



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.

PK
2022 JUL 12 AM 8:26

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-02-07

Time: 7:00 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, Saverio Fulciniti, Rob Paccione, Greg Phipps & Hamid Jaffari of RMLD, Jill Mayberry, Art Triglione, Jackie McCarthy, Jeff Kwass, Kara Sennott, Brandon Courier, Ugo DiBiase, Michael Correia, Maureen Giuliano, Mary _____, Dave Talbot, Jonathan Barnes, Josh Latham, Nancy Twomey, Carlo Bacci, Kevin Vendt, Bruce Johnson, Gregg Johnson, Ilene Bornstein, Jeremy Donovan, Tom Connery, Charlene Ciccariello, Jeff Olinger, Samuel Gregorio, Jesse Schomer, Giovanni Fodera, Christie _____, Dave F_____

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Andrew MacNichol

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Ms. Adrian called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

Proposed Plan Changes, 40R Plan Review

531 Main Street, Reading Chronicle 40R

Saverio Fulciniti and Robert Paccione were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Fulciniti explained this his team has been working with RMLD and has found another way to provide power to the site, so a transformer is no longer needed. He said the net result is that the project will end up with an additional parking space, and the end-cap units will end up with more favorable interior dimensions.

Mr. Paccione explained the garage plan which had a transformer at the right side. He said that the garage door can now be shifted down, a parking space added, the trash room was reconfigured and the egress path simplified. He noted that upper floor units were made a bit bigger, with the balconies pushed closer to the rear lot line. He showed the side and rear elevations.

Mr. Safina asked about the roof and windows along the south façade. Mr. Paccione noted that he had to remove the windows for fire separation. Mr. Safina opined that now the rear elevation is a big blank wall, which he considers a major change. Ms. Clish said she agrees that the big difference is the windows were removed. Mr. Weston commented that the setback change is also not insignificant.

Mr. Weston said he does not consider this a minor change. Mr. Fulciniti said he can add the windows back in. He said the setback has only changed in one section from 16.5' to 10'-7".



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish noted that in her perspective, it's a matter of the percentage reduction of the setback, for which abutters should weigh in.

Mr. Safina moved that the proposed changes to the 40R project at 531 Main Street are minor plan changes. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was denied 0-5-0. The CPDC believes the proposed changes are major and should be reviewed at a public hearing.

Ms. Mercier mentioned that the hearing will be scheduled for either Monday February 28 or Monday, March 14th.

Sign Permit Application **273 Salem Street, Dunkin Donuts**

Mr. Jeff Kwass of ViewPoint sign was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Kwass explained that the coffee cup will no longer be part of the image, and that the wall sign will just say Dunkin'. Mr. Safina said he has no issues. Ms. Clish agreed. Mr. Weston asked for clarification of what will happen to the wall behind the sign. Mr. Kwass said he believes it will be repainted.

Mr. Safina moved to approved the Certificate of Appropriateness for 273 Salem Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Weston and approved 5-0-0.

Minor Site Plan Review, Change of Use **175 Haven Street, The Style Lounge**

Ms. Kara Sennott was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Safina recused himself from the application.

Ms. Clish read the courtesy notice to abutters into the record.

Mr. MacNichol explained that this is the first time the CPDC will be using the new zoning bylaw language regarding Minor Site Plan and Site Plan Review.

Ms. Sennott explained that the two-story building used to be an accounting office and will be modified into a two-story luxury hair salon with wax room, 14 style stations, backwash system, luxury product items. She explained that there will be a waiting area when you walk in, and that the upstairs will contain 7 stations.

Ms. Adrian asked how many employees will be present on-site. Ms. Sennott said she expects to have about 8 stylists on her busiest day. Ms. Adrian asked what parking options the building will provide. Ms. Sennott said the previous owner had an agreement for 4 spaces at the Knights of Columbus building and that she has taken over that rent for those spaces. She said that she will seek employee permits when they are available, and also have her employees carpool. Additional shared spaces may also be a viable option.

