



RECEIVED  
BARBARA STATS

2021 NOV 22 AM 11:12

**Town of North Reading**  
*Massachusetts*

*Community Planning*

TOWN CLERK  
NORTH READING, MA

## MINUTES

**Tuesday, September 21, 2021**

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, September 21, 2021 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:30p.m. via Virtual Meeting (Zoom, participants may call 1-929-205-6099, meeting code 985 430 0926).

### MEMBERS

PRESENT: Warren Pearce, Chairperson  
Ryan Carroll, Clerk  
Jeremiah Johnston  
David Rudloff

### STAFF

PRESENT: Danielle McKnight, AICP  
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator  
Debra Savarese, Administrative Assistant

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

**271 Main Street/Pet Supplies Plus – Site Plan Review/Special Permit – cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. Pearce stated that they did not receive any new information that the applicant was supposed to send to them.

Mr. Benjamin Barry, CAD Technician of Fabo Architecture, Inc. stated that they sent some PDFs a little while ago this evening. He uploaded them to the server and then emailed to Mrs. McKnight.

Mr. Pearce stated that the information was not sent to the CPC and therefore, they have not been able to review it.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she can upload everything into the ShareFile.

Mr. Pearce stated that they will need to check to be sure that all of the issues that were brought up at the last meeting have been properly addressed.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she doesn't think that she'll have time to go back and review her notes from the last meeting against the plans that were just submitted. If the CPC thinks that they need more time to review the new information they can vote to continue the meeting.

Mr. Pearce stated that the CPC does prefer to have the information a couple of days before the meeting, so that they are able to review it. They will look at the new information and decide if they want to move on with the meeting.

**Minutes**

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0: (Mr. Hayden absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated August 17, 2021 as written.

Mr. Pearce asked for a roll call: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

**35 Cedar Street – Extension of Subdivision Approval**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she was contacted by Mr. & Mrs. Brogan to let us know that they would be needing more time to complete the subdivision. They are ready to start, but are not going to be finished by their October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021 deadline, that they were given when they last

extended the project. She is in the process of setting up a pre-construction meeting with Dave Giangrande of DCI.

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0: (Mr. Hayden absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested extension time to complete the 35 Cedar Street Definitive Subdivision (including binder, utilities and drainage until October 2, 2022).

Mr. Pearce asked for a roll call: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

**Select Board Meeting 9/20/2021 - Affordable Housing Overlay District Properties**  
**7 St. Theresa St., 57 Haverhill St., 44 & 46 Oakdale Rd.**

Mr. Pearce stated that the meeting wasn't very pleasurable.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she spoke to Kevin from Habitat and told him that we were going to be doing an update tonight, so he is in attendance.

Mr. Pearce stated that they put a lot of time into the Affordable Housing Overlay District and the zoning was approved in 2008, so that they could do something like this. The Select Board, at that time, was fully involved, they supported and endorsed it. So, they were a little surprised, last night, when the Select Board backed away from letting them move these properties along, with a whole bunch of different reasons. A lot of talk about wetlands and impacts from wetlands. It finally came down to a suggestion from Mr. O'Leary that the town flag all of the wetlands and then they would have more information on which to decide on what could be done with these properties. Flagging of the wetlands without any kind of engineering doesn't really give us any idea whatsoever. There are a number of things generally done by the developer and the process of developing a piece of property and all we wanted was the okay to put it out for an RFP, so we could see what we would get for input. Two of the projects: 7 St. Theresa St. and Oakdale Rd. were pretty straight forward, they're going to be a single family home, or two at the most. 57 Haverhill St. was the largest piece and the biggest bone of contention because it had the possibility to sustain more than just a two-family, it might be four or five, or even eight homes was the largest number that we have in the overlay, and the Select Board didn't like that. They told us to come back with a proposal to flag all of the wetlands and they'll give us the money to do it, essentially is what they said. He doesn't understand this because it's not something that's normally done. Normally what happens is we get permission to release the property and we put it out for an RFP, with some very clear conditions in it, and then we see what comes back and we bring that to the Select Board and then to Town meeting, to get a vote, and then we pass the property off. In the end, they voted to pass over all three of those articles, at town meeting. They were afraid that there would be collusion, in the flagging

of the wetlands. This could have easily been solved by putting in the RFP that the town choose the contractor who would do the flagging, so there would be no outside influence which is what they appeared to be concerned about. We voted to recommend all three of those at town meeting and that's in the town warrant, and his intention at this point is to continue along that line to recommend. He asked Mr. Fusco if he would be there to support this. There was a lot of input from the neighborhoods and they seemed to basically buckle under that.

