



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
2023 NOV -7 AM 9:26

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2023-10-16

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: Draft

Attendees: **Members In person:** Hillary Mateev; Tom Armstrong
Members Remote: Tony D'Arezzo, Vice Chair, John Weston, Chair
Members Not Present: Mark Wetzels; Heather Clish

Others Present in person: Community Development Director Andrew MacNichol, Senior Planner Mary Benedetto, Mary Ellen O'Neill, Deborah Feinn, Peter Seibold, Andrew Pandolph, Bob Judge, Maryann Judge, Dave Talbot, Dan Allen, Jason Adams

Remote Participants: Francesco, Toby Whitney, Carlton Quinn, Kendra Cooper, Eileen, Lisa Litterio, FastSigns Woburn, Cathy Zeek, Sarah Henic, April Jones, Sarah Bacci, Carlo Bacci, Andrew Brinker, Anthony Manupelli, Robert Galvin, Tracy Fitzgerald, Kendra Cooper, Mike Rowedic, Eric Dubrule, Connor Ennis, Veronica Lapointe, Sarah Brukilacchio

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Mary Benedetto

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD IN THE SELECT BOARD ROOM AND REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Mr. Weston called the meeting to order at 7:32 PM.

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

Sign Permit Application & Master Sign Plan Amendment 2 Haven St, Writers' Collaborative Learning Center

Mr. MacNichol gave an overview of the application and request to amend the existing Master Signage Plan, noting that the applicant and property manager had stated that the existing conditions of the Master Signage Plan were cost prohibitive to new businesses. Mr. MacNichol clarified for the Commission members that the discussion in the meeting had two components, both the approval for this specific business sign as well as amending the overall Master Signage Plan to allow for other materials.

Ms. Elaina Fresca from FastSigns Woburn was on Zoom, as the sign mechanic for the project, representing the applicant. She provided an overview of the proposal, they were suggesting a change of material from the existing Master Signage Plan by using a dibond aluminum that would be used as facing applied with screws onto the existing older tenant signs. They were also proposing white as an alternate color to the previously approved gold, primarily for visibility purposes, as the white is much more visible and the gold fades quite a bit over time.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weston asked if the changes to the material being proposed in the amendment to the Master Signage Plan would be proposed only for mounting onto an existing sign or if the newly proposed aluminum material would also be appropriate for putting up as an entirely new sign. Ms. Fresca indicated that the maximum depth that the material comes in is a 1/2". So it can be cut down to the 1/8" being proposed, but it is best used for refacing an existing sign, not for mounting directly to the building. Ms. Mateev inquired if a new business came in, if they would take off the facing and replace the facing with a new facing. It was indicated that was the intention, to allow new tenants to reface the older signs more affordably. Ms. Benedetto asked Mr. Weston if he felt that the materials should be written more broadly than what was currently written in the amendment, to allow for more flexibility in the future and it was indicated that the members would prefer to write the amendment less specifically to allow for greater flexibility. Ms. Mateev asked to clarify that in replacing the panel on top they would remove any older panels, but keep the layer that is directly mounted to the building exterior, and this was confirmed. Mr. MacNichol asked Ms. Fresca what they would do if they don't have an existing panel that is good enough to mount on top of it and there was discussion on this point.

It was brought up that there are already three signs on the building that are effectively following the proposed amendment to the Master Signage plan. Mr. D'Arezzo asked how the existing signs were approved. Ms. Benedetto indicated that two of them never came across to staff, that they were originally approved signs that were refaced and the refacing had not been approved. The third sign had been approved in early 2023, likely because the design continued to meet the requirements for the building, even though the material was inconsistent.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the lettering would be printed on top of the aluminum. Ms. Fresca stated yes and offered to drop off samples if that would help them. Mr. Armstrong stated he would prefer if all the signs matched color. Mr. Weston said that in general they prefer to leave more latitude to sign owners other than what is included. Mr. MacNichol agreed that in general in the more recent sign plans they prefer not to dictate colors too specifically.

