



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
READING, MA.
2024 MAR 12 PM 1:07

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:

Community Planning and Development Commission

Date: 2024-2-12

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: Draft

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

Others Present in person: Community Development Director Andrew MacNichol, Senior Planner Mary Benedetto, James Fucci, John Richards, Lynn Farrell, Mike Marrell, Andrea Farina, Elena Farina, Linda McKenzie, Sriram Narayan, C.R. McCarnahan, Jennifer Killeen, Elisha Willis, Jesse Schomer, Rob Paccione, Saverio Fulciniti, Carlton Quinn

Remote Participants: Carly Jacobson, Debbie Ribeiro, Katelyn Lloyd, Chris Latham, Ray, Marie, Ken, M Richards, Manu Chopra, Maureen Hart, Jamal

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 7:01 PM.

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

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

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Annette Lane to March 11, 2024. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0.

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

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to continue the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 0 Harold Ave to March 11, 2024. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0.

Public Hearing, Definitive Subdivision Application **246 Walnut St, Stella Construction**

There was a brief discussion amongst the Commission members as to if they needed to open the hearing and then continue it. Mr. MacNichol advised that they could just continue the opening. It was discussed if the public should receive another mailed notice and Ms.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Benedetto advised the members that the delay was because the applicant was still working through items with the Conservation Commission and as such the abutters were already well aware of the application and it was decided that there was no need then to re-notice for the opening of the public hearing.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to continue the opening of the public hearing for the Definitive Subdivision Application for 246 Walnut St to March 11, 2024. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion, and it was approved 5-0-0.

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

Mr. Jesse Schomer, the applicant's legal representation was in person to speak on behalf of the applicant and gave a brief presentation. Mr. Rob Paccione, Mr. Saverio Fulciniti, and Mr. Carlton Quinn were in person as well from the applicant team. Mr. Schomer's presentation focused on the project changes between meetings. He noted the new building position and circulation patterns on the site, the distances from the revised building location to the neighbors, new landscaping and berm, and the keeping of the existing home at 10 Pinevale. Mr. Rob Paccione, RP Architectural studio, spoke about the design of the building, noting the new stepbacks on three sides of the top floor of the building and the removal of the roof deck. There will be two accessible units.

Mr. Wetzel started with the questions and asked about some discrepancies between the plans and asked if there would be staff comments provided on the plans. Ms. Benedetto indicated that this set of plans was intended to see if this would be the overall correct direction for the site layout, before the applicant completed all the details. The plans were provided too late for staff to comment ahead of the meeting. Mr. Wetzel stated that this set of plans answered most of his questions, other than looking for more detail and the revised stormwater report. Mr. Quinn stated that the stormwater will be completed in the next round of plan revisions. Mr. Wetzel asked if on the fourth floor if the front units would have outdoor access and Mr. Paccione clarified that ones on the corner will have alcoves, but those on the very front will not have access. Mr. Wetzel asked how many affordable units and it was indicated the amount would remain at 10%, so under the current proposal it would be three Affordable units.

Ms. Mateev asked if in regards to the berm and retaining wall the applicant could supply a site section in order to see and understand how the site will work from Main St. Ms. Mateev asked how high off the ground the balconies are on the fourth floor and Mr. Paccione indicated he could add those heights to the plans.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he generally thought that the plans showed revisions that addressed all the resident issues. He wished that the front yard setback could be 10ft total, so there could be 5ft of landscaping instead of just 2ft, as he believed there wasn't enough space in the front to put anything of any height in the front. He asked if the building could be pushed back and the parking lot shifted farther back on the site as well. He would like the 9 trees that will be left on site in place to be tagged. He asked if the units would be rentals or home ownership and it was clarified it would be rentals. He asked the applicant to put together a pest control plan with their final materials. He indicated he would still like to see an example joint parking agreement for how parking could potentially work with the neighbor to the south. He asked about the line of sight on the Main St entrances combined with the shrubberies proposed. He asked if the sidewalk in front could be concrete instead of asphalt. He brought up that the owner of 2 Pinevale asked for a wall against their property to support their soil and to detail the fence between the site and 2 Pinevale. He brought up that the residents stated they did not want a pocket park off of Star St. He brought up that



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

the lighting should not shine into neighbors' yards. He brought up again the trash chutes as a proposal for interior trash management and asked if they would consider it and where. Mr. Schomer indicated that they would review trash and pests and come back with more detail at the next meeting. He asked for clarification about an easement for parking with the neighbor and Mr. Armstrong explained about his desire for the lot to the south to share parking with this proposal. Mr. Armstrong asked about the distance of the curb cut from Pinevale and that it may be too close. Mr. Schomer indicated that the curb cuts will be approved by MassDOT. Mr. Schomer covered what the Town's guidelines are for sight lines and that the final decisions will be arranged with the Town and MassDOT.