Mr. Kevin Fusco of the Greater Lowell Habitat for Humanity stated that he can show how Habitat has done this with other towns. Concord gave them four pages of conditions for the duplex they're building, that they had to meet in order to get the building permit, drainage, all kinds of things, had they not met those they wouldn't be building, right now. Part of the problem is that the Select Board wanted to know what the project is because they don't know what they're voting on. But, we won't know until we put in an RFP. He can't do, nor does he think a developer can do a project proposal when the property's not even available. He can certainly assure them, based on what they've done with other towns, as a non-profit they have no financial motive to monkey with any of the wetland assessments, or anything else. In fact, he was telling Danielle today that Carlisle handed them two pieces of property to do whatever they want with them, and after Habitat did their wetlands assessment we told them that we can't do anything with them because they can't get around the wetlands. The way it is typically done is issue the RFP with your conditions and concerns, developers and Habitat included respond. If none of the proposals are acceptable, or you don't feel that it's going to meet neighborhood means, or town means, you don't have to say yes to anybody.

Mr. Pearce stated that he had a feeling that they were not really listening to us and they really didn't have any interest and then, in the end when they said that the St. Theresa's property might be a good place for a lift station, for the sewer, that property is so high up, it's much higher than the street, and you don't put a lift station on the highest piece of land, you put it on the lowest piece of land, so that you can have gravity to it and then pump up to the collection site. So, that piece of property is never going to be a pump station location. He began to realize after a while that they were not going to be in favor of this, at all, and so, he finally gave up talking to them, because he thinks that he would rather talk to the town's people at Town meeting, and tell them the story and let them choose.

Mr. Fusco stated that one of the neighbors made an excellent point and he was the only one who said "Listen, we can either work with an organization to put in affordable housing that we control and we dictate, or eventually there's going to be an unfriendly 40B and you're going to get what you get". Habitat does not do any house until they work with the neighbors, the community in the town, and even if we meet all the requirements we get neighborhood input. He thinks that he mentioned once before that he defies anyone to go into a neighborhood where there's a Habitat home and pick out the Habitat home.

Mr. Pearce stated for everybody's edification that he is going to pursue it anyway. He's going to try to see if he can sell the concept to the people of the town, and see if they're willing to release the properties, so that we can do our piece and see what could be done.

Mr. Fusco stated that he thinks what is really important to explain to them, just because you issue an RFP, doesn't mean there's going to be a project. It means you're going to solicit proposals for a project.

Mr. Pearce stated that they can also put conditions in the RFP, when they do, to limit the number of houses or the number of dwellings in any one piece of property, so it's not as if we're going to automatically jam eight units onto a property. Two of these properties are basically good candidates for a single family at the most, the duplex and the other one could have a little more on it, but he knows that Habitat would take it, put one house on and be happy.

Mr. Fusco stated that they would put one house and be happy. He knows they were concerned about duplex because they probably have a typical duplex in mind. The one they're doing in Concord looks like a ranch. The upper floor is the one unit and the lower floor, which is below grade is another unit. It looks like a typical Concord ranch.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she wanted to mention one other comment that she got today. She had a resident on Heritage Way call her just to let us know that her opposition was because of the wetlands and she wanted it to be an appropriate size to the neighborhood. The suggestion that she made, which Mrs. McKnight thinks is very similar to what others suggested at the Select Board meeting is that they want the exact specifications, they want building plans and everything done before the town could decide whether to allow the Select Board to convey it.

She thinks that this is a very high hurdle and she's not sure we're going to be able to do that.

Mr. Pearce stated that what would have to happen here, is the Select Board would have to authorize us to put out an RFP on it, knowing that if we do that, at some point they're going to have to release the property, or else there's no sense to the RFP. That begs the question, why are we putting the cart before the horse. Let's do it in the right order.

Mrs. McKnight stated that the Select Board has to authorize the RFP.

Mr. Pearce asked if they would authorize an RFP, before the release of the property.

