



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: 2022-09-12

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, Pamela Adrian, John Weston, Tony D'Arezzo – Associate

Members - Not Present:

Others Present:

Community Development Director Julie Mercier, Senior Planner Andrew MacNichol, Town Manager Fidel Maltez, Jen Hocherman, Kathryn Gallant, Jesse Schomer, Jeff Olinger, Guy Manganiello, Sam Gregorio, Amy Allen, Corrine Tobias, Lisa Johnson, Bruce Johnson, 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.

Ms. Clish mentioned that the first discussion will only be able to proceed for an hour as the CPDC is under a time constraint with the scheduled 8:30PM hearing.

Concept Plan Review / Use Discussion

Town-Owned Land on Oakland Road, Affordable Housing Development Concept

Town Manager Fidel Maltez, Jen Hocherman of SV Design and Kathryn Gallant of the Reading Housing Authority presented the concept plan.

Mr. Maltez began with a presentation for affordable housing on Town-owned parcels on Oakland Road. He mentioned that a previous public discussion was held on July 12, 2022 and stated that there will be more community meetings to follow. The CPDC will not be making any decisions tonight.

Mr. Maltez went through the history of the project site, noting that the property was received via tax title in 1937. He said it comes up for discussion a lot.

Mr. Maltez went through three development projects in nearby communities: Weston, Lynnfield and Westford. The Lynnfield and Westford developments include senior housing at 80% Area Median Income (AMI). He said that affordable housing is not a new phenomenon and the need is not unique to Reading.

Kathryn Gallant, Reading Housing Authority (RHA) Director, spoke about the need for affordable housing in the area, noting that Reading is not immune from it. She said that



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

nearly 50% of low-income renters are cost burdened when it comes to affording their housing. She noted that the RHA manages the 80-unit senior/disabled affordable housing development known as Tannerville, which is subsidized by DHCD. They also manage and maintain additional properties scattered around the Town. She noted that the State subsidized housing wait list maintains just under 12,000 peoples. Approximately 4,000 applicants are in need of senior housing and 8,000 are in need of family housing assistance. She said a certain percentage have applied under emergency preference which includes natural disaster, survivors of domestic violence, veterans and more. Veterans are given priority, but will wait about 3 years for a housing solution. She said residents without Veteran status have to wait about 8 years. She said the Section 8 program wait list has over 200,000 applicants and 219 are from Reading. A majority of the wait-list applicants are defined as extremely low-income, making 30% or less than the Area Median Income. She said the RHA receives 7 new applications per week through the State program, but that units only turn over every 3 months or so.

Ms. Gallant read some comments she's received recently from Reading residents looking for affordable housing.

Jennifer Hocherman, SV Design, shared her screen and showed the Commission an aerial view of the site. She noted that Oakland Road is a busy road, but that the residential streets on the other side of the site are fairly quiet. They did a schematic analysis and noted that the interior of the site is lower and flatter, with some ledge on the edges. She noted that they do not intend to modify the topography, and would rather design with it and be mindful of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Hocherman referred to the site as "two separate lobes" with a senior building on the west, built into the hill so it will appear as a 2-story from the residential neighborhood and a 3-story from the street. She described the east lobe, which has 6 duplex family buildings (12 units total), a reduction of 4-units from the 16 total units originally proposed. She showed a walking path for the neighborhood across the site to the nearby school.

Ms. Hocherman showed a site cross section to illustrate the grade change and scale of the project. She noted that the front porches have some visibility to each other but will also be screened with some landscaping. There is a clubhouse and playground in the middle of the of the development, with some extra parking. She showed some renderings from similar projects that SV Design has done.

Ms. Hocherman showed floor plans for the senior building, comparing them to similar senior buildings they have designed. She shared additional statistics on the site land and proposed development.

Ms. Clish mentioned to the audience that this is the first time the CPDC has heard the presentation and had a chance to weigh in. She asked if any CPDC members had any concerns.

Ms. Adrian asked if there is a bus route on Oakland Road and any way to cut down on the number of cars and trips. Mr. Maltez replied the site is not located on a bus line.

