



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA. M.C.
2023 FEB 22 AM 7:52

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2022-10-17

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

Members - Not Present: Tony D'Arezzo – Associate

Others Present:

Community Development Director Julie Mercier, Senior Planner Andrew MacNichol, Town Engineer Ryan Percival, Edward Batten, Chris Gregoris, Greg Smith, Chris Latham, Saverio Fulciniti, Jill Mayberry, Brad Latham, Ted Moore, Nathan Jang, Rob Paccione

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.

Special Permit & Sign Permit Application

46 Woburn Street, Wood End Dental

Business owner Mr. Nathan Jang and Mr. Edward Batten of Batten Bros. Signs were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Batten explained that two signs are proposed on the property for the Wood End Dentistry business. One is a non-illuminated wall sign that is aluminum with raised acrylic lettering. The other is a double-sided free-standing sign that is aluminum with vinyl lettering. Both signs will have white backgrounds and green letters. The free-standing sign will be located 20' from all property lines; the yard is large there is room to comply while still allowing the sign to be visible from both Linden Street and Woburn Street.

Ms. Meyer asked why the free-standing sign would be located closer to Linden Street than to the business entrance off of Woburn Street. Mr. Batten said he didn't think too much about placement and that they will flag out a few spots before finalizing the sign location. Ms. Meyer opined that it might be more appropriate closer to the entrance of the business.

Ms. Adrian stated that the design is nice and clean and appropriate for the location.

Mr. Manu Chopra opined that the sign is nice and legible.

Mr. MacNichol pointed out that without a 4th member present, the CPDC can only vote on the Certificate of Appropriateness and not the Special Permit. They agreed to keep the Special Permit hearing open in case a 4th member shows up later in the evening.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed wall sign at 46 Woburn Street. Ms. Adrian seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0-0.

Mr. Weston arrived at 7:55PM.

Ms. Meyer read the Special Permit Hearing Notice into the record.

The Commission reviewed the Draft Decision.

Ms. Meyer moved to close the public hearing on a Special Permit for the proposed free-standing sign at 46 Woburn Street. Ms. Adrian seconded and the motion was approved 4-0-0.

Ms. Meyer moved to approve the Special Permit for the free-standing sign at 46 Woburn Street. Ms. Adrian seconded and the motion was approved 4-0-0.

Public Meeting, 0 Auburn Street Pocket Park Discussion

Town Engineer Ryan Percival was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Percival showed the approved Site Plan for the property. He acknowledged that Town staff committed to a public process for the open area, and noted that the fence location has been shifted. He gave an update on construction for the water tank, noting that there has been a slight delay related to the rock/ledge removal.

Mr. Percival commented that staff are open to all suggestions for what this open/community space looks like – he reminded the Commission that in the past people had suggested trees and maybe a bench.

Ms. Mercier chimed in noting that this is just the beginning of the discussion, an opportunity to hear what residents of the area would like to see. She suggested that staff could take the feedback and then come back to CPDC with some options for how to proceed.

Mark Delaney, direct abutter, thanked Mr. Percival for being available and informative. He suggested that more will be known once the final fence location is known and once it is clear whether the electrical wires can be relocated underground. He said he is looking for something nice on the property to mitigate the impact of the project on the neighborhood. He noted that it is early in the process.

Manu Chopra, stated that he would like to see benches in the park as well as a nice playground for children, a water fountain and places for people to ride bikes and walk dogs.

Jeanne Bromante, 45 Auburn Street, agreed that benches and a small play structure would be nice. She noted that there are a ton of children in the neighborhood.

Ms. Clish said she is hearing that people seem to want a usable active space.

Mike Lacey, 9 Beacon Street, greeted Mr. Percival, and asked for a couple community garden beds, and maybe horseshoe pits, a bocce court or shuffle board. He asked for trees with orange and red leaves.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Pamela Goodale, corner of Parkview and Weston, asked about the fence and what was planned for it – whether it would always be a chain link industrial fence.

