



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
2022 DEC 13 PM 1:24
RK

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-08-08

Time: 7:30 PM

Building: Town Hall

Location: Hybrid Meeting – Zoom and Select Board Meeting Room

Address: 16 Lowell Street

Session:

Purpose: Hybrid Meeting

Version:

Attendees: Members: Heather Clish, Chair; Catrina Meyer, Tony D'Arezzo – Associate

Members - Not Present: Pamela Adrian, John Weston

Others Present:

Community Development Director Julie Mercier, Senior Planner Andrew MacNichol, Jesse Schomer, Jeff Olinger, Guy Manganiello, Sam Gregorio, Wing Wong, Amy Allen, Corrine Tobias, Richard Batten, Lisa Johnson, Bruce Johnson, Nancy Twomey, Jackie McCarthy, Saverio Fulciniti, Gregg Johnson

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Andrew MacNichol

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Ms. Clish called the meeting to order at 7:31 PM.

Ms. Mercier gave an overview of the hybrid meeting set up and procedures.

Sign Permit Application

530 Main Street, Public Kitchen

Mr. Richard Batten of Batten Bros Signs was present on behalf of the application. He explained that a new restaurant named Public Kitchen has bought the building and is undergoing renovations. The proposed sign is similar in nature and size to the existing sign; however, the sign will be constructed of individual lettering. It shall be illuminated through halo illumination, none of which shall shine through the letters themselves. The lettering is 2" off of the building façade and the light shall project backwards onto the façade.

A projecting blade sign with the business logo is also proposed in the southeast corner of the building. A blade sign of the same size exists in the area today.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked what the area of the sign is at 27" in height. He noted that area is determined from the sign's maximum height and length. Ms. Mercier replied that the area calculates to 53.25sf. Mr. D'Arezzo asked what happens when the paint starts to fade and if light shall shine through such. Mr. Batten replied the siding and facing is constructed of aluminum so even if fading occurs no light shall shine through. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the logo is constructed in the same fashion. Mr. Batten replied in the affirmative. He provided more detail on how the lettering is welded, constructed and painted. He noted the paint is specifically made for signage and metal work and will last 15-20 years.

Ms. Meyer asked if the logo lighting is within the thin lining of the fork and arrow or if it is on plate. Mr. Batten replied it will be a challenge but lighting is made small enough to place within the logo itself and no plating is needed.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish opened the application to public comment. None were provided.

Ms. Mercier screen shared the draft Certificate of Appropriateness. She asked if language or conditions related to logo sizing is needed. Ms. Clish replied that a condition would be a benefit in the case that the logo size changes due to the proposed illumination style.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for a sign permit application at 530 Main Street. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0-0.

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

Attorney Jesse Schomer, Architect Jeffrey Olinger, Traffic Engineer Sam Gregorio and Applicants Guy Fodera and Guy Manganiello were present on behalf of the application. Peer review traffic consultants Wing Wong and Amy Allen were also present.

Mr. Schomer stated that beginning with the Green International peer review findings may make sense. Ms. Clish agreed.

Ms. Allen shared a presentation on-screen. She summarized the items reviewed during the peer review, including the site plans, traffic impact assessment (TIA) and subsequent memos.

Ms. Allen noted that minimum sight distances are met, though she added that traffic congestion can impact such. Due to the potential impacts it is recommended that left-hand turning movements out of the Washington Street exit be restricted.

Ms. Allen noted that the project proposing four (4) dedicated commercial parking spaces would be insufficient under the underlying Business-B zoning. She added that clarifications in the TIA are needed in terms of available public parking and number of parking spaces on-site. Ms. Allen continued that pavement markings and lighting should be installed for the loading zone so that those entering the site can safely avoid such. She asked that turning movements be provided for when the loading zone is occupied to ensure the spaces are accessible. Ms. Allen further added that turning movements and access of emergency vehicles should be shown.

