



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.

Rk

2022 JUL 12 AM 8:27

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-02-28

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, Saverio Fulciniti, Rob Paccione, Jill Mayberry, Art Triglione, Dave Talbot, Jonathan Barnes, Josh Latham, Jamie Gerrity, Jeff Olinger, Patrick McCarty, Bryan Vasser, Valerie____, Bob Holmes, Nancy Castine, Steve Knight, Liz Whitelam, Barry____, Chris Latham, Jeremy Donovan, Kevin Vendt, Lynne Port, Gregg Johnson, Anders, Sarah Brukilacchio, Neal McCush, Chris Senna

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.

Lot Release Request, 135-149R Howard Street 6-Lot Subdivision Joy Lane

Mr. MacNichol stated that the Applicant is requesting a Form L be endorsed by the CPDC to release the 6-lots of the Howard Street subdivision for building permit. Mr. MacNichol continued that the Applicant has met all conditions prior to lot release within the 2020 decision of the project. The CPDC endorsed the plans in 2020 and also approved the covenant and surety in 2022.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if lot release is common this early or if it should be requested upon completion of construction. Mr. MacNichol stated it is needed before any building permits can be issued. This applies to all approved subdivisions. He continued that a Certificate of Completion would be acted upon when the project is finished. While lots can be released individually the Applicant is requesting that all be released.

Ms. Clish made a motion to endorse the Form L Lot Release Request for the 135-149R Howard Street 6-Lot Subdivision requesting that lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 be released. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Continued Public Hearing, 40R Plan Review 6-16 Chute Street, Plimsoll Company

Mr. Josh Latham, Mr. Jeff Olinger, Mr. Jamie Gerrity, and Mr. Patrick McCarty were present for the application. Mr. Latham stated that the CPDC provided comments on project density at the last hearing which the Applicant would like to address.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Olinger shared the most recent plan set on-screen. Mr. Olinger opined that the project should qualify for a density waiver as it serves as an anchor to two primary commercial streets and is within 100' to the MBTA commuter rail line in Reading. He shared an image depicting areas within a five-minute walk of the project location. Those looking to walk from residential neighborhoods to the commercial area would benefit, and those living within the commercial district will have walkable residential neighborhoods to enjoy.

Mr. Olinger noted that the project's Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is 2.03, or 72% of allowable FAR under the zoning bylaw. He felt that the project will help redefine and activate the area. Due to the building's proximity to the train station it will limit traffic congestion as well as serve as a barrier to noise from the train itself.

Mr. Olinger stated that the cornice treatment on the Chute Street façade has been modified to better fit the design guideline language and requirements. At the last hearing the cornice was a mansard design and now is projecting to better match the rest of the building. A third-floor cornice has also been introduced to help soften the scale of the building to residential abutters in the rear.

Mr. Olinger continued that proposed open space on the project abuts the commercial retail spaces. The interior layout of the building was modified so that units are consistent in size and are marketable. The materials for the project have not been changed.

Mr. Latham shared language and references from the Town bylaws and plans that applied to the project and its location. He found that a 26' setback to residential abutters and second-floor retail space exceeds or is uncommon in today's district. Additional street trees and landscaping will be provided as well as private amenity space. Mr. Latham reviewed the economic impacts and benefits of the proposed development. Town fee revenue is approximately \$230,000 and real estate tax impact are approximately \$82,000 in excess of today. Other benefits such as additional shoppers and commercial tenants being brought to town can also be expected.

Mr. Latham stated that 39 parking spaces remain for the project. Mr. Latham compared the project to recent 40R developments in the downtown. He found that the project is the lowest FAR of all 40R projects with affordable units. It also provides the highest percentage of commercial space for all 40R projects with affordable units.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked to clarify the 54% lot coverage for floors 2-4. Mr. Olinger stated that the floor plate of the upper levels would be divided by lot area. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the calculation is gross area or net. Mr. Olinger answered that it is based on gross floor area.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if massing was reduced in the current proposal. Mr. Olinger stated that no major revisions were done on this plan. However, the 26' setback to residential abutters was presented in the fourth presentation of the project. Mr. D'Arezzo stated that the massing should come down if units are lowered. Mr. Olinger replied that it was felt that the building design was appropriate and the interior floor plans were adjusted to reflect the unit count.