Ms. Meyer asked about the sign permit. Ms. Sennott said that her original sign would have required a variance, so she is going with a sign on an awning similar to what was there before. She said she will resubmit the sign permit application.

Mr. Weston asked about trash removal. Ms. Sennott said that the shared dumpster behind the building is available for her to use. Ms. Adrian asked about chemicals. Ms. Sennott said that the plumbing for the sinks has a filtration system to filter out chemicals. She said the only chemicals that might be thrown away are a little bit of bleach in foil.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weston asked about construction loading for the fit-out. Ms. Sennott agreed that she will work with the Town through the construction process, and that once operational she will get one delivery a week of just a few boxes. She said that the chairs will be broken down into pieces when they are delivered, and so the fit-out shouldn't occupy Haven Street for long periods of time. Mr. Weston said he does not have any other changes and opined that it is great to see the building used more intensively.

Ms. Adrian asked if she is relocating from her location in Tewksbury with all her stylists. Ms. Sennott clarified that she is relocating from a different location, not Tewksbury. She said she is very excited about the move.

Mr. Weston noted that he is on PARC and suggested that Ms. Sennott talk to staff about future regulation changes to public parking.

Mr. MacNichol went through the draft Decision.

Ms. Clish moved to approve the Minor Site Plan Decision for The Style Lounge at 175 Haven Street. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Sign Permit Application **470 Main Street, Metro Credit Union**

Brandon Courier of Barlo Signs was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Courier explained that the application is for a second wall sign, which will be set up the same way as the first wall sign with the same halo illumination out of the M and Credit Union. He commented that the next sign is instructional/directional to direct traffic, and will be 4 SF and non-illuminated. Another sign is on Ash Street to identify the entrance, and will be 4 SF and non-illuminated, vinyl on metal. He noted that the green stripe for TD Bank is now blue, and that the awning will be non-illuminated with 8' of clearance.

Ms. Adrian asked whether the free-standing sign on Ash Street is set back far enough for snow clearance. Mr. Courier offered to pass the information along to the client. Ms. Adrian opined that everyone knows this building is a bank and so the Ash Street sign is not needed. Mr. Courier responded that residents might be aware of it, but the sign is to attract other people as well. He explained that the location was specifically chosen to be respectful to neighbors.

Mr. Safina asked if the Ash Street sign is actually on the bank property. Mr. Courier said he believes it is. Mr. Safina suggested that a single more robust signpost may be better, but that he has no problem with the sign being there. Mr. Courier said they can look into that and push it as far off the road as possible. Mr. Weston agreed with Mr. Safina's idea for a single post. Ms. Adrian recapped the requests.

Mr. Weston said from a sign permit approval standpoint, they will have to put it on their property, and that the single/double post situation is for the property owner to figure out and is more of a friendly recommendation than a CPDC requirement. Mr. Weston clarified that the sign-face will be the same regardless.

Mr. Safina asked if there will be an ATM at the front. Mr. Courier said there is one there now. Mr. Safina asked about branding and signage. Mr. Courier said his client hasn't asked about it but that Barlo Signs does not usually do ATM signage.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish moved to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 470 Main Street. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Minutes of 7/12/21 & 8/16/21

Mr. MacNichol screen-shared the minutes of 7/12/21 and 8/16/21 for the CPDC to review. The Commission reviewed them and made a few small changes.

Ms. Clish moved to approve the minutes as amended from 7/12/21 and 8/16/21. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-1.

Mr. D'Arezzo joined the meeting at 8:06PM.

Master Signage Plan Application

136 Haven Street, Postmark Square 40R

Mr. Josh Latham, Ugo DiBiase, Maureen Giuliuno and Michael Correia of Boston Wraps were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Latham explained the proposal for a halo-lit wall sign for The DiBiase Companies. He explained the free-standing sign for The Common District Meeting House, which has been reduced from 32' to 22.75' and now has black aluminum posts instead of granite posts. He said the location was chosen so the sign can be visible above cars. He noted that there will be undermounted lighting shining directly at the sign itself.

