



RECEIVED

2024 FEB -7 PM 2: 20

Town of North Reading  
Massachusetts

TOWN CLERK'S OFFICE  
NORTH READING, MASS.

Community Planning

## MINUTES

**Tuesday, December 19, 2023**

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, December 19, 2023 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:35p.m. in Room 14 of the North Reading Town Hall, 235 North Street, North Reading, MA and via Virtual Meeting (Zoom participants may call 1-301-715-8592, meeting code 9854300926, or visit <http://us02web.zoom.us/j/9854300926>).

### MEMBERS

#### PRESENT:

Warren Pearce, Chairperson  
David Rudloff, Vice Chairperson  
Jeremiah Johnston  
Jeff Griffin

### STAFF

#### PRESENT:

Danielle McKnight, AICP  
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator

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

### **Minutes**

Mr. Rudloff moved, seconded by Mr. Griffin and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated October 17, 2023 as amended.

Roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Carroll, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

### **97 Main Street - Informal discussion with owner's attorney on possible future use**

#### **Sterling Logistics Properties**

Attorney Chris Latham stated that he is representing Sterling Logistics Properties. They would like to get the CPC's thoughts, suggestions and initial input for 97 Main Street. Sterling Logistics Properties is the winning bidder in the purchase of 97 Main Street, which is under contract to purchase. They are looking to see that they're consistent with the town's thoughts as well on the future use of the property. Sterling Logistics is a private equity, real estate firm that was founded in 2007. It invests and manages over 1.9 billion of government pension and retirement funds by investing those in retail space, including Last Hour neighborhood distribution hubs with attention to generating streams of rental income for the clients and for its retirees. Sterling currently owns over 73 properties. They currently oversee and manage 12 million square feet of real estate. So they're not new to this process. 97 Main Street is the old Stop & Shop and currently Ocean State Job Lots. Before that it was the Starlite drive-in-theater.

Mr. Pearce asked what the Last Hour is.

Attorney Latham stated that the Last Hour is in the online distribution system. So it would be serving a radius of 15 miles. So it'd be North Reading and surrounding communities and basically, it's the goods coming in, they're being packaged temporarily and warehoused. Then the retail goods are being delivered to the house.

#### **Existing Conditions:**

The recent survey of the property that's depicts the conditions that are existing. There's two existing means of egress, on off of Route 28 (Main Street) with existing traffic lights, and the other is off of Rte. 62. With the existing building on the property it's about 70,834 square feet and a pertinent parking lot. The property is basically a shoehorn lot that is girdled by topography, as well as buffer and resource areas, including Martin's Brook, that basically runs through the property, and it's sort of challenge in terms of it's got a narrow tapered entrance off of Route 28, which results in the lot having limited visibility for Rte. 28. That limited visibility has made use of the property for traditional brick and mortar retail establishments difficult, and explains the last decades, periods of vacancy, and lower rate like tendencies. The property is

located in the Highway Business District and the Adult Overlay District. The intent of it is for commercial use and to provide for business, bulk and retail. The HB District generally requires special permits for varying commercial uses, many which are historically or pre-existing commercial uses in the HB District and the permitted uses tend to be traditional brick and mortar retail like grocery stores, general merchandise, or offices, legal insurance, financial and medical services, restaurant and amusements. Sterling does not believe that the best use for the property is adult use. It is because of 97 Main Street's location within North Reading, an area of high online retail activity as well as within the commercial zoning district and that it directly abuts Route 28 as well as this proximity to surrounding highways and the surrounding communities was what brought Sterling's attention to this property. It is their understanding that some of the competitive bidders that expressed an interest in purchasing this property that was obviously like Sterling's, based upon current market conditions, and demand either intended to use the property for residential use, perhaps multi-family with a mixed use of retail, or obviously like them for commercial purposes that they're proposing. It is also their understanding that none of those market driven bidders proposed any uses of 97 Main Street that are currently allowed under the Town of North Reading zoning ordinance. They don't know all bids, but they believe what they know about the bids.