Ms. Allen suggested pedestrian improvements including accessible curb ramps, textured crosswalks and new pedestrian signaling equipment at the Main Street and Washington Street intersection. The peer review also recommended vehicle mitigation methods including upgrading signal heads and to review the timing/phasing of the signals themselves.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if required parking was calculated under Section 10.5. Ms. Allen stated that Section 9.0 was utilized. Mr. D'Arezzo noted that parking requirements under 40R zoning is different and retail/restaurant does not require any commercial parking for such. Ms. Clish asked if public parking access is a concern. Mr. D'Arezzo stated access to the retail by customers is still a concern.

Mr. D'Arezzo added that the brick crosswalks have been problematic. He asked if other material such as stamped concrete can be utilized. Ms. Allen confirmed alternative materials and design are available.

Mr. Schomer recommended addressing the conclusions one by one. He stated the Applicant is agreeable to restricting left-hand turning movements out of the garage. He clarified that a



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

total of 20 parking spaces is proposed, 3 spaces of which are dedicated to the retail component. Mr. Olinger added that one retail parking space would be able to act as ADA accessible despite not being signed or restricted as such. Two of the commercial parking spaces will be assigned to employees and the other shall be flexible use. Mr. Olinger stated that additional excess parking may be available for guest parking. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if guest parking can be conditioned. Mr. Schomer replied such is not favorable to the owner as they would like the parking spaces to be as flexible in use as possible.

Mr. Schomer stated that ADA accessible ramping across the streets shall be provided. He stated that more clarity on the additional recommendations on crosswalks, signals, etc. is requested. He continued that the Applicant is open to ideas but wants to ensure more detail before committing to such.

Mr. Schomer stated a turning movement plan has been developed to demonstrate the use of parking while the loading zone is occupied and emergency access for an ambulance. He found that full-sized fire truck access is not required for buildings of such size. Mr. Olinger shared the turning plan on-screen. He found information on ambulance sizing information and that such can be accommodated on-site. He described how the turning movements into the site would work when the loading zone is occupied. Mr. Olinger opined that backing into the parking spaces while the loading zone is occupied is most feasible.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about ADA rules and use. Mr. Olinger replied paths must be illuminated and kept dry but drive aisles are commonly used as such even if not ideal. Mr. D'Arezzo asked how far off of the wall the loading truck is. Mr. Olinger replied approximately 1-foot. Ms. Mercier questioned if the loading zone can be pulled forward to help improve access to the retail site. Mr. D'Arezzo stated such may impact the accessibility of the parking spaces. Ms. Clish asked if deliveries will utilize the front retail door or the door in the garage. She found that 1-foot off of the wall may limit the ability to use the retail door. Mr. Olinger replied that the primary concern is fitting all on-site and fine details can be managed by owners.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the turning motion out of parking space #20 is shown clipping the loading truck. Mr. Olinger replied in the negative and that the turning movement is close to the striped area but not within the loading space itself. Ms. Allen stated that the turning movement plan will need to be reviewed in more detail as the peer reviewers have not seen such.

Mr. Gregorio found that public parking is available within 300-feet of the site but is limited to street parking. Beyond 300-feet is additional on-street parking and off-street public lots. He added that retail mix within the downtown will allow for patrons to park at any given site and walk to their needs. Ms. Meyer stated that at previous hearings it was mentioned that additional on-street parking may be available for construction. She asked if there is an update on such. Mr. Schomer replied that the Applicant is willing to work with the Town's DPW and Parking Task Force on such as a condition but no formal advancements have been made to date.

Mr. Schomer stated that the Applicant is willing to condition the peer review recommendation on reviewing signal timing before and after project occupancy. Ms. Clish asked if signal upgrades are agreeable. Ms. Mercier added that some recommendations within the peer review warrant review by the Town's PTTTF and may also require Select Board approval. Mr. Schomer agreed to follow such process but added that it is typical to do so later in the development process so that finer details are known.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish asked to clarify available public parking. She stated that the parking exemption is related to sites within 300-feet of off-street parking lots. Mr. Gregorio replied that on-street parking is available across Main Street and to the north of the project site. Mr. D'Arezzo noted that no commercial parking is required based on the retail size. Even if the space is utilized as an office the proposal meets minimum parking requirements.