Mr. Latham described the proposed halo-lit wall sign for Classified Realty, and the proposed second wall-mounted sign on the other side of the Classified Realty building.

Ms. Adrian asked about the lighting for the restaurant sign. Mr. Latham noted that it is an undermount for small angled lights within the frame of the sign.

Mr. Safina asked if the location of the restaurant sign is determined on a plan. Mr. Latham noted that they will determine it in the field, and that it isn't meant to be sitting on the wall and will be more angled for those coming down Haven Street. Mr. Safina noted that the stair wall projects forward and might block the sign if it's not far enough down Haven. He noted that the tree may block it as well.

Ms. Clish commented that the second sign for Classified Realty is a nice solution. Ms. Meyer opined similarly.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the height of the restaurant sign and whether it would be seen over the staircase wall. Mr. Latham noted that the ZBA variance put a limit of 7'-7" on the height. He offered to work with staff to come to an agreement on where it should be.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the lighting for the Classified Realty sign. Mr. Latham showed a detail of a down-light.

Mr. Weston asked about the limitations in the ZBA Variance and cautioned that the CPDC approval should have the same limitations. He said it is unusual for the CPDC to approve a sign without a specified location. He said he hopes that the 7'-7" accounts for the top of the sign, noting that there is lettering within it and that the dimensions on the plan do not account for it.

Mr. Safina suggested marking up the plan and Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. MacNichol went through the Draft Certificate and the changes that he made since the last meeting.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. DiBiase asked about what sign-offs are needed prior to sign installation, and clarified that some of the conditions are specific to certain signs and not others. Mr. MacNichol made edits accordingly.

Mr. Latham asked about illumination beyond hours of operation, noting that Classified Realty and The DiBiase companies would like to be lit all the time on a sensor at night. He noted that the lighting will be more subdued than the Keller Williams sign because the signs are backlit against brick. Mr. DiBiase explained how the sign lighting will interface with the gooseneck lamps along the ramp, the flagpole light, the roof deck, the parking lot, and the safety and egress lighting on the property, which are all tied into the building lighting system. He opined that subtle sign lighting could enhance the safety around the building.

Mr. D'Arezzo clarified that the lighting on the outdoor deck will be on even when the restaurant is closed. Mr. DiBiase said that it is lit for safety reasons because the stairs and glass area are open to the public. Mr. D'Arezzo asked about an abutting structure, which Mr. DiBiase noted is the Barile Funeral Home.

Ms. Clish asked to review the dimensions of the restaurant sign. Mr. MacNichol corrected some of the dimensions in the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Clish moved to approve the Master Signage Plan for the Postmark 40R. Mr. Safina seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Public Hearing, 40R Plan Review **459 Main Street, GC Fodera Contracting, Inc.**

Attorney Jesse Schomer, Jeff Olinger, Giovanni Fodera & Samuel Gregorio were present on behalf of the application. GC Fodera Contracting, Inc. is comprised of Guiseppe Fodera and Guy Manganiello.

Ms. Clish read the legal notice into the record.

Mr. Schomer introduced the development team and noted that he was just retained a week ago to represent the project.

Mr. Schomer showed an aerial photo of the site, while the Rise475 building was under construction. He commented that it is an optimal location for transit-oriented development as it is just a 6-minute walk from the depot. He showed a wider aerial view of the area. He noted that the proposed project is 12 for-sale units with commercial and parking on the 1st floor, and 3 floors of residential, which is consistent with the Rise475 project next door.

Mr. Olinger showed the project statistics: 48.2 units/acre with a 2.13 FAR. He noted that there will be 17 parking spaces for the residential and 2 retail parking spaces for the 1,671 SF of commercial space. He explained the setbacks at the podium level to the split-zoned residential abutter to the east and to the Rise475 lot line.