#### Residential Use

Sterling analyzed the prospect of residential use on the property, and determined that a residential use of the property would not be the best use of the property, nor in the best interest of the town, because such residential use will require a high density of residences to meet the purchase price of the property with an estimated 200 residential units. That would be a resident count of probably 435 people, including estimated, probable 70 school-age children. The septic design that would be required for something like that to meet such a high density, residential use would not, they don't think, would really be feasible, because number one, it would be expensive due to the property's location with respect to the groundwater table, but to buffer and resource areas, particularly Martin's Brook, and such residential use of the property would be a more likely candidate if there was a sewer connection available at the property. In addition, the traffic generated from residential use on the property, not to mention any mixed use /retail use of the property would be substantially higher than what their concept is that they're proposing, which is basically as a neighborhood distribution center. The residential is not good for the town either. Despite the dense residential use that would be proposed with 200 units, the town would most likely have to fund a fiscal deficit about \$366,000 per year from such a residential use, and such increased residential use qualitatively would have a negative effect and would likely result in future additional municipal expenditures, as well as straining existing municipal operations and services, including public works, schools, public safety, water. In addition, Sterling does not believe that a 40B whether it be friendly or otherwise, would be in the best interest of the town and so they're not proposing it for this property.

### Stop & Shop

As analyzed by Jones, Lang and LaSalle, Stop & Shop migrated from 97 Main Street as a direct result of the properties, poor visibility from Main Street, and lack of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Thereafter the site was vacant for 3 plus years until Ocean State Job Lots, which is a typical lower rent, paying tenant, filled the space. Ocean State Job Lots' lease ends in approximately 1½ years and there is a prospect that if something doesn't occur to change the use of this property, the site could potentially be vacant for a period of time. Jones Lang LaSalle basically looked at twenty surrounding retail properties like this property, and of the twenty, this property would finish dead last 20 out of 20. They concluded that, given the competitive set of dynamics, the site history, the visibility issues, they say, "We believe this is not a viable location for a grocery store or a shopping center." That's under current marketing conditions.

### Retail Life Cycle

Based on the retail life cycle, which Attorney Latham is not going to pretend to know the details of, but in terms of the size of that, the use of 97 Main Street as a brick and mortar retail is in clear decline and is no longer feasible, and it's basically resulting in lower income to both the property owner and to the town in terms of tax generation. So, therefore, what all the specialists are saying is that a change of the property is necessary.

### Sterling's Concept

Sterling's concept is to reuse the existing footprint of the structure on the property for a neighborhood distribution center which would continue to be a business involved in retail by serving as a facility used for warehousing, sorting, packaging, and or distribution of goods and materials that would be within that last hour of retail delivery. It's logistical. So this is, strongly current concept plan for the property with approximately twenty-one loading docks on the front of the structure and the existing gas station that is close to Martin's Brook will be removed. They believe that this would obviously improve supply chains in North Reading and the surrounding areas, and that it would decrease delivery times for retail home delivery, which is becoming more and more important and competitive among retail marketers.

### Traffic Counts & Calculations

Although traffic counts and the calculations are preliminary, initial analysis indicates that the daily traffic for neighborhood distribution at 97 Main Street would be 94% less than Stop & Shop was with the gas station. It'd be 89% less than the average department store, and 88% less than the recently proposed mixed use by one of the competitive bidders.

### Fiscal Impact

The fiscal impact of a neighborhood distribution hub for the town would be positive, with a net annual income to the town of approximately \$239,000 per year, and such use would require few municipal services. A one-time income from building permits from the building department and other permits would represent an additional \$149,365, plus or minus income on a one time basis. It is also anticipated that such use of the property they're also generating 205 jobs with an average salary of \$80,000 per year.

Conclusion

They would like and appreciate the CPCs input, suggestions and thoughts on the concept and would also like to know if they think this is something that they theoretically could support. Obviously there needs to be some amendment to the zoning bylaws for this to be possible. They believe that it would probably be better for the town if this concept was to move forward with the truck traffic going onto Rte. 28 as opposed to Winter Street.

Mr. Pearce stated that he is somewhat conflicted, but he does like the idea of keeping it commercial, but it was pointed out that the town needs more housing, and that's one of the reasons the small businesses don't do as well. He would like them to see the information from the consultant that the town hired about growing the residential base and the continuous pressure from the State to put more affordable housing in. But again, they've lost so much of the good commercial space to housing that he'd like to see something that has some kind of mix to it. But this essentially would come to be a warehouse. His concern would be that the truck traffic would be a fairly constant flow.

Mr. Scott Thornton, traffic engineer for Vanaesse & Associates, Inc. stated that one thing with this type of operation is, there's limited trucks that come in during the day. Most of the trucks are coming in later and it's probably a smaller number of overall tractor trailers, maybe in the 6 to 12 to 15 trailers that come in, and then if it becomes the delivery hub operation then those packages are brought in, sorted, loaded onto vehicles, and then those are the smaller vehicles.

