



RECEIVED  
BARBARA STATS

2016 MAR 23 AM 10:50

TOWN CLERK  
NORTH READING, MA

Town of North Reading  
Massachusetts

*Community Planning*

**MINUTES**

**Tuesday, March 8, 2016**

Mr. Christopher B. Hayden, Chairperson called the Tuesday, March 8, 2016 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:32p.m. in Room 14 of the North Reading Town Hall, 235 North Street, North Reading, MA.

**MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Christopher B. Hayden, Chairperson  
William Bellavance, Vice Chairperson  
Patricia Romeo, Clerk  
Warren Pearce  
Joseph Veno

**STAFF**

**PRESENT:** Danielle McKnight, Planning Administrator  
Debra Savarese, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Hayden informed all present that the meeting is being recorded.

**Wren Circle – Definitive Subdivision/Plan Endorsement**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she has not received the deeds, easements or covenants for Wren Circle and therefore the plans should not be endorsed this evening, but the name of the road still needs to be agreed upon.

Mr. Hayden stated that he was informed that the owner of the property would like to have the road named Goldcrest Drive which is a sub-species of a wren. The fire and police departments also have no problem with this name.

Mrs. Romeo stated that Goldcrest Drive is an appropriate name for the road.

Paul O'Keefe of 21 Francis Street stated that he would have liked it to be named after his family who have lived here for many years, but understands the reason why the Historic Commission does not approve.

**Minutes**

Mrs. Romeo moved, seconded by Mr. Bellavance and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes of February 2, 2016 as amended.

Mrs. Romeo moved, seconded by Mr. Veno and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes of February 16, 2016 as written.

**Zoning Board of Appeals**

299 Main Street – On the petition of Timothy Zanelli to appeal the decision of the building inspector.

The Community Planning Commission has reviewed the above-referenced application and has the following comments:

- The CPC supports the decision of the building inspector that a Site Plan Review application should be made to review the parking of construction equipment and trucks, as noted in Mr. DeCola's letter of December 10, 2015. Additionally, the structures referenced in the letter are used for outdoor storage. According to 200-39, Highway

Business A (2)(g)(2): "Outdoor storage of materials and supplies is prohibited unless specifically approved."

### **Planning Administrator Update**

#### **Charles Street Ext. – update**

Mrs. McKnight stated that the DPW has received a full application from the contractor, Jim Kellett. She will be meeting with the DPW to coordinate a meeting with the contractor, assuming they find the application acceptable.

#### **Thomson Country Club P.U.D.**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she received a letter requesting a modification to the P.U.D., for the dormers that were discussed.

#### **Rahnden Terrace – bond**

Mrs. McKnight stated that the street acceptance for Rahnden Terrace is fine. They are also asking the town to accept Lot 110 which looks like a small sliver that is in the midst of other town owned land. It makes sense that the town should own it because the town owns the street and the property around it, but it would require an Article to accept it at Town Meeting. The CPC said Mrs. McKnight should further investigate this in case it had the potential to be a buildable lot, and also to reach out to the Selectmen to see if there was interest in supporting the acceptance.

### **383 Park Street/Shay Lane – Definitive Subdivision – cont. P.H. 8:00pm**

Bob Osgood of TTI Environmental stated that they are proposing a 9 lot subdivision. The following changes have been made to the plans:

- 1) There has been a lot of concern from the abutters of Nutter Road, so they took the detention pond and moved it up hill away from those abutters.
- 2) A revised drainage report was submitted that shows an added sub-catchment, so they looked at the drainage in a couple of areas and split it, from two into three sub-catchments. They redesigned the pond and moved the outlet where it can go into a wooded area. The calculations were submitted and overall in all of the 2, 10, 50 and 100 year storms they lowered total volume of flow, flowing off the site. Not only do they keep the rate down, they lower the flow and the way they do this is that the bottom portion of the pond will store water and infiltrate it. They do not use the infiltration in the calculations, but the infiltration will occur and the pond will fill up to a certain point, in the 2 year storm there will not be any flow that comes out, the 10 year storm is a very minor amount of flow because the pond is sized to hold all of the run-off that is going to go into the pond, before it gets to the outfall. They lowered

the rates in all of the storms, but there are a couple of instances where the rate goes up by .01 per cubic feet per second, but the total rate on the three sub-catchments it goes down. It is a matter of 100 cubic feet goes off of the site in 24 hours, which is obviously very slow. It peaks at a point and then comes down, now there are 50 gallons of water being put out and during the storm it peaks a little higher than the pre-development, this meets the intent of the regulations. 3) Since the last plan they have lowered the width of pavement from 30 to 28. They still have to decide where the street trees are going to go, right now they are shown on the property line, right on the street right of way line.