Mr. Olinger went through the DSGD Design Guidelines, noting that he believes the project conforms to all guidelines. He explained that the proposed building incorporates Queen Anne Victorian and 2nd Empire French design. He noted that the project includes a series of human scale elements like balconies and planting areas, with a range of detail & texture incorporated within the architecture. He said the project seeks to retain the commercial storefront along Main Street, and to preserve street trees and allow for a wider sidewalk that may be able to fit café tables. He said the project will meet energy star standards and



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

be solar ready, and have a green roof for a portion of the podium to help mitigate stormwater runoff.

Mr. Olinger went over building setbacks and noted that all north elevation windows have been removed. He noted that the retail space could include a grease trap for a future restaurant. He continued that they have reached out to RMLD but that the transformer is proposed to remain in the same location as it is now, which will result in little to no disruption to electrical service.

He went through the garage layout, noting the entrance will be off of Washington Street and the exit onto Main Street, with a loading area off of Main Street in the garage. He opined that the traffic impact from 12 units will be low. The residential pedestrian entrance will be off of Washington Street. Bike storage and future PV battery storage areas are provided at the northeast corner of the garage. He noted that the trash area is shown but can be moved, and that the garage has been designed for two-way flow.

Mr. Olinger went through the 1st and 2nd floor plans, which have a mix of 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom units. He showed the 3rd floor, which is the 1st level of the two-floor upper units. He showed the 4th floor which contains the 2nd level of the two-floor upper units and an amenity room/multi-season sun deck. He went through the proposed material palette. He opined that there is a range of massing and that the building is divided in its vertical dimension. He showed the elevation up against the Rise475, which is 1.5' higher than the proposed building. The proposed building is at 45 feet, and is designed to continue the massing of the Rise475 building. He noted that the proposed building is setback about 1.5 feet which accommodates a wider sidewalk. He added that the building details turn the corner onto Washington Street and aim to be a friendly neighbor.

Mr. Safina asked if the traffic analysis shows the entrance on Washington Street. Mr. Gregorio of TEC, noted that the traffic study shows 3 different alternatives for the driveway, including the scenario shown, an entrance on Main/exit on Washington, and a full access driveway from Washington. Mr. Safina opined that it might be difficult to enter from Washington Street. He asked if the gate will be at the property line. Mr. Olinger replied in the affirmative but noted that it could be setback if needed, though this would result in the loss of a parking space or reduced trash area, etc.

Mr. Safina asked about whether a transformer is needed, given a prior conversation with another applicant. Mr. Safina noted that knowing what is underground will be of utmost importance, and discoveries could be costly.

Mr. Weston added that the location is fairly unique and that he has a hard time understanding how the retail will work without any parking on-site dedicated to it. He noted that zoning does not require it, but without it there will be a dead storefront without such. He said there are safety concerns with people parking across the street by Elm Park and trying to get across the intersection, and he doubts people will even do such, which will mean the retail space is not functional. Mr. Weston commented that the circulation on the site is the most limiting factor and that the proposal will not work as designed. He asked them to re-think the site.

Ms. Clish commented that the site is tricky for the reasons stated and that she is concerned with the configuration and odd shape of the retail and to rethink it so it can be usable and adaptable for a number of uses. Mr. Olinger noted that it will be a single-purpose use to it, and a nice opportunity for a back-of-house space that is not competing with the storefront.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish added her concern about where the foot traffic and walkers will go, since the driveway breaks up the continuity of the storefront along Main Street. She asked if it is possible to have more continuity along Main Street. Mr. Olinger said they looked at an entrance/exit solely off of Washington Street, which created a very shallow retail space. He noted that they could reduce the parking and add more retail, but they are trying to balance the need for commercial parking.

Mr. Weston commented that this is a great design for that corner, but that he is stuck at the functionality of it and how it will operate in Reading on that corner. He has been thinking about the site for a long time knowing it would come up for redevelopment. He opined that the site cannot handle mixed-use, and should either be commercial or residential with less density. He said the site has significant limitations and cannot support too much. Mr. Safina disagreed and said he pictures himself walking there from the east side.