Mr. Pearce stated that it is across from the Catholic Church and there is a residential neighborhood right next to that parking lot. So, 15 tractor trailers coming in at night may not go over well with the people in this neighborhood.

Mr. Thornton stated that is a valid point, but when you look at what a Stop & Shop could have done, they're getting deliveries later at night and early in the morning. As they get further into the design process they can look at those kinds of things. The reason for the loading docks being in the front of the building is because it faces Rte. 28 where there's already a fair amount of truck traffic.

Mr. Rudloff asked if they currently have properties in Massachusetts.

Mr. Greg Fantela, Corporate Counsel for Sterling Logistics Properties, stated that they do not have any other properties in Massachusetts that he's aware of. Sterling Logistics is a newer organization from Sterling Retail. They've been operating for about a two to three year period, now. So all the properties that Sterling does have for Sterling Logistics are under construction, or in the process of getting kicked off. And right now it's six properties across the country.

Mr. Rudloff asked if that was the trend that they have their properties, and then move them into this logistics, is this how this came about.

Mr. Fantela stated that it came about through Sterling's experience in the retail sector and largely assessing different types of retail assets. That's where it's strip malls or grocery anchored shopping centers, or big box structures, and the reality that there's less and less operators that are looking for big box structures. So, there's an entire real estate class of existing big box structures that have a current layout that has less and less perspective users. So these are all 20 plus year old buildings, but the layout of them will make some attractive for the big box structure. Big box operators in the 1990s makes them attractive for fulfillment operations today, because of higher ceilings, a large parking field, not sharing a property with other users, so there's not impeded access, and use restrictions on site, and its location near highways or vehicular access while also being within a driving distance of residential population.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he struggles with this because the town has the postal service center and Walmart. He disagrees with why Stop & Shop left. He believes they left because they were getting beat by Market Basket and they just went with moving to the smaller store down the street and this kept the other competitors from coming in. What the CPC is trying for and has spent taxpayer's money on studies to see if they can improve this area and make it more of a downtown and walkable area. This proposal isn't really the solution here, but he is going to keep an open mind and listen. He's disappointed because he thinks they don't have a town center, really and they're trying to make a town center, and this would just be a huge stage that would be taken away for the CPC to achieve that. He asked if they had looked at the retail side.

Mr. Fantela stated that a lot of the assessment numbers that Atty. Latham was sharing were based off all the same office buildings. Sterling works with market dynamics and what makes sense for the property. It goes back to the stand-alone big box structure that is kind of unique from some of the other more successful retail concepts today. That's part of the challenge for the property and part of what they see as the opportunity with it.

Mr. Pearce stated that he's been watching what's happening around the world and in our area and seeing that this is kind of what's happening and it's getting pretty popular. So, he can certainly understand this proposal, but the CPC looks at it more local. It seems to him that with all the different things that could happen here, there are a lot of downsides to this, for example. With trucks arriving at night where will they be parking? In the front of the building? If so, this means in the morning all of them have to be started up. There's a lot of traffic and noise being generated and even if the traffic could be mitigated. It is beneficial to have the existing traffic light on Main Street and it would be a good idea to work on the timing of that light in order to let enough trucks get out each time that light changes, or the trucks are going to be backed up to the building. But having that many vehicles and having to deal with them every day and night, and having truck trails coming in at night might be just a little too close to residential and they would not be happy with it unless there is a way to mitigate that.

Mr. Fantela stated that those are very valid points, and that's the sort of thing that they want to get this feedback on. They're not here with a specific request. They want to understand the extent to which they can find a solution for the site and the best way to collaborate to figure it out. On the idea of the truck traffic that's something they started and the concept plan was

something that they shared because there are two different access point to the property. There is a version of the plan that has all the loading activity happening on the left side of the building which would compel access from Winter Street, and looking at it from getting this feedback that wasn't as optimal because of these concerns of the church and neighbors being right there. So, the idea would be, there would be one access point that would be restricted solely for truck access and the other half ingress, egress would be for all of the regular access, and that would create the dynamic where trucks are only coming from Main Street.

Attorney Latham stated that the trucks are typically scheduled to occur off peak. So that's a mid-morning type of operation when the vehicles leave and then they come back, and they usually work an 8 to 10 hour shift and come back after the evening commute, so that way it's less of an impact. The peak activity for this site will occur non-coincident to traditional.