Mr. Weston asked what the maximum height of the building is to be. He stated that with the slope of the site and different elevations it can be difficult to determine. He found that the height does require a waiver request and if it is a matter of inches the cornice should be adjusted to be in conformance. Mr. Olinger replied that the height of the cornice can be adjusted if it is found to not be in conformance as proposed. Ms. Adrian asked if the elevator shaft would require a waiver for height. Mr. Olinger stated that mechanical units do not account towards the height requirement.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Safina asked if the construction of the roof and parapet would work with the proposed height. Mr. Olinger stated that insulation can be provided on the interior of the roof and poly-iso can be applied. This is more common nowadays and also helps with energy efficiency.

The commission further discussed the building height calculation with the applicant. The Applicant opined that the average grade is calculated at 2.89', and the average height of the building is at 47'6". This provides a maximum building height of 44.61', conforming to the Bylaw requirements.

Mr. Weston found the drive aisle width calculations to be inconsistent with one another. He stated one aisle is measured from outer column to within the parking spaces and the other is measured from mid column to parking space. He questioned if 16' drive aisles can be provided due to the columns. Mr. Safina agreed that this must be clarified.

Ms. Clish asked if a landscaping plan is available for the 'green wall'. Mr. Gerrity stated that a plan detail is available which can be forwarded. The plantings will all be hardy and maintained. Ms. Clish asked what material will be provided at the base of the green wall. Mr. Olinger stated that a terracotta solution can be provided or a variable brick band. Ms. Clish asked about the balcony materials as well. Mr. Olinger replied that balconies are constructed of the same patina material on the building façade and utilize railings constructed of bronze like material.

Ms. Clish asked if the shadow study depicting just the building impacts can be provided. Mr. Olinger stated that he can provide such as just the general shadowing is shown within the plan set.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if all units will account to SHI if the affordable unit calculation is rounded down. Mr. Latham clarified that he has recently learned that it may only account if rounded up and he must look more into it. Ms. Mercier stated that DHCD has started requiring rounding up on such but the local bylaw does currently allow Applicants to round down. It is likely that not all units would count to the SHI if rounded down.

Mr. Weston stated that while the proposed changes are welcoming he would prefer the project to maintain a density of 65 units per acre or lower. The Board has found this number to be the desired maximum based on recent public discussions. Mr. Latham stated that the 40R district is not a one size fits all and this site may justify a bit higher density. Mr. Safina stated project pro forma was requested to determine the feasibility of density. Mr. Latham reviewed the projects return on cost and how such compared to previous iterations. He also compared such to Massachusetts 40B requirements. He stated that the proposed development is below the minimum 40B requirements.

Mr. D'Arezzo questioned land costs and what is fair value or an over payment by the owner. Mr. Latham defined fair market value and stated such is used in the calculation.

Mr. Safina asked how an additional affordable unit can be provided without increasing the total unit count. He found providing all units on the SHI would be a benefit if other impacts can be mitigated. Mr. Safina continued that the 39-space parking count is appropriate for 29 units and if more total units are added it is less incentivizing. He asked if there is an additional waiver or condition that the developer would require to ensure project costs if the affordable unit count was rounded up.

Ms. Adrian opened the hearing to public comment.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Barry Gagne of 100 Woburn Street stated that his concern is with the overall size of the building and its massing. He stated that unit count being reduced is not enough to mitigate the concerns of the building envelope. Mr. Olinger stated that the massing is driven by the proposed FAR which is lower than allowed. He continued that density is driven by factors such as unit size, type and mix.

