



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
RK
2022 NOV 10 AM 8:19

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-06-13

Time: 7:30 PM

Building: Town Hall

Location: Hybrid Meeting – Zoom and Select Board Meeting Room

Address: 16 Lowell Street

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, Conservation Administrator Chuck Tirone, Annika Scanlon, Town Counsel Ivria Fried, Vasu Patel, Josh Latham, David O'Sullivan, Donnie Garrity, Peter Ogren, Jeff Olinger, Jesse Schomer, Giovanni Fodera, Guy Manganiello, Lisa Bellino, Bruce Johnson, Dave Talbot, William Crowley, Nancy Twomey, Jackie McCarthy, Samantha Couture, Lorraine Willwerth, Sarah Brukilacchio, Robert Corwin, Anna MacDonald

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Andrew MacNichol

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Ms. Adrian called the meeting to order at 7:32 PM.

Sign Permit Application

583 Main Street, Pizza World

Vasu Patel of Fast Signs was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Patel described the proposal for two awnings at Pizza World, noting that the restaurant is taking over the space next to it. He explained that one awning will include the "Pizza World" name with the logo on the side, and that the other awning will be left blank, black in color.

Mr. Safina noted some discrepancies on the Sign application and some updates for staff to make to the application. He asked if the logo would be visible from the right side with the other awning so close to it. Mr. Patel said he suggested keeping it so pedestrians could see it, even though some areas would be blocked. Mr. Safina opined that it won't be visible.

Mr. Safina asked why all the window signs are jammed onto one side rather than spanning the windows for both sides of the storefronts. Mr. Patel said the business owner prefers to have all the awning signs on one facade and all the window signs on the other facade.

Ms. Adrian asked if the door on the left is usable. Mr. Patel said he is not sure. He asked whether a zoomed-out view of the windows would help with perspective on the amount of signage.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish opined that having the signs split up could be incoherent for someone who does not know what door to go into. She suggested they stretch the window signage across the bottom of the left and right windows. Ms. Adrian and Mr. Safina agreed.

Ms. Adrian noted that the wording does not match up between the awning and the window. Mr. Safina commented that the CPDC cannot actually discuss the verbiage.

Ms. Adrian asked about splitting up the words Pizza and World between the awnings. Mr. Patel said he tried it and found that it did not really work. Ms. Adrian suggested they move the logo from the north end of the awning to the front of the left awning so it's visible. The rest of the Commission agreed.

The Commission agreed to condition the changes and let staff review them. Mr. Patel reviewed the requested changes.

The Commission reviewed the Draft Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 581-583 Main Street, Pizza World, with the conditions as discussed. Mr. Safina seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Sign Review, 1481 Main Street Mattera Cabin

Conservation Administrator Chuck Tirone and Conservation Commission Chair Annika Scanlon were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. MacNichol explained that no formal review or vote is needed but that the applicant wished to get the Commission's comments.

Mr. Tirone explained the Mattera Cabin, Bare Meadow, Community Garden site and described the sign. He said the sign will be made of HDU -high density urethane - which lasts 25 years and may just need one coat of paint before then.

The sign will be 8' high, 4' wide by 2.5' tall, and will be held up with 6"x6" granite posts, will be painted and generally match the sign for Town Hall, except for white lettering and no Town seal. He explained the proposed location for the sign, which was coordinated with Engineering so as not to block sight lines.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the current sign for Bare Meadow. Mr. Tirone noted that it is a dedication sign that was installed when the Burbank family donated Mattera Cabin and Bare Meadow to the Town. He noted that the sign will remain and/or be updated at some point soon.

Mr. Weston asked about the three different fonts on the sign, and whether there is a Town of Reading font that all Town signage should have. Mr. Tirone noted that the sign will match whatever font is used on the Town Hall sign and DPW sign.

Mr. MacNichol screen shared an image of the DPW sign. Mr. Safina pointed out that it has two fonts. Mr. Weston suggested using the same fonts as the DPW sign. The other Commission members agreed.

Mr. Tirone noted that at some point in the future, they will add a hanging sign to the bottom that is for the Community Garden at Bare Meadow.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Public Hearing, 40R Plan Review **25 Haven Street, 25 Haven Street LLC**

Josh Latham, Attorney; Donnie Garrity, Architect; and Walderi Lima, Owner, were present on behalf of the application. David O'Sullivan and Peter Ogren attended via zoom.