Mr. Weston noted that the site is zoned S-15, which does not allow for multi-family developments like this. He noted that the Town is not technically required to comply with zoning, but that all prior town developments have gone through the process and been held to the same standard operating procedure. He noted that Reading certainly has an affordable housing issue and that he is a big proponent for affordable housing and has been approving such projects for 15 years. However, he opined that though this is the right thing



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

to do, it's not located at the right site. He commented that it is a municipally-focused area of Town. He said it's hard to grapple with the idea of introducing seniors into an area that's very vibrant and loud. He said he would have liked to see more of a planning process for this instead of jumping right to the answer. He noted that when projects skip the process they typically fail. Mr. Weston said the Town needs to make sure that the actions it is taking are solving the problems. He suggested wrapping a discussion of this into the Housing Production Plan process that is currently ongoing. He noted that the senior housing component may be too large for the site and would not be allowed anywhere else in a S-15 district.

Mr. Weston cautioned about using examples comparing to unrelated developments, noting that the images of a 2-story and townhouse family developments are misleading to what is proposed in Reading.

Ms. Meyer noted that seniors need transit, services, and housing in locations that are walkable. She said she could be in favor if there is a good justification and it aligns with found goals.

Ms. Clish said she is on board with finding more places in town for affordable housing. She opined favorably on the paths connecting the neighborhoods. She said that downtown is often thought of as the heartbeat of the Town, but that the Birch Meadow area is actually much more active and could really be the heartbeat. She said she wants something here that complements the area and uses. She also suggested that the renderings should be reflective of what is actually proposed.

Bill Brown, Martin Road, expressed concern that there is no sewer to the area, and that there is just an 8" water line. He noted that the site has been explored for a multitude of uses, and that this is a perfect site for female affordable housing and for victims of sexual abuse.

Sheryl Estrade, Gould Street, commented that this is a great area for affordable housing, and that combining the kids, students, and seniors is a good thing for everyone. She noted that she works as a CNA at the school and that she sees the difference and positive outcomes of combining generations. She asked if the garages could be added back into the family housing underneath the building.

Ms. Hocherman explained that the garages were removed because of costs associated with them – as they are typically not covered under affordable housing funding.

Jonathan Webber, 84 Hartshorn Street, opined that he appreciates the effort. He said this area has three schools, which are full all week long. He said the traffic in this area is incredible, and speeds on some roads are very fast. He said that RMHS gives out parking passes but they always run out and kids are parking on Oakland Road. He noted that visitors and emergency vehicles need places to park. He found it was the right thinking but wrong place. He said that John Carver should be considered as part of the overall plan. He said this part of Town is over-taxed and over-burdened.

Carolyn Whiting, 17 Chestnut Road, is concerned that the land is rocky and steep, and that there will be a lot of water runoff. She said there are wild creatures living there and that the Town should not take away their habitat or they will become a problem. She agreed with the concerns presented about traffic impact.

Mary Ellen O'Neill, 125 Summer Ave, expressed opposition to developing this parcel of land. She said the Town should hold onto every tree it has and maintain tree coverage.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Merle Rossler, 20 Hillside Road, said she is confused because affordable housing and senior housing are being conflated. She said they have different needs and will be challenged by each other. She noted that she didn't see anything regarding access for fire trucks and emergency vehicles, which needs to be addressed in a concrete and satisfactory way. The wildlife habitat is important to maintain. She asked why Reading is permitting the development of so much un-affordable housing, and mentioned the housing by the train and along Main Street. She asked whether any market analysis has been done regarding the impact on property values in abutting neighborhoods.

Marlena Bita, Strawberry Hill Lane, thanked CPDC and said the plan is nice but that she agrees with others that this is not the best place for it. She noted that the Town Manager is working on an RFP for developing the RMLD land.

George English, Hillside Road, said his own land is very difficult and that he expects a great amount of impact with whatever happens on this site. He asked people to look at this differently and noted that all the concerns being said are true. He said his land abuts the property and that any development of the site will impact his property, which is on a slope. He mentioned snow pile up in the winter. He said this proposal is way out of line, it's not right to stuff this many people in an area constrained by the presence of a school system. He mentioned that there have only been two opportunities to weigh in.

Margaret Cowell, Main Street, noted that the neighborhood is single family. She expressed concern with what would happen when they hit ledge, and what blasting would do to the neighborhood and her very old house. She reiterated the concerns with traffic, snow removal, and municipal services.

Jeannie_____, Hillside Road, said she agrees the use is needed but this is not the place for it. She noted that the parking issues happen during any event at the school and the fields, and that people do not adhere to parking regulations. She commented that it's very hard to get an ambulance down Hillside Road when cars are parked on both sides. She noted that the Aberjona River is at the bottom of Hillside and asked whether there have been any environmental impact studies done.