Mr. Percival noted that there was quite a bit of discussion about the fence. He said that it has to be see through because of the DEP's regulations for water facilities, but that it will match what is there and be replaced at the end. Ms. Goodale asked if there would be an internal fence blocking off the water tank from the rest of the site. Mr. Percival explained that the fence line will move and will separate the tank and cell carrier buildings from the abutting open space. There will be no fence around the open space area.

Mr. Percival said the Town is working hard to have the telephone poles, with electrical service, moved. He said that they are not Town-owned so coordination is needed. He noted that the poles and wires bisect the open space area, and that they would rather have the service undergrounded or more directly connected.

Ms. Clish recapped that people want an active place with plantings that change with the seasons. Ms. Meyer said there is appetite for more programmed space than passive space. A neighborhood gathering spot.

Mr. Percival said that tree planting is easy and can be done internally. He suggested that other uses may require more coordination – for example community gardens would need to be in an area where they will get appropriate sun.

Ms. Clish asked Mr. Percival what he sees as next steps.

Mr. Percival said he'll develop a planting list with the Tree Warden and explore areas for gardens, horseshoe pits, etc. on a conceptual level. He said he'll bring the ideas back to CPDC.

Mr. Weston asked whether people want buffer plantings, from the street or from the abutters. He noted that the space could be more inviting than just a flat grassy space. He commented that sometimes with parks there is a need to have shrubbery on the edge, but that might not be necessary since Auburn Street isn't a high-speed road. Mr. Percival suggested maybe planting shade trees on the site edges and keeping the inside more open.

Ryan Martinello, 10 Beacon Street, noted that he likes the idea of a park and also that he likes Mr. Lacey's ideas. He said no use should require more grading or jack hammering. He said he'd like the park to be open, and that the roads are a high school cut through. He asked for a yield sign or full stop sign to slow the traffic especially if it becomes a park with no fence. He also stated that fencing the entire park is not aesthetically pleasing but may be necessary depending on what type of play structure, if any, is erected.

Another neighbor said that it should not become a hangout for teenagers and that she does not want any more traffic. Mr. Weston noted that almost anywhere can become a hangout for teenagers, even a tot lot, whether it's appropriate or not.

Ms. Adrian suggested getting a garden club member involved for landscape suggestions. Mr. Percival noted that the Community Garden group is connected with staff as well.

Ms. Clish asked people to send additional comments to staff.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

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

Ms. Meyer read the request to continue the public hearing for a 40R Plan Review at 25 Haven Street, and the Extension of the 120-day timeframe for CPDC to make a Decision to December 1, 2022 into the record.

Ms. Clish noted that there is no CPDC meeting between November 7th and December 1st and asked if CPDC will be required to make a decision on November 7th. Ms. Mercier said she will follow up with the Applicant, and that CPDC will need to get another Extension of Time on or before November 7th.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to continue the public hearing for a 40R Plan Review at 25 Haven Street to Monday November 7, 2022 at 8:30PM. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Minor Site Plan Review **581-591 Main Street, Chris Gregoris**

Property owner Chris Gregoris was present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Gregoris said they are removing the building's concrete parapet and replacing it with brick.

Ms. Clish said she has noted that it's clear the parapet needs to be repaired or replaced. She commented that the façade length is a long way to have a flat parapet. She asked for something more decorative. Mr. Gregoris said he would be happy to review and will speak with the mason about concepts. He suggested they could lay some bricks at different angles, which probably would not add to the expense.

Mr. Weston agreed with Ms. Clish's comments that it should be more visually interesting. Ms. Clish asked for it to include more features from the surrounding area such as dentil molding. She asked CPDC if staff should administratively approve the design change or if the Applicant should come back.

Mr. Gregoris said that he doesn't want the project to be delayed because it needs to be structurally repaired due to safety concerns.