The Commission members indicated they had no issue overall with the proposal and the sign. Mr. MacNichol summarized the Certificate of Appropriateness and went through it for the members. Mr. D'Arezzo commented that he would prefer consistency going forward with the signs and felt that the amendment was setting the signs up for inconsistency by providing the original and revised option. Ms. Mateev stated that she thought that all the signs should all have the relief from the façade that the original have. The Commission members agreed that as long as there is a relief off the façade, the actual material of the sign was less important. Ms. Benedetto clarified that they meant not to put the thin proposed aluminum flat against the building. Mr. Weston stated that he agreed that he wanted it to have the relief from the building that was included as a component in the original Master Signage plan. Mr. MacNichol stated that he would clarify the language and revise the conditions to reflect the Commission members desire to keep the relief from the building while allowing the new materials and alternate color.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the members wanted to give further leeway on the colors and Mr. Weston indicated that he didn't want to give further than what was already being proposed and agreed to by the Building Management. FastSigns stated that gold and white would be the cleanest for the visuals of the building.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about approving the amendment and not the sign permit application for that specific unit. Mr. Weston seconded that he would prefer to just amend the Master Signage Plan and then let staff administratively approve the sign permit.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Weston asked if there was public comment and there was none.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to approve the Amendment to the Master Signage Plan for 2 Haven St, as amended. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Public Hearing, Definitive Subdivision Application **0 Annette Lane, Peter Seibold**

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

Mr. Andrew Pandolph was in person to present on behalf of the applicant, Peter Seibold, who also attended in person. Mr. Pandolph summarized that 0 Annette Lane is a vacant wooded lot with wetlands in the northern and southern portions and municipal sewer on the southern part of the lot. The lot is currently S-20, and meets all requirements of the zone except for frontage. The Preliminary Subdivision application for 0 Annette Lane was approved in April 2023 by CPDC. The Definitive proposal has no major changes from the Preliminary. It proposes a 1-lot subdivision and roadway extension. They are requesting a waiver to not build the roadway extension. The work is a total land disturbance of 13,000SF and a net increase in impervious surface. For stormwater mitigation Mr. Pandolph reviewed that they are proposing 2 leaching fields, one north and one south of the driveway. They propose a stone trench around the driveway and the house, essentially at the limit of work, to mitigate the conversion to grass. They want to keep runoff on their property or on the paper layout of the property. All stormwater will be captured and treated on-site, and not in the wetlands. The applicant is proposing to build a boardwalk in lieu of the roadway, as suggested by the Conservation Commission. The applicant team will be presenting to the Conservation Commission in upcoming months. Thirty trees will need to be removed in order to complete the project and tree removal and replacement will be conducted with approval of Conservation Commission. Mr. Pandolph discussed the snow storage location and that final approval would be coming from Conservation.

Mr. D'Arezzo started off the questions, but there were some disturbances on the Zoom so questioning was paused while people were kicked off the Zoom. Mr. D'Arezzo then asked about the waiver for the profile of the roadway, and if granite curbs would be included in the proposal. Mr. Quinn indicated from Zoom that they had requested a waiver for the roadway profile. Mr. Weston clarified that the CPDC didn't want a profile for the full roadway that isn't being built, but would need a profile of the roadway that is being proposed, as well as a profile of the driveway and boardwalk.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked where the proposal for the boardwalk was coming from, and Mr. Pandolph summarized that in the Preliminary application it had been discussed that they should tack on a public benefit and that it was brought up as a nice thing to add. Mr. D'Arezzo indicated that if it wasn't requested by the community then he would rather not build it. Mr. Armstrong asked if the final decision on the boardwalk would come from Conservation and Mr. MacNichol indicated that the final decision about the boardwalk would come from the Conservation and Trails committees and there would probably be strong support from the Conservation Administrator.

