



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
READING, MA.  
RK  
2023 MAY 17 AM 8:53

### Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

#### Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2023-03-13

Time: 7:30 PM

Building: Town Hall

Location: Hybrid Meeting – Zoom and Select Board Meeting Room

Address: 16 Lowell Street

Session: Open Session

Purpose: Hybrid Meeting

Version: Final

Attendees: Members: Heather Clish, Chair; John Weston, Mark Wetzel, Tony D'Arezzo – Associate, Pamela Adrian (remote)

**Members - Not Present:** None

#### **Others Present:**

Community Development Director Andrew MacNichol, Robert Galvin, Bob Judge, Maryjane Judge, Peter Seibold, Andrew Pandolph, Joe McDonagh, Bill Schneider, Kris Asgeirsson, Eddie Buckley, Joey Fonseca, Kevin Kelly, Maureen McHugh, Gina Buckley, Rachel Poulin, Joe Dasilva, Randy Miron, Bruce Johnson, Mark Delaney, Jackie McCarthy, Angelo Salamone, Freddie Murphy, Phil Christiansen, Susan Caram, Carolyn Whiting, Mary Joyce, Trish Marfione

**Minutes Respectfully Submitted By:** Mary Benedetto

---

### Topics of Discussion:

#### **MEETING HELD IN THE SELECT BOARD ROOM AND REMOTELY VIA ZOOM**

Ms. Clish called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM.

Mr. MacNichol gave an overview of the hybrid meeting set up and procedures.

#### **Public Hearing, Preliminary Subdivision Application** **0 Annette Lane, Peter Seibold**

Mr. D'Arezzo read the notice into the record.

Mr. Robert Galvin presented on behalf of Peter Seibold. The application is for a single-lot subdivision of a leftover lot from when the subdivision was designed in 1985. He noted that the town is an abutter to the north of the property with a property taken through tax foreclosure. Mr. Andrew Pandolph then presented as he is the land surveyor for the project. It is currently a wooded lot, with some wetlands on both the northern and southern portions and the highest portion in the middle of the lot. The lot currently conforms to all S-20 requirements with the exception of frontage as it only has 3 feet currently. They propose a 1 lot subdivision in order to get the required frontage, and by extending Annette Lane to Applegate Lane. They propose a 145" long elevated roadway over the wetland area in the southern portion of the lots. However, instead actually building the elevated footbridge they're proposing extending a 30 ft portion of Annette Lane that would give access to a 19' wide driveway that would provide access to the house. There are things to consider for both options—connecting the roads or just the small 30' addition. Water/sewer at the house would be connected to the existing service mains in the southern portion of the lots. The



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

project would also involve putting in a utility pole on the west side of driveway to connect electric and telecom. There also is an existing hydrant in the middle of the proposed driveway, so that would be relocated to the opposite side.

Mr. Galvin then took over the presentation to discuss the list of waivers requested. He discussed that most of the waivers are regarding a typical subdivision, which is not what is being proposed at the site. He detailed the list of waivers requested including some for drainage, roadways, traffic impact study, granite curbing, installation of granite monuments, and the environmental impact report. He noted they will have to file with the Conservation Commission, but are outside all the resource areas and buffer zones. He pointed out that it is a large lot for the neighborhood and they are willing to build the extension of the road. Nothing they are proposing will cause undue hard to any abutters other than the fact that people have become accustomed over the years to seeing nothing on the lot. He discussed that Peter Seibold is an experienced developer and that they intend to leave as much of the lot undisturbed as they can.

There was then a meeting disturbance from the Zoom participants and a recess was called while the participants were removed from the meeting. The meeting was then resumed and Mr. MacNichol repeated the hybrid meeting set up procedures.

Mr. Galvin finished up his comments by reiterating they believe it is an appropriate use for the land.

Ms. Adrian stated she believed the large number of waivers need to be voted on individually. They Commission discussed that they could vote on them as a whole unless a member takes issue with individual ones. Ms. Adrian stated she believes they still need test borings. She was fine with the rest of the waivers.

Mr. Weston asked to review the process and what their role is and what is under CPDC purview in the process. Mr. MacNichol stated that the purview of CPDC is the right of way, design, requirements, and confirming that the lot meets those requirements. Mr. MacNichol clarified that the Preliminary Plan is not a buildable plan, the later Definitive Plan if approved is what is used for plan endorsement. So CPDC is being asked to consider the project as a concept along with its requested waivers. Mr. Weston questioned if the CPDC is being asked to approve instead of or in conjunction with the Board of Health. Mr. MacNichol clarified that the Board of Health receives a copy when the proposal doesn't include a sewer connection and is proposed septic instead, he then went into further technical details on the Board of Health's role.