Ms. Sarah Brukilacchio of 48 Maple Ridge Road asked to reiterate the number of units and parking spaces. She also asked how many spaces are compact spaces. Ms. Brukilacchio also asked the Applicant to address the resident request for more open space. Mr. Latham stated that 29 units are proposed with 39 parking spaces for a 1.39 count. Approximately 28% of the spaces are proposed as compact. Mr. Latham continued that open space is provided at the retail areas, as well as private amenity space for the tenants. He stated that the developer is open to ideas on how to activate the open space whether it be a public art display, outdoor dining or other amenities.

Mr. Dave Talbot stated that the existing outdoor area is over 640sf. Mr. Olinger stated that the survey showed 440sf existing. He stated that where the area becomes sidewalk is a bit unclear but based on property lines it is the 440sf. Mr. Talbot asked how much of the space is lost. Mr. Olinger replied approximately 80sf. Mr. Talbot questioned why the area cannot remain as it exists. Mr. Olinger stated that the buildings relationship and functionality to the space relates to the outdoor design.

Ms. Adrian summarized that issues to address include clarification on building height, parking aisle dimensions, affordable unit count, and project density. Mr. Latham suggested that discussion on affordable unit count and project density continue but the rest be conditional. Mr. Weston stated that project affordability is a major goal of the Town and felt that such be re-addressed by the Applicant team. He continued that a vote can be conducted on what is presented but unit count would not be conditioned.

Mr. Safina stated that the loss of square footage at the corner be considered with respect to quality and design of retail. Mr. Weston asked if the area under the proposed building overhang is accounted for in the open space calculation. Mr. Olinger replied in the affirmative and added that an operable window is to be provided to help activate the outdoor area and the adjacent retail space.

Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for a 40R Plan Review at 6-16 Chute Street to Monday March 14, 2022 at 8:30PM. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Sign Permit Application **643 Main Street, William Raveis**

Mr. Bryan Vasser of Archer Signs was present for the application.

Mr. Safina found the sign design and lighting not appropriate for the building. He found it to not be consistent with the existing signage or the historic elements with the building.

Mr. Weston suggested that the lettering size be consistent with the existing Latham Law Office signage.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the business will occupy the ground floor or the second floor. Mr. Chris Latham stated that the business will maintain the entirety of the right (south) portion of the building.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Safina stated that the street tree may impede visibility of the signage.

Ms. Clish questioned if the rendering depicts true size or not. Mr. Vasser replied in the affirmative. Ms. Clish stated that the blue banding should be maintained within the existing sign band and not be wider. She agreed that the lettering size should also match existing signage. Ms. Meyer agreed but added the font does not need to remain the same style.

Mr. Safina asked if the Latham wall plaque would be moved to the left side of the façade. Mr. Vasser replied that he is unsure.

Mr. Weston questioned if the halo illumination is needed for a day time use. The abutting business sign does not utilize any illumination. Mr. Safina added that a double lamp post exists in front of the building. Mr. Vasser responded that the business would desire visibility from pedestrian and vehicular traffic at night.

Ms. Clish asked if illumination is proposed again would the white lettering be opaque. Mr. Vasser replied in the affirmative and confirmed no lighting would shine through the face or sides. He stated that if the lettering is reduced in size the lighting style proposed may not be feasible. He stated there are other alternatives for lighting.

Mr. Vasser replied that reducing the signs banding can be explored. He felt that illumination would remain in some form. Mr. Safina asked to ensure lighting not be visible from the sides and that the sign box not be lit as internally illuminated signs are not allowed. Mr. Vasser confirmed. Ms. Clish encouraged exploring the need for lighting further. Mr. Weston agreed. He stated while no restrictions on hours of illumination are within the Bylaw it is considered within the certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Vasser asked if the commission reviewed what is allowed under the bylaw or the design of signage. Mr. Weston responded when it comes to downtown signage review they include design review. He recommended compatibility with the existing building signage, design, and exterior lighting.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked to confirm the sign box will not be illuminated. Mr. Vasser confirmed. Mr. D'Arezzo suggested it may help to flip the color scheme. Mr. Vasser stated a white box may not be aesthetically pleasing.

The Applicant agreed to revise the proposal and present such at the next CPDC hearing.