Mrs. McKnight stated that's something that we talked about for Carpenter Drive and that's actually our plan for Carpenter Drive. She doesn't know if they'll get any proposals because people will be responding to a property that may, or may not end up being available. But, we figured that was the only way to show Town meeting exactly what would be built here. She



thinks that might make more sense for a really large project, but for these small projects, she doesn't know if we're really going to be able to do that. It was something that she had suggested as a possibility and she thinks Kevin and she had talked about that a couple days ago and maybe she misunderstood. She had thought of the idea that if we put out an RFP, at least for 57 Haverhill Street and had a response. Then, that could be used, as the basis of "Well now, we can have the town meeting vote, because this is exactly what's going to go here, and this is the designated developer, if Habitat was chosen." But, it sounds like that's probably not a great option, since Habitat has said they can't respond to that, so maybe that's not really something that should be promoted as a possibility.

Mr. Pearce stated that it was a bit unexpected that we would get put in this position. So, he doesn't know what the final result will be here. But, all we can do is go to Town meeting and plead our case and see what happens. Because the Select Board can recommend anything that they want, but the people vote.

Mr. Fusco stated that he was very disappointed with the St. Theresa property, that one was so perfect for development. He kept thinking about the neighbors when they were talking about the pumping station and would they rather have a nice residential house or a sewage pump.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she assumed that having the zoning in place already, which it has been in place all these years that that was enough. Clearly that wasn't enough. Which is why she focused so much for the presentation on what the zoning allows, not what was definitely going to be built there because we didn't have a developer.

Mr. Pearce stated that until we get to the point where the property is released, and we can put out an RFP, he doesn't know how else we can move forward on it. Though it looks like if this is going to be the answer to our affordable housing initiatives and it looks like we're never going to get any affordable housing.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she did want to ask one question just about this, as we approach town meeting. On the neighborhood meeting call, last week, someone asked if we could do a site visit and a couple of people echoed that. She asked the CPC how they would feel about that. She talked to the town engineer and he would be happy to join her. They talked about possibly next Thursday morning. On a site walk we're not supposed to have deliberation, you're not supposed to take comments, it's not a posted meeting. So, she has concerns, but also has concerns about the fact that it was brought up at that meeting and she said she would look into it, but she really doesn't have a good way to communicate to the neighborhood if they don't do it.

Mr. Pearce stated that we're not the developer and to go on a site walk and try to act like a developer, which is not what we should be doing. This is why we put out an RFP and get a professional developer, to give us an analysis of what they would do. Last night Mr. O'Leary

seemed to indicate that the town going out and identifying and flagging the wetlands would solve the whole problem. He doesn't see how that is because whoever flags them is going to flag them the same. He told them that it has to be a professional botanist, somebody with credentials. They offered to give us the money to hire someone to do that, and that becomes a whole process. Could we ask DCI to do it?

Mrs. McKnight stated that they could just select someone and we could certainly ask DCI to do it. The problem is that she doesn't know how quickly they would be able to get the money to do that. Certainly not in time for town meeting and she doesn't know what the process is to ask for the money.

Mr. Carroll asked why they would be doing any pre-emptive wetland delineation. When any developer would have to do it themselves. This is part of the development process.

Mr. Pearce stated that they brought up the fact that the developer might hire somebody who would be friendly to them and mark the wetlands in such a way to help the developer get more out of it.

Mr. Carroll stated that's the risk with any piece of property in the entire town.

Mr. Pearce stated that his answer was that the town could choose whoever does the flagging and put in the RFP and then the developer would pay for it.

Mr. Carroll stated that they can just dismiss that concern because it's a registered environmental engineer who's not going to risk their license to try to get a developer, to be able to put another unit on a piece of property. It just doesn't happen. In his mind, the focus here should be on dismissing the idea that the town would ever... Why would we waste taxpayer money doing the developers job unless we're going to somehow stipulate that the town gets reimbursed for those costs, if a developer buys it. But, otherwise we're just wasting taxpayer money on private developer costs.

Mr. Pearce stated that there are a number of problems. So, we go through this whole thing and they go out and they flag the wetlands, and then we try to go through the process, through a couple of town meetings and by the time we get a property released the flags are all gone, and then we have to do it again.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she was surprised too because we have a very capable Conservation Commission who oversees that entire process and would never accept a delineation that was done improperly.