Mr. Weston discussed that because this project fits the requirements the owner has a right to subdivide. That being said, the overarching development scheme concerns are for safety. While the current two options are either for a cut through or remaining as a dead end, Mr. Weston pointed out that in current standard proof designs Annette Lane would actually have a cul-de-sac at the end of it. He has concerns about having a house at the end of a dead end and the possibility of having fire trucks there. He stated they really want the topography of the surrounding properties and they'll have to do it for Conservation anyway. Mr. Weston is not interested in giving a waiver on curbing, especially where it may have an impact on drainage, and he felt the same way about bituminous concrete.

Mr. Pandolph responded that there is space there to fit a cul-de-sac and they could do that if that is preferred. He also noted that the Fire Department was present at the DRT meeting and their only concern at that time was that the driveway would be wide enough and strong enough for a ladder truck to go up the driveway, which they can absolutely do. The reason



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

they requested the waiver on granite curbing is only because there isn't granite curbing on Annette Lane now.

Mr. Weston asked if having a cul-de-sac would change the subdivision and Mr. Pandolph confirmed that it would slightly, the lot lines would change, but overall it would be the same.

Ms. Clish asked how the Fire Department would get a ladder truck back out, would it just reverse back down? Mr. Pandolph said yes, they would reverse. And stated that the Fire Department was fine with the relocation of the fire hydrant.

Mr. Wetzel asked for detail about Annette Lane. He asked if it was an accepted street and Mr. Pandolph confirmed that it was, although there are no granite curbs. Mr. Wetzel asked if there would be an opportunity or possibility to put a walking path through to Applegate and Mr. Pandolph confirmed it could be a slightly elevated boardwalk, to provide a public benefit and pass through for people.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if Applegate was a public way and Mr. Pandolph confirmed it was. There was a discussion clarifying that the foot bridge just refers to a elevated roadway and that their preferred option is not to build the road, just to build the extension.

They opened it up for public comment.

Mr. Bob Judge, a resident at 10 Annette Lane discussed the current natural state of the property and the fact that it is a wetland. He stated he felt that if there was a built-up bridge it could feel like a bayou. He could see extending it some feet to add on the house, but doing a built-up roadway would be totally different feeling. He did have concerns about if they end up building up the front part of the lot which is a wetland, how that will affect the flow of water in the area, on his property, and in neighbors' basements. He can't imagine where the cul-de-sac would be, because the land really drops off at the end of the road. Mr. Weston clarified that though the applicant has to prove that they could build a roadway, they would prefer not to, they just want to build the 30 ft roadway. Ms. Clish asked Staff at what point the issue would go to the Conservation Commission to decide if they could build a road there and Mr. MacNichol explained that on a Definitive application it would go concurrently to CPDC and the Conservation Commission. Mr. Weston agreed that the issues of drainage would be very important to the Definitive plan approval.

Mr. Bill Schneider from 27 Applegate Lane spoke with great concerns about the possibility of the bridge and hoped the road bridge would not be built. He shared Mr. Judge's concerns about water and water flow in the area, stating that it is of concern to the residents now even before changing the topography.

Mr. Kris Asgeirsson from 70 Martin Road spoke and shared the prior residents' concerns about water runoff and agreed asking for the topographic lines of the surrounding parcels would clarify the discussion. He stated that all the neighbors live at the top of a swamp and a small change in that swampy area could be detrimental to all the surrounding neighbors. Ms. Clish agreed.

Mr. Joe McDonagh from 47 Deborah Drive asked questions about the entire process of what will happen. He asked if an environmental assessment is waived, how does that interact with Conservation? Mr. Pandolph stated that with Conservation they would file a full notice of intent to build the house which includes things like stormwater runoff, how they're going to handle and mitigate any changes from the construction and Engineering and that Conservation won't allow any impacts to other properties. Mr. McDonagh asked to clarify



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

then why the applicant was requesting to waive the environmental assessment? The Commission members discussed that an environmental assessment is a lot larger than just the water issues and much more detailed and, on a site this small (for a subdivision) a full environmental assessment might not be needed, and even if it is waived that there will be many opportunities to discuss water issues even without it. Mr. McDonagh stressed that the drainage easement exists there for a reason which is that there are already water issues.

The Commission members stressed that this is a Preliminary plan and process and Mr. Schneider said that even so, the neighbors want to be clear that they have concerns.