Ms. Meyer stated that recommendations for pedestrian and vehicular improvements is a benefit and should be explored further. Ms. Clish asked Green International if there is anything more required. Ms. Allen responded that they have not reviewed the formal responses provided and will need to do such.

Ms. Meyer asked about the data utilized in the traffic impact assessment and if it is utilizing the most recent available date. Mr. Gregorio replied that new data is available however upon review of such the change is negligible. He stated that outcomes and recommendations would not be subject to change. Ms. Allen stated that a closer look will be provided. Ms. Clish found that one additional trip may be an impact at that specific intersection.

Ms. Clish asked the Applicant to respond to staff comments provided. Mr. Schomer shared a written letter addressing the comments made by the Reading Fire Department, Reading Police Department, Reading DPW and the Economic Development office.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked how a field house can be developed before foundation construction. Mr. Schomer replied it is a temporary structure but ensured all codes and permit requirements would be met.

Mr. Schomer noted that any future lane closures during construction are expected to be short-term and temporary. There is no proposal for long-term or permanent lane closure. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the sidewalk is to be closed. Mr. Schomer replied that the sidewalk along the sites Main Street frontage shall be closed for the duration of construction on the project. Mr. D'Arezzo stated that Green Street crossing does not utilize any pedestrian signaling and is a concern asking pedestrians to cross there. He asked if lane closures no longer than 24-hours can be expected. Mr. Fodera replied that lane closures are expected for no longer than 2-hours at a time. Ms. Clish asked if a condition can be placed that no road closures occur during 'peak road hours'. The Applicant agreed such is amenable.

Mr. Schomer stated snow removal within the fencing, scaffolding and jersey barriers shall be conducted by the Applicant.

Mr. Schomer stated that sidewalks extending beyond to the project site shall remain open at all times and no staging or construction material shall be stored in front of the Rise475 building. Ms. Clish asked that signage also include language that businesses are open during construction. Mr. Schomer agreed and also found that the proposed material laydown area is sufficient in size and is placed to best allow access without major disruptions to abutters. Material storage shall not impede access to the Rise475 building. Ms. Clish asked if large deliveries can be moved onto the site in a short period of time. Mr. Fodera responded that materials are delivered in sets and the crane will immediately pull the materials off of the truck and onto the site.

Ms. Clish asked if there is an estimated number of days expected to request lane closures. Mr. Fodera stated it is hard to say without a full construction set and schedule. He stated that trucks will be directed to utilize the rt-125 bypass road towards the north when exiting the site. He added that box trucks can pull into the site and lane closure is expected only when large deliveries are needed. Mr. D'Arezzo asked how trucks can be required and



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

expected to utilize the bypass road. Mr. Fodera replied that they will be bounded by the contract. Ms. Meyer asked if the additional north bound lane will remain open at all times. Mr. Fodera replied in the affirmative, even if loading is occurring. Ms. Clish asked if the Reading Police Department can provide more input on the plan. Mr. Schomer reiterated no additional material laydown area is needed. He continued that contractor parking and access to the site is being worked on.

Ms. Clish opened the hearing to public comment.

Ms. Lisa Johnson, 166 Washington Street, stated that the retail parking is not visible from the street and patrons will not know that the parking exists for use. Ms. Johnson asked if no left-hand turning movements will be conditioned within the decision. Ms. Mercier replied that the PTTTF will discuss such but the Police Department may not be able to directly enforce such out of private property. Ms. Clish found such to be an important element to mitigate traffic impacts and if it cannot be enforced correctly it will be impactful.

Ms. Johnson asked if the peer reviewer will confirm the recent census data does not dramatically impact the findings and recommendations. She agreed that a few additional cars at this intersection can be impactful. Ms. Clish confirmed.

Ms. Johnson found that the TIA findings to be concerning. She stated that 138 new vehicle trips a day should be considered dramatic and impactful. She continued that a lane closure, even temporary, will add to the congestion in the area. Ms. Johnson provided findings she had personally conducted by viewing the site during the day. She found that approximately 75% of the vehicles at the intersection traveled north and that if they must merge into one lane it will impact traffic patterns and those who can get through the light cycle.