Mr. Armstrong asked a series of clarifying questions because he hadn't been a part of the Preliminary Plan approval. He inquired if the lot to the south would be built on and if waiving down the roadway profile would reduce the ability to build on that lot in the future, as well as questions about the right of way and overall roadway design. Mr. MacNichol went over the lot to the south and answered Mr. Armstrong's questions. Mr. Armstrong asked if there were any issues with the applicant accepting the conditions of the Town Engineer and the



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

applicant confirmed there were not. Mr. Armstrong asked about the sewer in that area and if it would be gravity-fed and Mr. Pandolph replied that it would be gravity-fed. Mr. Armstrong reviewed the waivers requested, Mr. MacNichol stated that lighting waiver request, the moving of the hydrant, and the rest were all agreeable to staff. Mr. MacNichol reviewed for the Commission members the difference between the Environmental Impact report that Subdivision law asks for vs. what is covered elsewhere in the process, to decide if they were still comfortable waiving the requirement. Some of the content is covered in the drainage report, some in the test borings, and some in the Conservation NOI filing. He also reviewed that the Stormwater Permit application was filed to CPDC but would be addressed with Conservation. The Commission members seemed comfortable with the information that was available to them even without the Environmental Impact report.

Mr. Armstrong summarized that his concerns on the proposal were materials storage, appropriate stormwater management criteria, and impacts to the wetlands. Mr. Pandolph responded that nothing would be stored in a wetland during construction, nothing refueled on site, and everything stored appropriately. Mr. Armstrong inquired if there are sidewalks on Annette Lane on both sides and when it was confirmed they are on the north side, then asked for sidewalks on the north side extending up to the driveway, to match the existing layout on Annette Lane. Mr. Armstrong indicated he was also neutral about the boardwalk, and his concern would be in turning it over to the Town and maintaining it. Mr. Armstrong asked about a condition from the Draft Decision and Mr. MacNichol indicated that line was a holdover from a prior application.

Mr. Weston indicated that the plan has not substantially changed since the Preliminary Plan and that the plan has been signed off by the Town Engineer clarifies a lot for them. Mr. MacNichol stated that from the staff perspective they would like to see Conservation Commission give approval before CPDC approves it. Staff want a level of confidence from Conservation that this proposal is appropriate before CPDC approves. Mr. Weston remarked that Conservation deals in inches and CPDC deals in feet and the Commission members indicated that they were in agreement in wanting Conservation's approval before they would approve.

Mr. Weston opened it up for public comment.

Mr. Bob Judge from 10 Annette Lane spoke in person. He stated that his concern was the water, but he admitted he was not an Engineer. He asked if they were ever to have issues with water after this, would there be any recourse. Mr. MacNichol indicated that CPDC leans on the reports and approvals from Engineering and can always confirm that they are complying with their maintenance and erosion plan, and in terms of groundwater recharge, that would be included. Mr. Judge asked if he started getting groundwater in his basement would he have recourse with the Town, Mr. MacNichol stated no. Mr. Judge asked about the extension of the roadway and the turn into the driveway, and he asked about how the profile of the roadway is compared to his land and Mr. Pandolph discussed the scope of the land in relation to Mr. Judge's lot. Mr. Judge stated he want to make sure the new lot isn't an eyesore and Mr. Pandolph indicated that they're planning on putting some screening plants but that those final plant decisions will come from Conservation.

Ms. Deborah Feinn, from 3 Deborah Drive, spoke in person. She asked about the extension of the roadway and some clarifying questions about the requested waivers and the location of the driveway, which were answered by Mr. Pandolph. She inquired if there will be any blasting as part of the construction and Mr. Pandolph responded not to his knowledge. Ms. Feinn asked about the boardwalk and if what is proposed would end on the paved road. Mr. Pandolph indicated that the goal of the boardwalk would be for it to end just past the pavement on Annette and also on Applegate. Ms. Feinn asked about the hurricane fence



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

that is currently up and Mr. Seibold indicated that it would come down. Ms. Feinn asked about which direction construction equipment would be entering the site and Mr. Pandolph stated they would come from Annette Lane.

