



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
2024 FEB 14 PM 2:47
LG

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2024-1-8

Time: 7:00 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 In person:** Tony D'Arezzo, Vice Chair; Hillary Mateev; Tom Armstrong; Mark Wetzel; Heather Clish; John Weston, Chair

Others Present in person: Community Development Director Andrew MacNichol, Senior Planner Mary Benedetto, Chris Latham, Scott Thornton, Carlton Quinn, Chris Alphen, Greg Elliot, Mike Farrell, Lynn Farrell, Ken Reardon, Linda McKenzie, Aram Boornazian, Tom DeCroteau, Laura Richards, John Richards, Chris Murphy, Ray Gagnon, Marie Gagnon, Debbie Riberio, Maureen Hart, Doreen Cronin, Dan Cronin, Andrea Farina, Elena Farina, Sri Narayan, Joan Guidi, Katelyn Lloyd, Patricia McCarthy, Elisha Willis, Angela Bina, Dave Talbot, Jack Sullivan

Remote Participants: Jason Adams, Dan Allen, Saverio Fulciniti, Janine Sciuto, John, Len Joseph, Eric Jones, Support, Fang Yu, Jackie McCarthy, Nancy Docktor, Angela, Matt Haskell, ArtFX, Bill Cowie, Karen Cowie, Connor Ennis, Aaron Parry, Iphone, Daniel

Minutes Respectfully Submitted By: Mary Benedetto

Topics of Discussion:

MEETING HELD IN THE SELECT BOARD ROOM AND REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

Mr. D'Arezzo called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM, as Mr. Weston had not yet arrived.

Mr. MacNichol gave an overview of the hybrid meeting procedures.

Continued Public Hearing, Definitive Subdivision Application

0 Annette Lane, Peter Seibold

Mr. Armstrong made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Annette Lane to February 12, 2024. Ms. Clish seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Armstrong, Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Wetzel).

Sign Permit Application

5 Harnden St, Dollar Tree

Mr. Matt Haskell from ArtFX signs presented on Zoom and covered the proposed signs and lighting.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the signs met all specifications. Mr. MacNichol indicated that they do meet all requirements.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Wetzel asked about the timing on the signage lighting, Mr. Haskell indicated the sign lighting would be on from 1 hour prior to opening and turn off 1 hour after closure and that those timings were standard Dollar Tree policy. He stated that if it was an issue they could work with Dollar Tree to meet the Town's needs.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about a shadow shown on the rendering and Mr. Haskell clarified that the signs would not be internally illuminated, only externally lit by the goosenecks. Mr. D'Arezzo asked why 8 goosenecks were being proposed and the applicant indicated that the number was based on the size of the signage and that they would be lower lumen than if there were fewer goosenecks proposed.

Mr. D'Arezzo opened it up for public comment and there was none.

Mr. MacNichol reviewed the Certificate of Appropriateness with the members. Mr. Armstrong noted that the condition needed updated for the lighting to be on after the close of business.

Ms. Clish made a motion to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for 5 Harnden St, Dollar Tree, as amended. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Armstrong, Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Wetzel).

Public Hearing, Definitive Subdivision Application **0 Harold Ave, Zero Harold Ave LLC**

Mr. Wetzel read the public notice into the record.

Mr. Jack Sullivan presented on behalf of the applicant with Attorney Mr. Chris Alphen. He provided an overview of the site and reviewed the submitted plan sheets. He explained that they will be splitting the lot into two parcels, with the rear parcel remaining separated with some intention to possibly donate it to the Town as a conservation site as it is unbuildable. He brought up that the applicant team had gone through multiple DRT meetings with staff and that the Fire Department had indicated that if there was more than one house they would require a cul-de-sac, so the decision was made to move forward with just one house on the site. The waivers being requested are thus all related to the fact that no roadway is being constructed for the project, just a driveway.

Mr. Wetzel kicked-off the Commission discussion, asking if the roadway was a 30ft right of way with a 20ft paved portion and that as it was a private way, what that meant for them and the applicant. Mr. MacNichol indicated that when a subdivision is being permitted off of a private way, the applicant has to prove rights of access, and he provided some background into the previous proposal that had been submitted some years ago and the still open proof of access questions for the site. Mr. MacNichol indicated that Town Counsel is currently reviewing what the applicant has provided for their proof of access to the private way and that a memo will be forthcoming in a few weeks.