Ms. Johnson asked about the primary routes to be utilized during construction, specifically if trucks will exit onto Washington Street. She noted an area in the draft decision for correction.

Mr. Bruce Johnson reiterated his concern about the split zoning of his parcel. He found that the local language on lots in two zones to be confusing. He questioned why his parcel is not treated as a directly abutting residential zoned parcel and asked the development to treat it as such, specifically for required setbacks.

Mr. Schomer stated that no truck traffic is to be directed to Washington Street. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if a box truck can turn around on-site to exit on Main Street. Mr. Fodera replied that a box truck and a flatbed truck can accommodate the turning movement on-site. Ms. Clish asked that flatbed trucks not utilize the street for any turning movements. Mr. Schomer agreed to such. Ms. Clish stated that realistic agreements are needed and that if not held to such there will be a true detriment. Mr. Fodera agreed and found that thought has been given in advance to truck access and circulation.

Ms. Mercier clarified the zoning of the abutting parcels the Johnson's own. She stated that zoning lines do not specifically follow lot lines. The abutters lot is comprised of the S-15 zoning district and the Business-B/DSGD zoning district. She continued that under the DSGD Bylaw the project site does not directly abut the S-15 zoning district due to the zone extending into the Johnson's property. Ms. Johnson asked if the lot is considered a Transitional Area. Ms. Mercier stated that under the DSGD Design Guidelines the property is treated as a Transitional Area. Mr. Schomer replied that dimensional requirements such as setbacks are not specifically required to Transitional Areas. Mr. D'Arezzo found that there are step-back requirements from two-family dwellings within the Design Guidelines Section 7 and Section 10.5 of such also applies. Mr. Johnson questioned why Diagram C does not



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

apply. Ms. Clish explained that the building can technically have a setback of 0' but is proposed at 15' away with additional step-backs at upper levels. She asked to explain such in a written memo for interpretation. Mr. Johnson asked that split-zoned be defined. Mr. Schomer stated such will not result in changes or requirements to the project. Ms. Clish stated she wants such for going forward in the future. Mr. Johnson found that a letter would be a benefit to clarify.

Mr. Schomer opined that more impactful uses can be developed by-right under the underlying zoning. He stated differing retail uses can be more demanding and would result in the same concerning issues. Ms. Mercier stated that such would likely trigger a Site Plan Review and would have conditions placed on such. Mr. Schomer stated that similar conditions would be placed and the project would not be deniable. Ms. Clish stated that the traffic impacts of this specific project are under review.

Ms. Meyer suggested signage indicating available retail parking be placed on the site.

Mr. Schomer asked to discuss next steps privately with the clients. Upon return Mr. Schomer opined that the 40R process is intended to be expedited review and stated that the client is facing issues with the contracting parties. He stated that the Applicant is agreeable to continue once more to the September meeting and agree to continue the extension of the hearing to such date. Ms. Mercier stated that extra days will be required to finalize any decision made. Mr. Schomer agreed and added that many requests have been met throughout the hearing process and additional items are for review in the future by the relevant parties in Town Staff. Ms. Mercier stated that Town Counsel will be consulted to ensure proper deadlines are met and agreed to.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to continue the 40R Plan Review to September 12, 2022 at 10:30PM. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0-0.

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

Ms. Meyer stated that the Applicant has requested a continuance of the hearing to the next CPDC meeting date of Monday September 12, 2022. She read the letter into the record.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to continue the public hearing for 40R Plan Review at 25 Haven Street to Monday September 12, 2022 at 9:30PM. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved by roll call vote 3-0-0.

Other Business **Adoption of 53G**

Ms. Mercier explained that while the CPDC has utilized Chapter 53G for the hiring of consultants no records within the minutes showed a vote was made to officially adopt such. She asked that the Board move to adopt officially the legislation. This will help with clarity in the future.

Ms. Meyer made a motion for the Reading CPDC to adopt Chapter 53G. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0-0.