Ms. Virginia Adams, Reading Historical Commission, shared the Inventory sheets with the Commission showing the significance of the historical parapet. She said that the RHC has a lot of comments and requests. She noted that there are lots of epoxies and materials that can be used to maintain the architectural significance of the building.

Mr. Jon Barnes, Reading Historical Commission, noted that this is a significant historical structure in Town that is protected from demolition. He summarized the architectural significance of the parapet. He read excerpts from the Architectural Description in the Inventory, which notes the 4 concrete urns and dentil cornice. He noted that many other historical elements of the building have been removed over the years, and that the parapet is really the last major feature remaining. He opined that while it legitimately qualifies for Minor Site Plan Review with CPDC, the changes are not minor from a historical perspective.

Ms. Penny Flaherty, property owner, asked if the Town has a preservation fund to help restore the building. Ms. Mercier noted that the Town is not a CPA Town but that there is a Historical Preservation Trust Fund. There are parameters and limits on how the fund can be spent and that it is not up to staff.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Barnes agreed that there is a Historical Preservation Trust Fund that the Reading Historical Commission oversees. It has guidelines and does not have a lot of money in it. He said to his knowledge it has not been used for private property.

Ms. Clish asked if this application requires Reading Historical Commission review. Mr. Barnes said that generally full demolition requires a hearing with RHC, but that partial demolition is not always required to – it is at the discretion of the Building Commissioner, and depends on whether a demolition permit application is required for the work.

George Liakos, property owner, asked that the Application not be delayed any further.

Mr. Weston noted that the parapet has looked like it was going to fall down for many years, and that it's hard to believe it's urgent at this time. He said that the argument it needs to be fixed immediately is not compelling when you consider it will be a change to a long-standing historical structure.

Mr. Liakos rebutted that pieces have recently come down and that the side of the wall is leaning over with a support. He noted that the proposal is a short-term fix.

Ms. Clish said she is not ready to approve it without knowing whether it requires a demolition permit and whether it will go before RHC or not. She said she would like to explore other options with the RHC, look into the guidelines of the Trust Fund and whether funds can be used for a private project if there is public interest. She asked for more exploration of products to restore the historic style.

Ms. Meyer said she was originally under the impression that the RHC had approved it.

Mr. Gregoris said he could work with the architect to design something nicer, perhaps restyling the brick for the building. He said he is not sure whether the building is structurally sound enough to have concrete on top. He noted that many staff departments, including Building and Engineering, have signed off on the permit request. He said he hopes that delaying does not become an insurance liability or that the cost doesn't get out of control.

Mr. Weston clarified that no one is suggesting it be replaced with more concrete, but that there may be alternate products that are lighter and could work.

Ms. Clish asked them to coordinate with the RHC and come back to CPDC on November 7th. Mr. Barnes offered to coordinate with the applicant, and noted that the RHCs next meeting is on November 9th, but they could try to schedule another meeting sooner for this applicant.

Ms. Meyer moved to continue the Minor Site Plan Review for 581-591 Main Street to November 7th at 9:30PM. Ms. Adrian seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Minor Site Plan Review **625 Main Street, GSD Associates, LLC**

Project architect Greg Smith of GSD Associates, LLC, and property owner Carl Valeri were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Smith noted that the building is under scaffolding currently, and as it is being repaired more structural issues are being uncovered and they have discovered that the existing



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

balconies are not safe. The balcony structure has been condemned. He noted that there is a spiral staircase on the balcony which is very unsafe and doesn't extend all the way to the ground as an exit balcony should. He said in general, balconies have liability issues, especially on multi-family buildings. He explained the proposal is to install a series of handrail/guardrail Juliette balconies, add painted shutters, and clean up the building's front façade.

He noted that the building had a basement flooding issue recently and the owner had to replace the entire electrical system. This has raised project costs.