Ms. Clish read the public hearing legal notice into the record.

Mr. Latham introduced the development team and described the project. He noted nearby landmarks like the Depot, 24 Gould, 6 Chute, and 30 Haven, and abutting properties/uses. He described the site plan, with two frontages on Haven Street and Green Street. He noted that the site is currently maintaining a vacant single-story, single-tenant retail building and 18 associated parking spaces on a paved lot.

Mr. Latham explained that in 1887 the site was part of the Black's Block corner property, which was a 5-story building that burned down some years later. He noted that it was subsequently taken down over the years. In 1939, RMLD acquired the site via Town Meeting vote, for their offices and show rooms. He noted that the building today, though substantially modified, is essentially that same building. It became Ainsworth's, then Rite Aid, then Walgreens. His client purchased the property in 2020.

He noted the proposed 40R redevelopment which is for 25 ownership units, with 5 deed restricted affordable units and 2 ground level commercial spaces. He described the commercial spaces, lobby, courtyard, etc. which allows them to close the Haven Street curb cut and provide continuity along Haven Street. He showed some images and renderings of what is there currently and what is proposed.

Mr. Latham provided a data table comparing the 25 Haven proposal with all of the other 40R projects in Town. He mentioned that he submitted a Definitive Subdivision Plan on Monday, May 2nd, which froze the current zoning, so this project is not subject to review under the zoning that was adopted at April 2022 Town Meeting.

Mr. Donnie Garrity, project architect of O'Sullivan Architects, gave an overview of the iterations of the project that were shown to Town staff over the past year. He noted that they originally proposed a 32-unit building with 6300 SF commercial space, 5th floor recessed penthouse unit with below-grade parking. He noted that existing drainage lines, and construction budgetary factors made the below-grade parking infeasible.

He described the next iteration – a 27-unit building with no penthouse level or below grade parking, but with a community roof deck. He said the Town was interested in having the commercial expanded to fully activate Haven Street.

Mr. Garrity described the current proposal, with two commercial spaces separated by a residential entry. He noted that they are hoping to preserve the entire historic façade, refurbish it, and outfit it with Commercial Space #2. He noted that services and vehicle parking will be accessed off of Green Street and will be separated into two garages. The garage closest to the depot will have all the compact spaces; the garage further up Green Street will allow for service delivery.

Mr. Garrity described the 1st floor, which is mostly 2-bedroom units. He noted step-backs of 7' from Green Street, pushing the massing towards the Depot and Haven Street. He also noted that floors 2 and 3 are the same in layout. He described the 4th floor, noting additional step-backs to break up the massing, including 14' from Haven Street.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

The roof plan does not include spaces for human occupancy, just spaces for mechanical units pulled back from building edges.

Mr. Garrity showed typical unit layouts, which include private outdoor spaces for each unit.

Mr. Safina asked whether any 3-bedroom units are proposed, noting that the floor plans show them. Mr. Garrity noted that he hasn't fully laid out all the units and is not sure they can commit to any 3-bedrooms given window requirements. He said they are proposing 2-bedroom units at this time.

Mr. Garrity described the building materials and colors - fiber cement panel system in grays and blues. He noted that materials wrap the corners onto all four sides of the façade. They have wrapped the brick masonry all around and will also include the garage doors and glass. He described Commercial Space #1 with an adjacent landscaped courtyard space, and Commercial Space #2.

Mr. Garrity noted the building façade on the Depot side has a zero setback from the lot line, but a portion of the façade is recessed to allow for some windows. He showed some illustrations/renderings/views of the building from various perspectives, as well as some building sections.

Mr. Garrity noted that a density waiver and a waiver from providing a formal loading zone will be needed.

Mr. Latham commented that the project did meet some of the zoning criteria that the CPDC proposed to Town Meeting, but that he needs to review the final zoning voted by Town Meeting to understand whether they still meet it. He said he will provide an analysis for the next hearing. He concluded by noting that he feels the project meets the spirit and intent of the 40R bylaw.

Ms. Adrian pointed out that if the loading is on Green Street, all trucks will utilize Green Street.