Mr. MacNichol clarified for the Commission that the parking lot is currently within the extension of the 30ft zone and that if they tried to shift the building further back that the drive aisles would be too narrow for public safety and they would not be able to keep the parking within the 30ft extension zone. Mr. Quinn indicated that the building is actually back 8ft, but less from the lot line, so there may be room under the existing condition to put the larger trees in front of the building as Mr. Armstrong requested.

Mr. Schomer indicated it would not be an issue to change the proposed sidewalks to concrete. Mr. MacNichol brought up the replacement of the sidewalk down Pinevale and that there are 2 mature trees on Pinevale that would have to be taken down in order to replace the sidewalk all the way down Pinevale Ave. The applicant team indicated that they are open to replacing the sidewalks, if there is interest and approval from the neighborhood.

Mr. D'Arezzo asked what is to be expected from lighting in the parking lot in general. Mr. Quinn indicated 20 ft poles with down lighting and that the lighting will be wildlife sensitive as required by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Weston opened it up for public comment.

Ms. Jennifer Killeen, 12 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person. The neighbors still believe that the proposed building will be too much for the site. They still have concerns with restaurants and waste. She has some questions about what the landscaping will actually look like and requested more detailed renderings in the next round of plans. She noted that with the building being moved into the middle of the property and the garage at 10 Pinevale being removed, the line of sight will actually be worse for her on her property and she is concerned about the lighting and fencing. Mr. Wetzel suggested that the applicant provide some options for going to a site to see a berm with a fence or other items that could help residents visualize the proposed landscaping berm with fencing. Mr. Quinn clarified that the proposed fence would be a solid vinyl or wood stockade type fence. Ms. Killeen asked about the internal trash room and if would be possible to have it, given ongoing neighborhood concerns about trash with the Domino's pizza.

Mr. MacNichol requested a draft property management agreement from the applicant, to specifically address trash management. Ms. Benedetto stated that the issues the neighbors repeatedly cited with the health department and Domino's were, from the Health Department's perspective, freshly opened in December and in process as no complaints had been made for several years prior to December. Mr. Schomer stated that obviously it is in their best interest to keep the neighborhood rat free. Mr. Quinn brought up that the dumpster proposed is the same one they use at every Starbucks and they are proposing a design that is specifically designed to contain food waste.

Ms. Sarah Fuller, 24 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person to bring up concerns with flooding and she brought up that in the prior meeting there were concerns with the water being sent off into the wetlands and she wanted to make sure that the water design would be further



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

addressed in future meetings. Mr. Quinn noted that the improved design would and should address all the needs in the future and that he thought that the stormwater design for the site would more than meet their needs. Mr. Schomer spoke and said that projects are required to "do no harm" and the situation of flooding comes from not having enough infiltration. Mr. Weston asked them to clarify what the existing grading is and noted that the re-grading of the site will be pretty dramatic. Mr. Quinn clarified that there will be no stormwater captured on site that won't be treated on site and noted that this site is the tallest site around, so under existing conditions the site's stormwater was actually flowing off-site to other neighbors and thus this should be a clear improvement not just for the site but also the surrounding.

Ms. Debbie Ribeiro, 15 Pinevale Ave, spoke from Zoom and spoke to concerns about flooding. She brought up that the dumpsters with Domino's just arrived a few years ago and were not there previously. Mr. Weston asked how Domino's was handling their trash previously and she stated that other retail spaces have their own trash cans and she supposed that previously they also had their own small trash cans. Ms. Ribeiro stated that the arrival of the dumpster coincided with the arrival of the rats. She asked if at any place in the proposed fence around the property that there would be gates. Mr. Quinn responded indicating that they intend to have no gates, unless they are requested. Ms. Ribeiro inquired if the owner of the building could also put a gate between there and 10 Pinevale since he owns both properties. Mr. Schomer indicated again that they were fine with no gate.

Ms. Lynn Farrell, 2 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person and asked why the applicant was moving the driveway on 10 Pinevale from one side of the house to the other. Mr. Schomer stated they moved the driveway to put more landscaping between 12 Pinevale and the rest of Pinevale Ave, and that there is still landscaping being proposed between 10 and 2 Pinevale, even with moving the driveway over to that side.

Ms. Linda Mackenzie, 7 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person about the issues with the Fantasia building trash dumpsters. She says that the building is still too big and that many things will still overflow to their neighborhood. She remains opposed to the project.