The applicant's attorney, Mr. Alphen, spoke in person about the title, the locus, and the rights of access to the road. He asked for the opportunity to speak directly to Town Counsel to resolve any issues. He reviewed the memos that had been submitted with the application, the summary of which was that they believed that the locus has always had access to the private roadway. He argued that they had submitted enough information to prove they had rights to access.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the problem would be solved if they didn't have to subdivide. Mr. Alphen indicated that for questions in front of CPDC it wouldn't change it. Mr. MacNichol



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

indicated that whether or not the access is solved, the subdivision is still required to prove the frontage for the house; they need to extend the street to get the required frontage.

Ms. Clish asked staff if the Commission could approve a subdivision proposal if they aren't sure they have rights of access. Mr. MacNichol indicated that this is a local issue, so they could entertain a waiver for the access, or they could look at it and approve it if they believed there wasn't a detrimental impact. Mr. Armstrong indicated that he would be very hesitant to approve if Town Counsel did not make it very clear that there was access. Ms. Clish seconded that she felt they should not provide comments without Town Counsel. (Mr. Weston arrived at 7:32pm.)

Mr. MacNichol brought up the issue of the Definitive Proof Plan not meeting the required standard, although the applicant had requested to waive it. Mr. Sullivan spoke and said that the standard cul-de-sac is for sight lines, but this is a one-lot subdivision on a one-lot road which is why they felt it was appropriate to ask for the waiver.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if this application would go in front of Conservation and Mr. MacNichol confirmed that they would, and this application with CPDC would stay open until the Conservation Commission approves.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the construction and the drainage design requiring significant maintenance. Mr. Sullivan indicated that maintenance is a normal part of any site design, and if the trench around the house isn't maintained then the basement garage would flood, which is why it would be in the O&M. He indicated that the driveway maintenance obviously will fall to the future owner. Mr. D'Arezzo asked some follow-up questions about the drainage on the driveway and Mr. Sullivan covered which direction they anticipated the water to drain in their design. Mr. Armstrong asked if the existing private road has a signed agreement as to the ongoing maintenance of the road. Mr. Alphen clarified that he didn't find anything, but that it doesn't mean it doesn't exist, his focus thus far had been on title research.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that the last two houses on the road been developed under a PRD, so they might have an agreement. Mr. Armstrong asked if the applicant would have any issues with joining an existing road agreement and the applicant indicated they would have no issue.

Mr. D'Arezzo opened it up for public comment.

Mr. Aram Boornazian, 9 Harold Ave, spoke in person and brought up some issues about the site, including the existing wetlands, and brought up a point in the Subdivision guidelines that an area not more than 6ft above the nearest wetland should be deemed unsuitable to build, on page 8 of the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Len Joseph, also an attorney for the developer, spoke from Zoom and discussed his title research. He pointed out that Harold Ave is not currently a taxable parcel and he didn't believe the road was ever deeded out.

Mr. Bill Cowie, 110 Van Norden Road, spoke from Zoom, he is the abutter just to the east on the map. His concern is the stream coming off Van Norden Rd and that the entire area is just a big wet area, and they at times get water into their cellar, so they will want to see where that water is going and make sure it has an opportunity to subside before going back and into the wetlands. He asked if he should bring up those concerns to Conservation, and Mr. D'Arezzo replied affirmatively.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Wetzel did indicate that there is a stormwater report, but that the Town Engineer has not commented yet due to the other questions on the application.

Ms. Janine Sciuto, 45 Colburn Rd, right behind the project, spoke from Zoom asked how far back the project will be going into Colburn Rd, and how much of the landscape and trees they will be taking down. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the proposed house is far from Colburn Rd, that there will be 2 acres in between the house and the houses on Colburn Rd.