Kristen Zady, Chestnut Road, asked whether a traffic consultant has been hired to look at the impact of this project on the neighborhood. Mr. Maltez said that a traffic consultant has not been hired yet but will be later into the project. Mr. Weston explained all the different consultants that need to review the project.

Jillian Black, agreed that traffic is a concern and reiterated a point from the last meeting. She said that the area is the number one most traveled area for very young first-time drivers and said it is complicated.

Mr. Maltez wrapped up the discussion by saying there is a long road ahead should the project even continue forward. He mentioned the Housing Production Plan (HPP) process and that the 2018 HPP recommended looking at this site for affordable housing.

Kim Mahoney, abutter to project asked that the process be fully transparent. She noted she is a close abutter but had no idea about the July meeting, and that the neighborhood needs to be included in the process. She opined that Reading does not have a good process for community development.

George English asked about earlier discussions about rental properties throughout town. He noted affordable duplexes existing near Oakland Road.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish expressed her own personal support for achieving affordable housing in town that is well planned and well thought out.

Ms. Mercier gave an update on where the Town stands with the HPP Update and on three upcoming opportunities for feedback.

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

Jesse Schomer, Jeff Olinger, Giovanni Fodera, Guy Manganiello, and Sam Gregorio were present on behalf of the project.

Ms. Clish recapped the process to-date. She noted that the most recent information was received by staff late last Wednesday evening.

Mr. Schomer summarized that the civil and architectural plan sheets were updated per comments received. An interior series of doors within the garage have been modified to ensure there are no conflicts with the loading zone. The Applicant team also spec'd out vehicular sizes for ambulances and have confirmed that larger sized ambulances can access the garage if needed. He noted that the Reading Fire Department has commented that an ambulance would not enter the garage but added that clearance for such is available. Signage has been noted on the plans to install No Left Turns outside of the garage and commercial parking availability. The 'Do Not Block Driveway' box has been removed as requested. He continued that updated census data was utilized to reflect traffic impact and no major changes to trip distribution were found. Turning movements and vehicle templates were provided. The Applicant confirmed they are willing to contribute \$25,000 to advance additional off-site improvements recommended by peer reviewer Green International Associates.

Mr. Olinger shared the plans on the screen. He clarified that Gross Floor Area has been calculated per Section 10.5 of the Bylaw. The definition excludes certain areas such as the basement utility room but GFA has increased to 2.37. The parking area is excluded due to it now being open to the air and not a part of the enclosed building. If the parking area is included in the calculation comes to 2.73 which is below the maximum of 2.8 allowed. Mr. D'Arezzo asked how the second through fourth floors were calculated as they may be undersized in such. Mr. Olinger answered that to be conservative terraced areas have been included as well as measurements to the exterior of the walls. He continued that the first-floor calculation includes the retail area, storage areas, and utility rooms, some of which may be excluded in the definition but again were included in the calculation to be safe. Mr. D'Arezzo asked for the total GFA of level two and level three. Mr. Olinger replied 7,179sf for level two and level three includes a variation of about 800sf less. The roof level has also been included in the calculation. A compact summary on such has been provided. Mr. Olinger explained that level four is less area due to the step-backs/step-ins and mansard roof design. He noted that gables are used on the level and do reclaim some of the area. The third-floor and fourth floor calculation include the stairwells and double high areas within the units. It is about a 10% loss of area from the third floor to fourth floor. Mr. Olinger reiterated that he is confident the application is below the allowed GFA.

Mr. Weston stated the plans and calculations on the screen differ from those within the packet. Mr. Olinger stated the methodology was updated to reflect Mr. D'Arezzo's recently provided comments but the plans have not changed. Ms. Clish found it to be problematic that CPDC has not reviewed the calculations shown. Mr. Weston asked if it was a difference in interpretation or if the calculation was done incorrectly. Mr. Schomer replied it was a



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

difference in interpretation that the Applicant is trying to correct. He continued that it was found that no additional waivers are required.

Mr. Olinger stated the turning movements and radius have been advanced to ensure the analysis works. Parking spots 18, 19 and 20 have been shown to work and avoid striped areas within the garage. Mr. Olinger continued that drive aisle height clearance has been shown to accommodate 10' tall vehicles and potentially up to 11' in height. A 20' moving truck was also shown to be accommodated within the garage.