Mr. Galvin responded that they understand everyone's concerns and have no intention of negatively impacting the neighbors. He brought up Google Earth to point out that they intend to leave the majority of the vegetation in the site there as they will be required to because of the wetland area. He also stated that it seems unlikely that a fire truck would ever go down the driveway, primarily police cars or an ambulance in terms of emergency access. They're also not opposed to putting in a fire suppression system.

Ms. Clish indicated that they would be defaulting to whatever the advice was from the Fire Department.

Ms. Maryjane Judge asked how many feet buildings needed to be from vernal pools, given that there are vernal pools in the area—there are wood frogs. Ms. Clish indicated that would be a question for Conservation. Mr. Galvin stated that if there were vernal pools they would need to be 100 ft away from it, but that there are no certified or suspected vernal pools on the property. Mr. Wetzel clarified for Ms. Judge that the lines on the plan that are 25 ft and 35 ft wetland buffers that are protecting the wetland areas.

Mr. Eddie Buckley from 62 Martin Rd spoke from the Zoom, he had bought on the road because it was a dead-end drive and now it isn't going to be. He stated that he is a firefighter and he thought that it was bad to have a house where there may be no way to fit a firetruck or two firetrucks down the driveway.

Mr. Pandolph again reiterated that they intend to build the driveway so a ladder truck can go out to the house, as based on the discussion in the DRT. Mr. Buckley reiterated his points about safety.

Ms. Clish asked the Commission members how they wanted to proceed. Mr. D'Arezzo stated they could vote on the waivers now. Mr. Weston asked about cul-de-sac vs. straight through and he would like to see and understand from Town Council what the difference in implication is from those two options. Ms. Clish asked if he wanted to wait to have that before voting on the waivers and Mr. Weston said that it would change his mind about the plan itself, probably not the waivers.

Mr. Judge clarified for them the difference in the end of Deborah Drive and Annette Lane. Mr. Weston stated their discussion was in that the end of Deborah Drive was laid out as a paper street so you could build a through street but instead was a cul-de-sac. Another resident in the meeting agreed that this was the situation with Deborah Drive. Mr. Pandolph stated that 54 Deborah Drive had a very similar situation and they got a variance for their frontage.

Ms. Clish stated then that they could go through the waivers one by one but Mr. D'Arezzo stated he would prefer to vote on the application and waiver requests together and Ms. Adrian and Mr. Weston agreed. Mr. Galvin stated that based on the discussion they would probably withdraw a few of their waivers and send over a revised list of waivers.



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. MacNichol summarized that he would try to get a summary memo from the fire chief, look for revised waivers from Mr. Galvin, and that they would like a trail or boardwalk proposal between the two roads. The Commission members discussed that the boardwalk would be for people and not for cars. Mr. Judge stated that it used to be a walk and that at some point it was blocked off and Ms. Clish hypothesized that perhaps it was related to the sewer easement.

***Ms. Adrian made a motion to continue the Preliminary Subdivision Application for 0 Annette Lane to April 10, 2023 at 7:30pm. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.***

### **Public Hearing, Preliminary Subdivision Application 45 Beacon Street, Angelo Salamone**

Mr. D'Arezzo read the public notice into the record.

Mr. Salamone joined from Zoom but his engineer was not on, so the Commission decided to move on to the next item of business and come back to the 45 Beacon St agenda item later in the meeting.

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

Mr. Weston read the request for a continuance of the public hearing, submitted by the Applicant, into the record.

***Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for 40R Plan Review at 25 Haven Street to Monday April 10, 2023 at 9pm. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.***

### **Public Hearing, Site Plan Review 431 Main Street, Chase Bank LLC**

Mr. D'Arezzo noted to Ms. Clish that he had submitted the 23B form documenting his relationship with the VP of real estate at Chase Bank. He stated that relationship has no monetary value whatsoever, he is simply an old friend from high school. He asked if anyone had any issue with him being part of the meeting or if he should recuse himself and no one on the Commission had any objections. Mr. D'Arezzo read the public notice into the record.

Mr. Joey Fonseca with Bohler Engineering was on Zoom, presenting on behalf of Chase Bank. He went through an overview of the location, that the site consists of two lots, one of which is zoned business and a second back parcel that is zoned residential and is currently used for car storage. The proposal fits within the existing gas station footprint. They covered in detail the existing conditions of the gas station, drainage, greenspace, and traffic flow. He then covered their proposals for site layout, landscaping, drainage, lighting, traffic flow, etc. He stated they did have comments from the DRT and can address any of those comments here as well. He then turned it over to their traffic team, Ms. Maureen McHugh, associate at McMahan who had prepared a traffic impact study for the proposal. They examined the current site, the intersection, and proposed use following MassDOT guidelines. She brought up that there was was a prior study from MassDOT with recommendations to reconfigure the driveways near the intersection to be directional—to control the left turn out. They found that existing site trips exceed the proposed use as a bank.