Major Plan Changes, 40R Plan Review **531 Main Street, Reading Chronicle 40R**

Ms. Clish read the legal notice into the record.

Mr. Chris Latham, Saverio Fulciniti and Robert Paccione were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Latham began that the modification is proposed because RMLD has found that the approved transformer is no longer required. The approved location was along Chapin Avenue and would have been screened from view. The building is now proposed to be entirely electric. Due to no longer requiring gas utility the gas meters along the east façade of the building are no longer required.

Mr. Latham summarized that the proposed changes push the buildings east façade to the eastern lot line with a 0' setback which is allowed under zoning. He continued that the north



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

façade was also expanded 5'9" in length. These reconfigurations allow for a new access design, one additional parking space, an increase in balcony size and additional landscaping opportunities. The garage door was shifted slightly to the east but the width of the curb cut has not changed.

Mr. Latham shared examples of transformers and gas meter lighting from other approved 40R projects.

Mr. Latham explained changes to the interior of the building layout. Balcony doors are now able to be sliding doors instead of projecting which also helps add natural light to the units. There are no changes to building height or number of units. He continued that the buildings rear parapet was extended in length to better the symmetry of the building. Lighting fixtures along the north façade are also able to be reduced to mitigate impacts to residential abutters.

Mr. D'Arezzo stated that risers to the second floor were reduced from 25 to 20. Mr. Paccione replied that the length can be increased if needed. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if trash bins were reduced in count. Mr. Paccione replied the total number was reduced but an excess of 2 bins per unit remains. Mr. D'Arezzo asked the size of the remaining balconies. Mr. Paccione answered that balconies are approximately 4-5' wide.

Mr. Safina stated the concern is that the increased length in the front bump out along Chapin Avenue appears flat due to the amount of white coloring. He felt something must be done to break the massing up. Mr. Paccione replied that the darker colored material could be provided for the additional two windows. Mr. Safina found the other changes more sustainable to tenants and moving away from fossil fuel connections is another benefit.

Mr. Weston asked to confirm that the building's east façade is not being further expanded to the lot line. Mr. Paccione replied in the affirmative as the 2nd and 3rd floors were approved at a 0' setback to the east lot line. Mr. Weston asked if access to the bike parking is provided through the garage or only the front door. Mr. Paccione replied that tenants can access such through the garage but it does require using a small stair case. Mr. Safina stated that the doors being so close to each other may impede the functionality. Mr. Weston asked to explore the access to the bike parking further.

Mr. Weston found that the eastern balconies now face residential abutters where they previously did not. He asked if solid windowed walls were an option to mitigate noise impacts while still allowing natural light. Mr. Safina opined balconies add to the community feel and that single-family home owners are allowed porches facing others. Mr. Weston suggested that fencing and screening can add security while maintaining activity in the area.

Ms. Meyer asked to clarify that landscaping would be added in just the northeast corner. Mr. Latham confirmed.

Ms. Adrian asked if electrical utility applied to all kitchen appliances. Mr. Latham replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Clish asked how the units would be heated. Mr. Paccione stated that heat pumps are within the roof and pump heat through the ventilation system of each unit. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if there is significant change to rooftop mechanicals. Mr. Paccione replied in the negative. Mr. Safina asked if individual splits are proposed. Mr. Paccione replied in the affirmative. Mr. Safina found these units to be quiet when running. Mr. D'Arezzo stated the concern is an increase in size to each mechanical unit. Ms. Adrian asked if compressors exist



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

within the system. Mr. Paccione replied in the affirmative. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the sizes remain as approved. Mr. Paccione replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Adrian opened the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Neal McCush of Reading Square Auto Body asked if the east wall will now be a full-sized wall. Mr. Paccione stated that the wall will extend from and be flush from the first-floor to the third-floor. Mr. McCush asked how he would service this side of his building if needed. He asked if the lot lines have been surveyed. Mr. Paccione replied the wall is off set slightly from the lot line which was surveyed. Mr. Latham asked if access currently exists along the east lot line. Mr. McCush replied that there is a walkway. Mr. Latham asked if his building is located right along the lot line. Mr. McCush stated that he was not sure as he has never conducted a survey. Mr. Latham stated that the setback is allowed and is conditioned that no degradation occur to the abutting building. Mr. Paccione estimated about 1-2' of space to be between the buildings. Mr. McCush stated that downspouts exist in this portion of his building pointing to the street.