Ms. Adrian stated that a fire truck would be expected if an ambulance is present. She asked if there is room for such within the garage. Mr. Olinger replied it is unlikely the fire truck would utilize the garage. Mr. Gregorio confirmed no fire truck would enter the garage. Ms. Adrian clarified her question is if the access from the garage/building to the truck is achievable. She stated there are concerns with the fire truck utilizing Main Street for extended periods of time. Mr. Schomer replied that the Fire Department will plan ahead for such and asked to check in with them on the parking logistics.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if an over-height vehicle can access the garage and cause damage. Mr. Olinger replied that a conventional bumper will be installed to signal the height limits within the garage and protect the structure. Critical infrastructure will be strategically located to ensure safety.

Ms. Mercier informed the Board that there is updated comments from Green International's peer review team. Ms. Amy Allen of Green International introduced herself. She stated no new information is being presented but a series of comments can be provided. She explained the level of review conducted. The requested updated trip generation data was provided and was found to not change total trips into and out of the site. She confirmed it was clarified that commercial parking is not required under the Zoning Bylaw Section 10.5 and 20 spaces are to be provided on the site. The turning movement diagrams were reviewed and no issues were found. Ms. Allen continued that a contribution has been confirmed to advance a series of off-site recommendations. She confirmed that all comments presented by Green International have been resolved.

Mr. Weston asked if the trip generation data can be clarified. He found such is typically conducted on a macro level of the region. Ms. Allen agreed that is how such is typically conducted. Mr. Weston stated such is fine for a general understanding but on a micro and local level more information is needed. Local residents will know to avoid certain routes and find alternative ways to travel. Knowing the Main Street and Washington Street intersection is problematic, residents of the building will learn to take alternatives quickly and may even take left turns out of the garage despite the restriction. The restriction is not truly enforceable and many areas within Town that prohibit similar movements see the movements occur anyways. He opined that delays at the intersection will be exasperated and that the proposed recommendations don't accurately solve the problems that the intersection and development will face.

Mr. Weston stated that the data shows 108 commercial patron trips are expected to park off-site. This would result in 108 daily pedestrians crossing at the intersection and further delaying the signal and intersection. He stated that while such is not typically included in the analysis it is worth noting. This results in further pedestrian and vehicular delays at the intersection. He continued that the intersection and signal have been reviewed up to four times over the last few years and the Ash Street intersection/railroad add more concerns. He noted that if a vehicle queue extends over the rail line the Town will lose its quiet zone designation which is not desirable. Mr. Weston concluded that the project is a unique area and has not shown to properly mitigate the concerns around the density proposed.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Clish asked how much reflection has been given to the problematic intersections in the area by the Town's PTTTF. Ms. Mercier replied the PTTTF was in favor of the installing the recommendations of the peer review but acknowledges concerns will persist. Mr. Weston stated prioritizing the turning movements of this single site over the entirety of the area is not a good solution.

Mr. Weston asked if the recommendations include an expected cost. Ms. Allen replied the expected cost of all the proposed recommendations would total approximately \$50,000. The Applicant reiterated they are willing to contribute \$25,000 to the off-site improvements. This estimate is for signal upgrades and not specifically to sidewalk ramps. Mr. Sam Gregorio stated it is about \$2,000 per ramp. This cost and improvement would be separate from the improvements that the \$50,000 would cover. Ms. Meyer asked if it is confirmed that all ramps are required for upgrade based on the plans. Ms. Mercier answered that the Town Engineer would separately require such.

Ms. Clish asked what 'solar ready' means. Mr. Schomer stated that wiring install will be planned for future solar install. Mr. Olinger added that the roof would be designed to withstand the weight of solar panels. The future management/association of the building would decide whether to buy or lease solar install.

Ms. Clish asked if all balconies are accessible from the units and are at least 4' deep for use. Mr. Olinger answered that all balconies are at least 4' deep and door swings will be reviewed for practicality. Ms. Adrian asked if sliding balcony doors could be utilized. Mr. Olinger stated such is common but are very leaky for air tightness and are not energy efficient.

Ms. Clish opened the hearing to public comment.

Ms. Lisa Johnson of 166 Washington Street found that the traffic data presented all seems to relate to the residential portion of the building. She asked if vehicles such as Amazon deliveries, food deliveries, etc. are included in the traffic data. Mr. Gregorio replied that the information is based on the ITE trip generation manual and proposed land use. The study does not discriminate against any type of user entering or leaving the site meaning that the counts do not differentiate between residents, visitors and/or deliveries nor where they are going. The peak AM and PM hours are reviewed for impact by the proposed use and design expectancies are included. Ms. Allen confirmed that is how the analysis would be conducted.