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Fonseca then handed it over to Mr. Kevin Kelly from Core States group to go over the architectural drawings. He walked the Commission through the materials, elevations, and interior layout. Ms. Adrian asked if there would be lockboxes and where the vault would be. Mr. Kelly indicated where the cash room was on the layout and where cash would be stored. Ms. Adrian asked if there was planning to be an exterior drive-thru and they confirmed there would not be a drive-thru. Ms. Adrian asked where the managers offices would be and they explained which rooms in the design are for offices (labeled PCS) and which are conference rooms.

Mr. Weston asked in the floor plan about a future ATM location and wanted to know what the implications of that would be on the outside. Mr. Fonseca clarified that they don't plan to have a drive-thru ATM. Mr. Wetzel asked about the North elevation and that moving the location of the building to the front of the lot will be a big change in terms of openness and he asked if it could have more of an urban storefront feel and that just having a big wall of windows isn't as welcoming. Mr. Kelly indicated he could take that back to Chase to discuss. He also stated that they are still putting together the signage so that could change the feeling. Mr. Weston clarified that though from Chase's perspective it is the back of the building, from the street it is in fact the front of the building and the Commission members discussed ways it could feel more like a storefront. Mr. Kelly stated that all the storefronts do have sunshades going out to shade them. He stated that they could add architectural elements to make them stand out a bit more and Ms. Adrian stated that would help.

There were more outbursts from Zoom and staff had to temporarily put everyone on Zoom back in the waiting room before bringing the presenters and Pam back in.

Mr. Weston stated that the materials read as very Chase Bank and were fine but that he agreed with Mr. Wetzel that they just want to make sure it is thoughtful, with the landscaping and overall design. Ms. Clish agreed that she would like to make sure the side facing the streets don't look like a back.

Ms. Clish asked about pedestrian safety and the walkable nature of the drives and how pedestrians will be accommodated and welcomed there. Mr. Fonseca went over the current design. Ms. Clish asked for more clarification about those walking down the sidewalk, not heading into the bank. Mr. Fonseca stated they had received comments from the DRT about the island just being striped instead of being mountable and raised and that they could stripe the sidewalk across as well.

Mr. Weston stated that they do not want just paint as the islands, they want to see the right in, right out at the driveway. But they don't want to see a granite curb because of the difficulty for pedestrians, but they do want something that you don't want to drive over. The proposal also needs to be good for pedestrians and ADA accessible. Ms. Clish and Mr. Wetzel agreed with Mr. Weston and cited examples of kids on their bikes going down to McDonald's. Mr. Fonseca said he understood and would come back with a proposal.

Mr. Weston asked about the sign package and noted that he would strongly encourage instead of the free-standing sign to put in a monument sign, ground mounted. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if it is in Business B and Mr. MacNichol confirmed that it is and they discussed that there is currently a free-standing sign from the gas station usage and that they could keep it but it would not be preferred by staff. Mr. D'Arezzo also noted they were proposing three signs even though they are only allowed two. Mr. Weston did not like the reuse of the free-standing sign.

Mr. Wetzel asked about any other comments from the DRT and Mr. MacNichol indicated that there were comments that staff requested onsite treatment and discharge of drainage



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

onsite so that they would revise that. Mr. Fonseca confirmed that they intend to address them.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the traffic study was done including multi-family development nearby and Ms. McHugh confirmed they had consulted with planning and engineering to include the nearby sites already known to be under development as well as their traffic studies of trip generation to include the most up-to-date information in the study.

Mr. D'Arezzo inquired that in other gas station conversions in town the remediation was handled by the gas station company. Given that this is an independent operator, who will be responsible for the remediation? Mr. Fonseca stated that he did not know the answer off the top of his head, but would get the answer and get back to them.

Mr. Weston asked out of curiosity if traffic generation trips have been going down to banks because of online and mobile banking. Ms. McHugh confirmed that online banking has been making big changes to sites with ATMs and queuing and the ITE data is a bit out of date.

Ms. Adrian commented that the traffic study was very complete and concise and was pleased since it was the best she has seen since joining the board.

They then opened it up for public comment.

