that can afford public benefits in space and economically.

Ms. Clish was wary of requiring open space that results in less square footage than projects are currently proposing. Mr. Weston agreed that the square footage requirement is difficult to assess. The quality of the open space development varies based on location, style, design and more. Mr. Safina stated that CPDC can weigh the development style and determine its appropriateness. An open space narrative and table should be provided that summarizes how the goals are met. The commission agreed that there should be a stringent requirement to be met in order for a baseline.

Mr. Weston stated that if payment in lieu for open space development should be considered further. Such payments may result in an impactful open space development over small pieces spread across the downtown. The Board agreed the concept should be explored further. Ms. Clish stated that the pricing scheme should be based off of real construction costs to develop open space or potential connections. Mr. D'Arezzo questioned if the Town has a way to accept such. Ms. Mercier stated a mechanism may need to be approved by Town Meeting.

The Board agreed that ground floor commercial requirements should be more stringent when projects are seeking excess density waivers.

Mr. Weston presented concerns of the top tier mentioning over 80 units per acre. He did not want to endorse such a concept as such a dense development seems unlikely.

The Commission and staff agreed to give more thought on quantifying Open Space requirements.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. D'Arezzo recommended a payment in lieu for affordable housing when projects are less than 13 units. Ms. Mercier replied due to regulations such payments may be difficult to use in direct benefit to the district. Mr. Weston asked to determine impact from a minimum lot size requirement. He asked how many lots would be impacted and the feasibility of development of such. Mr. Weston found town characteristics to be lost on small dense developments.

Ms. Brukilacchio asked if there is a deadline to get the amendments to April 2022 Town Meeting. Ms. Mercier replied that DHCD and Town Counsel must review prior to town meeting. The proposals must be finished before the end of January in order to allow for the required reviews.

Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for proposed zoning amendments to Section 10.5 DSGD to Monday January 24, 2022 at 9:00PM. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Meeting Minutes

Due to the late time the Commission elected to review meeting minutes at future hearing dates.

Adjournment

Mr. Weston made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:43 AM. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clish and approved with a 5-0-0 vote.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 1/10/22
- CPDC Minutes of 7/12/21 and 8/16/21
- Downtown Smart Growth District Zoning Amendments
 - ZBL Section 10.5, Track Changes Version, dated 1/10/22