Mr. Safina noted that he walked the site the other day, and that the façade is in bad shape with structural issues. He said there are issues with lintel/limestone/fluted trim and that bad repairs have made it worse. He said he is unsure it can be salvaged, and asked what will happen if it cannot be saved. He asked if the Historical Commission has weighed in with what they want, and opined that it is historically significant but not the greatest Art Deco building he has ever seen. He suggested that any brick should be more red than brown.

Mr. Safina noted that the plans seem like they were hastily prepared, have a lot of typos and mis-labeled components. He noted that the commercial spaces do not seem feasible or realistic in layout and that the parking spaces behind the commercial spaces are not usable. He noted that the commercial spaces have no storage, and the garage does not include any storage for the ownership residential units.

Mr. Safina went on to note that the elevations are weakly derivative of the Rise475 building, and commented that O'Sullivan Architects can do better. He asked whether the panels will be anodized or color matched, noting that the failure points of similar buildings are where the big colors are without scaling elements. He suggested a siding scale or masonry scale.

Mr. Safina noted that the renderings show glass in the trash room and asked if it is real or faux. He asked whether the west elevation would be better served with glass or an opening



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

for ventilation so a fan system is not needed. He asked why the sections with blue paneling don't have windows. Mr. Garrity said these sections are at the lot line.

Mr. Safina noted that the parking provided is exactly what is required. He inquired that the parking does not work, and reiterated his concern that no storage has been provided. He suggested they do a structural core to eliminate some of the bracing that caused problems in the Postmark building.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the striped areas on the garage floor plan. He also asked about the use of gross floor area versus net floor area, and read the definition of Gross Floor Area from the bylaw. He questioned the FAR provided. Mr. D'Arezzo asked for a shadow study for the neighboring buildings, noting that they should be shown on the plans.

Ms. Adrian asked for a traffic study that focuses on the one-way nature of Green Street. Mr. Safina inquired whether it might make sense to change Green Street to two-way just up until this building. Ms. Mercier suggested that the Parking Traffic Transportation Task Force (PTTTF) can discuss such concept later this month if the Commission thinks it is an idea worth exploring.

Mr. D'Arezzo noted that the two curb cuts proposed will require approval by the Select Board.

Ms. Clish noted that her biggest concern is the viability of the commercial spaces, given how narrow they are. She reiterated the concerns expressed by Mr. Safina. She asked about the potential for creating a cut through path between the building on the northern side, to connect Green Street and Haven Street. Ms. Meyer agreed with the suggestion noting that such might meet the spirit of the changes to the 40R Bylaw.

Ms. Clish asked whether the green roof would be functional from a stormwater perspective. Mr. Garrity noted that it is a modular manufactured roofing system, not a usable system.

Mr. Weston accentuated the comment about the façade on High Street, noting that from one view, it actually is the front of the building. He noted that it is a well-used front-door to this area of the Town, but that it presents as the backs of many buildings. He opined that he would hate for this trend to continue, noting that everyone wants it to feel enticing – to draw people around the train depot to the Haven Street front.

Mr. Weston asked about garage clearance given the idea that it will include a loading zone. He commented that the de-facto will be for delivery trucks to park on Green Street, especially because it is a bit wider in that location. Mr. Weston stated that a standard traffic study will discuss trip generation, but the issues are turning movements within the downtown, with parking on both sides and narrow conditions. He said there is a cumulative impact of adding all these truck movements to existing vehicular paths.

Ms. Clish affirmed Mr. Weston's comment that the High Street side is an entry way to Reading and really needs to make a positive impression.

Mr. Safina said that saving the historic building merits discussion. He marked up some ideas for how the commercial spaces could be wider and where the residential entry could be located. He said he is not sure symmetry matters because the building is not symmetrical.

Ms. Samantha Couture, Chair of the Reading Historical Commission (RHC), noted that the RHC issued a demo delay in July because the plans were fuzzy and the CPDC process had not happened yet. She said they are happy to see the Applicant wants to keep the front



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

façade, because it is the only Art Deco building and a former RMLD building which is significant to the Town's history. She said they also had concerns about the viability of saving it, noting that notes from a structural engineer commented on the structural integrity. She said that RHC does not have as much of a say in the new building, but that to her it is a bit jarring and could be tied in better to the historic façade.