Mr. Pearce asked them how flexible are they as far as looking at this and coming up with something different than what they're currently proposing.

Mr. Fantela stated that Sterling's background is retail and logistics space. So for the most part that's the lens through which sterling is figuring out and has the grounded expertise to understand about the property, to take its market to succeed. Most of the other bidders for the site were interested in residential development. What are the limitations here that allow for them to be the highest bidder for the property, and to pursue this, when the idea of residential would seem to need more support, but would still require a change in zoning?

Mr. Pearce stated that he is not trying to push residential on them, but the CPC did have hire consultants who told them that they need to have residential if they want to attract businesses to the town. There is a new storage unit on Main Street and they did provide retail spaces, but were unable to rent out and are now using them as storage units, so he understands this. The consultants that were hired by the CPC did show them a building that was changed into a market space with multiple store and businesses which became a destination location, not just for North Reading, but people from other towns and that provides the value that is needed.

Mr. Rudloff asked if they are in "Due Diligence" for the property.

Attorney Latham stated that with they have been for a couple of months and they have to make a decision as to where things go from here. With respect to the consultants that work for the municipality they need to look at the price of the property because no one can do that unless it's done by the municipality. The price of the property is so high that you can't get some of the things that you would rather have.

Mr. Peter Ogren of Hayes Engineering stated that there is not a lot of residential around it. The only way to support that is to do a concept. It's a small village center with a log of residential. That's the model that they're using in Wakefield and there's a little retail and a lot of residential. Some mitigation would be needed on the north side, where the trailer park is, and it's pretty well isolated on the

South side by wetlands in the back and by open land. So he thinks they're in a good spot to come up with things to mitigate to truck traffic.

Attorney Latham stated that they did speak to most of the abutters and they are not in favor of residential.

Mr. Griffin stated that the description of this proposal sounds like it should be on Concord Street. The CPC has talked about Main Street many times and they look at it like a jewel that they've got to polish. What are the actual hours of operation for this proposed plan?

Mr. Fantela stated that they are looking at it in a conceptual way right now, without an end user. So that means each user would be a little bit different, but the general trends are that it would be a 24 hours with everything really smoothed down throughout the day, so it doesn't have high peaks. It has larger trucks and that a handful of larger trucks that are overnight, and then phased operations throughout the day.

Mr. Griffin asked if Attorney Latham said that there will be 24 loading docks in the front of the building.

Mr. Fantela stated that there will be 22 loading docks and 8 or 9 of them will accommodate vans. The existing loading docks on the right side of the building will go away.

Mr. Griffin asked if Sterling did the study, was there was no mention of grocery stores or shopping centers.

Mr. Pearce stated that Stop and Shop put deed restrictions on the property to not allow for grocery stores.

Mr. Griffin stated that the CPC is trying to come up with some ideas because they know what the town is hungry for, and they know what the town will support and that's why they're trying to find a happy medium. He does not think that a distribution center is a good fit for Main Street.

Mr. Johnston stated that when he first saw this on the agenda he was initially excited, because we all know the property and the potential role that it could play in the community. If you would have asked him what was the last thing he would like to see this property used for this would be that idea. This is definitely a Concord Street kind of business use. He also thinks that deliveries in this community are getting very close to being a nuisance that may need to be regulated with delivery trucks just blocking the roads like the law doesn't apply to them. It seems like delivery trucks have more rights than pedestrians do, and so, bringing a hub with a whole fleet of little buzzing trucks that are just going to violate all of the parking and road laws would be the last thing he would want to see put in the heart of the community.



**7 Charles Street / 249 Haverhill Street – pre-submittal conference for OSRP Special Permit.**

John Bobreck of Bobreck Construction stated that they have talked to the CPC a couple of times, and they've fine-tuned their plan and are working towards a discussion on the current layout that they've shown Mrs. McKnight. But they're looking at two separate entrances with a current total of 23 simple family lots. They are looking at one or two duplexes depending on the siting at 249 Haverhill Street side. They had another survey done and they don't have enough room, so they're making the assumption that the house is either going to be relocated or demolished. The plan shows two separate cul-de-sacs and two entrances, one on Charles Street and the other on Haverhill Street. There are 10 lots on the North side and 13 lots on the South side. The North cul-de-sac is approximately 450' long and will be coming off of 7 Charles Street. They have discussed the DCR paper streets through which these lots are deeded to pass and re-pass, so there is a shared driveway that's going to go to a dual lot with reduced frontage. On the Southern side there will be another cul-de-sac approximately 950' long. They'll be doing a wetland crossing and they've cited these lots to be outside of the "no build". The existing structure at 249 Haverhill Street is not going to work with the round base, so they're showing it being demolished. They are looking at doing a couple of duplexes in this area and will be presenting this as a special permit because it is an open space concept.