Ms. Kendra Cooper from 20 Covey Hill Rd spoke from Zoom about the concerns about water and that the wetlands are fed by springs that predate all the housing. She stated that people from Martin road have had difficulty with their septic systems for ages and the wetland that is on 0 Annette Lane continues on down between Martin and Deborah Drives, to Franklin and to the golf course. She stated that it's not just the area there that is no longer going to be as absorbent, that the trees they are taking down also help absorb the water and discussed that the entire area is an aquifer area. She reiterated that the issue here is not just one house, it's the entire area. Ms. Cooper said that the drainage ditch in the area has been cleaned out only twice by the Town since the 1980s and the rest has been maintained by the neighbors.

Mr. Weston responded that the entire stormwater report is covered by the Town Engineer and that Conservation Commission will take up the issue as well and that when they sign off then CPDC will feel okay about it. He opined that it is hard to ask one lot to fix the systemic problems that were created in past development. Some of what is being proposed will assist, but that's not to say that it will solve broader issues.

Ms. Cooper said they've only had issues twice with water and it actually hasn't been this year even though this year was so wet. She just wants this development to not make things worse for the neighbors downstream and stated she was upset that there is not a whole lot of recourse if it does cause issues. Prevention is what the neighbors want. She also indicated that more neighbors should have been notified outside of the 300ft buffer zone. Mr. Pandolph also responded to her about the Town of Reading's stringent by-laws about tree replacement and they will be meeting those requirements and following the letter of the law. Mr. Judge also brought up that there are two very large oak trees in that area and as they come down they will impact absorption of water in that area.

Mr. Weston stated that he wanted to continue the application until CPDC will be comfortable taking a vote. Mr. MacNichol indicated they would continue until December 11 for now as the schedule for 2024 hadn't been set yet, and then can move forward again until January, which is when they might anticipate having input from Conservation. Mr. Weston stated that he doesn't anticipate any plan changes other than addressing any Town Engineer comments and any issues that may evolve from updating the plan in response to Conservation Commission hearings.

Mr. Pandolph brought up that the current layout in their plans they have the roadway shown at 60ft, and as they have a waiver to reduce it down to 50ft that would be the only change on their end. Mr. Weston clarified that the waiver is for the right of way, not the paved width and Mr. Pandolph indicated yes. Mr. Pandolph stated that if a waiver will be granted they would like to go ahead and revise their plans down. Mr. MacNichol indicated that they should revise their plans to match their list of waivers and then if that were denied they could change the plans afterwards.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Annette Lane to the December 11, 2023 meeting date. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Public Hearing, Site Plan Review Application **413 Main St, McDonald's c/o Bohler**

Mr. D'Arezzo read the public notice into the record. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if it was an opening or a continuance. Staff clarified it was an opening, as they had not opened the hearing at the last meeting.

Mr. Dan Allen from Bohler and Mr. Jason Adams from McMahon were in person on behalf of the applicant, with Ms. Sandra Martell—part of the McDonald's corporate leadership team—on Zoom.

Mr. Weston gave a disclosure before they started presenting that his company does work with McMahon Associates, but nothing related to this project, but he did want to relay that he does business with them generally. No concerns were found in relation to his disclosure.