Ms. Meyer agreed with Ms. Clish that a double-wide vehicular entrance on Main Street would be an unwelcome break in the pedestrian environment. Mr. Olinger commented that a drive entrance less than 24' wide would require a waiver.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked how this project will comply with the proposed 40R Bylaw changes and waiver requirements for 48 units per acre. Mr. Safina noted that these are future zoning amendments. Mr. D'Arezzo responded that the amendments are supposed to guide development and give them an idea of what we are looking for in order to grant density waivers. Mr. Olinger defended the proposed density. He opined that the retail will have excellent visibility and is a gateway to the Town.

Ms. Adrian opined that traffic flow will be a problem. Mr. Olinger said they can reverse the traffic flow so people enter on Main Street and exit on Washington Street.

Mr. Gregorio said that the traffic flow mentioned was studied and that 12 units will not generate a large number of trips per hour. Ms. Adrian pointed out that it could be hard for people to take a left turn out of the property onto Main Street. Mr. Olinger noted that a right-turn only sign was one proposed solution. Mr. Weston noted that a right-turn only will be hard for the police to enforce, and the reality is that no one wants to make a right anyway, because the draw from this site is to southern connections. He suggested they move past the exit onto Main Street, and also noted that the proposal to box out the street in front of the driveway, to prevent people from queueing in front of it, is not fair to the neighbors. He said he cannot see such receiving approval.

Mr. Weston continued that the light cycle is not long enough to accommodate people wanting to turn into the site. People will get stuck at additional light cycles, and the traffic backs up quite a bit there. He said that the intersection has been failing for a while and every little disruption causes a problem. Ms. Clish noted an email from public safety officials expressing safety concerns at the intersection.

Mr. Safina said that maybe the exit could be onto Washington Street, but it is also hard to figure out. Mr. Olinger said that even though the existing site and use (128 Tire) doesn't have as many trips, it does have a lot of curb cuts and traffic is not managed well there. Mr. Safina and Mr. Weston agreed that what is happening there is not comparable at all.

Mr. Schomer commented that the site will be self-selecting to people who wish to use alternate forms of transportation.

Nancy Twomey, 23 California Road, was present on behalf of the Johnson's, who live next door. She asked about the 15' setback from a residence district, and how it would apply



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

here given that the Johnsons lot is split-zoned. She noted that the garage and wall go up to the property line. She also asked who will maintain the green roof and who will be able to access it. Mr. Olinger noted that the split-zoning on the abutting lot does mean the property can be built to the site lines. He commented that there is currently a continuous 8' fence which is a screen along the property line. He offered to work with the neighbors to make the back wall as attractive as possible. He said the 15' setback is to the upper podium levels.

Ms. Twomey clarified that the wall will be higher than the fence, at 10' in height or more. She noted it is a significant structure right against their property line. Mr. Olinger offered that it could be open air parking, but such comes with its own challenges.

Mr. Bruce Johnson, 166 Washington Street, asked if setbacks and step-backs could be considered more fully for this project. He noted that an enclosed garage is beneficial, and asked about the overall height of the building. He commented that he would like it to be in a good proportion and noted that he will be losing sky and sunlight.

Mr. Jonathan Barnes, 44 Pratt Street, said he concurs with many of the Commission's comments. He said that many units are 2-bedroom units and may include children, and cars. He agreed with the comments about the intersection and challenges of getting in and out of the site. He asked if the stories will be stepped back at all. Mr. Olinger went over the setbacks and step-backs along all facades.

Mr. Schomer offered that a Parking Demand Management Plan could be provided.

Mr. Safina asked if the 3-bedroom unit has large bedrooms and if it could be reworked. Mr. Olinger noted that they could almost be 4-bedroom units. Mr. Safina clarified that no affordable units are being proposed because the project is at 12 units, and asked for at least one affordable unit. Mr. Schomer noted that it's not proposed for economic reasons. Mr. Safina asked for a pro-forma & suggested that an affordable unit could help the project get approved.