Ms. Fang Yu, 27 Harold Ave, spoke from Zoom and asked about the application being called 0 Harold Ave, and why in the Assessor databases it is listed as 0 Van Norden Rd and asked why it is called one thing vs. another. Mr. D'Arezzo indicated that the number 0 is used to indicate a property that doesn't currently have a number, not that it will ultimately be called 0 Harold Ave.

Ms. Karen Cowie, 110 Van Norden Road, spoke from Zoom, and stated that although it is at the end of the street Harold Ave the project will be clearly seen by 110 Van Norden.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if they needed to vote to allow them to speak to Town Counsel and Mr. MacNichol clarified that it wasn't required to vote for that.

Mr. Wetzel made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Harold Ave to February 12, 2024. Mr. Armstrong seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Armstrong, Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Wetzel).

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

Mr. Dan Allen from Bohler Engineering presented on Zoom on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Jason Adams from McMahan was on Zoom as well to answer any questions specifically about the newly supplied traffic counts. Mr. Allen reviewed the changes from the last meeting including changing the fence material as requested, reducing the height of the lights in the rear of the lot, changing the lighting at the request of the Conservation Commission, and some additional analysis on traffic. He indicated that the site can handling a doubling of traffic onsite and reviewed the newly provided stacking plan. He discussed the proposed Decision condition that staff had presented and that McDonald's is amenable to the condition proposed regarding future traffic.

Ms. Clish asked about traffic, inquiring if they expected cars to go through the drive-through faster given the dual order-points. Mr. Allen indicated that there will be improvements to the queuing time but that overall, they don't foresee the additional order point as a driver of additional traffic. Ms. Clish stated that her concerns aren't with entering, but with the potential backing up of the traffic on Main St due to cars coming out of the drive-through onto Main St faster. Mr. Adams spoke from Zoom, again reviewing what they have seen at the site in terms of traffic counts under the existing conditions and proposed. Ms. Clish then asked to clarify what that does to the traffic backing up onto Main St if you have a car coming out every 30 seconds instead of 60 seconds. Mr. Adams clarified that it is about 1 vehicle exiting every minute today under peak conditions, but it takes them 30 seconds to exit the site. He stated that those exiting vehicles will be metered by the drive-through and will still come out at a measured pace, even if they can order slightly faster. Ms. Clish asked if the purpose of the second drive-through is to service customers faster. Mr. Adams clarified that it is to better serve customers on-site as under existing conditions they cannot serve all the vehicles that want to be served on site, so under the proposed experience they can do more stacking on-site. Ms. Clish asked if the side-by-side drive-through was really



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

necessary. Mr. Adams stated that the dual drive-through is the new industry standard to be able to better organize the kitchen. Ms. Clish argued that the second drive-through might not be necessary. Mr. Allen indicated that the second order point allows the kitchen to keep cars moving, so people don't get backed up behind a large order and it improves the customer experience. Mr. Allen clarified that drive-through and sales data is considered proprietary and they won't make specific site information available because it is considered proprietary.

Mr. Weston spoke about his own research into quick-service restaurant data. His main points of inquiry being to try to determine (1) if the proposed changes will result in additional traffic to the site and (2) if that additional quicker processing time would lead to more conflicts, on Main St or on Ash/Bolton St. He stated that at peak times, currently traffic is usually queued up on Main St already, down towards Bagel World, so if you can get through McDonald's drive-through a minute quicker it's not going to influence your decision to go to McDonald's because of the existing quite bad traffic in the surrounding area. He summarized that what the applicant won't say is that their order times currently are slower than other fast casual restaurants like Burger King and others so that what they won't say is that they are just trying to get back to normal processing times as compared to their competitors. Mr. Weston reiterated this his concern isn't Main St, but the opening up of the Ash St intersection, because right now there isn't anyone exiting there. Mr. Weston indicated that the issue is actually on the Town side, not McDonald's side. Mr. Wetzel agreed that the whole Main/Ash/Bolton intersection is an issue and that at some point the Town has to make the decision about how to improve it and it comes back to the Town to decide how and when they want to change the intersection. Mr. MacNichol brought up the efficiency of exiting the site and concerns with queuing, which was the thought process that staff worked on in designing the potential Decision condition.

