



RECEIVED

2022 JUN 24 AM 9:45

Town of North Reading  
Massachusetts

TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE  
NORTH READING, MASS.

Community Planning

## MINUTES

**Tuesday, April 19, 2022**

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, April 19, 2022 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:37p.m. in Room 14 of the North Reading Town Hall, 235 North Street, North Reading, MA.

### MEMBERS

#### PRESENT:

Warren Pearce, Chairperson  
Christopher B. Hayden, Vice Chairperson  
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.

### **Cranberry Meadow Estate - Covenants**

The CPC signed the Supplemental Restrictive Covenants for Cranberry Meadow Estates. Attorney Jill Mann will have the covenant recorded and send a copy to the Planning Department.

### **126 Main Street – storage discussion**

Attorney David Click stated that he is representing Mr. Alfred Antonucci who is the original declarant, but, is now currently the owner of four of the commercial units in that 11 unit business condominium. Two of the units in particular are being used for a tire and exhaust business. Every month there ends up being an overage of tires, which end up outside of the garage. So, to alleviate any issues or any future disagreements with the other members of the business condominium Mr. Antonucci would like to place a 20' long x 8' high storage container, in the rear section of the site. The majority in the rear of the site is undeveloped and green space that leads into what appears to be wetlands. Attorney Click distributed a site plan that was recorded 6/21/1988, but has since been revised to show corresponding parking spaces. An overhead plan of the site was provided to him by the Conservation Agent, Leah Basbanes showing where the storage container might be placed by highlighting that area and will not take away any parking spaces, from the tenants, nor will it interfere with the fire department's turning radius. The site is located in the Highway Business District and is well within the minimum lot area which is approximately 52,500 sq. ft. in area and the building is approximately 12,650 sq. ft. The building is surrounded on three sides by parking spaces.

Mr. Pearce stated that on the overhead plan it looks like it might make that corner a little too tight for the fire engines, so he's assuming that it wouldn't be quite that far forward. There are a couple of vehicles underneath the yellow highlight, so does that mean those vehicles would be removed and the container would go there. It also looks like that area is not paved and he recommended putting a stone bed under the storage container.

Attorney Click stated that the vehicles will be removed and putting a stone bed would be a possibility for the storage container.

Mr. Pearce stated that this storage container is not going to be a permanent construction, so there's not going to be a foundation, but this would require a building permit from the building department.

Mrs. McKnight asked if they would need to file a Site Plan Review.

Mr. Pearce stated that it is not a permanent structure, and while it is storage, it is not outdoor storage, so they don't need to file with the CPC.

**Minutes**

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

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated April 5, 2022 as written.

**Economic Development Committee – Appoint CPC member**

Mr. Rudloff moved, seconded by Mr. Johnston and voted 3-0: (Mr. Hayden abstained and Mr. Carroll absent)

that the Community Planning Commission move to appoint Mr. Christopher B. Hayden as the CPC's representative/member to the Economic Development Committee during the period of April 19, 2022 to May 19, 2023.

**Planning Administrator Update**

- Rte. 28 Corridor Study – Mrs. McKnight stated that a draft should be ready soon and she will share it with the CPC. She did receive a preliminary draft and would like to be sure that the town engineer has had a chance to also review it and to be sure that there are no major changes that he would like before it's shared.
- MBTA Communities – Mrs. McKnight stated that she did submit the community information form that's required for the MBTA communities which was due May 2<sup>nd</sup>. She did put in that the CPC believes that they do have a district that would be a good candidate for meeting the regulations, though it does not fully comply, so she did say that technical assistance would be requested, or any grant funding that would be available.

Mr. Pearce asked if there were any updates on the criteria. So, that the town could either opt out, or get a waiver as a result of the fact that the town does not have any MBTA services. The town does not have any place where they can put something, unless the MBTA is going to bring in a train line or a bus route.

Mrs. McKnight stated that in this situation they still expect the town to have a district. It's just that there's no requirement that it'd be within a certain distance of any train station. It was submitted into the comments that some type of waiver be given, but the final draft guidelines will probably not be ready until the summer.

- **Upcoming Projects:**
  1. Anthony Road Subdivision
  2. 148-150 Park Street

- Economic Development Committee - Is planning two events this year. The first one is planned for May 24<sup>th</sup>.
- Wastewater Studies – Kleinfelder study for the sewer planning is underway. They have been given a lot of contacts for businesses to reach out to and Mr. Parisi, DPW director has been working very closely with them to figure out what the assessments might look like and they're going to be sending out some communications soon, to businesses and residents to start asking questions.
- Charles Street Ext. Subdivision – Is a bit of a mess. It has a lot of sediment and erosion controls are not being kept up with, so Dave Giangrande of DCI, Leah Basbanes, Conservation Agent and Mrs. McKnight are communicating with the owner, Michael Bruno.