Mr. Fadi Murphy(?) who lived at 90 Northgate Rd and has been in Reading since 1997. He stated that he doesn't think we need more banks in Reading. With the town growing people need places to get gas and fix their cars more than they need banking. He believes the building is too close to the corner of the lot. He also stated there is a creek running behind the building and Commission members asked for clarification about exactly where the creek was and they discussed its location. Mr. MacNichol indicated that Conservation wasn't a part of the DRT, although it was noted that there is a buffer in the residential lot so more detail on grading in that lot will be important for conservation.

Mr. Bruce Johnson from 166 Washington St asked about the residential lot and how that will be maintained and what the access to the property will be. Are there any plans for it to be developed or sold off at any point? Mr. Fonseca went over the current landscaping plan as proposed, but that they don't have any other information to share beyond the current grass parcel. Any future plans for the lot would be decided by Chase. He also stated that they had been in discussion with Chuck and Conservation and that the buffer area is in the rear of the residential lot and they don't plan to do any work in that area.

Mr. Weston inquired as to why the residential lot is included in the proposal if only landscaping is being proposed. Mr. Fonseca indicated that both parcels were bought by Chase, it is just that they are locating the bank on the business portion. Ms. Clish stated that the maintenance of the lot is of concern, that it is well-kept.

Mr. Elias spoke from Zoom with his concerns that the building is too close to the sidewalk and corner given the other development downtown. He stated he would prefer the corner to remain more open.

Ms. Clish asked them to confirm if the sign package would be included in the revisions coming back to them and Mr. Fonseca confirmed he would try to include that in the revisions. Ms. Clish stated that they want the proposal to still include right turn directional islands but also a good pedestrian environment. They also want some work done to the façade on Washington St and they want a human scale to the building. Mr. MacNichol



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

indicated the other point was who was responsible for the environmental cleanup of the gas station.

***Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for Site Plan Review 431 Main Street to Monday April 10, 2023 at 8pm. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.***

The Commission then inquired if the applicant for 45 Beacon St was available in the Zoom and Angelo Salamone and Phil Christiansen were not yet available. They decided to move on to other business and then come back to the 45 Beacon Preliminary Subdivision Application.

### **Other Business**

Request for reduction of surety and to issue the certificate of completion for the Coakley Way subdivision. Staff was asking for the project to be entirely released. Everything is built and as-builts provided and Engineering has signed-off. Mr. MacNichol stated that they have completed everything and from staff perspective they are good to issue the Certificate of Completion.

***Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to accept the Form M Reduction of Surety to \$0 and the Form O Certificate for the Coakley Way subdivision. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.***

Phil Christiansen and Angelo Salamone finally joined the Zoom and the Commission switched back to their agenda item.

### **Public Hearing, Preliminary Subdivision Application 45 Beacon Street, Angelo Salamone**

Ms. Clish officially opened the public hearing and Mr. D'Arezzo read the notice back into the record. Mr. MacNichol added a correction to the notice that this is a 3-lot subdivision, it is a net of 2 buildable lots and he will ask they correct that going forward on any definitive plan.

Mr. Angelo Salamone started by asking the Commission members if they knew the history of the site. Ms. Clish indicated that they Commission received a background memo from Town Counsel. Mr. MacNichol gave a quick background of the site that it was previously approved in the mid-2000s as a 40B under a comprehensive permit through the Zoning Board of Appeals as a 10-unit development. Subsequently through filing for permit fees town staff at the time felt their time had expired, but the owners appealed it to receive an extension. Several other extensions were granted and some site work had begun but town staff felt it wasn't enough to qualify that the permit should continue, which was also appealed and it is still in ongoing litigation through the Housing Appeals Committee. Out of those discussions came an alternative for this subdivision which the owner could find desirable in lieu of the 40B.

Ms. Clish clarified that what is before the Commission today is what is included on the subdivision application.

Mr. Salamone said that this subdivision proposal is a welcome alternative and they feel will be a better fit for the neighborhood. Mr. Salamone began discussing the settlement and Mr. Wetzel questioned what he meant by settlement and Ms. Clish tried to refocus the conversation onto just the subdivision application before them now, not on the other case. Mr. Wetzel asked that if they are making a decision that impacts the settlement than they should be having Town Counsel advise them and Mr. Weston and Ms. Clish clarified that what they are looking at with the preliminary application is not related to any settlement.





## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

While Town Counsel provided a background memo, the preliminary application is separate from that settlement. Mr. MacNichol stated that all comments should be focused solely on the merits of this application.