Other Business **Affordable Housing Trust Fund**



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Mercier stated that new procedures are proposed regarding the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Ms. Meyer asked for the reasoning for such. Ms. Mercier replied that a trust does exist but was adopted prior to the State legislation. The current trust requires that the Select Board and Reading Housing Authority agree on spending. The new language would allow one overseeing committee to direct spending. Ms. Clish added that Town Meeting has requested such amendments be considered.

Ms. Mercier stated that Town Meeting must act to reallocate the existing funding, adopt the proposed language and also authorize a certification of trust be registered. The Select Board will vote on such November 9, 2022 and will bring such to 2022 Subsequent Town Meeting in November.

Ms. Clish asked if the proposed language heavily reflects what the State uses. Ms. Mercier replied in the affirmative but added some language has been revised to better reflect local processes. Mr. Carlo Bacci of the Select Board agreed that procedures for use is needed. He added that a Select Board review or approval for additional checks and balances may be required for costs over a certain amount.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked how much funding currently exists. Mr. Bacci stated it is around \$400,000. Mr. D'Arezzo questioned if the audit language in Section XX.6 is concerning. Mr. Bacci and Ms. Mercier agreed the language on independent auditors should be reviewed further.

Ms. Clish asked if CPDC has any purview of the funding or Board. Ms. Mercier replied in the negative but stated that CPDC can support the proposed article if fitting.

Other Business

Housing Production Plan

Ms. Mercier stated that the update to the Housing Production Plan (HPP) is starting soon. A kick-off with the working group is scheduled to meet tomorrow. She stated that the HPP is relevant to maintain or claim safe-harbor from 40B development in the future, so long that statutory requirements are met.

Ms. Mercier found that scheduling of dates and submissions is important. Anser Advisory has been contracted as the consultant to help the process. They are also the consultant to help manage the regional affordable housing group that Reading is a part of.

Ms. Mercier stated that many CPDC members have expressed interest in joining the HPP working group. She suggested that members rotate in meeting attendance and when public workshops are scheduled a CPDC agenda posting can be made. Ms. Clish stated that if other members are interested she would delegate to such. Mr. D'Arezzo suggested that if a body is needed he can attend. Ms. Meyer stated that the time commitment can be tough and the revolving members may have merit. Ms. Mercier stated that if meetings are missed it is not a big concern and updates can be provided.

Mr. D'Arezzo suggested a CPDC lead and if they cannot attend then other members be reached out to.

Ms. Mercier asked if later evening meetings are preferred or if day time meetings work better. She also asked if a member can attend the kick-off at 4:00pm tomorrow. Ms. Meyer and Ms. Clish found later evenings to be more conflicting. Ms. Meyer agreed to be the CPDC lead and Ms. Clish and Mr. D'Arezzo be alternates. Mr. Weston and Ms. Adrian will be reached out as well. Mr. D'Arezzo agreed to attend the kick-off.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Other Business

Potential Zoning Amendments for 2023

Ms. Mercier updated the Board on a number of zoning initiatives. She agreed with the Board's prior recommendation that amendments related to housing await the HPP update and recommendations from such.

Flood Zone

Ms. Mercier stated that new flood maps are expected in early Spring 2023. If the map date is known prior to 2023 Annual Town Meeting it could be accommodated but likely 2023 Subsequent Town Meeting will be more feasible. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if language on 'most recent maps' can be used. Ms. Mercier replied the State has indicated the specifics be required.

MBTA Communities

Ms. Mercier stated there is no information on when final guidelines related to MBTA Communities will be released.

Life Science

Ms. Mercier found that uses not related to housing are under review. Staff met with Mr. Nick Safina to discuss Life Science development comparisons on both zoning requirements and parcels in Reading. She continued that the Town's zoning is not far off from other municipalities who have seen such development. Large parcels also exist within the Industrial Zoning District but timing of property sales is important. She added that if CPDC does find the use to be a benefit staff can explore an 'Expedited Permitting' process under the State. This can allow a schedule of review to be expected for developers. More detail on levels of use can be defined if desired as well.