Lorraine Willwerth, 26 Green Street, commented that Green Street residents have been through a lot, noting that traffic is worse than it used to be and that Green Street is a cut-through. She said they worked hard to have it be a 1-way, and noted that people fly down Green Street. She asked whether the Town would ever convert Green Street into a cul-de-sac so the residents along there can be at peace.

Ms. Willwerth said converting it to a 2-way would require Do Not Enter signs and that there is not much room down there. She noted that the Postmark traffic study did not account for the fact that the Post Office was moved across the street, so that all the traffic was still in the same vicinity. She asked whether the garage entrance could be on Haven Street and exit on Green Street. She asked for less congestion at the bottom of the residential street. Mr. Safina noted that the cul-de-sac idea may have some merit and could also provide an opportunity for additional landscape.

Ms. Adrian asked about a landscaping plan and proposed tree removal.

Mr. David Talbot, 75 Linden Street, said that the major issue downtown is that there is no master plan to account for the ways the pieces fit together. He opined that going site-by-site to achieve things has resulted in many problems. He commented that it may not be true that this project does not have to comply with the new zoning voted by Town Meeting. He mentioned some of the requirements of the new zoning, such as the 30' combined setback, and offered some ideas for how he thinks it could work on this site. He opined that CPDC still has the power to not grant the density waiver.

Mr. Safina noted that one person wants the historic façade preserved, and someone else wants a 30' setback, which could become a really nice park or public amenity like in front of Bunratty's. A discussion of priorities ensued. Mr. Safina noted that if at the end of the day, the façade cannot be preserved, then they would not get either the Art Deco elements or the park.

Ms. Sarah Brukilacchio, Maple Ridge Road, noted that Mr. Talbot and Ms. Willwerth spoke to many of her thoughts. She asked for the garage to be reconfigured so the entrance and exit are not so close to one another, especially on a street where sidewalks are not plowed. She opined that unit owners will want more parking, and that she hopes future occupants will be informed of the parking limitations when they move in. She encouraged the applicant to review the Design Guidelines more thoroughly because they include a lot of ideas for what is desired. She said she loves the idea of a walking path between the two streets, with murals or artwork about RMLD on the High Street facing wall.

Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for a 40R Plan Review to Monday, July 11th at 7:45PM. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

CPDC recessed for a 5-minute break.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

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

Jeff Olinger, Architect; Jesse Schomer, Attorney; Sam Gregorio, Traffic Engineer; the Fodera family and Guy Manganiello were present on behalf of the Application.

Ms. Ivria Fried of Miyares & Harrington (Town Counsel) was present.

Mr. Schomer introduced the project team and made some initial remarks about the updated materials submitted on June 1st. He opined that they are fairly significant, and include an updated civil plan set, updated architectural plan set, a revised garage plan to increase the width of compact spaces and to add more parking spaces, a new shadow study, updated construction management plan, snow management plan, comments on traffic safety, and responses to the Engineering, Fire and Building Department memos.

Mr. Olinger, project architect, went through the plan changes. He noted that they have increased the retail parking to three (3) dedicated spaces, and still maintain the seventeen (17) residential spaces, which includes two (2) dedicated visitor spaces. He noted that the eastern wall has been removed, so the structure is now set back 15' from the property line, and the wall replaced with a cedar fence. A portion of the garage is now open. He noted that the drive aisle could be reduced to 20' and still comply with standard one-way flow, but they are keeping it at 24'. He said there is an annotated summary for construction management.

Mr. Schomer walked the CPDC through the construction management plan, which includes a re-routed pedestrian path, notes about police details to minimize disruption of traffic, retail space as a storage/construction management office, closure of corner sidewalk and crosswalk locations, the area of parking spaces #1-5 will be for material deliveries, parking spaces #6-20 will be used for contractor parking (carpooling to the site will be necessary), and scaffolding and lighting will be used along the Washington Street side.

Mr. Schomer played a video of the shadow study. Mr. Olinger said the study was done at the spring equinox (March 21st), as the most equitable time to show the impact of the shadow. December would have the worst shadow; June would have the least impact.

Mr. Olinger explained the changes to the garage and building façade. He noted that the open parking plan is similar to what happens at Rise475. He explained that the loading zone has been improved and that the retail size has been retained. The garage allows for 11' clearance, which allows for 9'x9'x20' box truck (typical moving truck), a 9'x6' Amazon vehicle, and accessible vans and ambulances. These changes were able to be made because a utility space was removed.