Mr. Phil Christiansen then took over the presentation and started going through the details. There is an existing house that is a part of the proposal, and then the development of two new lots. Based on the condition of Beacon St. and the site they came before them with a Preliminary Plan to request various waivers before they get any further into the process in order to help with their plan development. One of the waivers is for the width of the roadway as the roadway is currently 40' and subdivisions require 60' so they are requesting to continue to current road width at Beacon St. Additionally, the area is very steep and they cannot reasonably meet the road grade requirements without extreme costs given the maximum 2% grade coming into a street and that they have to come in at a negative slope, since that can't really work on the property. They are also requesting that the roadway be revised down to 20' when connecting into the public road. Subdivision rules also required a cul-de-sac, and they are proposing a turnaround instead. Subdivision rules also call for an island within the cul-de-sac, which public safety prefers not to have, so requesting a waiver on that as well. If they are required to build the cul-de-sac it would require an additional 10' grade change. They are also requesting the waiver of the granite curbs and sidewalks.

Ms. Clish and Mr. Weston brought up that the site plan impacts the waivers and vice versa so they started discussing the waivers and site plan. Mr. Weston brought up that they usually never waive the right of way being 60 ft, but they usually allow a waiver to have the pavement be reduced.

Mr. Christiansen said that the current road is only 40ft and Mr. Weston indicated that the Commission was not inclined to just continue things that were done in the past and they don't have to include those in the future. Mr. Christiansen brought up that if they were to extend the roadway to 60ft then the house currently on the lot won't meet setback requirements because of the new width of the roadway. Ms. Clish stated that these are all things to consider. That the width of the right of way should be 60ft, and that if there isn't space for the right of way and the homes then that should be noted.

Mr. Weston discussed with other Commission members that when considering if a parcel should be subdivided they consider layout ability. That they need to prove they have the ability to meet the guidelines. Now, once they have proven that the site could meet the requirements, then later the Commission can agree to accept waivers and reduce them down to what makes sense on the site.

Mr. MacNichol brought up that when a right-of-way exists, they prefer extending that right-of-way at its pre-existing width, though the cul-de-sac would maintain a 60ft width. Ms. Clish said that at this point she is considering does the subdivision meet what the Town requires and then later accepting waivers to fit the lot better. Mr. Christiansen said that he has done subdivisions with a road of 24' and Mr. Weston clarified that this isn't for the right-of-way but for the pavement. Ms. Clish stated that then on the proof of concept plan they would want to see if everything can fit. Mr. MacNichol stated that for this application they put both the proof plan and concept plan on the same plan, so there is a lot of information on it. Mr. Weston stated that on this plan they show a 40 ft wide roadway plus the 60 ft cul-de-sac. Mr. Weston said that from his perspective then he thinks it meets the criteria of the road and frontage as long as they are okay with the 40 ft right-of-way.

Mr. Christiansen stated that one of the biggest issues for them is in trying to fit a paved cul-de-sac on the site and brought up that though the subdivision regulations require an island that public safety prefers them without. Mr. Weston confirmed that in his 15 years on the board they have never approved one with an island in it. Mr. Christiansen pointed out that



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

in the proposed option there is a wall at the end of the turn-around because the grade immediately drops about 10 feet and so the cul-de-sac would be a big challenge for them.

Mr. MacNichol indicated that at a minimum they would be asking for a 45 ft minimum paved cul-de-sac or a bulb ending, but that they could do a waiver to that. Mr. Wetzel brought up the fire department wants a cul-de-sac and that if they weren't going to do a cul-de-sac they would need to meet their needs and the rest of the Commission discussed and agreed that they wanted to do whatever the Fire Department needed and that there was a memo from the Fire Dept included in their information. The Fire Captain confirmed the 24-ft roadway was fine, but that they preferred a cul-de-sac and for it to be 60 ft radius. Ms. Clish said that though they could talk about the merits of the T shaped turn around that if the Fire Department is opposed to the turnaround that she would not be voting for it. Mr. Christiansen brought up the diameter vs. the paved area and that the regulation is a 45 ft paved road and the 60ft accommodates sidewalks and the Commission agreed. Mr. Christiansen suggested that if the cul-de-sac was brought towards the existing street, that would help solve some of their grade issues on the back of the lot. The Commission members discussed if sidewalks are necessary and they generally agreed that they are not. They stated that they didn't necessarily see an issue with moving the cul-de-sac forward and having it off center. Mr. Wetzel stated that the proposed T turnaround doesn't work for public safety or snow or any of the reasons they usually consider whereas an off-center cul-de-sac would be less of a problem across all those issues. Mr. Wetzel asked if on the north side that is a retaining wall or drainage and Mr. Christiansen clarified that it is a retaining wall and there is a 14 ft drop from that wall to the far end of the cul-de-sac. He went over some details about how dramatic the slope is in that area.