Mr. Carroll stated that in lieu of stipulating actual environmental he would say that we're better off stipulating in the RFP that we have the right to a peer review. If conservation had a concern

that there was an issue with the wetlands study that we would have the right to a peer review at the developer's expense. We should strongly be rejecting doing it at the town's expense.

Mr. Pearce stated that they've had plenty of subdivisions built in this town, over the years and the wetlands flagged. Conservation has gone out, and there have been some that had to make changes and some that were good.

Mr. Fusco stated that he doesn't know how the other developers would do it, but for habitat, as part of the RFP process, the first step, they would take would be to flag the wetlands to decide if we want to reply to the RFP.

Mrs. McKnight stated that in terms of strategy for town meeting do we want to restrict the number of units on these properties. One unit for Oakdale, two units each for St. Theresa and 57 Haverhill.

Mr. Carroll asked if that was the concern from the abutters.

Mrs. McKnight stated that for 57 Haverhill because the concern was too many units for the neighborhood. Also, because there are wetlands and the neighborhood has water issues and flooding, there was a concern that too much development on that site would create additional water problems.

Mr. Pearce stated that they could certainly tell the people that we are going to put those conditions into the RFP, but he thinks to try to make a motion at this particular juncture, he thinks that they should deal with the basics, the basic are: Are they going to let us do this? Because there is not a single piece of property we're not going to run into the same thing, are they going to support this affordable housing bylaw, or not. That's basically the question. So, are we trying to manipulate that, or trying to reformat the RFP in the process of getting it released, he thinks is going to muddy the waters.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she was told by the abutter who called today that she would have no problem at all with a project on 57 Haverhill Street if it was up to a two-family house and no more, and it was on Haverhill Street and not in the back by the wetlands and if other people felt that way then possibly that would be enough to address those concerns. She's not saying that they have to do it this way, but she did check with town council, and it would be possible to limit the number of units in the motion, if that was something that we chose to do.

Mr. Pearce stated that he would certainly be okay with Mrs. McKnight writing a couple of motions to modify them. If we could just get one house built then the abutters would see that it looks like a typical single family home, then the next one will be easier.



Mrs. McKnight stated that they are going to have to address the issue with the belief that St. Theresa's might be appropriate for our sewer infrastructure.

Mr. Pearce agreed and stated that you do not put a pump station on the highest piece of property. It needs to be at the lowest piece of property. Also, would you rather have a single family home, or a sewer pump station next to you?

Mrs. McKnight asked what she should do about the site walk. She wanted to know if anyone from the CPC would like to attend.

Mr. Pearce stated Mrs. McKnight and the Town Engineer, John Klipfel can go on the site walk, and he'll try to join them, if that's what the abutter's want. But, they're not going to see any flagging of the wetlands, so they won't see the limitations.

Mr. Fusco thanked the CPC members for their time and effort and told them that it's because of people like them that help make these projects possible.

**Cont. from page 2**

**271 Main Street/Pet Supplies Plus – Site Plan Review/Special Permit – cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. Rudloff stated that one of the new documents shows the difference between the current pylon sign and proposed logo on the pylon sign, and he's fine with that. The other two documents are identical except they just have different sign sizes, it goes from a 32" letter to a 30" letter, but overall, shows the same façade. So, he's not sure if they're just trying to show two different option there. There's no plaza drawing in there.

Mr. Pearce stated that he also sees the elevation profile in context, the whole plaza. Noting what will be removed, as well as what will be added, gable, signage, etc. So, that's one of the things that we asked for. We did ask for the whole plaza, to see how it all laid out, and is looks like they didn't get that.

Mr. Benjamin Barry, CAD Technician of Fabo Architecture, Inc. stated that they did send a PDF showing the whole plaza. It was a single PDF with three sheets. One showing their previous proposal, one showing a proposal based off of the CPCs recommendation in lowering the façade, and one with a close-up in a very basic demo elevation plan.

Mr. Rudloff stated that there are two different sheets and then there's obviously the front pylon sign, but there's two different sheets.

Mr. Barry stated that there were three that were sent over from their sign vendor and then there was one with three sheets that was sent from them.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they only have three of the sign.

Mr. Pearce stated that he's looked at all three plans and still doesn't see the whole plaza.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she only has three files in PermitEyes, also. She only sees the proposal B elevation, proposal A elevation and monument sign.

Mr. Benjamin Barry, CAD Technician of Fabo Architecture, Inc. stated that he sent an email tonight to Mrs. McKnight with all of the information.