Mr. Weston brought up his concern about the loading and that he saw an 18-wheeler there on-site at 6pm on a Friday night. Mr. Armstrong brought up the conditions related to the loading spaces on page 10, number 32. He would like the loading zone to be required to be coned off for use. Mr. Allen clarified that if the loading zone was removed they would technically have enough spaces to meet zoning needs but that they would prefer to keep them operationally. The members discussed that under existing conditions the lot is quite open so if the truck is blocking off spaces it isn't an issue for cars to get around. Ms. Clish asked how the truck would get into the proposed loading zone. Mr. D'Arezzo asked where the truck is unloading into and Mr. Allen indicated it would be through the back door.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked about the queuing onto Main St and asked again to clarify the distance between the pull-up window and Main St. Mr. Allen indicated that the distance in between the pull forward window and Main St is 30 ft. Mr. D'Arezzo indicated that the pull-forward window isn't enough for the required stacking out onto Main St. Mr. D'Arezzo asked where employees would exit from in order to bring food out to someone in the pull forward spaces. He stated that the issue for him was that the drive-through does not having 54 ft of stacking capacity exiting out onto the road. Mr. Allen indicated that the second window towards the exit is a not the primary pick-up window.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the landscaping and the proposed changes along Bolton St. Mr. Allen covered the landscaping changes proposed and the shrubs being proposed along Bolton St in response to prior comments. Mr. Armstrong stated that he wanted to reduce the view of the parking lot from the road. Mr. Armstrong asked about the fence proposed between McDonald's and Chase Bank to the north and the Commission members debated if a fence was even needed at the site. Ms. Clish asked why force people to climb a fence from Chase Bank over to McDonald's. Mr. Weston argued that kids are going to cut through the parking lot from the bank and he would prefer not to have a fence. The members decided



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

that no fence was better than the proposed fence. The Commission members discussed other fences in the area like the Dunkin across the street and their guardrail fence. Mr. Allen clarified that they would be fine with no fence, and the Commission members agreed that they would prefer no fence in the front, only near the rear with the dumpster and the applicant agreed to those changes.

Mr. Armstrong asked about some items during construction, and he asked about sheet C-904 and the directional signage shown. Mr. Allen clarified that those directional signs would be at the entrances and exits and those ones are allowed to be slightly larger than the rest of the directional signage allowed on-site.

Mr. Weston opened up the hearing up for public comment.

Mr. Dave Talbot, 75 Linden St, reminded CPDC that over 100 people had signed a petition to oppose this type of development. Mr. Talbot reiterated that no traffic counts have been supplied. Mr. Talbot brought up slides to cover his points comparing this to the North Reading McDonald's location and his own traffic counts from the North Reading location. He asked CPDC members to reject the application and use their creative thinking to find a way to deny the application.

Ms. Nancy Docktor, 371 Pearl St, spoke from Zoom. She indicated she was confused on the drive-through design and asked if employees will walk out through exiting cars in the drive aisle to deliver food to the pull forward spaces and Mr. Allen confirmed yes. Ms. Docktor asked if the on-site lights would operate the same as Dollar Tree and Mr. Allen confirmed yes. Ms. Docktor asked if in the future we could ask for more money from McDonald's for the intersection. Mr. Weston indicated that the issue in the future is that we don't know what the desired fix for this would be in the future.

Ms. Clish asked what recourse they would have if this does cause a bunch of traffic. Mr. Armstrong discussed that it is a difficult intersection and asked about the possibility of putting boxes in front of the exit. Mr. Armstrong spoke about the improvements to the building and perhaps about a report back period. Mr. Weston spoke that the loading zone should be addressed in the conditions, that if the Police note an issue with the loading zone that it should be able to be retroactively addressed. Mr. Wetzel stated that the real issue with the application is that the process has identified a lot of problems, but that there aren't clear solutions.

Mr. MacNichol spoke that Staff interpreted the drive-through from the primary pick-up window. Ms. Clish asked to clarify if the pull-forward window would be used. Mr. Allen indicated that it is their prototype but it isn't used always. It's a secondary point. Mr. Weston asked about waiving the drive-through length stacking as the Commission members made clear they didn't share Staff's view. There was a discussion about if there was a condition needed about removing the second window and figuring out how to waive the drive-through windows.