Mr. Weston opined that the electrical issues and balcony safety problems are too bad. He commented that it is an important building downtown and changes to it will have a dramatic impact. He commented that without the balconies, the building is super flat and boring and would never be approved as new construction today. He said it's problematic for such a flat building to be in such a visible location – it will dramatically change the aesthetic downtown. He asked for more visual relief on the building whether via projection over the Juliette balconies, or something better.

Ms. Clish expressed a similar sentiment. She asked if a smaller more usable balcony could be added instead of Juliette balconies, or if the building could be trimmed out more creatively. She asked about the white trim material.

Mr. Smith said the trim proposed is to be PVC so it won't decay. Ms. Clish expressed concern that it will look like shiny, white plastic. Mr. Smith offered to add more dimension to the trim.

Ms. Meyer said she thinks the existing balcony structure is obtrusive and is not upset to see it eliminated. She is more concerned with the loss of outdoor space for existing residents. She noted that this is one of the only properties downtown with reasonable rental prices and that she is ok with not adding a lot more steps/expense to this project.

Mr. Weston asked for something to be done that is relatively low cost and will break up the façade a bit more. He noted that the balconies likely do not comply with zoning and so once they come down, this is it – they may need a variance to be put back at a future date.

Ms. Clish asked what is proposed in terms of plantings, etc. once the balcony structure is removed. Mr. Valeri said he would like to revamp the landscape and dress up the façade a bit to enhance curb appeal. He said that the balconies were considered a second means of egress, and so without them additional fire-rated doors are required throughout the building.

Mr. Valeri asked the CPDC to give them direction so they can proceed. He mentioned further unexpected costs and delays that have come up. He said they have the Juliette balconies on site and need to install them as soon as the balcony structure comes down.

Mr. Weston said he has no problem approving demo and installation of the Juliette balconies and then reviewing additional plans later. The Commission asked staff for guidance on how to partially approve some things and condition others. Ms. Mercier suggested that they could condition the provision of façade design plans and landscaping plans to staff that can then be administratively approved.

The Commission reviewed and modified the Draft Decision.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Meyer moved to approve the Minor Site Plan Review Decision for 625 Main Street as conditioned. Ms. Adrian seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Plan Change to Approved 40R **531 Main Street, Chronicle 40R**

Property owner Saverio Fulciniti, contractor Peter Zanni, project architect Rob Paccione, and project attorney Christopher Latham were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Latham explained the proposal is to remove 22 windows from the south side of the proposed building, which is just 3 feet from the neighboring structure. He noted that the windows are not visible from the street, have no aesthetic value, and that they are not needed for egress. He stated that the windows provide no direct benefit to people who will be living in the final structure. He pointed out that two windows towards the front, which are visible from the street, will remain.

Mr. Latham explained that the cost of fire-rated windows has increased a lot due to inflation. In addition, he referred to a letter from the Building Commissioner noting potential safety concerns. Fire-rated windows are only fire-rated if the glass is not broken.

He clarified that there are no modifications proposed to the north, west or east elevations.

Ms. Adrian asked what kind of lighting will be in the hallways. Mr. Paccione said it will be artificial recessed down-lighting.

Mr. Weston pointed out that the changes make sense, as long as the abutting building is still there. He commented that many buildings have come down in recent years, and if the neighboring building comes down, the wall will be an enormous flat expanse. He said it is worrisome to approve that large of a blank wall. He suggested putting insets framing out bricked-in windows to continue the pattern, or something similar, so that the wall isn't entirely blank. He suggested that the upper level more critically needs something than the lower area. Ms. Clish agreed.

Mr. Latham mentioned that from an economic perspective the abutting property would likely be developed to the property line in the future. The cost of the property is too high to not utilize and maximize the space. Mr. Weston commented that will happen only if allowed. Mr. Paccione added that a future 2-story building would block the wall. He expressed concern with brick patterning looking artificial and worse.