Mrs. McKnight found the link and copied the information to the ShareFile.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they did make the changes that the CPC requested, from the last meeting, and it looks better that way. He asked if the lettering could be explained because one says 32" and the other says 30".

Mr. Barry stated that they asked their sign vendor to provide two options. One with the previous and one with the new proposal. They misunderstood their request and sent the new elevation with two different sized signs, instead of two elevations with a different size sign for each of them. The 30" lettering is what the CPC will see when they upload their full size elevations, they'll know what they mean.

Mr. Joe Hochendoner of Pet Supplies Plus stated that's not correct. They're going to do whatever the code dictates to them, but from his understanding a 32" sign is allowed and what they just asked their sign vendor to do is when the new façade was proposed, to see if they could still maintain the 32" sign, if it was still going to look proportional with the existing façade, and then they also had them do a 30". But, looking at both of them it still looks like the 32" works within the overall proportions of the building façade, so they would still prefer to go with the code compliant sign.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she is looking through the files that were sent, but she cannot find the elevation drawing that shows the whole plaza, with the new view.

Mr. Barry stated that there should be three sheets, each with an elevation drawing at the bottom at the larger scale, we can make it and put on the sheet with their enlarged counterparts on each sheet. The first sheet will show their previous proposal, the second sheet will show their recommended proposal and the third sheet shows enlarged elevations of just their frontage.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she is still unable to locate the plans, showing the whole plaza.

Mr. Pearce stated that they're not going to get anywhere spending time looking for these plans. This is why everything needs to be submitted a few days before the meeting. Submitting information this late, makes it very difficult, especially in this particular situation where we have to ZOOM everything. If they can get the information to Danielle and then she can get it to the CPC they would be in a better position to vote at the next meeting, because they really needed to have it earlier than this. This last minute stuff has never worked and, in many cases they've refused event to consider stuff that came in last minute, so they tried to give a break, here, to see if they could get it again, but this is getting to be a bit too much.

Mr. Rudloff asked if the other elevation ones they're talking about just all the photos because he noticed Mrs. McKnight has all the photos.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she just added six photos and there are four pdfs, but is still not seeing the elevation of the whole plaza.

Mr. Barry state that the name of the file is 2021.09.21\_FA20157 proposed elevations.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she found the photo.

Mr. Rudloff asked if there was a photo with the front of the Stop & Shop in it.

Mrs. McKnight stated that it's not in a photo, but is in the elevation.

Mr. Rudloff stated that the gable shows that the hatch is some sort of texture versus the rest of the plaza having vinyl siding clapboard, below that eve, into the sign field. He asked what material they are proposing to put in.

Mr. Barry stated that they're just proposing a white trim to match what's there, and an eve to match the cream colors, of the other anchor facades, in the plaza. He would have uploaded these files to the CPC, but he thought that files he uploaded to the building department would have been available to this board.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she could have accessed them if she had known they were there.

Mr. Carroll stated that the bottom elevation shows it pretty well. It's small, but it does give the proportions. They did a nice job reducing the height of it, and it makes the same visual impact from the street without overwhelming the plaza. So, he's in favor of the changes made here.

Mr. Pearce stated that it looks like it matches up to Cowabunga's a little better and matches up to the rest of the buildings.

Mr. Rudloff stated that it does look better.

Mr. Pearce asked the members if they were ready to make a vote on this.

Mr. Carroll stated that his main concern was the height of that and he thinks they addressed that. The other concern was the signage and the brightness of the signage which has not been addressed this evening.

Mr. Hochendoner stated that they did go back to their sign vendor and asked them about the lumens, and they typically use green LEDs in their signs which actually reduces the limits and they came back to them and said that the typical lumen output would be between 45 to 50 lumens for their building sign.

Mr. Barry stated that they do call out on these drawings that a dimmer switch should be put in and they verified that it could be, if it was too bright.

Mr. Rudolf stated that 45 to 50 lumens is not a lot and he likes the idea that there is the ability, should they get any complaints, and they can revisit it. He thinks that they did what the CPC wanted them to do, certainly on the architectural side and he's happy with that. He doesn't want to hold up a business from opening, as long as they're protecting, especially the neighbor's interest, that was at the first meeting.

Mr. Carroll stated that the scale of the façade is much more aligned and it fits in with the scale of the rest of the façade. He thinks the sign is appropriately sized for the facade and the dimmer control. He is in favor of moving forward.