Ms. Clish moved to continue the hearing for 40R Plan Review at 459 Main Street to March 14th at 7:30PM. Ms. Adrian seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Continued Public Hearing, Zoning Bylaw Amendment for April 2022 Town Meeting Section 10.5 Downtown Smart Growth District (40R Overlay - The 'DSGD')

Ms. Mercier informed the Board that input on the draft amendments was provided by Town Counsel. Additional public input was also provided late today.

Ms. Mercier shared the Town Counsel comment document on-screen.

The first comment from Town Counsel was that a Lot Coverage definition is proposed but is not used later in the Bylaw. Ms. Clish stated such was done due to instructional motions that related to lot coverage. Ms. Mercier agreed and found a clarifying definition helpful.

Town Counsel also noted that a minimum lot size should be acceptable provided that it does not reduce the number of developable units in the district. Mr. Weston recalled that a minimum lot size is desired if it results in affordable unit development. He found that a lot size of at least 8,050sf is needed to develop a 13-unit building; this calculation also reaches a maximum density of 65 units per acre. Mr. D'Arezzo added that developers will avoid such density due to both Town and affordable requirements. Mr. Weston suggested any threshold less than 8,050 does not result in any change. Some lots over such are still challenging to



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

provide more than twelve units. He questioned if minimum lot size is needed if maximum density thresholds are set. Ms. Mercier stated there is potential to reduce the threshold of units triggering affordable requirements. Mr. Weston asked if one to two affordable units is cost effective to all parties. Ms. Mercier replied that the management and monitoring of such is done by different agencies or parties and should not be a limiting factor.

Ms. Clish asked what minimum number is desired. Ms. Mercier opined projects over eight. Ms. Adrian asked if that applies to rental and homeownership. Ms. Mercier replied in the affirmative. Mr. D'Arezzo added that the entire district must maintain a 20% affordable unit count. Ms. Mercier stated that the 20% minimum units on projects that trigger such cannot be reduced.

Ms. Mercier suggested that if a minimum number triggering affordable units is required the CPDC should propose a number and allow DHCD input. If not done for the warrant it may not be available to be added later. Ms. Clish asked if a developer can ask to waiver the local requirement since the State limit is more. Ms. Mercier stated this will be asked to both Town Counsel and DHCD.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked how fractional unit requirements are accounted for. Ms. Mercier stated if less than .5 the number is rounded down, if above .5 it is rounded up. This differs from 40B requirements and the proposed language on density tier requirements. Mr. Safina stated that affordable units should be asked for on every project even if not triggering the requirement. He found that providing such could be used to justify waivers.

Mr. Weston cautioned that too low of a threshold can infringe development. However, due to the number of non-affordable developments already permitted or under review, a lower number is now justified. Mr. Safina stated that the number required is the same for a project proposing 8 units as it is for one proposing 10 units. He suggested eight be the threshold. Ms. Mercier stated that too low of a number may be rejected by DHCD. Ms. Clish asked what happens if Town Meeting approves a Bylaw that DHCD has yet to. Ms. Mercier stated that the Bylaw is likely not effective until DHCD approves. She has submitted the proposed changes so that they receive input prior to Town Meeting.

Ms. Mercier stated that Town Counsel is reviewing the proposed language on the rejection of a project further. The statute states denial on 'extraordinary adverse project impacts'. Town Counsel will review if massing, scale, size, and compatibility is deemed extraordinary. Ms. Mercier asked if this language should be used in the local bylaw. Mr. Safina found that the language would not allow the denial of any project. Mr. D'Arezzo found using 'extraordinary' to match the State language a benefit to the Town. Mr. Safina stated awaiting Town Counsel input determining what extraordinary is defined as is appropriate.

Ms. Mercier stated that Town Counsel currently has no major concerns on the waiver tier requirements.

Mr. Weston opined that with lower affordable thresholds and the waiver tier requirements smaller developments are less likely.

Ms. Mercier shared the public commented document on-screen.