Mr. Pearce asked what they did with the other drainage on the other corner. Is it going to be tied in with the existing drain system?

Ben Osgood stated that in the existing drain system, there's a catch basin with a barrel block with a 6" corrugated metal pipe coming out of it. They did not propose tying into it, but the outfall is right there so it will run down the hill and go into the catch basin if it has the opportunity or there is a little swale that it will run-off into the road and down the edge of the road and there is another catch basin right by the sidewalk.

Mr. Hayden stated that he does not like the idea of putting drainage from this subdivision into the road.

Mr. Pearce stated that it is already going in that direction.

Mr. Hayden stated that he knows this, but this is the time to get it fixed.

Mr. Pearce stated that the plan was to have this investigated to find out where it all went to make sure that it was a viable avenue, and if not, to clean it up to make it a viable avenue.

Ben Osgood stated that the plan has been sent to the review engineer, David Giangrande of Design Consultants. Test pits were done yesterday and the requirement is that there needs to be three in each pond under the Stormwater Management regulations. The town engineer, Mr. Soraghan wanted Mr. Giangrande to review the test and be on site when they were done, and this was done. They actually walked the site and he will offer his opinion and believes that it will remain the same and they will not be any harm to abutters.

Mr. Pearce stated that he wants to be sure that this does not get forgotten in the whole process, because it could add more security for the abutters in that area.

Ben Osgood stated that they changed a lot of the grading on the site. They tried to reduce the number of steep slopes that were between properties to fit the proposed houses a little better, so the grading has been tweaked and the plan will show some topo lines between the houses. There will be a double 4' high, split face, concrete block wall. A step back from the front to the

back wall is a 6' step back, so there is not really a structural problem and will offer some landscape opportunities. The site distance at the entrance looking east is 400' and the posted speed is 35mph. On the other side it is 500' from the center line of Southwick Road. Actually, the site distance can be seen all the way down to the intersection which is about 850'. In order to change the grading they raised the cul-de-sac, so the low point was at the end but now the roadway comes down, has a little dip in it and then comes back up and from an aesthetic standpoint it is also a little better.

Mr. Hayden asked where the sidewalk and trees would be located.

Ben Osgood stated it is on the west side and the trees will be placed on this side all so.

Mr. Pearce stated that the trees that are planted should not grow too big so the DPW trucks do not hit them. His suggestion would be to put them just behind the sidewalk and root block them. The trees should be put in the covenant so that if the homeowner takes it down they will be responsible for replacing it.

Dave Murray stated that what they have been doing is put the sidewalk right up against the curbing. This will keep the trees back, so that when they plow the sidewalks they can put it right out into the street and clean it up, instead of having a grass strip, and the town will not have to maintain a grass strip.

Mr. Veno stated that he does like the suggestion of having the trees inside the sidewalk. He would like to know who will be responsible for the trees if it is put into the covenant.

Dave Murray stated that the town owns the tree, but the homeowner will know that they should not take the tree down.

Mrs. Romeo stated that she would like to see a travel speed report and an accident statistics report for the junction of Park Street and Concord Street, and Park Street and Mill Street.

Ben Osgood asked if they would be responsible for getting the information.

Mr. Pearce stated that they can ask the North Reading Safety Office to do a speed check at different times of the day.

Elaine Regan of 7 Gloria Lane asked how wide the proposed road and sidewalk is going to be.

Ben Osgood stated that the road will be 28' and the sidewalk is 5'.

Chris Simpson of 7 Southwick Road stated that he would like to go back to the last meeting to see if the questions asked at that time, now have answers. Who is responsible for maintaining the retaining wall?

Mr. Pearce stated that once the street is accepted by the town, the wall is in the layout of the street, so the wall will belong to the town.

Chris Simpson stated that in terms of the ponds, is the size of the outlets going to be sufficient if it is going to flow or drain. He is concerned because he lives northwest of where the easement goes from that corner down to Gloria Lane. He asked Ben Osgood if he walked this area and saw what was there because at the corner lot down to Gloria Lane there is a grate and then further down there is another grate. Who owns the easement/strip?