Mr. Johnston stated that looking at the elevations he thinks that the reduction in height looks a lot better, and he thinks that if the landlord eventually wants to do something similar, with some of those other spaces and the CPC follows a similar kind of sizing setup, it wouldn't look piecemeal. The building would be framed nicely. So no objection from him.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she would just suggest two conditions if the CPC is ready to vote tonight and those two conditions would be that just confirming that if the CPC finds that the lighting is too bright that plaza owner has to work with the CPC to a satisfactory level of brightness, and then that the night light lighting view on the pylon sign needs to match the channel letter pattern of the other signs that are on there. She just wants to confirm that because it's hard to tell from the sign plans, whether it will. The other signs on the pylon all only have their channel letters visible and no background visible at night, and this really should follow the same scheme.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they didn't talk about the 30" versus the 32", and should probably talk about that.

Mr. Pearce asked if anyone object to the 32" because it seems that is what they prefer. He doesn't see that a couple of inches is going to make a big difference.

Mr. Rudloff asked if they get 105' versus 92' and asked Mrs. McKnight what they were at before.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she thinks it's the same, but she would have to go back to the memo that she did from the last time to see what she put for a calculation.

Mr. Pearce stated that if they're going to vote on this tonight they can simply say that it cannot exceed what they looked at before.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she would like to be more specific about it.

Mr. Rudloff stated that the only he can direct anyone looking at the elevation with the 32" is that it's right up against the rate board/roof edge and when you look at the 30", it drops it down a little bit and the ability to drop down. The original from two weeks ago, also has a little bit more space between the P and the S, from the actual roof line, but he thinks the 30" looks better.

Mr. Pearce stated that he agrees that the 30" looks best.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she found her calculations from last time. It was 111 sq. ft., the wall space devoted in the store is 747.5 sq. ft. The sign takes up 15% of the wall, but the sign can take up to 20% of wall space, for the façade, if the CPC issues it as part of the special permit. So, it's an exception that the CPC can issue up to 20%. She was confused as to whether the 32" be a 20%, and require the special permit and the 30" be compliant.

Mr. Pearce stated that the 92 is a little less intrusive, and it does fit better.

Mrs. McKnight asked if the CPC would still be issuing a special permit for the 30".

Mr. Rudloff asked what the rules are.

Mrs. McKnight stated that while the signs are limited to 10% of the wall area, however under exemptions by special permit, the CPC can allow it to be increased to a maximum of 20% of the wall area in which they're displayed. So previously the sign they looked at took up 15% of the wall, so, the CPC's issuing a special permit anyway because it's over 10%.

Mr. Barry stated that the area of the new façade is 475 sq. ft. and with the square footage that's provided by their sign vendor, at the 30" sign is that 19.5% of that 96 sq. ft.



Mr. Pearce asked if was the 32", don't they go over the 20%.

Mr. Rudloff stated that it would be over the 20%.

Mr. Pearce stated that they will go with the 30%.

Mr. Pearce closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ryan moved, seconded by Mr. Rudloff and voted 4-0: (Mr. Hayden absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the site plan entitled, "Pet Supplies Plus"; dated 8/5/2021; revised 9/17/2021; drawn by KW, including the new façade and special permit to increase the size of the signage. Subject to the terms and conditions of the Certificate of Conditional Approval dated 10/4/2021, as amended this evening. (30" channel letters for the signage, view B for elevations).

#### **Planning Administrator Updates**

##### **Selection of CPC Representative to Facilities Master Plan Committee**

Mr. Pearce stated that he has been asked by Ms. Hurlbut to be the representative and he has consented to do that.

##### **Transcript College Intern**

Mrs. McKnight stated that Maureen Doherty of the North Reading Transcript has a college intern working for her and she would like the intern to cover some of North Reading related to government news, including the CPC meetings. She'll be meeting with her soon to get to know each other and hopefully they'll be seeing her at some upcoming CPC meetings.

##### **Economic Development Committee**

Mrs. McKnight stated that the EDC is hosting an information session for businesses regarding the sewer article at Town Meeting. Invitation went out today and will go out by email tomorrow. The sessions will take place next Wednesday and Thursday. There's one in-person session and one virtual session to talk about the town meeting article related to sewer.

Adjournment at 9:10PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