Mr. Allen gave an overview of the project site and how it works today and the current proposal. It is a raze and rebuild of the McDonald's with a reconfigured drive-thru and parking layout. He brought up the existing underground culvert and the limiting factors it has on the overall design for the sign. He stated that they had considered rerouting the culvert, but Engineering had said it would be easiest to maintain it as is. Mr. Allen discussed the new dual-order point aspect for the drive-thru and the new recirculation lane proposed in front of the building, to keep more circulation on site. He reviewed that there are currently 43 parking spaces, with only 30 proposed for the new building. Some of the other improvements being made are to the location of the ADA stalls and that now anyone parking doesn't have to walk through the drive-thru lane to go in the restaurant. He reviewed that they had proposed a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk and are proposing it as red stamped asphalt. Mr. Allen confirmed to that they had already been granted a Use Variance from ZBA and had agreed to install a sound barrier fence to the rear of the site and limit the sound disturbance to the direct residential abutter, as well as moving parking from the rear of the site. Mr. Allen confirmed they did file a Notice of Intent with Conservation and met with them last month and overall it was very positive thus far.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the drive at the front of the building and Mr. Allen indicated that it is the proposed recirculation lane. Mr. Armstrong asked about the dual-order point and how large queues had been. Mr. Adams from McMahon summarized their existing site and stacking requirements, as presented in their included traffic report. Mr. Armstrong indicated that he wasn't sure about the dual order point, and he thought perhaps it may actually cause accidents. Mr. Armstrong indicated that overall, he doesn't mind the revised traffic plans on site, he just wasn't sure they need the second order point. Mr. Allen explained to the Commission members how the dual order point and multiple pick-up windows improve restaurant operations because they reduce customer wait times as customers don't get held up behind very large orders. Ms. Mateev asked if the second order point was for peak times only or if it was always to be operated. Mr. Allen stated that as part of the ZBA appeal the outer lane will be closed at 9pm. Mr. Weston countered that with a 12ft fence he would guess that the abutter would hear more noise from the farther lane than from the closer lane, and perhaps it would be preferable to close the other lane than what they were currently suggesting, and CPDC might want to condition that instead.

Mr. Weston surmised that McDonald's might be the top traffic generator in Reading. He reviewed the McMahon report and that the peak hour trips are high, asking if they had any sense currently of which direction customers are going when they leave the site. Mr. Weston summarized that right now everyone exits out of the one point, and that right now it's near to impossible to take a left turn southbound as that blocks up traffic even more. The revised traffic pattern would allow people to exit out onto Bolton St and he wanted to know if this



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

would have any noticeable change for the traffic flow into the intersection. Mr. Adams stated that they don't predict a large change in the number of vehicles traveling to the site, there is just the access management issue that will be solved by the additional recirculation lane. The focus of their proposal is on managing the on-site traffic better. Mr. Weston asked again that they don't have a sense of which direction vehicles are coming from and too into and out of McDonald's and it was confirmed that the applicant does not currently have that information. Mr. Adams would suppose that the recirculation lane would decrease left turns onto Main St but doesn't have the data. Mr. Armstrong clarified that their traffic work didn't include anything on left and right turns out of the restaurant. Mr. Adams confirmed yes, that is correct, their focus so far has been on overall traffic counts and site circulation, not on the enters and exits.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the loading zones. Mr. Allen indicated that there are no designated loading zones, that for current operations at the restaurant they unload during off-peak hours and they thought that the truck parked in the spots on the north side of the lot. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if they considered including loading zones. Mr. Allen indicated that they had discussed it, and that it often isn't included in site plans like this. Mr. D'Arezzo indicated that currently the designated loading zones on the site are actually in the pass-thru lane in the back. Mr. D'Arezzo said that typically they use an 18-wheeler based on what he has seen, and that technically they should have 2 loading zone spaces based on their proposal. Mr. D'Arezzo pointed out that unless they could find a spot where there are no cars, it would be challenging to find a place to park an 18-wheeler on site in their new proposed site plan. Mr. Allen reiterated their plan to do deliveries at off-peak hours when parking would be available on the north side of the site. Mr. D'Arezzo asked about what would happen if a car was parked in one of those spaces. Mr. Allen indicated that the spaces on the north side would be employee parking spaces. Mr. Weston said that CPDC would want more details on the trucks being used for deliveries, the typical hours, and the parking for the existing deliveries before approving a waiver on the required loading zone spaces. Mr. D'Arezzo said he would be happy to grant the waiver for one loading spot of the two required, but that it felt like the applicant didn't even try to accommodate them on site in the current proposal. Mr. Armstrong asked if the garbage dumpster areas could be reshaped to accommodate a loading area, but Mr. Allen indicated that the current proposed amount of space is required for the trash operations.

Mr. Weston brought up the amount of directional signage on site and that they would not approve those with branding on it. Mr. Allen asked if he was referring to those at the enter and exit and it was confirmed that was the signs being referred to. Mr. MacNichol indicated that he wants CPDC to focus on wall and free-standing signage and staff can focus on the directional signage which can be approved administratively. Staff would ask the applicant to remove all signage which doesn't require CPDC approval from the sign package. Mr. D'Arezzo stated they also need to remove the marking of having a Master Signage Plan to correct the application.