Mr. Talbot spoke again in person about the North Reading site and asked that the CPDC request additional funds than the mentioned \$25,000.

Ms. Andrea Farina, 1 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person, she said that she wasn't sure who decides what in town and that we should leverage this development to improve the intersection. She said that she wanted to second that the Main/Ash/Bolton intersection should be addressed.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Wetzel asked about if the Town had an idea of how much any of the Green International concepts would cost and Mr. MacNichol indicated that at that time those plans weren't completed to that level to have cost estimates because a preferred option has never been chosen.

Mr. Weston asked for any final public comment and moved to closed the public comment period.

Ms. Clish made a motion to close the public hearing on the Site Plan Review for 413 Main St. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Weston, Wetzel).

Mr. MacNichol reviewed the draft Decision with the Commission members. Mr. Armstrong asked about the language on deliveries and changed it to "will" schedule in relation to delivery times. Mr. Armstrong asked if there should be language about the fencing in the landscaping section and Mr. MacNichol indicated he preferred to address it in the conditions. It was added on Page 9 as a condition. Mr. D'Arezzo brought up that the signage still doesn't meet requirements and Mr. Weston asked a sentence be added to clarify the Commissions intentions on the signage they were approving, irrespective of what is shown on the plans.

There was a discussion amongst the Commission members about the proposed condition language on traffic impacts. Mr. Weston wanted the applicant to pay the percentage of the improvements that are based on the utilization of the intersection – thinking primarily about Bolton/Ash St. There was a discussion around how to quantify future changes with traffic counts and changes. They discussed future vehicle utilization of the site and how it would show operational issues and what that would look like. The members discussed many wording options for the potential condition. Their intention was for future payments into any proposed improvements to be based on McDonald's proportional share of the traffic utilization to/from the site. They left the final wording of the condition to Staff and the applicant team, who would have to get approval from McDonald's corporate.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to grant the Special Permit for a not illuminated monument sign in Business-B. Ms. Clish seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Weston, Wetzel).

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to approve the waiver request from section 9.1.1.7 to provide two loading spaces on site. Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to request the waiver be amended from two spaces down to one space, requiring them to have a permanent loading space. There was no second, the amended motion failed. The original motion for two spaces was seconded by Ms. Clish. It was approved 4-1-0 (Clish, Mateev, Weston, and Wetzel in favor, D'Arezzo opposing).

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to approve the Decision for the Site Plan Review Application for 413 Main St, as amended. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0 (Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Weston, Wetzel).

Continued Public Hearing, Site Plan Review Application, Special Permit, Stormwater Permit 252-262 Main St / 10 Pinevale Ave, BLVD Reading LLC

Mr. Chris Latham was in person to present on behalf of the applicant with Mr. Carlton Quinn. Mr. Latham reviewed the overview of the properties, existing conditions, and the application. He reviewed the proposed changes from the prior meeting and discussed the



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

proposed changes summarized in the slides. Mr. Carlton Quinn with Allen & Major Associates then reviewed the revised plans, including changes to the parking layout, the removal of all items from the 100ft wetland buffer shown and the change of the Pinevale Ave drive into an "exit only".

Mr. Weston started off the Commission's discussion by noting the large amount of public comment from the last meeting and set expectations for the public on the discussion for this meeting.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked if the new plans had been commented on by the Fire Department and staff clarified that the new plans hadn't been formally commented on by any staff due to their late submittal, but that the Fire Department had previously noted that they were conceptually fine with an 18ft drive aisle in the parking lot as long as the turning movements still worked.

Mr. Weston asked about the engineering memo comments and Mr. Carlton Quinn indicated that he had spoken to Town Engineer Ryan Percival and anticipated being able to work through all the concerns with no issues.