Mr. Pearce asked what they would be putting on the piece of land after they demolish the existing home.

Mr. Bobreck stated that they will put a structure back there. They're going to recreate the lot lines in a different fashion, to be more even, because that is a pretty big sized lot. They've had their traffic engineer start to look at the area and do some traffic counts and speed to prepare themselves for the special permit. They did have a discussion last time, with the board members, on accessing through the DCR paper street, out back, to the park and how they could help that. So, they're going to create a pathway for any users of that street to access through a lot.

Mr. Johnston stated that he was very pleased to see the pathway access.

Mr. Pearce stated that there may be people who do not live on that street, but may hear that there is a place to park to gain access to the State Forest. Where will they be able to park?

Mr. Bobreck stated that they can do some research and see what can be made available and discuss it further with the CPC. He's envisioning a gravel path, nothing too substantial.

Mr. Pearce stated that access should not be restricted.

Mr. Bobreck stated that the DCR path is mostly cleared and they're going to work with the Conservation Commission to restore the crossing.

Mr. Pearce stated that where the existing road goes up to the edge of the State forest there is a little bit of an area that Mr. Halchak said he was going to create a parking spot. So, if you're going to put a pathway there that is going to encourage people to park in that cul-de-sac. Is that really the best idea?

Mr. Bobreck stated that that was the original DCR plan. He would like to get more feedback from the CPC and that would be a good point of discussion.

Mr. Johnston asked how this is different from the existing trailheads around that southern section of Harold Parker. Because there are multiple places where there are circled end of roads which have 2 or 3 parking spots and there are cars there, now and then, but those are people just using the spaces, so how would this be any different than the status quo for the other neighborhoods around that area, or concern about outsiders coming in. He's steps away from one of the trailheads and around hunting season there are cars parking there first thing in the morning. He's not thrilled about the hunters, but it's their right, and he's happy to see people use the natural resources and this just seems like in keeping with maintaining access to that section of Harold Parker. The idea that was mentioned at another meeting about unsavory characters using these access points and he's wondering if there's a problem he's unaware of. The southern part of Harold Parker in North Reading is a quiet area that is mostly used in his experience by town folk and there already are access points around the other neighborhoods, so encouraging developments that put this natural space behind somebody's backyard, and if someone is hiking and can't come out to the streets, to get their bearings if they get lost in the woods is a disservice to the community.

Mr. Pearce stated that that roadway is going to stay there, so theoretically, one could drive right up to the edge of the forest, so his only concern is are there a couple of parking spots where they could park. If not, they would want to try to take one of these roads and park there.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he agrees with Mr. Johnston because he uses the access point on Arlene Drive. So, he's not really understanding the issue because the existing road is going to stay that way, so they can still come in off that intersection on North Street, or Arlene Drive to get into that area, but the developments to the north and south are kind of independent they're just on either side, so perhaps it's not good to have an implied path.

Attorney Jill Mann asked if the big question is the availability of parking and they provide a connection that is not just pedestrian access, but also vehicle access, not necessarily to DCR land, but to provide vehicle access to park and then use pedestrian paths.

Mr. Johnston stated that he's not looking for dedicated parking, but a solution to where people are going to park.

Mr. Rudloff stated that if some of the access issues could be addressed that would be it.

Attorney Mann asked if the question is about the availability of parking. So, you want to make sure that they provide a connection that it's not nearly pedestrian access that you want to ensure vehicular access, not necessarily directly to DCR land, but to provide vehicular access to the park and then use the pedestrian paths.

Mr. Johnston stated that he is not asking for dedicated parking, but as long as there is a solution for people who are going to the park.

Attorney Mann stated that there are a lot of options on this property to do something like that, and probably down in the back of the cul-de-sac isn't the best because then they would have to try to create a multi-purpose area by making the cul-de-sac bigger, so maybe doing it at that shared location and then there may be a gate at the DCR access.

Mr. Bobreck stated that ultimately the paper streets are mostly for fire access, so that's why it's chained off.

Mr. Rudloff stated that they could provide a map showing the access points.