Mr. Dave Talbot of 75 Lincoln Street summarized that the proposed changes are:

- That CPDC clearly state in the Bylaw that no projects over 60 or 65 units per acre will be considered;
- Transformer pads and utility areas be accounted for in the Lot Coverage definition;
- That an 85% maximum Lot Coverage be instituted;



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

- Unreasonably Impaired definition be expanded to state that CPDC has the authority to request and review development pro forma;
- That more thought be given to the 30' combined setback requirements;
- That no maximum setback of 30' be allowed so that cases where more can be done it is not restricted from such;
- That a maximum of 20% of parking spaces be allowed as compact spaces (down from 33% proposed);
- That more discretion be given to CPDC on a payment-in-lieu cost as \$75 per square foot is not enough;

Ms. Clish stated that the payment-in-lieu number was generated off of current land valuations and numbers that generated enough payback for the developer to consider developing the space or results in the Town receiving significant funding. The proposed data used to calculate such was shown on-screen. Ms. Mercier added that the cost of payment-in-lieu is also indexed to inflation.

Mr. Talbot asked why building efficiency is tied to density tiers. He felt it did not belong as State and local incentives are offered already.

Ms. Clish found that a maximum density of 60 units per acre may be too limiting. Previous projects over 60, but under 65, have been done and accommodated CPDC desires. Mr. Weston asked if an explicit limit is needed. Ms. Clish found it okay as a maximum limit could be requested to be waived. Mr. Weston agreed. Mr. D'Arezzo agreed that 65 units per acre is a good limit.

Mr. D'Arezzo suggested that matching Lot Coverage definition to Section 2.0 of the Bylaw is preferred. Ms. Clish and Ms. Adrian agreed. Mr. Safina stated that better data has been gathered on lot coverage and other factors which will continue.

Ms. Mercier stated previous discussions found that pro-forma may be asked for in the application. She asked if the language is desired in the zoning. Ms. Adrian found the application requirements to be sufficient. Ms. Meyer did not wish to deviate from the DHCD definition of unreasonably impaired. Mr. D'Arezzo agreed and stated that Unreasonably Impaired is not mentioned again in the bylaw and that there are no criteria for such within the Bylaw. Mr. D'Arezzo stated that provision of public benefits is more desirable than reviewing pro forma.

Ms. Adrian stated the 85% Lot Coverage requirement is appropriate. Mr. Weston disagreed and stated that much is already being asked for in the proposed language. Flexibility was the key in the proposed language and a hard requirement is not reaching such goal. He continued that is a development is at 86-89% lot coverage but reaches tiered requirements it should be considered. Ms. Meyer agreed and found that the 10-15% Open Space requirements proposed gets at the same goal. Ms. Clish agreed that the concept is understandable but the goal is reached elsewhere in the Bylaw, thus the hard requirement is not needed.

Mr. Talbot asked that a 90% maximum be considered at minimum. He found that such would not be exceeded on the proposed language. Mr. Weston stated that CPDC negotiation on the Open Space is preferred rather than a development simply checking a required box if lot coverage limits are met. Mr. Talbot stated that he did not understand why a limit cannot be imposed if it will not be exceeded. Ms. Clish answered that conceptually the limit makes sense but the CPDC preferred approach is to word the Bylaw so that usable open space and other public/private benefits are developed. Mr. Barnes stated a limit can be requested for waiver so having such is not a deterrent.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. D'Arezzo stated that the proposed language under Footnote One would only apply to front setbacks. Ms. Mercier stated that such is not the intent. Mr. Barnes stated that the language was originally proposed under Footnote Two and may be more appropriate in such. Ms. Mercier agreed to review such further to ensure clarity. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if such language is more appropriate in the Design Guidelines than the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Barnes responded that he has proposed similar language and amendments to the Design Guidelines as well. The Board elected to keep the original language.

Mr. Weston asked if data showed that 33% compact spaces resulted in negative impacts. Ms. Mercier replied that a majority of 40R projects are not experiencing negative impacts due to such. She added that the CPDC proposed language allows up to 33% and less can be requested. Mr. Weston was in favor of a reduced maximum but noted that more attention will be needed on garage aisle widths and other circulation needs. Ms. Meyer stated that MAPC has provided numbers on such and is in favor of keeping the 33% limit since it is currently working. She stated that increased space requirements may take away from other amenities. Ms. Clish agreed but found it concerning allowing a higher number as the spaces are not always properly managed and can be tough to get out of. Ms. Mercier suggested a limit of 25%. The Board agreed.