Mr. Armstrong asked if there is eating outside by the proposed landscaped area. Mr. Allen indicated no. Mr. MacNichol stated they could have outdoor dining if they wanted.

Mr. Weston brought up the Engineering comments and responses, asking for Staff input on the applicant's responsiveness. Mr. MacNichol stated that the stormwater pre-treatment was still very low and was non-responsive to Engineering's asks. Mr. Allen reviewed a lot of the challenges of the site and that there are a number of constraints to providing underground infiltration on site, but that they could review it. Mr. Armstrong asked about fat, oils, and grease removals. Mr. Allen confirmed that they have a 2000lb grease trap.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Armstrong asked about the 20ft light poles being proposed. Mr. D'Arezzo asked for any light poles to be included in the renderings of the rear of the site and Mr. Allen indicated there are none at the back of the property. Mr. Armstrong stated he wanted language changed about plants dying and the replacement window and McDonald's said they would be comfortable with a 3-year replacement window with Conservation, or as discussed. Mr. Weston asked about detail on the fence on the back and indicated that he wants the specs on the actual fence, not just the rendering with the landscaping. Mr. Allen brought up the specs for the fence on the back and the Commission members asked for the technical specs of the fence to be included in the next packet. Ms. Mateev asked who owns the fence between the Chase Bank and McDonald's and neither the applicant nor Staff was sure.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the exterior of the building and the commission members reviewed the exterior rendering. Mr. Weston asked what the proposed materials were and the Commission members requested clarification on the materials. Mr. Allen confirmed what is proposed is an aluminum batten that is proposed to look like wood. Mr. Armstrong stated that he wants the landscaping and exterior to be high quality.

The proposed monument sign under a special permit was brought up for discussion and the total signage requirements were discussed amongst Commission members. Mr. Armstrong asked about the location of the monument sign and sight lines and it was clarified that the sign is located at the entrance sign and as such would not impact any sight lines at any of the exits. Mr. D'Arezzo asked staff if the parcel is zoned Business-B and if a monument sign is allowed. Mr. MacNichol indicated that it is a special permit in Bus-B, that the proposed sign is under the required height parameters, and there is waiver language, thus CPDC can authorize the free-standing sign in a side setback. Mr. D'Arezzo said that he doesn't like having a free-standing and wall mounted. Mr. MacNichol indicated that in Business-B they can have both a free-standing and a wall-mounted sign.

Mr. Weston shared that CPDC and staff did receive a letter, signed by a number of members of the public. Staff confirmed that it had been sent to the applicant and circulated out to all the CPDC members. Mr. MacNichol indicated that right before the meeting we did get additional signatories, the letter now has over 60 signatories. Mr. Weston opened the hearing for public comment.

Ms. Mary Ellen O'Neill from 125 Summer Ave spoke in person. She stated that she does believe there will be an increase in traffic and she is opposed to the on-site recirculation lane. She would like to see that front area dedicated to landscaping, instead of the recirculation lane. She stated that this entire area of Downtown is a heat island and while this is an increase in landscaping there isn't any actual shading. She stated that she would like to see the landscaping shifted to provide more benefit to the community and provide shading.

Mr. Dave Talbot, 75 Linden St, resident of Town for 30 years spoke in person. He said he was out there the other day and there was an 18-wheel truck parked on the right side of the parking lot doing deliveries. He asked the applicant team how much of an improvement it would make for customers in terms of improving the experience and speed for the customer to have a second order point and additional drive-thru windows. Mr. Adams said that internal operational efficiency would also be improved in addition to improving the customer experience at the drive-thru. Mr. Talbot stated that the improved operational efficiency would increase traffic in ways that aren't captured in the limited traffic report supplied so far. Mr. Talbot discussed McDonald's as a real estate company and that the site is a crucial spot for our community and is at the nexus of many current planning projects. He presented some slides to CPDC and the applicant. He brought up the congestion of the area currently and that McDonald's said the traffic impact of the rebuild will be negligible, less than 6-7



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

additional trips per hour. Mr. Talbot asked for there to be an independent review of the traffic study due to the increases in order point and order windows. He cited McDonald's advertising on I-95 as examples of marketing not incorporated into their traffic forecast. He gave examples of different McDonald's locations that had been redeveloped into different models that did not remain car-centric.