Mr. Wetzel asked about the building being made 8ft smaller, noting that the 8ft was taken from the south side instead of the side nearest the direct abutter. Mr. Quinn indicated that was because of the ask for more landscaping in the parking lot. Mr. Wetzel stated he would prefer to see more of a buffer between the neighbor rather than more trees in the parking lot. He also asked about the patio for the commercial building and why it was removed, as he considered it a desirable amenity for a restaurant. He asked why the South Main St Design guidelines ask for more landscaping towards the street and their design instead has almost no landscaping between the building and the street. Mr. Wetzel asked about the input from MassDOT and Mr. Quinn indicated that would happen after they have an approved plan from the CPDC. Mr. Wetzel asked about the proposed potential pocket park on Star Road and it requiring the approval of the direct abutters who own the paper street.

Ms. Clish asked about the location of the building on the site and why the building was being chosen to be sited so close to the direct neighbor. Mr. Quinn indicated that moving the building elsewhere on site to the south meant that the curb cut on Main St would be significantly closer to Pinevale and the design would end up with dead-end parking behind the building. Mr. Quinn asked about the prior site plan approval for the site and its design. Mr. Latham clarified that moving the building is an issue with entrances/exits being too close to the intersections on Main St and the Town's Engineers citing it as an issue. Mr. Quinn argued that moving the building to the south makes the vehicular traffic flow on site worse, the decision to move it just needs to be weighed against the other options. Ms. Clish asked to hear more about the options for moving the building away from the home. Mr. Weston seconded that request.

Mr. Weston clarified that from his perspective, this is a unique review for CPDC as a special permit as unlike the McDonald's application there is more specific criteria that will need to be met. Mr. Weston argued that this site is not just part of the Main St neighborhood, but it is also part of the Pinevale neighborhood and that is where he is going to evaluate the Special Permit criteria both by its relation to the Main St neighborhood as well as the Pinevale neighborhood.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the excavations and soil being removed and if the excavation of all that material wouldn't impact the wetlands behind the site. Mr. Quinn indicated they are currently in front of the Conservation Commission and any impacts would be discussed with them. Mr. Armstrong surmised that lowering the site improves the overall height of the



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

building but wondered if any of that soil could be used for berms between the neighbors. Mr. Armstrong stated that he preferred the new revised parking lot layout versus the original presented. He asked where mail delivery was and the applicant team stated it will be in the rear of the building within the main resident lobby. Mr. Armstrong said he wasn't sure the rideshare parking is in the right spot. He questioned the location of the trash dumpster and if there would be in-building trash chutes or anything like that. Mr. Armstrong was interested in the resident thoughts about the removal of soil, the elevation height of the building, and the proposal for a pocket park. Mr. Armstrong indicated he would prefer them to come to a joint parking agreement with the commercial neighbor to the southern side to share parking. Mr. Armstrong asked about visitor parking and Mr. Quinn indicated there is no reserved parking on site, it is all first come first serve.

Mr. Weston asked about the viability of the commercial spaces and the sizes proposed, he pointed out the access and size of the third proposed commercial space, and the viability of those commercial spaces being so far away from the parking and being so far away from Main St. He viewed it as a bad spot for retail and wasn't sure the developer would have success in filling the spaces.

Ms. Clish brought up that she wanted more thought as to it fitting in with the neighborhood. Ms. Clish had noted the item from South Main St Design guidelines relating to the fourth-floor setbacks, and indicated that she would like to see it stepped back on the fourth floor. Ms. Mateev highlighted the design guidelines for the DSGD and indicated she would like to see a design more in step with those, clarifying that the changes in the façade are so minimal that they don't respond to the buildings on either side.

Ms. Benedetto asked about the Commission if the members would be interested in providing parking waivers when considering the parking lot design. Mr. Wetzel indicated he thought the building was too large for the site and noted the questions about parking on Pinevale Ave due to its narrow exiting condition. Ms. Clish stressed that the building and units and commercial spaces are too large for the site and for the required parking spaces. She believed there is no place for overflow parking, so the parking needs should be reduced so there are extra spaces. Mr. Quinn clarified that it sounded like they meant they wanted a higher parking ratio and Ms. Clish stated no. Mr. Quinn followed up because in asking for overflow spaces the only way to achieve those would be through a higher parking ratio. Mr. Armstrong indicated that if the site had a shared parking agreement then it meant that he would be fine with reducing parking requirements on site. He seconded that he would consider the division of commercial spaces to be unfavorable to future tenants. Mr. Wetzel brought up that the parking lot to the south isn't anything special but that if they could open it up that way they could close the Pinevale exit. Ms. Clish asked for more information about the retail spaces and tenants and stated that she wasn't inclined to offer more advice.