Ms. Johnson found that other 40R developments downtown include parking out front or in adjacent parking lots to utilize for deliveries, visitors, etc. She reiterated that the Reading Police Department has expressed concerns and does not support the project due to its location. She agreed that residents taking left turns out of the garage despite the restriction will be problematic and added that it may be worse during construction.

Ms. Johnson opined that the Applicant can not adequately mitigate project impacts and such is a criterion for approval.

Mr. Bruce Johnson of 166 Washington Street reiterated that the site is within a Transitional Area and asked why both a setback and step-back are not required. Ms. Clish replied that a 15' setback is proposed but not explicitly required because the site does not directly abut the residential zone due to the split-zoning of the 166 Washington Street lot. Mr. Johnson asked where such a definition and interpretation exists. Ms. Mercier stated a definition of split-zoned lots is not found within the Bylaw. She continued that the development lot abuts the Business-B/DSGD zoned portion of the 166 Washington Street lot.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Ivria Fried, Town Counsel, pointed to section 10.5-dimensional control requirement and language of abutting a residential zone. She continued that step-back requirements are outlined in Section 7 of the Design Guidelines where language of abutting use exists over abutting zones. Ms. Clish added that the 10' step-back at the second or third story is a design guideline requirement that applies; however, this is assumed that the building is located at the property line. She continued that the step-back requirement was previously met but during the discussions such was replaced with a setback per the abutter requests. Ms. Mercier added that setback area does not equate or apply to required step-backs, which are intended to mitigate different issues, but due to the evolved discussion/plans it may warrant a waiver from the requirement.

Mr. Schomer stated that Section 3 of the Design Guidelines allows the CPDC to permit minor deviations from the requirements. He continued that due to the plan changes a finding and/or waiver be granted to allow such change. Ms. Clish suggested that a waiver be requested/included so as to allow for language in the decision to reflect why such was allowed. Mr. Schomer agreed. Mr. Johnson stated that further step-backs would better the development and Transitional Area. Ms. Clish clarified that the split-zoned lot was not a new development under the DSGD adoption and existed in the underlying Business-B zone. Ms. Mercier added that zoning districts were previously determined from 100' from the center line of the right-of-way which resulted in many split zoned lots. The DSGD overlay adoption went directly over the downtown's Business-B zone.

Mr. Schomer stated that the Reading Police Department letter was submitted from the original project design and with the density reduction such comments have not been reiterated. He continued that 12 residential units and a commercial space is a minor impact per the trip generation data presented. Allowable commercial spaces by-right may be far more impactful. He further added that the condition language of the project can allow for zoning enforcement if items such as left-hand turns are not followed. While such may not prevent the turning movement, it would pressure the management to restrict such in a practical way.

Ms. Meyer asked if the existing use of the site is considered within the trip generation study. Mr. Gregorio replied that while such can be excluded from the report the Applicant did not exclude it and the data provided shows more than what is expected from the proposed development.

Ms. Mercier shared the Draft Decision on the screen. Mr. MacNichol summarized sections and language within.

Mr. Weston questioned language on allowable office space within the commercial portion of the development. Mr. MacNichol stated that the current language in the Bylaw restricts it to 33% of the total ground floor area, not just commercial space. Because the proposed use includes parking and other components on the ground floor the total commercial space is less than 33% of the ground floor area. He noted that this language has been corrected in the most recent zoning bylaw amendments, which do not apply to this project.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if dark sky compliant lighting is required on all floors or just upper levels. Ms. Fried noted that the design guidelines require all lighting to be dark sky compliant unless up-lighting is shielded from roofs or similar. The language within the Decision's finding #13 was amended to reflect such.

Mr. Weston asked if any Town bylaws require conformance with trash removal. Ms. Fried replied that General Bylaw 8.11 restricts timing of trash pick-up. Mr. MacNichol suggested condition language be flexible enough to allow up to certain number of pick-ups per week or



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

a certain amount of bins/area. Ms. Mercier stated such can also require conformance with the General Bylaw requirement.

Mr. Olinger noted that windows were removed on the north façade based on previous comments. It does include continuous material from the rest of the building and a material/color change at the mansard roof. He found if such is interpreted to not be a minor deviation and not meet Design Guideline Section 7.5.5 a waiver be sought and granted from such.