Mr. Olinger noted that building materials have not changed, but the green roof is no longer proposed.

Mr. Schomer said they agree with all of the conditions requested by the Town Engineer. He noted a request from staff, recapping CPDC's comments, regarding traffic safety. He read through the responses in TEC's memo, noting some ideas that Green International had for the Walker's Brook Drive corridor and for the Washington/Main intersection. He opined that most traffic will be coming to the site from the south and exiting the site to the west, so the most problematic turns (left into and left out of the site) will be rare. He noted that the most difficult turn out of the site will happen just 3x per hour, and that a "do not block" pavement marking has been proposed if needed.

Mr. Schomer also suggested that parking spaces (or a temporary loading zone) could be added along the Main Street frontage of the buildings residential entrance, similar to what



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

was done in front of the Rise475 commercial entrances. Mr. Safina noted that the distance from the parking in front of Rise475 to the commercial spaces at the proposed project would be far enough that it would not work.

Mr. Weston noted that the on-street spaces require parallel parking, and could be tricky. Ms. Meyer noted that the closer to the intersection, the trickier it gets. The Commission discussed parking availability in the area.

Mr. Weston expressed disappointment that the traffic engineer is not present. He noted that the traffic safety memo did not provide much new or helpful information, and that he has a lot of questions. He noted that the traffic engineer recommended that the Town make improvements to Town streets in order to fix problems for the redevelopment site. He said that the Road Diet recommendation is not at all feasible for Washington/Main Street. He questioned why no documentation of directionality of findings was provided and opined that 15% of traffic coming from the east does not really seem realistic. No back up documentation was provided to substantiate this claim. Mr. Weston said he has concerns with every item, but that in the end having a peer review consultant look at the traffic and circulation issues on-site could be beneficial to help solve the issues.

Mr. Weston also questioned the 13'-6" platform with an 11'-6" clearance due to piping and sprinklers hanging from the ceiling. He said it really won't accommodate a 20' box van or an ambulance. He also asked what happens when deliveries do not pull in to the site – there is nowhere to go. He expressed concern with the retail space, which is not really served by nearby parking. He opined that an on-street solution for loading, as done at Rise, could be a solution, but pointed out that Rise475 had enough room to accommodate parking and an accessible sidewalk due to the flare of the sidewalk. He noted that the right of way narrows as it goes towards the proposed project site.

Mr. Safina noted that if the loading in the garage is used, the three (3) parked vehicles behind will have a hard time backing out. Ms. Clish noted that cars will not be able to block the road while waiting to pull into the garage. Mr. Schomer described some turning movements that could work. Mr. Weston noted that no retail patron would go inside the garage and make those turning movements. He opined that this is a non-functional retail space but that it could work for a legal or professional office where everyone who goes there is a "regular" or scheduled.

Ms. Meyer asked about queueing and length of time throughout the day that the queueing on Washington St actually blocks the driveway. To her, the safety concern is having the driveway blocked and having to navigate a long queue to make the turn. She said she would like to see how the traffic coming out of the driveway interacts with the queue.

Mr. Weston noted that the signal timing could be problematic, and that relying on the courtesy of eastbound or westbound traffic may not work. Cars pulling out could cut other cars off from an entire light cycle.

Mr. Safina noted that the Google Earth view shows cars all the way from Main Street blocking both proposed driveways. Mr. Weston said he would rather cut down John Street, circle around and make the turn in. Ms. Clish agreed a peer review would be helpful because this site will surely change the traffic pattern in some way.

Mr. Bruce Johnson, Washington Street, attested that the sidewalk is not as wide in front of the project site as it is in front of Rise. He said that the project does not comply with sections 6.2, 6.4 and 10 of the Design Guidelines. He noted that Attorney Crowley reached



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

out to DHCD re: 40R Statute and got a response that 40R does not address split zones, so it is up to local zoning. He read from a note he prepared, which he agreed to submit to staff.

Mr. Weston agreed that the construction management plan does not include much of what CPDC was asking for. He believes the project will take up a lane of Route 28 at times. The construction management plan should say whether this is proposed or not, and if so, then see what the life safety issues are regarding that. Mr. Safina asked whether the garage floor can be occupied during construction before the sprinkler system is in place. Mr. Schomer was not sure. Mr. Safina also asked about the boom and crane and where it would have to be positioned to make the construction work. Mr. Olinger said the crane may only be needed for the steel, and that smaller lulls would be used for other components. The Commission talked about the CMP at length.