Mr. Weston opened it up for public comment, but asked residents to be respectful of the time being 11pm.

Mr. Dan Cronin, 55 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person and proposed moving the building down to the south in the lot and putting together the shared parking arrangement with the next parking lot. He brought up all the concerns going out at Pinevale Ave and residents being "trapped" on the street behind others trying to exit onto Pinevale. He asked how the applicant was planning on addressing these concerns.

Ms. Debbie Riberio, 15 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person stating that the egress off of Pinevale Ave was offensive.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Ms. Joan Guidi, 54 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person stating that the counter proposal is an insult to the neighborhood and that it isn't fair. She is opposed to the proposal to tear down 10 Pinevale Ave. She stated that it is a money grab.

Ms. Laura Richards, 50 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person and had provided slides in which she covered the issues she had noted in the transportation impact assessment provided by the applicant. She cited current traffic issues with their street and the construction impacts, and her concerns with the walkability of their street.

Mr. Chris Murphy, 19 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person and made a comparison between this site and the buildings in downtown.

Mr. Tom DeCroteau, 20 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person about the water flow, and that the area already has flooded basements and yards during storms and the water shouldn't go back into the wetland but out to Main St.

Mr. Ken Reardon, 25 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person on the proposed infiltration system, asking for clarification on where the discharge system would be discharging the water. Mr. Quinn indicated it would be discharged into the ground onsite and that they had completed the test pits to determine that the soils are appropriate and Mr. Wetzel asked a few follow-up questions about it. Mr. Reardon noted that the current pitch of the lots drain out to Main St. and cited that many neighbors run sump pumps year round. He cited statistics about the rainwater and how much water will be onsite and reiterated the neighborhood concerns. He asked about the charging stations and if they count as parking spots and how their usage is done. He asked why in the downtown zone parking lots are allowed to provide only 25% compact spaces, with other sections of town being allowed up to 30% compact spaces.

Mr. Mike Farrell, 2 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person about his concerns as the owner of the directly abutting building closest to the proposed building. He is concerned about the shadows, rooftop amenity space, and concerns for the space. He submitted a written letter as public comment.

Ms. Clish made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Site Plan Review Application, Special Permit, and Stormwater Permit for 252-262 Main St / 10 Pinevale Ave to February 12, 2024. Mr. D'Arezzo seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0. (Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Weston, Wetzel).

Other Business

MBTA Communities zoning – Mr. MacNichol presented some smaller versions of the existing concept, as requested at the 12/22 hearing.

Mr. Wetzel brought up that people kept asking why it couldn't be in other areas and though the Commission members understood the majority of why, this was going to be the primary question to answer though the hearings.

Ms. Benedetto asked the members if they would be amenable to adding a maximum lot size into the proposed MR district and the members indicated they were all amenable to the idea if it was possible, as it would reduce concerns about the combining of lots to create large lots with high unit counts.

Mr. Weston and Ms. Clish expressed preference for 1.5 parking spaces/unit, as brought up at the first hearing.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Adjournment

Ms. Clish made a motion to adjourn at 11:48 PM. Ms. Mateev seconded and it was approved 5-0-0 (Clish, D'Arezzo, Mateev, Weston, Wetzel).

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- 0 Annette Lane Continuance Request
- 5 Harnden St Sign Permit Application
 - Sign Renderings
 - Draft Certificate of Appropriateness dated 1/8/24
- 0 Harold Ave
 - Site Plans, dated 11/4/23
- 413 Main St, McDonald's
 - Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan, Stacking Plan, dated 12/15/23
 - Slides, submitted by resident Dave Talbot
 - Draft Decision, dated 1/8/24
- 258 Main St, Strada
 - Presentation slides, by applicant
 - Plans, dated 1/3/24
 - Presentation slides, by Ms. Laura Richards
- MBTA Communities Zoning Amendments
 - Slide with smaller map versions