Ben Osgood stated that he did walk the area and did view the grates. The ownership goes with the house at 1 Gloria Lane and the drainage easement is in his deed and it grants rights to the property. The deed for the property grants an easement for the use of the property. It was part of the subdivision that was done for Gloria Lane. When the lot was sold the easement was reserved for the use of the property.

Mr. Hayden stated that it is for the property that is being subdivided again. At this point it should be addressed to the town because it is off the detention pond and needs to be maintained.

Chris Simpson stated that this is a red flag for this property because he has gone to the town to see who owns it, but was unable to get any answers. There is a wall behind 9 Southwick Road and Mr. Osgood stated that this is going to maybe help retain water if it builds up there. This is a fieldstone, porous wall and does not see how it will help to retain water because in the past he has seen bubbling water on this site and has seen it go through the wall.

Ben Osgood stated that from one point to the south it is a typical fieldstone wall, but from that point to the north the grade is higher than the grade to the south. On the west side it is at least 1½' higher.

Mr. Pearce stated that the point Mr. Osgood is trying to make is that it is higher than the water would ever come through there. All of the existing drains are going to be checked and cleaned to be sure that they are operating correctly.

Chris Simpson asked who will maintain the ponds.

Mr. Pearce stated that this board would like to set up a fund to have DPW continue to maintain the ponds.



Mr. Hayden stated that the DPW usually cleans them every five years. The developer will need to provide an Operations & Maintenance Plan to the town.

Chris Simpson asked if any of the sub-catchments that are in the northeast section, will be placed in the northwest section.

Ben Osgood stated yes. Some of the water goes through the wall and runs off-site.

Chris Simpson stated that that is his backyard.

Mr. Pearce stated that right now there is an existing condition and the existing condition is water runs from the high point of that land to the lower point. If Mr. Simpson's or any other abutter's land is lower than this land, by any amount, then when it rains right now and there is nothing built there the water runs from the high point to the low point. The charge for the engineer is to be sure that post-development which means that once the development is built there is no increase, but he does not have to eliminate or decrease. The engineer/developer has looked at the catchment areas and have calculated them all out and those drainage calculations will be given to the town engineer and peer engineer for review and approval.

Ben Osgood stated that in the post-development condition they are going to do a little swale/ditch that will take the water that flows down into the abutting properties and intercept it through the ditch, into a pond that will be controlled and released down the easement. So, there will be less water coming into the yards.

Chris Simpson stated that if the new homeowners in the development take down any of the trees that are to be planted they should be responsible for replacing the tree.

Mr. Pearce stated that this is going to be in the covenant.

Lori Lytle of 5 Southwick Road stated that there is a natural rock wall on her property. It has been stated that a gully is going to be constructed in this area and she wanted to know if the existing trees are going to stay and if so, who owns the land and will maintain it. How does she know the new homeowners will not take down the trees?

Ben Osgood stated that the property will be owned by the new homeowner and they have a right to take down the trees.

Lori Lytle stated that what she is being told is that they are going to leave a buffer, but the new homeowner can take down the buffer.

Mr. Hayden stated that anyone can take down trees if they are located on their property. The engineer is going to do what is asked, but cannot prevent the owner from taking down the trees.

Peggy Gannon of 3 Southwick Road stated that she has lived in her house for over 40 years and it is very disheartening to know that they are going to lose all of the trees. On the other side of her rock wall a gully is going to be constructed and she wanted to know if it would go through or over the rock wall.

Ben Osgood stated that the flow is very small in this area. Swales are typically 2½ to 3' wide and 6" to 8" deep which is plenty to handle coming off of the backyard.

Laurie Trifone of 7 Southwick Road asked if they could explain the size of the outlet valve for drainage being insufficient for maintenance and working.

Ben Osgood stated that the ponds have an outlet structure that is a big manhole and they drill holes in different sizes on the side of the manhole. Some of the holes are small and they need this because the volumes of water are very small and the only way to control them is to have a small outlet, they are not insufficient.

Mr. Hayden stated that the lower ones are smaller, so before the water can run out of the pond there is a larger hole that is going to take the water to the structures.

Laurie Trifone stated that the integrity of the road on Gloria Lane is lousy because there has been no maintenance on the road for years. Is Gloria Lane going to be cleaned up near the grates?