Ms. Jill Mayberry of 16 Chapin Avenue presented concerns on balcony size increasing which may add to noise. She was also concerned of storage within the balconies which may appear unsightly over time. Mr. Latham stated that storage can be addressed within the property management documents to ensure proper maintenance. Ms. Adrian asked how many people can fit within the balcony. Mr. Paccione replied if squeezing people tightly it could fit about ten peoples but this is unlikely. Mr. Latham stated that most interested tenants are Reading residents and 'empty nesters'.

Ms. Mayberry asked if the sidewalk width was reduced due to building changes. Mr. Latham stated that the approved sidewalk design shall not be modified.

Mr. MacNichol shared the Draft Decision on-screen. The Commission requested a condition be placed that the Applicant submit revised renderings of the north façade that depicts the requested changes. They also found that rewording the eastern façade setback language is needed.

Ms. Clish made a motion to close the public hearing for a Major Plan Change to an Approved 40R Project at 531 Main Street. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the proposed Major Plan Changes to an Approved 40R Project at 531 Main Street as amended. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Other Business

MBTA Communities Guidance

Ms. Mercier stated that a meeting was held with both DHCD and Town Counsel to review the CPDC's proposed amendments to the Town's 40R Bylaw. DHCD has found Reading to be the most implemented 40R District and applauded the work done. No major concerns were found with the proposed amendments but some adjustments have been requested.

DHCD has stated that the multi-family definition under 40R can be amended to three-units which would allow compliance with the State's MBTA Communities Guidance.

DHCD requested that a standard be referenced on the language for drive aisle widths to ensure developers know what to aim for. Ms. Mercier added language drafted with the engineering division.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

DHCD found that lowering the affordable unit trigger can be allowed. CPDC has proposed affordable units be required for projects over 8 units, while the State statute requires for projects over 12 units. They would also allow CPDC to control waivers from the local requirement as long as the project conformed with State requirements. Town Counsel added language in 10.5.12 to ensure no conflicts.

DHCD has requested that criteria for plan denial language be consistent with the state statute. Significant is proposed to change to extraordinary adverse to match such. Ms. Mercier noted neither is defined by the State.

Ms. Mercier stated that the Select Board is reviewing the Town Meeting warrant tomorrow night. DHCD may provide further input once all data is submitted. Ms. Clish asked what the process is if DHCD has changes after the warrant is approved. Ms. Mercier stated that friendly amendments can be made on the floor of town meeting or the warrant may be amended.

Ms. Mercier reviewed the MBTA Communities Guidance. Last January the State passed new legislation to Section 3A of the Zoning Act. The legislation requires that MBTA Communities allow for a district of reasonable size to allow multi-family development by-right within a certain area from MBTA stations. Additional requirements on the units are also within the language. It was found that the 40R Plan Approval process is considered a by right process which is a benefit to Reading.

Ms. Mercier summarized the draft language on determining reasonable size of a district and number of units required under the legislation. Reading is currently designated as a bus service community which requires 20% of existing housing stock to be met within the district.

If the Town does not comply with the legislation within set timeframes they will not be eligible for grant opportunities such as Housing Choice, MassWorks, etc.

Ms. Mercier stated that concerns and questions on the language are being drafted and will be submitted to DHCD.

Mr. Weston stated that the Town's designation should be based on utilization. There is only one bus line in Reading with few stops. Ms. Clish agreed and asked if every bus stop is considered an MBTA station. Ms. Mercier stated bus stations are defined but bus stops are not. A Reading bus line was removed due to low ridership. The definition of bus service communities excludes municipalities with commuter rail stations which conflicts with Reading's designation. The FAQ however, states a community with access to more than one transit type shall be required to conform to the higher capacity requirements. Ms. Meyer asked if require unit counts is the only additional requirement due to the designation. Ms. Mercier stated that it also reduces the timeframe allowed for compliance to December, 2023. This deadline does not clarify what level of approval is required by such.