The Commission reiterated their concerns and requests for additional information.

Ms. Clish mentioned that the shadow study makes it abundantly clear that the proposed units immediately on the south façade of Rise475 will always be in shadow. She asked if there is anything that can be done to allow more light into those units – an additional setback or similar. Mr. Schomer commented that the architects for Rise475 were shortsighted when they designed the south façade, not considering future redevelopment of the project site. He opined that there is nothing that can be done to mitigate this. Mr. Safina agreed that the Rise architect chose to build to the lot line, which comes with risk and reward.

Ms. Clish asked about the small trash room and whether the retail and residential tenants would both use the same trash room. She asked how the commercial tenants would access the trash. Mr. Olinger noted that they can add a door to make the trash area accessible from inside the garage instead of out on the sidewalk.

Mr. Weston asked if the Commission is okay with the retail space as configured because he is not and the last thing the Town needs is dead retail space. Ms. Clish agreed that the retail configuration does not work. Mr. Safina said his problem is that mixed-use does not work on-site. He said one use would work best for this site, but he is not sure he wants them to do just residential and give up on the retail space. He suggested a two-story professional building. Mr. Weston asked if they can require this to be professional office space so that it is not retail. He noted this would create a different traffic flow and influence the traffic analysis.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about an entirely residential building, noting it could be possible for CPDC to waive the height requirement and end up with bigger setbacks.

Ms. Meyer opined that it is a nice space location-wise for retail if other components of the intersection change for the better over time. She asked what CPDC would need to do operationally to require different types of commercial other than retail.

Mr. Schomer noted that his client was originally hoping to let the use be dictated by the market, but that he would agree to accept a condition requiring the space to be an office use. Ms. Clish said she is unsure she wants to restrict the potential use.

Ms. Clish made a motion that Mr. Weston work with staff to develop a scope for a peer review of the traffic study and safety analysis. Mr. Safina seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weston made a motion that Town staff engage a peer review consultant for the project's traffic study and safety analysis. Ms. Clish seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for 40R Plan Review at 459 Main Street to Monday, August 8th at 7:30PM. Mr. Safina seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Planning Updates & Other Topics

Commission Reorganization

Ms. Adrian noted that she would like to step down as Chair.

Mr. Weston made a motion to nominate Ms. Clish as Chair, starting in July 2022. Mr. Safina seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. The motion was approved 5-0-0.

Ms. Clish made a motion to nominate Ms. Meyer as Secretary. Mr. Weston seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. The motion was approved 5-0-0.

Minutes

The Commission reviewed the minutes for September 13, 2021, and made changes. Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the minutes of 9/13/21 as amended. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

The Commission reviewed the minutes for November 1, 2021, and made changes. Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the minutes of 11/1/21 as amended. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

The Commission reviewed the minutes for December 6, 2021, and made changes. Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the minutes of 12/6/21 as amended. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Adjournment

Ms. Clish made a motion to adjourn at 12:03AM. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 6/13/22
- Meeting Minutes of 9/13/21, 11/1/21, 12/6/21
- 583 Main Street, Sign Permit Application
 - Sign Permit Application, dated 5/16/22
 - Sign Renderings and Specifications, dated 6/10/22
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 6/13/22
- 1481 Main Street, Sign Review
 - Sign Permit Application and Renderings, dated 6/9/22
- 25 Haven Street, 40R Plan Review
 - Engineering Plan Set, dated 4/29/22
 - Architectural Plan Set, dated 4/29/22
 - Traffic Impact Assessment, 25 Haven Street
 - Draft Decision, dated 6/13/22



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

- 459 Main Street 40R Plan Review
 - Summary Letter, dated 6/1/22
 - Civil Plan Set, dated 6/1/22
 - Architectural Plan Set, dated 6/1/22
 - Draft Construction Management Plan, dated 6/1/22
 - Snow and Ice Removal Plan
 - Access and Safety Memo, dated 6/1/22
 - Response to Town Engineer, dated 6/1/22
 - Response Letter to Staff Departments, dated 6/9/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 6/13/22