#### **14 Concord Street – Site Plan Review – cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. Hayden read the public hearing notice into the record.

Attorney Jill Mann of Mann and Mann stated that she is representing the applicant Sergio Coviello. The property was recently rezoned from residential to industrial office. The property contains 14 acres of which 11 acres are located in the Aquifer Protection District and there are a lot of wetlands on the property. The existing single family home uses are going to stay residential because this is a separate part of land that they're going to access. The area became pretty tight because of the existing wetlands and where they were located, so they had to break the project into two buildings instead of having it into one building. As a result of that they're going to do it in two phases because the Coviello's really want to relocate their business to this particular property, so phase I is going to be that 22,000 sq. ft. building that will serve as the principal location for Coviello Electric. There will be a mezzanine, but it's only going to be for storage. They do have an outdoor storage component just like they currently do at their existing building. They even have a fuel supply place and she noticed that a couple of times it was mentioned is the fuel storage within the Aquifer Protection District, or is it outside of it, and that was mentioned by both Mrs. McKnight and the fire department. Those fuel storage tanks are located intentionally outside of the Aquifer Protection District because they're required to do that. One of the other elements of the Aquifer Protection District is that we can't render impervious more than 15% of the area and they comply with that, even though this entire building and its development is in the Aquifer Protection District. The property is going to require that they cut in a new roadway and a new access and as a result of that they did hire Ms. Rebecca Brown, P.E., Senior Project Manager of GPI Greenman-Pedersen, Inc. to review and confirm that the site is going to be safe from a sight distance perspective, access perspective and also what the contributing issues are on the roadway. Ms. Brown did make a couple of suggestions of what they can do to just improve the general area in its current condition and those are included in that report. A full Stormwater report was submitted and all of the plans showing setbacks to the wetlands. They submitted an

application for a Notice of Intent to the Conservation Commission and met with them on April 13<sup>th</sup>. A site visit is scheduled for April 23<sup>rd</sup>. They comply with all of the landscaping requirements that say that they have to maintain a certain amount of landscape buffer when the property abuts a residential area. Once they receive the approval they will begin the building as soon as they get a building permit. Once phase I is completed, phase II will commence. However, because they will be in the middle of doing stormwater, the reason why they want to get it all done at once is because they aggregate no matter what. So, they do have a stormwater facility out behind the building, plus there's a wetland crossing, so they really had to permit this all at once.

Mr. Luke Roy of LJR Engineering stated that one of the main things was the topography and grading of the site with the highest elevations being along Concord Street and the lowest elevations at the wetlands, and then ultimately at the Ipswich River at the very back boundary of the site. It was a balancing of cut and fill for a slab building of this size. The driveway is going to be downgraded coming into the site and dropping into where the building is. The septic system is elevated at the front and there's a fill through the rear side with some retaining walls and stormwater areas. One of the main parts to the design that was kind of important and critical in this case is the stormwater design with the site being within the Aquifer Protection District and also adjacent to the Ipswich River, so they paid special attention to the stormwater regulations, not only the town bylaw but the DEP's stormwater regulations and complying with those for pre-treatment. They have a deep sump hooded catch basins throughout the site for collection. They have pre-treatment structures, oil grit separated tanks, sediment floor base and infiltration basins strategically located at collection points for the stormwater and they've documented all the details in the soil model report. He knows that DCI is engaged as part of the review and looks forward to addressing any comments or input that they may have.

Mr. Rudloff asked where the fence line will be.

Mr. Roy pointed to the plan and showed that the fence line will be around the outside storage.

Mr. Hayden asked how high the building will be.

Attorney Mann stated that the height is 29'.

Mr. Rudloff asked about the sight line looking back towards the Bobcat property and was anything recommended to be pulled back a little bit.

Ms. Brown stated that they did put together a traffic impact assessment for this project which really looked at how much traffic would be generated and focused mostly on the safety of the driveway itself, based on the fact that this is a pretty low traffic generator even with the two phases combined. They did look at trip generation for the site and they used the standard institute of transportation engineers or ITE data that was available and also received some information from the applicant on their existing facility for the numbers of employees that they