Mr. Hayden stated that he does not know the schedule for the town, unless they have to work in that manhole. If the system is intact and they can clean it to make it work they will not have to do work on Gloria Lane.

Mr. Pearce stated that the part that she is speaking about is in the layout of Gloria Lane and the layout belongs to the town.

Laurie Trifone wanted to know if consideration was taken in regard to the wall that would be constructed and the site line for the new development.

Ben Osgood stated that the wall will be 40' back from the edge of the road and will not block the site line.

Laurie Trifone asked who will own the swale that will be behind the wall and who will maintain it.



Ben Osgood stated that it will be in the covenant.

Peter Tassi of 22 Nutter Road stated that he would like to thank everyone's efforts at this point on his behalf.

George Zambouras, P.E. representing Peter Tassi submitted a memo (dated 3/18/2016) to the board. One minor request would be if they could slide the proposed septic system to the west of Mr. Tassi's property.

Ben Osgood stated that the septic systems have not been designed yet, but they would take this into consideration.

George Zambouras, P.E. stated that he has worked with the 1" and 2" orifices and it does not always work, but they might want to consider is to put a 12" inlet on the outflow manhole, build a diversion wall on the inside, have the orifices in there, but have the shelf upset at a certain height so that the inside shelf vs. an overflow, before it gets to the ultimate overflow on the outside.

Chris Simpson stated that in terms of checking the integrity of the system that goes northwest corner of Gloria Lane. Who is going to be responsible for that?

Mr. Pearce stated that they are going to look into it.

Chris Simpson stated that the town is going to rely on the engineer/developer. He would recommend that the town do the testing.

Mr. Hayden stated that the peer review engineer already has and they will get a report from him.

Chris Simpson asked if any elevation was being added to this area because it may affect his land by changing the height.

Ben Osgood stated that there are spots that will be higher. Whether they go higher or lower it will increase the run-off and this is the purpose of the ponds. The ponds capture the run-offs, infiltrate it, control it and release it slowly so that the downstream structures can handle it.

Mr. Hayden stated that they are still waiting for the Stormwater Management review from Design Consultants, Inc..

Public Hearing continued to March 22, 2016 @ 8:00pm.

**291 Main Street – Site Plan Review/Retail Bldg. – cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. George Delegas, AIA of REM Central LLC stated that they are still working on the colors for the building.

Mr. Hayden stated that the changes made are much better. He would like to know where the air conditioning equipment will be located.

Mr. Delegas stated that it will be located on the roof top and the 4' parapet will shield the units. Knee walls were added to the front windows and a combination of siding on three sides of the building and paneling of the same material in the front. They replicated faux windows and added details on the side of the building.

Mrs. Romeo stated that her first impression is that the windows are still an invitation for signage and the building still looks like a convenience store.

Mr. Hayden stated that the board prefers external lighting on the building and the street sign. The Horseshoe used external and it looks very nice.

Mr. Bellavance stated that it is also cheaper to maintain.

Mr. Hayden asked what the requirements were for the number of pylon signs on a property.

Mrs. McKnight stated that one free-standing sign is allowed.

Mr. Hayden stated that this is a single property, shared with Dunkin Donuts and Dunkin Donuts already has an existing free-standing sign.

Mr. Delegas stated that they have not looked at this yet.

Mr. Hayden stated that the signage for the new building will have to be added to the existing sign which will need to be replaced to handle more signage and the sign should be moved to the middle of the two buildings.

Mr. Pearce stated that the board should finish the site plan and have the signage done as a separate package.

Mrs. Romeo stated that she still does not like the façade; it still seems a little stark. It does not seem to fit with this section of town.

Mr. Pearce stated that it is probably because it is broken up into three buildings, with too much glass and blank space. If they get a single tenant then the board may be able to have them change it.

Mr. Bellavance stated that he agrees with Mrs. Romeo's opinion of the building, but does not know what can be done to change it.

The public hearing was continued to March 22, 2016 @ 8:00pm.

**Planning Administrator Update cont.**

**Complete Streets Policy**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she put this on the agenda because she was unsure how much of a discussion there would be at the Board of Selectmen. She has been working on the draft policy and wanted to know if the board had any concerns, thoughts, suggestions or changes.

Adjournment at 10:00PM

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Patricia Romeo". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Patricia Romeo, Clerk