Mr. Weston asked staff what letter had been forwarded, and Mr. MacNichol clarified that it had been sent to staff just before the meeting and the new signatories could be forwarded on, but that the content of the letter had not changed.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the restaurant was a franchise. Mr. Allen indicated that McDonald's owns the property. Mr. Talbot stated that McDonald's owns the land, then leases it to the franchisees and they pay the cut of sales. Ms. Martell from the McDonald's team spoke from Zoom and clarified that McDonald's corporate owns the land, with a local owner/operator who owns and operates the restaurant. She stated that Mr. Troy Faulkner had brought the resident letter to the McDonald's corporate leadership team for her to investigate and since she just got the letter today she doesn't have more to add, only that she is here for future discussion.

Mr. Weston stated that he was interested in understanding McDonald's corporate response and feelings about the site. He did reiterate that those discussions are outside of the site plan review process. Mr. Weston indicated that he is always skeptical of the numbers on the traffic discussion and could see it going either way and they don't intend to gloss over the impacts to that intersection.

Ms. Sarah Brukilacchio from 48 Maple Ridge Road spoke from Zoom. She stated she was excited by the opportunity to discuss the project with McDonald's corporate. She discussed that in many different projects the Town is trying to make that area more bicycle and pedestrian safe. She reiterated that we should tell McDonald's what we want for Reading and how we want it to fit into the future. Ms. Brukilacchio stated that the focus McDonald's had put forth was really on increasing the throughput, but in Reading that area doesn't need more throughput.

Mr. MacNichol stressed to the public that he would like to continue those conversations with McDonald's corporate leadership offline and report back to the CPDC. Mr. Weston stated that he does want to take up the second opinion on a traffic study. Mr. MacNichol clarified for the Commission members and the applicant that CPDC is authorized to require a third-party traffic study. Mr. Armstrong asked for an accident report for that area. Mr. Talbot asked if the Town ever pays for and hires third party consultants. Mr. MacNichol clarified that the Town does at times pay for our own studies and we do already have layouts and analysis for nearby intersections that can be brought to the discussion. Mr. Talbot stated that he believes they need additional marketing analysis. Mr. Weston noted Ms. O'Neill's comments on the area in front of the restaurant and that the questions about how to landscape and use the front area are all related to the recirculation lane or perhaps not needing it.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review Application for 413 Main St to Monday November 6, 2023. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Other Business

Endorsement of Grandview Road Subdivision Major Modification Plans - Mr. D'Arezzo asked about when the shed will be torn down and Mr. MacNichol explained the



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

upcoming timeline, with a pre-construction meeting coming up after the plans are endorsed. With not enough members in person to endorse the plans, there was a discussion about who else could stop in the office to endorse them this week.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to endorse the plans for the Grandview Road Major Modification Subdivision Plan. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

MBTA Communities Update – Ms. Benedetto summarized the outcomes of the two public events on 9/19 and 10/11. The Commission members indicated that those who had attended found them to be very educational and positive. Staff had a few specific questions for the members. Mr. MacNichol asked if the CPDC would want to continue having site plan review for 3- and 4-unit buildings, which are proposed by-right under the preliminary new district design. Mr. Armstrong asked about what would be covered in site plan review if 3 and 4 units came to CPDC and Ms. Mateev asked if CPDC sees them now and there was a discussion about current requirements for site plan review. Mr. Weston noted that he would expect that the zoning regulations coming out will be such that CPDC wouldn't have a lot to add to it when the development is by-right, similar to how single-family homes currently aren't under site plan review. Mr. D'Arezzo asked if across the district there would be more than 15 units per acre and stated that if we were going above 15 du/ac then perhaps they should come to CPDC. Mr. D'Arezzo pointed out that without site plan review the abutters wouldn't be noticed. Ms. Benedetto stated that was a primary reason to move forward with keeping it. Mr. Weston noted that to allow neighbors to speak is important, but if it is all by-right then comments won't be taken anywhere which can also create public distrust. There was a discussion on if setbacks didn't meet the newly proposed controls if they would go to ZBA or if they could request waivers, and it was determined this would be decided after the final district design. The Commission members generally discussed the use of business districts for MBTAC and agreed with staff that the avoidance of business districts was appropriate given the scale of what is being proposed.