Mr. Paccione showed sections demonstrating sight lines, and commented that the upper story really won't be visible. Mr. MacNichol showed renderings from when The Chronicle 40R first came to CPDC, which demonstrate that the top part of the wall will be visible from Main Street.

The Commission discussed where the Applicant should add fake window insets and all agreed that the lower level doesn't need them and the rear of the façade doesn't either. They agreed the first two bays toward the front should have them – which would total about five fake window insets. Mr. MacNichol suggested maybe the two projecting bays should have the fake window insets. The Applicant agreed to provide renderings of both as well as a perspective from Main Street, so that staff can select one and Administratively Approve the change.

The Commission reviewed the Design Guideline regarding blank facades and determined that with this slight design change, the façade will not be blank and no waiver will be



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

needed. Mr. Latham pointed out that there will be changes in massing, texture and plane as well.

The Commission also agreed that the proposed change can be considered a Minor Plan Change and that no public hearing is needed.

Ms. Meyer moved to approve the Minor Plan Change for The Chronicle 40R project at 531 Main Street. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Minor Amendment to Approved PUD-R Johnson Woods, Johnson Woods Realty Corp.

Property developer Ted Moore, project engineer Bill Bergeron and project attorney Brad Latham were present on behalf of the application.

Mr. Latham explained the proposal which includes:

1. Removal of 4 units from the site;
2. Increase in on-site off-street parking and on-street parking spaces;
3. Building 5 to be modified from duplex to 2 single-family units; and
4. Pre-Approved Building Envelopes for a little flexibility in building location.

Mr. Weston commented that he likes the idea of building envelopes. He asked about the plan showing Building 5A and 5B and noted that one of the driveways is coming off of Johnson Woods Drive, which may be on a slope. He asked if that will be a tough place for a driveway. Mr. Moore shared a plan showing topography and explained the design. Ms. Mercier and Mr. MacNichol commented that they never received that plan electronically. The plan is titled Overall Architectural Illustrative Site Plan.

Mr. Weston also noted that prior changes have run into trouble because they impact people who have already moved in. He asked about the plan showing the proximity of Building 62 to Building 61, and Mr. Moore said that Building 61 is no longer proposed. Mr. Weston chastised the Applicant for providing confusing information, and for showing new plans to the Commission at the meeting. Ms. Clish agreed. Mr. Moore came up to the table and showed Mr. Weston some information. Mr. Weston and Ms. Clish complained that it is unfair to not show things on the screen, for the benefit of the zoom audience and live audience.

Mr. Weston opined that yet another problem is that one plan shows building envelopes and the other plan shows building foundations, so they are not the same. Mr. Latham explained that the Application explains everything and is not ambiguous.

Mr. Weston asked about the footprint shown for Building 47, noting that the footprint is closer than the foundation originally approved. Mr. Moore explained that CPDC approved the change in May 2021.

Beth Mosier, Johnson Woods resident, said that they are desperately in need of additional parking on the site. She asked about Building 25 on the curve where Talbot Lane meets Taylor Drive – it looks like the proposal will remove two of the parking spaces for those units. Mr. Moore clarified that the parking spaces are not being removed and could be relocated as needed.

Brendan Gray, Johnson Woods Board of Trustees, explained that the Board unanimously approved the changes and that the homeowners at Johnson Woods are happy with the changes.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Thomas Callaghan, Chair of JW Board of Trustees, says he shares some of the concerns of the Commission, noted that the Trustees are in support of the proposal which includes more parking and more open space. The Board lends its support with the caveat that they are a bit disappointed with the process.

Bonnie Karoub, abutter to 5A and 5B, asked what the distance will be from what is proposed to where she lives at Building 4. Mr. Moore said it will be 18.3 feet, as shown on the Overall Architectural Illustrative Site Plan.

Mr. Weston asked for the building envelopes to be added to the Overall Architectural Illustrative Site Plan.

The Commission went through the Draft Decision.

Mr. Moore said the 14 off-street spaces will meet Town standards and the 8 on-street spaces will be designed similarly to other bump outs throughout the development.