Mr. Ryan McCarnahan(?), 239 Main St, spoke in person stating that he walks everywhere and there aren't really crosswalks in this area and he feels that this project will add to the traffic. He felt that traffic calming measures in this area would be appropriate to slow down traffic, and a flashing crossing signal would be useful in the area as well. He stated that they have more water in their backyard since the building of the big apartment building next door to him and that they have seen more wildlife in their backyard. Mr. Wetzel brought up the issues with crosswalks in that area are because Main St is a state highway and MassDOT has their own requirements. Mr. Wetzel and Mr. Weston indicated that there may be an opportunity to put a cross-walk in at this area, as previously they had been able to put a crosswalk in at Minot. Mr. MacNichol indicated they could investigate if a crosswalk would be possible.

Mr. Mike Farrell, 2 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person indicating that he wants to review the fencing with the applicant team and he wants guarantees that any damage to his building will be addressed by the applicant. Mr. Schomer spoke and indicated that there will be no incursion across the property line on any sides. Mr. Farrell clarified that he is worried about vibrations. Mr. Schomer clarified that no blasting will be required for this project and the EPA carefully regulates any blasting. Mr. Weston indicated that the Farrells should do a joint inspection with the applicant ahead of time in order to have a signed agreement.

Mr. Schomer summarized and clarified that a number of the concerns that had been heard were not actually about the proposal, but about other buildings and their tenants. Mr.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Weston reiterated for the group that the point of the plan set that was submitted for the meeting was to assess if the applicant was headed in the right direction. Mr. Weston stated that for himself he feels that the plan they submitted addressed some of the critical concerns he had previously heard about the plan set. He indicated it would not be a waste for the applicant to continue furthering the design. Mr. Wetzel agreed that the location of the building and the Pinevale exit were the primary concerns and that these plans answer many of the resident concerns and he sees the building proposed as a good compromise.

Mr. D'Arezzo 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 March 11, 2024. Ms. Mateev seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Public Hearing, proposed Zoning Amendments related to MBTA Communities compliance

Mr. MacNichol started with a summary of the memo staff had been working on, and asked for any feedback on the memo. Mr. Weston thought it was good to have all the background in one place. He stated he felt it was accurate, but the affordable housing section was too long and Ms. Mateev agreed. He suggested to staff to clarify the descriptions of the alternative concepts with description, then limitations, then areas to be examined and staff agreed they should revise those sections.

Ms. Mateev stated that overall the memo was quite long. Ms. Benedetto indicated that much of that was by design, as the primary questions staff kept receiving from the public were what the prior parts of the process were and next steps, and that just explaining the process and public comment to date took several pages.

Mr. MacNichol indicated to the members that he wants to put forth just one final plan per concept when they re-open public engagement, so that there aren't options with multiple confusing sub-options. It was discussed that the multiple versions of the map from the public hearings was extremely confusing to residents.

Mr. Armstrong spoke and stated he felt they did need to focus on where they've been so it doesn't end up being re-hashed over and over. Mr. Armstrong indicated he thought the existing proposal was pretty close to final after these public hearings, if it ultimately is the one that moves forward to Town Meeting. He wanted staff to get more info on historical properties and Reading's definition of the historical groupings. Mr. Weston clarified that historical, while overlapping with CPDC in the built environment, is governed by a different body and any proposed changes to any items related to historical protections will be addressed separately from zoning amendments. Mr. Armstrong asked for clarification on Mr. Weston's point and Mr. Weston clarified that he felt that the decisions about historical properties should be made by the Historical Commission whether or not the zoning amendments go forward. Mr. MacNichol clarified that the topic is outside of CPDC purview.

Mr. Armstrong asked what the group viewed as other open items or topics that haven't been discussed in relation to the current proposal. Mr. Weston indicated he agreed that Option 1 is a near complete concept and that there is no reason to spend more time on Option 1, the details have been resolved, the question is just if people want this or another option. Mr. D'Arezzo brought up the only question outstanding from his perspective is if they could get below 22 units per acre. He asked about frontage and if tweaking that could get below the 22 units per acre and Mr. MacNichol indicated there is no way within the current design to lower it.



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

Mr. Armstrong asked about affordability and the economic feasibility analysis. Ms. Benedetto clarified that the economic feasibility analysis would be a later step, once the geographic area and zoning is completed.