2024 Schedule Discussion – Commission members had no issues with the proposed schedule. There was a discussion around whether they wanted to keep the meetings at 7:30pm or move them back to 7pm and it was requested to ask the members that weren't in attendance before deciding. Ms. Mateev noted that the 1/1 date is a holiday and Ms. Benedetto clarified that the proposed application dates hadn't yet been adjusted to avoid holidays, but would be once the members approved of the general meeting dates.

Executive session on 459 Main St – Mr. MacNichol informed the members that he would be scheduling dates for a standalone meeting to discuss the 459 Main St litigation.

Meeting Minutes

The Commission reviewed the minutes for September 11, 2023, and made changes. Mr. Armstrong made a motion to approve the minutes of 9/11/23. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-0.

Adjournment

Ms. Mateev made a motion to adjourn at 11:13 PM. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded and it was approved 4-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- Sign Permit Application
 - Certificate of Appropriateness
 - Sign Renderings, received 10/10/23



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

- Definitive Subdivision Application, 0 Annette Lane
 - Cover Letter, dated 8/15/23
 - Plan Set, revised 9/27/23
 - Memo Response to RFI, dated 9/27/23
 - Geotechnical Report by Aardvark, dated 7/20/23
 - Drainage Report, dated 8/11/23
- Site Plan Review Application, 413 Main St McDonald's
 - Civil Permit Plan Set by Bohler, dated 10/3/23
 - Colored Elevations by Aecom, dated 9/6/23
 - Fence Section Rendering, dated 10/2/23
 - Stacking Exhibits, dated 10/3/23
 - Traffic Assessment by McMahon, dated 4/26/23
 - Drainage Report, dated 7/28/23
 - Memo from Town Engineer, dated 8/31/23
 - Letter submitted as Public Comment, dated 10/11/23
 - Slides submitted as Public Comment, dated 10/16/23
- Draft Minutes: 9/11/23
- Calendar for 2024

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
2023 NOV -8 AM 9:28

Town of Reading
Community Planning & Development Commission

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, Mark L Wetzel (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 - Definitive Subdivision Application ANNETTE LUNE for the property located at 0 ANNETTE LUNE which was held on Oct 16, 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. 10/23/23 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 6th day of

November 2023

Mark L Wetzel
Name

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 11/8/23

By: Mary Benedita

Position: Senior Planner

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA 010
070

2023 NOV -8 AM 9:28

Town of Reading
Community Planning & Development Commission

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, Mark L Wetzel (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 -
Site Plan Review McDonald's Restaurant for
the property located at 413 Main Street which was
held on Oct 16, 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. 10/24/23 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 6th day of
November 2023

M L Wetzel
Name

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 11/8/23
By: Mary Benedetti
Position: Senior Planner



Town of Reading
 16 Lowell Street, Reading, MA 01867
 Community Planning & Development Commission
 Mullin Rule

RECEIVED
 TOWN CLERK
 READING, MA.
 2023 DEC 11 PM 12:36

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, Heather Clish (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 McDonald's - Site Plan Review or the property located at 413 Main St. which was held on 10/16/23.
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. X 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 10th day of December

Name: Heather Clish Digitally signed by Heather Clish
 Date: 2023.12.10 11:07:42 -05'00'

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 12/11/23
 By: Mary Bennett
 Position: Senior Planner