Ms. Clish stated that they were unlikely to approve the waiver for the cul-de-sac and Mr. Salamone asked and pointed out that there is another right of way that goes out to Main St but that is unpaved and could be used for emergency vehicle access and asked that if it was done in gravel and plowed and maintained if that would work. Ms. Clish asked for clarification on which right of way he was discussing and they discussed. Ms. Clish then indicated that based on the memo from the Fire Department they would not be inclined to consider that appropriate and that the Commission goes by what the Fire Department states. Mr. D'Arezzo also stated that they would need to see proof that they have the right of way on that thoroughway. Mr. Salamone stated that it exists and can be used but the Commission members stated that they would need further proof before agreeing to that. Mr. Christiansen summarized that basically the Commission will sign off on what the Fire Department states is appropriate and Mr. Weston said yes, but that a different manner of ingress and egress besides for emergency access that introduces other points of discussion so that could be a new conversation.

Ms. Clish summarized that yes, the Fire Dept. needs to agree that it will work for them, but if it is something other than what has already been proposed, then they will need to consider the other proposal and impacts.

Mr. Christiansen asked about requiring sidewalks and the Commission indicated that they probably would not require sidewalks but for the layout to include room for a sidewalk and Mr. Wetzel pointed out that Beacon doesn't currently have sidewalks.

Mr. Weston asked staff about granite curbing and Mr. MacNichol confirmed that it is typically required, especially where it is being used to direct water for drainage. Mr. Wetzel asked for some profiles on the plans so there would be more detail to look at. Mr. Christiansen stated that this was mostly because they needed to put a plan together to come before CPDC and get input, but that they were mostly looking for input at this time.



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Christiansen indicated that the stormwater management plan and everything else will be coming later as they make the plans definitive. He then asked if the application fees could be waived given all the legal costs Angelo had faced so far and Ms. Clish stated that she was disinclined to waive the fees if it is seen in any way as being related to the other case and the other Commission members and staff agreed that it should be separated.

Mr. Weston reviewed all of the requirements for a 3-lot subdivision and that everything else proposed seems to meet the requirements and so the waivers are mostly about the street layout and engineering design of the road and Mr. Christiansen confirmed that to be true.

Mr. Salamone brought up that the existing road Beacon St is a private way and they would like it to stay that way and Mr. MacNichol stated that they would just need to note on the plan that it is their intention to keep it a private road. Mr. Wetzel asked to clarify that where there are currently houses in not a public way, and Mr. Salamone confirmed it is currently a private way.

Ms. Clish then opened it up for public comment.

Ms. Mary Joyce at 890 Main St spoke and inquired as to why the retaining wall didn't go to the end of the property and she was inquiring as to it based on concerns about runoff. Ms. Joyce wanted to clarify to the Commission that Mr. Salamone has the use of the unpaved right-of-way but he doesn't own it. She wanted to speak on the 40B and prior experiences and Mr. MacNichol clarified that there was a prior variance approval allowing the house to be developed as long as it was only one home, but that variance did not restrict the ability to further subdivide the lot, just to keep the lot as a single-family home. Ms. Joyce clarified that she has other history but that she could provide it to Mr. MacNichol via email.

Mr. Mark Delaney spoke on Zoom and stated that the project presents a lot of issues and brought up that the existing house is operating as a rental and he thinks it is more than single-family as he says it is not unusual for 6 or 7 cars to be parked at the house. And he wants to confirm if the new houses will actually be single-family or if they will be rentals as well and he is worried about the increase in traffic and what it might do for the kids in the neighborhood.

Ms. Clish asked Mr. Salamone to confirm that it is a single-family home and he confirmed that it meets single-family code.

Mr. MacNichol stated that someone on the Zoom listed as Jamie's iphone chatted him to confirm that everything Mr. Mark Delaney had said was true.

Ms. Carolyn Whiting from 17 Chestnut Road spoke about her concerns of potential runoff going downhill towards the other existing houses down the Oakland road side. She said that Susan Caram(?) was on and that she would be concerned about her property getting runoff from the new proposal.

Mr. Salamone wanted to respond to the stormwater and stated that there is no drainage on Beacon St and that currently near the bottom of the property there is currently a ton of water and any implementation of drainage would be a significant improvement over the existing.