Mr. MacNichol asked about members feelings on the overall size of the districts. Mr. Weston indicated that there were physical, rational limitations on the areas in mind. Ms. Benedetto reminded everyone that there are tradeoffs between size of the district and height of buildings. There was a discussion on these points. The members agreed that they don't want to approve a zone that is expected to produce zero units. Mr. Wetzel cautioned that he heard the NIMBY concerns very strongly in the hearings. Mr. Armstrong stated that the discussions around using commercial zoning are identical to the discussion happening with the Main St/Pinevale application and the members agreed that those residents who believe commercial zones won't impact single-family homeowners are not correct. Mr. Armstrong brought up his concerns with large buildings in the commercial areas. Mr. D'Arezzo brought up that people were very opposed to the largest maps presented and believed reasonable size maps should be presented.

Mr. Weston opened it up for public comment.

Mr. Sriram Narayan, 16 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person and asked if there was any regulation preventing any neighbor from buying multiple properties and combining them to build a large development. The members clarified that under the proposed zoning there is not, same as under current conditions—but there would still be the same limitations on building size, etc. in relation to the size of the lot.

Mr. Armstrong asked about the design book/pattern book. Mr. MacNichol indicated staff still intends to do it, it just will happen after this stepping back to look at alternatives. They can't produce a design book if they don't know what district will be the final choice. Mr. Armstrong asked if other Towns/Cities had examples and he suggested staff start gathering examples.

Ms. Jennifer Killeen, 12 Pinevale Ave, spoke in person asked a question about the guiding principles of the process and if they had considered doing a working group. Mr. Weston brought up that the point is that everyone has a different view on it, that every different gathering of the public that has taken place has actually had a different tone and different view. Ms. Benedetto noted that most Towns that had convened a working group chose to do so as their first step, and Reading had chosen a different path. To convene one now would be a tremendous amount of work and given what staff has seen of other processes, even a Plan produced by a working group has no better chance of success in the public hearing process.

There was a discussion around revisions to the memo and the publishing of it on the project webpage.

Mr. D'Arezzo made a motion to close the public hearing for the Zoning Amendments related to MBTA Communities. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion and it was approved 5-0-0.

Other Business

Mr. Wetzel stated that he wished that communication from the Planning department were clearer about our priorities, it seems like an octopus with too many legs. Staff indicated that there are currently a wide variety of types of plans that the Town has grants for, some of which have overlap and many of which don't...in addition to MBTA Communities. Mr. Wetzel



Town of Reading Meeting Minutes

brought up the prior Instructional Motion from Town Meeting about looking at a Master Plan and Mr. Weston indicated that staff should again dig up what was needed, what was asked, and the time and financial commitment. It was agreed by all the clear communication of priorities is important.

NZAP Recap – Ms. Benedetto provided a general recap of the plan and recent meeting. The members noted that the Towns and Cities with better emissions per capita than Reading were those with a greater share of multi-family housing and smaller share of single-family homes. There was a discussion around Green Communities and electrification.

Walkers Brook Drive Redesign Meeting Recap – Mr. MacNichol provided a general recap of the plan and recent meeting. Mr. D’Arezzo asked a series of detailed questions about the proposed roadway redesigns, inquiring if the consultant had done enough background work. There was a discussion around the current use of the roadway and the desire by the Town to use a roadway redesign as a starting off point for potential rezoning and redevelopment.

Minutes –

The Commission reviewed the minutes for 12/4/23, and made changes. Mr. D’Arezzo made a motion to approve the minutes of 12/4/23, as amended. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-1 (Ms. Mateev abstained).

The Commission reviewed the minutes for 1/8/24, and made changes. Mr. D’Arezzo made a motion to approve the minutes of 1/8/24, as amended. Mr. Wetzel seconded the motion and it was approved 4-0-1 (Ms. Mateev abstained).

Adjournment

Mr. D’Arezzo made a motion to adjourn at 10:12 PM. Mr. Wetzel seconded and it was approved 5-0-0.

Documents Reviewed at the Meeting:

- 0 Annette Lane Continuance Request
- 0 Harold Ave Continuance Request
- 246 Walnut St Continuance Request
- 258 Main St, Strada
 - Presentation slides, by applicant
 - Plans, dated 2/1/24
- Draft Minutes
 - 12/4/23
 - 1/8/24



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

RECEIVED
 TOWN CLERK
 READING, MA.
 PH
 2024 FEB 21 AM 9:51

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 Special Permit Site Plan Review 258 Main/10 Pinevale or the property located at _____ which was held on February 12, 2024.
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. 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 20th day of February

Name: Heather Clish Digitally signed by Heather Clish
 Date: 2024.02.20 21:44:18 -05'00'

Received as part of the record of the above matter:

Date: 2/21/24
 By: Mary Bennett
 Position: Senior Planner