have, the number of deliveries and the number of contracting vehicles. So, even though they're coming out during an extended period they looked at a worst case scenario if they were all coming in and out during the same peak hour, what would that generate for traffic. With the two buildings combined it would be roughly 47 trips during an hour, if they were to combine all of the employees that arrive over a three-hour period into one hour and the volume traffic that would be generated by this it would be pretty low. They also looked at the collision history along the section of roadway on Concord Street, starting at the Bobcat driveway going all the way up to Park Street over the most recent five year period to see how crashes had actually occurred there and they compared it to the State and district-wide averages for similar types of roadway and what they found for the crash rate for this section of roadway is about half of what the State and district-wide average is. But, what they did note is that the majority of the crashes that were happening there, although there is a low number was speed related. In order to assess the sight lines on the road they did do a speed study to look at travel speeds and right now headed northbound through the curve it is posted 40mph and posted southbound is 30mph. So, there is quite a difference in what's posted. The actual observed speeds or 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds that's the speed that about 85% of the time at or below and it's generally considered the design speed of the roadway is 38 to 39mph, depending on direction. So, significantly higher than the posted 30mph southbound, but consistent with the 40mph northbound. In the vicinity of the curve there are currently no curve advisory warning signs that are located out there that you would typically see going around the curve. In addition, if you're coming off of Park Street and turning onto Concord Street there is an existing 30mph speed limit sign, but it's located on a utility pole that's set far back from the edge of the roadway and it's almost entirely blocked by vegetation which probably is contributing to the travel speeds going southbound.

#### Recommendations:

1. To post curve advisory signs in advance of the curve in either direction and supplement that with the curve advisory speed placards, so that it would note that this curve should be traveled at 30 to 35mph, depending on the radius of the curve.
2. Relocate the sign that is located up by Park Street. To be posted on a signpost and visible.
3. Supplement that with orange flags that are on the top of the sign, to help draw attention to it.

#### Sight line for proposed driveway:

They found that looking to the south near the Bobcat property the sight lines do actually meet AASHTO's minimum recommendations for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speeds. So, there is adequate sight line there going to the south. They did find some deficiency looking to the north as you're exiting the site driveway. There are some trees and an embankment that was blocking the intersection sight lines. So, they did recommend some re-grading that is reflected on the site plans and will be able to meet AASHTO recommendations for the minimum required sight distance in that direction. There is a vertical crest on Concord Street approaching the driveway and you would not be able to see far enough ahead of you if you're traveling at that 39mph that people are traveling at right now to be able to see a vehicle that is coming out of the site

driveway. This is the only one that does not meet the AASHTO recommended sight lines. They cannot extend that one without re-grading the entire roadway in this area, and with the grades of the properties and buildings that are immediately adjacent they wouldn't be able to regrade the roadway. However, they would only need to lower the travel speed on that roadway by one mile per hour, in the southbound direction to be able to have the sight lines meet AASHTO requirements, so that is why they're recommending the speed measures and signage. Another measure that could also help to increase the sight lines in both directions, coming out of the driveway would be as you're traveling northbound on Concord Street, right now it's striped for a 15' wide travel lane and a 1' shoulder which gives people the impression that they can travel pretty quickly around that curve. So, they would recommend narrowing the roadway to provide a 12' travel lane and a 4' shoulder in that area and by narrowing the roadway, this should act as a traffic calming measure to slow people down. But, also by having that wider shoulder it gives somebody who's exiting the driveway the opportunity to stop at the stop bar, check for traffic and then inch up a little bit into that shoulder and see a little bit further along the roadway, to increase the sight lines there.

Mr. Rudloff asked how much the elevation of the driveway itself when exiting plays a role in some of the sight lines, especially to the north.

Mr. Roy stated that shifting the driveway any further north quickly steepens it that much more and the driveway is probably about as steep as it needs to be for them to feel comfortable with it.

Mr. Pearce asked what the grade of the driveway is as it enters onto Concord Street.

Mr. Roy stated that he doesn't remember the exact measurement, but it was getting up to a point where he didn't feel comfortable.

Mr. Pearce asked if the recommendations being made are going to be the responsibility of the town or Mr. Coviello.

Ms. Brown stated that these would be done as mitigation.

Mr. Johnston stated that he understands the logic of narrowing the street, but there are bigger and heavier trucks coming and going along that road and it seems narrowing the street on that stretch could be a little bit dangerous.

Ms. Brown stated that the bigger trucks could overhang onto the shoulder if they needed to, but a 12' around that curve should be more than enough for a tractor trailer truck to navigate.

Mr. Rudloff asked if the increase to the 4' shoulder just adjacent to the entrance, like a certain distance on each side of the entrance.

Ms. Brown stated that it would just be a re-striping of the roadway.

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

that the Community Planning Commission voted to continue the public hearing for 14 Concord Street until Tuesday, May 17, 2022 @ 8:00PM.

Adjournment at 8:55PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to be 'Ryan Carroll', written in a cursive style.