Ms. Clish asked how energy efficiency is addressed in the tiered waiver requirements. Ms. Mercier stated it is a requirement of Tier Three. Ms. Adrian stated that state requests and incentives are being provided for such and that asking for it is a benefit. Mr. Weston stated it may not be appropriate as a density relief as it is already happening. Mr. Safina agreed and found that sustainability is a desired goal but as a density relief it is not as desirable because developers will pick it as low hanging fruit. He suggested building performance be a pre-requisite for development. Mr. Talbot stated that unless explicit goals or requirements for such are set it is not a benefit. He agreed that such should be a pre-requisite for all tiers. Ms. Clish stated that the proposed language does not state any baseline for energy improvements. She asked if it is improved to the existing building or state minimums or other.

Mr. Safina stated that a building can be designed to meet certifications such as LEED without pursuing the actual accreditation. Ms. Meyer asked if there is a minimum LEED certification expected. Mr. Safina replied that design to certification alone is enough. He suggested additional language for such. The Board agreed to relocate the language out of Tier Three so that such is asked for on every development.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked that one category from Tier Three be allowed to be chosen instead of two, as two may be too limiting. The Board agreed.

The Board agreed to explicitly state a maximum density per acre of 65 units per acre in Section 10.5.12.1.

Ms. Mercier summarized the need for the Town to comply with the recent legislation for multi-family development surrounding MBTA properties/communities. Currently as defined the local 40R District may not apply to such based on how multi-family is defined. Chapter 40A defines such as three-units or more, and 40R defines such as four-units or more. In efforts to better comply with 40A, which will not change, the CPDC may wish to redefine multi-family to include three-units or more. This would also be dependent on DHCD allowing such a definition since it would differ from the state 40R legislation.

Mr. Weston was in support of such a change if allowed. Such may not impact development patterns in Reading or densities proposed. He opined that the ability to generate the



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

number of units required is tough. Ms. Mercier agreed but noted fixing the definition is the first step to comply and then unit calculation follows. The Board elected to include the definition change in the proposed amendments.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if Starter Home Districts under 40R would comply with the MBTA zoning requirements. Ms. Mercier replied it is not explicitly clear.

Ms. Clish made a motion to close the public hearing for a proposed zoning bylaw amendment to Section 10.5 DSGD. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Ms. Clish made a motion to include the proposed zoning bylaw amendment to Section 10.5 DSGD to the warrant for April 2022 Annual Town Meeting. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

The Board elected to wait for Town Counsel review before the final recommendation.

Adjournment

Mr. Weston made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 1:04 AM. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clish and approved with a 5-0-0 vote.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 2/7/22
- CPDC Minutes of 7/12/21 and 8/16/21
- Proposed Modification to Approved 40R, 531 Main Street
 - Architectural Plan Sheets and Redlined Changes, dated 1/28/22
 - Summary of Proposal, dated 1/19/22
- Sign Permit Application, 273 Salem Street
 - Proposed Sign Renderings and Dimensions, dated 1/10/22
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 2/7/22
- Sign Permit Application, 470 Main Street
 - Proposed Sign Renderings and Dimensions, dated 2/1/22
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 2/7/22
- Minor Site Plan Review, 175 Haven Street
 - Summary of Use and Proposed Floor Plans, received 1/11/22
- Master Signage Plan Application, 136 Haven Street
 - Signage Overview Plan Set, dated 11/28/21
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 2/7/22
- 40R Plan Review, 459 Main Street
 - Civil and Architectural Plan Set, dated 2/1/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 2/7/22
- Downtown Smart Growth District Zoning Amendments
 - ZBL Section 10.5, Track Changes Version, dated 2/7/22