Mr. Weston asked the applicant if they would be ready to come back in April or return in May and Mr. Christiansen stated they would prefer to return in May.



## Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

**Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Preliminary Subdivision Application at 45 Beacon St to Monday May 15, 2023 at 7:30pm. Mr. Weston seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.**

The Commission then decided that nothing else on the agenda was time sensitive. Ms. Clish stated she hates Daylight Savings time and they should not schedule meetings the day after Daylight Savings Time. Mr. MacNichol stated that they do need to vote for a secretary and Vice Chair and the next Executive Session for the 459 Main St could be scheduled for the next week or two otherwise they'll have to squeeze it in on April 10 and the Commission tentatively scheduled it for March 20.

### **Adjournment**

**Mr. Wetzel made a motion to adjourn at 11:30 PM. Mr. Weston seconded and it was approved 5-0-0.**

### Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- Preliminary Subdivision Application, 0 Annette Lane
  - Preliminary Subdivision Plan Set, dated 2/28/23
  - Letter from Robert Galvin re: Requested Waivers, dated 3/12/23
  - Letter from Counsel re: Annette Lane, dated 3/7/23
  - Draft Decision, dated 2/6/23
- 40R Plan Review, 25 Haven St
  - Request for continuance
- Site Plan Review, 431 Main St
  - Site Development Plan set, dated 2/3/23
  - Elevations, dated 9/9/22
  - Floor Plan, dated 7/25/22
  - Sign Package, dated 10/17/22
  - Drainage Memo, dated 2/3/23
  - McMahon Traffic Report, dated January 2023
- Preliminary Subdivision Application, 45 Beacon St
  - Preliminary Subdivision Site Plan, dated 10/13/22
  - Waiver request list, dated 3/17/22
- Coakley Way Subdivision Certificate of Completion
  - Form M
  - Form O

Town of Reading  
Community Planning & Development Commission

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
READING, MA.  
RX  
2023 AUG 14 AM 10:44

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO G. L. c. 39, SECTION 23D OF  
PARTICIPATION IN A SESSION OF AN ADJUDICATORY HEARING WHERE  
THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBER MISSED A SINGLE HEARING SESSION

[Note: Can only be used for missing one single hearing session; cannot be used for missing more than one hearing session. Inquiries concerning this form and your ability to participate in a matter where you missed a single hearing session should be addressed to Town Counsel.]

I, Hillary Mateev (name), hereby certify under the pains and penalties of perjury as follows:

1. I am a member of said board.
2. I missed a hearing session on the matter of 2-lot Preliminary Subdivision Application for the property located at 45 Beacon Street which was held on March 13, 2023.
3. I reviewed all the evidence introduced at the hearing session I missed, which included a review of (initial which one(s) applicable):
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ audio recording of the missed hearing session; or
  - b. HM video recording of the missed hearing session; or
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ a transcript of the missed hearing session.

This certification shall become a part of the record of the proceedings in the above matter.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 14 day of August, 2023 2020.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name Hillary Mateev

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 8/14/23  
By: Mary Benedetto  
Position: Senior Planner

Town of Reading  
Community Planning & Development Commission

RECEIVED  
TOWN CLERK  
READING, MA.  
RK  
2023 AUG 14 AM 10:44

CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO G. L. c. 39, SECTION 23D OF  
PARTICIPATION IN A SESSION OF AN ADJUDICATORY HEARING WHERE  
THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBER MISSED A SINGLE HEARING SESSION

[Note: Can only be used for missing one single hearing session; cannot be used for missing more than one hearing session. Inquiries concerning this form and your ability to participate in a matter where you missed a single hearing session should be addressed to Town Counsel.]

I, Thomas Armstrong (name), hereby certify under the pains and penalties of perjury as follows:

1. I am a <sup>N Alternate</sup> member of said board.
2. I missed a hearing session on the matter of -  
subdivision Request of Angelo Salomone for  
the property located at 45 Beacon St which was  
held on March 3, 2023.
3. I reviewed all the evidence introduced at the hearing session I missed, which included a review of (initial which one(s) applicable):
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ audio recording of the missed hearing session; or
  - b. EMA video recording of the missed hearing session; or
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ a transcript of the missed hearing session.

This certification shall become a part of the record of the proceedings in the above matter.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury this 11<sup>th</sup> day of  
August, 2020.

Thomas M. Armstrong  
Name

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 8/14/23  
By: Mary Benedetti  
Position: Senior Planner