Ms. Mercier stated that a build out analysis is required to determine unit count but at this time not a lot of guidance is provided for such. Ms. Mercier shared a spreadsheet of parcel data she has begun to gather. She added that potentially more than one district may be utilized and both areas of the A-40 and Business-A Districts are within the 0.5 mile of the train depot. Both districts also allow multi-family development by-right.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the required unit counts are needed to be built or not. Ms. Mercier stated that there is no requirement to develop such but have the zoning that allows for it.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

The legislation seemingly allows for a combination of existing multi-family units that were developed by-right and potential units but more clarification is needed. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if each development is required to maintain minimum densities or if those less than 15 units an acre can contribute to the count. Ms. Mercier stated if defined as multi-family they would account. Ms. Meyer asked if the two-family properties which exceed minimum densities can account toward the requirement. Ms. Mercier stated that she has asked for more information on such.

Mr. D'Arezzo found that if the entire 0.5-mile radius from the depot allowed multi-family development needed project densities may not be so high. Ms. Mercier stated a minimum gross density of 15 units per acre must be maintained in a district. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if that is what must be allowed or maintained throughout the district. Ms. Mercier replied the latter is expected.

Mr. Weston found the current path of using the DSGD, A-40 and Business-A a preferred approach. Ms. Clish agreed it is helpful to know what may be allowed in these districts before altering others.

Mr. Weston suggested quantifying the value of compliance. He asked if past awarded grant numbers can be summarized. He found that changing the character of Reading may not be worth some of these grant opportunities. Ms. Mercier agreed to do such.

Ms. Mercier stated that public comments must be submitted by March 31, 2022. The guidelines must be presented to the Select Board which is scheduled for March 22, 2022. Compliance will be awarded through 2022 if the Select Board brief is done and a Community Information Form is submitted before May. Ms. Mercier expects another discussion with the CPDC on their March 14th agenda if time permits.

Other Business

Potential Zoning Amendments for Nov. 2022

Ms. Mercier stated a lot of work is required for 40R analysis and MBTA Community conformance. She opined a zoning workshop may not be feasible this year but asked the commission if they desired such. Mr. Weston found the work required for on-going projects and goals to be enough. He stated that continuing to think of amendments to the Use Table is needed but not possible within the next month. He found letting some of the recent amendments to play out would be a benefit.

Other Business

Ms. Mercier stated that previously approved Outdoor Dining applicants will be reached out to ensure compliance with their approvals.

Ms. Mercier informed the board that the State allowed an extension of remote meetings under Open Meeting Law to July 15, 2022. She asked if the Board wished to meet in-person going forward or if remote is preferred until then. Ms. Adrian stated March is too soon to meet in-person. Ms. Mercier added that it is not clear if hybrid meetings will be allowed. Mr. Weston and Ms. Clish found hybrid meetings to be a benefit if they are possible. Ms. Mercier stated that she will have further discussions on such. The Board elected to keep the March 14 meeting date remote.

Adjournment

Ms. Clish made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 12:07 AM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Weston and approved with a 5-0-0 vote.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 2/28/22
- Lot Release Request, Howard Street Subdivision
 - Form L, dated 2/28/22
- 40R Plan Review, 6-16 Chute Street
 - Civil and Architectural Plan Set, dated 2/15/22
 - Drawing Clarifications, dated 2/23/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 1/24/22
- Sign Permit Application, 643 Main Street
 - Signage rendering and specifications
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 2/28/22
- Major Plan Change, 40R Plan Review, 531 Main Street
 - Architectural Plan Set, dated 2/14/22
 - Landscape Plan, dated 2/14/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 2/28/22
- MBTA Communities Guidance
 - Draft Guidelines: MBTA Communities