Mr. Moore said that the building shown at the end of Talbot has not been proposed for a long time and will not be constructed.

Thomas Callaghan said the developer has assured the Board of Trustees that the footprints will not be expanded, but that the envelopes will just allow flexibility in location. He asked for clarification between the footprints and the envelopes, and for certainty that the buildings will not be made larger. Mr. Moore pushed back on this assertion and said he committed to building the same types and sizes of buildings he's been constructing for the past several years. Mr. Weston opined that he is not comfortable approving specific building footprints and square footages, but that he will approve building envelopes.

Ms. Mosier clarified that the concern is if the buildings get bigger there will be less open space on the site. She noted that the buildings at Johnson Woods have gotten larger over the years. Mr. Weston noted that in 15 years on CPDC and dealing with Johnson Woods, there has never been a concern with the buildings getting substantially larger. He commented that the proposals and discussions have been about configuration and type mostly.

Ms. Meyer moved to approve the Minor Amendment to the Johnson Woods PUD-R Special Permit as conditioned. Mr. Weston seconded and it was approved 4-0-0.

Other Business

Subsequent Town Meeting 2022, Article 6

Ms. Mercier informed the CPDC that they can vote on whether to support Article 6 at Subsequent Town Meeting in November 2022. The article is a proposed update to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund previously discussed at CPDC hearings.

Ms. Meyer made a motion that the CPDC vote to support and recommend Article 6 to Subsequent Town Meeting in November 2022. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Other Business

MBTA Communities Update

Ms. Mercier stated that final guidance on MBTA Communities legislation was released in August 2022. She attended an informative webinar on the new language. It was confirmed that Site Plan Review and 40R Plan Review are considered as-of-right processes. It was also confirmed that Reading is designated as a commuter rail community, reducing the number



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

of zoning capacity units to 1,493 units. She continued that affordable unit restrictions were included and limit to 10% of new zoning and to 20% of pre-existing zoning language. The Reading 40R Bylaw has requirements of 25% which will complicate the analysis of units.

Ms. Mercier stated that language cannot require more stringent energy efficiency or mixed-use. Because Reading's 40R required higher energy efficiency for density waivers it may not be problematic but more review is needed. All uses allowed in the District are by-right uses.

Ms. Mercier stated that new language allows for different sizing and locations of zoning district. Reading was found to need a 43-acre zone, 40% of which is required to be within ½ mile from the Reading Train Depot. The remaining required area can be split into different zones of different sizes across the Town.

A compliance model and tool for municipalities to input relevant data is being developed. Reading is one of nine communities selected for early action technical assistance and will be able to test the model to provide input. Questions remain on how under sized parcels count towards requirements.

Additional to the 40% of the zoned area being within a ½ mile from the train, 40% of Reading's unit capacity must also be zoned within the ½ mile radius. This results in 598 units needed to be zoned within a ½ mile from the train depot. Ms. Mercier stated she is exploring a few opportunities to comply with such.

Interim compliance has been granted to Reading. In order to remain in interim compliance Reading must submit an Action Plan by January 31, 2023. Interim compliance should keep the Town eligible for grant opportunities. The Action Plan or compliance must be put into place by December 2024. Ms. Mercier provided examples of recent grant awards that the Town has utilized and could be affected by MBTA Communities compliance.

Due to the complexity of Reading's 40R district being accredited or not the focus may shift to other areas of Town. Ms. Mercier provided data that presented the estimated shortfall of units from Reading's 40R district. The Compliance Model Tool will help determine if the 40R zone meets area requirements.

Ms. Mercier stated that the town's Gateway Smart Growth District may be an opportunity for compliance. The units per acre requirement is met but zoning definition of multi-family use in the district would need to be revised. The abutting and underlying Business-C may also provide opportunity for zoning compliance as 28 acres of land exists but other questions persist. Business-A zones allow multi-family development but under strict dimensional controls. The existing multi-family zones will be reviewed for compliance with density and other requirements. The Industrial Zoned parcels in Town could be considered but residents of the recent Economic Development Forum expressed little interest in housing for that area.