Ms. Mercier noted that there is general waiver justification language within Section 10.5 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Clish stated that Mr. Weston is not eligible to vote on the project due to missing two hearings. This results in four voting members and three affirmative votes are required for any approval on a vote. Mr. Weston asked if he should abstain on votes or is simply not voting. Ms. Fried answered that he will not vote. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if waivers will be voted on individually. Ms. Clish replied in the affirmative.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver for a project density of 51 units per acre where 20 units per acre is permitted by-right, for the 459 Main Street 40R Plan Review. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was denied 1-3-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver to allow four compact spaces that measure 8'x17' where 8.5'x17' are required. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-1-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver to allow drive aisle widths of 24' wide where 26' is required. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver of the submittal of a full landscape plan. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-1-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver for Design Guideline 7.1.2 requiring a building step-back of 10' at the second or third floor level. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver for Design Guideline 7.2.1 requiring a change in plane, specifically for the building's north façade. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-1-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the requested waiver for Design Guideline 7.5.5 requiring a change in material or building plane for the building's north façade. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was denied 2-2-0.

Ms. Clish asked how to best proceed. Ms. Fried stated that the Commission has the option to continue with the Decision on-screen based on ZBL Section 10.5 language allowing the denial of a project if a waiver is not granted. Another option is to approve the project, including granted waivers, under the condition that the Applicant build at by-right 20 units per acre. A third option is that the CPDC approve an entirely by-right project with no waivers approved.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. D'Arezzo suggested including a condition of approval to meet by-right density. Because the math is not perfect it would equal a density of 21.24 units per acre (5 units total). Ms. Clish questioned how much of the design would change based on such and if that would be handled administratively. Ms. Fried stated it would be left to staff to determine future compliance with such. Mr. D'Arezzo found that the same building envelope would have to be used but with five residential units. Any deviations may require a plan change process.

Ms. Mercier shared a draft decision that would approve a by-right only project. It is limited in findings due to an unknown design. A single waiver of density at 21.24 units per acre would be required. Standard conditions would apply.

Ms. Fried suggested approving the project under the condition of five residential units. This would give the CPDC a level of confidence on the design proposed. The Commission agreed and found that any deviations would require a plan change review process through the Commission. Ms. Fried stated if the building design does not change with five units proposed the project would be eligible for permitting. Any changes would require an analysis for review and process.

Mr. Schomer stated that the project design would be uneconomical at five residential units and a condition to such is tantamount to a denial. He asked if the Commission would be interested in specifying/approving an appropriate density rather than denying or conditioning to by-right. Ms. Clish stated impacts discussed are based on the proposed density and such are unknown at differing densities. Mr. D'Arezzo stated an appropriate number is unknown based on potential design changes of such which can impact shadows, parking and more. Mr. Schomer found that some impacts discussed relate more to intensity than density.

Ms. Mercier added a condition requiring the project to meet a density of 21.24 units per acre, which results in a total of five (5) residential units. Ms. Meyer made a motion to accept the condition as written. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-1-0.

Ms. Mercier added a condition requiring the project to meet Design Guidelines Section 7.5.5. Ms. Meyer made a motion to accept the condition as written. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

The Board reviewed the Draft Decision and amended condition language based on the approved waivers and discussions.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to close the public hearing for the 459 Main Street 40R Plan Review. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the Decision as written and shown on-screen for the 459 Main Street 40R Plan Review. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 3-1-0.

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

Ms. Meyer read the continuance request submitted by the Applicant into the record.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to continue the public hearing for the 25 Haven Street 40R Plan Review to 8:30PM on Monday, October 17th, 2022. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Other Business

MBTA Communities Legislation

Due to the late time the Board elected to discuss the MBTA Communities Guidance at a future hearing date. Ms. Mercier stated current findings can be sent to the CPDC and noted that a deeper future analysis is coming.

Potential Zoning Amendments for 2023

There were no updates at this time on future Zoning Bylaw Amendments.

Adjournment

Ms. Meyer made a motion to adjourn at 11:48 PM. Mr. Weston seconded and it was approved 5-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 9/12/22
- Public Meeting, 0 Oakland Road
 - Summary Presentation, received 9/8/22
 - Schematic and Concept Designs, received 9/12/22
- 40R Plan Review, 459 Main Street
 - Summary of Changes, dated 9/7/22
 - Architectural and Civil Plan Set, dated 9/7/22
 - Revised Trip Generation Distribution Data, dated 8/29/22
 - Green International Response to comments, dated 8/18/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 9/12/22
- 40R Plan Review, 25 Haven Street
 - Request for Continuance Letter, dated 8/18/22
- MBTA Communities Legislation
 - Summary of language, dated 9/12/22