Ms. Meyer asked if other municipalities have utilized the expedited permitting process. Ms. Mercier stated more research is needed on such. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if a minimum lot size is needed. Ms. Mercier stated a comparison is being conducted but there are parcels in Town comparable to recent Life Science developments.

The Board discussed scheduling of Town Meeting and when is appropriate to bring zoning.

Brewery, Distillery or Winery

Mr. MacNichol shared potential language on defining a *Brewery, Distillery or Winery* use. The definitions found from other municipalities range from very specific to very broad. Specific definitions describe dimensional limitations, restrictions on amount of beverage brewed, food requirements etc. He noted that such definitions could be limiting to future developments though. A less complicated definition can be crafted but externalities of the use may not be fully captured. A third option that CPDC may consider is treating the use similar to that of a restaurant, as the existing definition of restaurant may allow such; however, restaurants are limited in review under the Bylaw.

Mr. MacNichol questioned if CPDC knew why *bar and taverns* are prohibited in Town. The definition of such does not mention food requirements and patrons in existing establishments are not required to purchase food items. It would be important that any future definition of *brewery, distillery or winery* differ and distinguish itself from *bar and tavern*. Mr. D'Arezzo stated brewers produce on-site. If a commercial kitchen is provided it could be considered a restaurant. Mr. MacNichol agreed and opined that the primary use of a brewery is manufacturing and distribution as opposed to a bar/tavern being the primary



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

use of serving. A brewery can allow serving/tasting as an accessory use. He provided examples of tasting room definitions.

Ms. Meyer asked if a brewery would be prohibited from selling. Mr. D'Arezzo replied in the negative but would be restricted to selling their own products that are manufactured on-site. They should not be required to include food sale. Mr. MacNichol agreed that sales be limited to their own product. Ms. Mercier asked if that would allow a partnership to be formed with another brewer. Ms. Clish opined that local/craft partnerships should not be restricted as it allows for business incentives and promotional events.

Ms. Meyer stated definitions should not be overly restrictive as to placement and use of Tasting Rooms. Ms. Clish agreed. Mr. Carlo Bacci found that food trucks, snacks and other items should not be restricted and account towards any potential food requirements.

Mr. MacNichol stated the use itself can be regulated in the Table of Uses. Proposed for consideration is that it be a by-right use in the Industrial Zone and by Special Permit in business zones. If allowed by-right it is likely that a Site Plan Review would be triggered for change of use. Ms. Mercier opined that a brewery in a mixed-use building may not be preferable. Mr. D'Arezzo said that developers of new construction should have this use planned ahead if desired due to the utility needs. Ms. Clish agreed that a Special Permit should be required where externalities could impact residents most, especially if a broader definition is preferred. Mr. MacNichol agreed. He stated that if desired an additional section to the Special Permit Uses of the bylaw can be developed for breweries. A footnote can also be provided for the 40R District.

Corner Lots

Mr. MacNichol suggested that a definition and dimensional controls for corner lots be considered. The Zoning Board and Building Commissioner have requested such for clarification on proposals going forward.

Other Business Minutes

The Commission elected to review meeting minutes at a future meeting date due to the late time.

Adjournment

Ms. Meyer made a motion to adjourn at 10:58 PM. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded and it was approved 3-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 8/8/22
- CPDC Meeting Minutes of 1/24/22, 3/14/22 and 4/11/22
- Sign Permit Application, 530 Main Street
 - Proposed Sign Rendering and Specifications
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 8/8/22
- 40R Plan Review, 459 Main Street
 - Draft Construction Management Plan, dated 8/1/22
 - Draft Traffic Management Plan, received 8/1/22
 - Transportation Peer Review, conducted by Green International Affiliates Inc., findings, dated 8/2/22
 - Turning movement study, presented 8/8/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 8/8/22
- 40R Plan Review, 25 Haven Street
 - Continuance Letter, dated 7/27/22
- Potential Zoning Bylaw Amendments for 2023



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

- Draft Amendments on Brewery/Distillery/Winery, dated 8/8/22
- Draft Amendments on Corner Lot Controls, dated 8/2/22