Ms. Meyer asked if pre-approved densities are accounted for. Ms. Mercier replied that only projects that were approved by-right, meet 15 units per acre and don't exceed the affordability requirements would count towards unit requirements.

Mr. Weston asked the likelihood of submitting an Action Plan by end of January 2023 if the Compliance Tool is not yet released. Ms. Clish asked how specific the Action Plan is required to be. Ms. Mercier replied that more is to be learned at upcoming trainings. Ms. Meyer asked if the deadline dates are changeable. Ms. Mercier replied they may be as they changed from the initial draft guidance.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Mercier asked if CPDC preferred to look for immediate compliance or if focus should be directed to real large-scale zoning changes. Mr. Weston recommended first looking how to comply with the requirements of ½ mile from the train depot. If there is not a path to immediate compliance in the area it will be difficult as it is unlikely the Town will allow for increased density when recent 40R Bylaw changes limited such. Mr. Weston expressed disappointment that affordability restrictions may reduce Reading's existing unit compliance count. Ms. Meyer agreed and stated there is a shift in the market to not prohibit development in lieu of beneficial affordable development. Ms. Clish also agreed as property values near transit are so high that it pushes affordable units out of the area desired. Ms. Mercier stated that language also restricts to affordability to 80% AMI so developments of 50% AMI cannot be considered.

Other Business

Symonds Way Exploratory Committee

Ms. Mercier provided an update on the upcoming Symonds Way Exploratory Committee being formed by the Reading Select Board. An initial meeting will be held in December for the group to decide future meeting dates. The CPDC has been requested to elect a member to the committee.

Mr. Weston asked if additional committees are being formed for other CPDC interested projects. Ms. Mercier stated she is not aware of any at this time.

Ms. Meyer made a motion to nominate Heather Clish to the Symonds Way Exploratory Committee (SWEC). Mr. Weston seconded and it was approved 4-0-0.

Other Business

Meeting Minutes

3/14/22

Ms. Meyer made a motion to approve the CPDC Meeting Minutes of 3/14/22. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

4/11/22

The Board elected to review the April 2022 meeting minutes at a future meeting date due to the late time of evening.

Adjournment

Ms. Adrian made a motion to adjourn at 12:02 AM. Ms. Meyer seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- CPDC Agenda 10/17/22
- CPDC Draft Meeting Minutes of 3/14/22 and 4/11/22
- Special Permit and Sign Permit, 46 Woburn Street
 - Sign Renderings and Specifications, prepared by Batten Bro Signs, dated 9/9/22
 - Ground Sign Location and Setbacks
 - Site Aerial Image
 - Draft Decision, dated 10/17/22
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness, dated 10/17/22
- Public Meeting, 0 Auburn Street
 - Approved site plans, dated 4/12/22
- 40R Plan Review, 25 Haven Street
 - Continuance Request to 11/7/22
- Minor Site Plan Review, 581-591 Main Street



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

- Project Summary, received 9/12/22
- Existing and Proposed elevations, received 9/12/22
- Pedestrian Access and Scaffolding Plan, received 9/12/22
- Draft Decision, dated 10/17/22
- Minor Site Plan Review, 625 Main Street
 - Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans, dated 6/28/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 10/17/22
- 40R Plan Change Review, 531 Main Street
 - Project Summary, dated 10/4/22
 - Existing and Proposed Elevation Comparison Sheets, dated 7/1/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 10/17/22
- Minor Amendment to Approved PUD-R, Johnson Woods
 - Project Summary, dated 9/20/22
 - Site Key Plan, received 9/20/22
 - Proposed Building Tolerances, received 9/20/22
 - Draft Decision, dated 10/17/22