#### **66 Winter Street – discussion**

Attorney Jill Mann stated that she is representing Ed Spinney of SignArt and that they are attending this meeting just to give clarification. When they originally came to the CPC to present the project they originally presented it as doing a 6000 sq. ft. addition onto the existing building, and it is. The issue was that they have to take down the skin and roof of the building, because it's dilapidated, and that was always the intent, but they truly did not explain it to the CPC properly, because Danielle made it abundantly clear that what the CPC thought was that they were doing an addition and renovating the building, and they are: brand new skin, brand new roof and new structural supports, but the foundation is remaining. She believes that this is all incorporated in the decision, but wanted to come back to explain. If the CPC wants them to do a minor modification then they will do that.

Mrs. McKnight stated that they could add the letter from Attorney Mann to the file, but that would be the decision from the CPC if they thought it would be sufficient.

Mr. Pearce stated that he doesn't know if they actually need to take a vote, or agree to it. Maybe a consensus that they understand what the situation is and that they're ok with it.

Attorney Mann stated that the CPC should also ask that the letter be part of the record.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he thought the existing building was always staying.

The consensus of the Community Planning Commission is to accept the letter and explanation.

**Greenbriar – treatment plant building design – informal feedback/discussion**

Mrs. McKnight stated that the condominium association would like a new structure constructed around the package treatment plant on the site. This does not trigger a site plan review by the CPC, but the building inspector has asked if the CPC would informally comment on the design.

Mr. Rudloff stated that it will be a buffer building that covers up the treatment plant. It's a very simple color to match those earth tones. But, we could make an argument to improve the aesthetics, at least, even if it's just the base that faces Main Street. The picture depicting the proposed building is a mockup, so it could be way bigger. The CPC should ask that they revise the plan to show elevations.

Mr. Pearce stated that there is going to be a certain level of methane coming out and he's wondering how they're going to vent it from the new structure.

Mr. Griffin stated that that can be very dangerous, but there are all sort of ways to monitor and watch those levels.

Mr. Pearce stated that they're asking if the CPC is ok with the aesthetics and they are, but he would question the noise that's going to come from the fan and any other impact it may have.

Mr. Rudloff stated that he wonders if the CPC is setting precedent by letting a buffer encapsulate like an envelope for the treatment package, or do they want up the game a little bit, and he doesn't mean the whole building, but at least the Rte. 28 face.

Mr. Pearce asked Mrs. McKnight to ask Joe Parisi if he would take a look at the plan and see if there was anything that he might want to change.

The consensus of the CPC is that additional information is needed (such as elevations).

**Minutes**

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

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the minutes dated November 21, 2023 as written.

Roll call vote: Mr. Johnston, Mr. Griffin, Mr. Rudloff and Mr. Pearce in favor, none opposed.

**157 Haverhill Street - updated survey discussion**

Mrs. McKnight stated that they should invite the neighbors in to give them some comment, and maybe have a workshop style discussion about this. She knows that the CPC was going to focus on one property at a time in the Affordable Housing Overlay Districts, so they don't have to do it immediately, if they're not ready to do it. LJR Engineering finished the plan and asked her where the lot line for the ANR should be and she thinks that would be worthy of having a workshop discussion.

Mr. Pearce stated that the ANR is to separate the wetlands from the buildable lot.

**Planning Administrator Updates:****7 Saint Theresa Street - RFP**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she has prepared a draft RFP for the disposition of 7 Saint Theresa Street. The draft has been reviewed by Town Counsel and by MIAA, the Town's insurer. If the CPC finds the draft acceptable the next step would be to send it the Select Board for review.

**MBTA Communities – proposed zoning district**

Mrs. McKnight submitted to the State the proposed zoning district and is waiting for feedback on whether they would accept it. They should have a response by the end of November. They could plan a community meeting before that time to inform people about it.

Mr. Pearce stated that they should wait until the State sends their feedback to them.

**Municipal Vulnerability Program**

Mrs. McKnight stated that she submitted an expression of interest to the program which they are part of and eligible for their grants. It's just an expression of interest, but the actual grant program opens in the spring. She worked with DPW and it would be to ask for money for the two failing culverts on Chestnut Street and Burroughs Road.

**Swan Pond - study**

There's an ongoing study to look for new trail heads in the Swan Pond area managed by the Forest Committee and she's been invited to attend their meetings.

Mr. Pearce stated that they should also look to see where the best place would be for parking.

Adjournment at 9:32PM

Respectfully submitted,  
Ryan Carroll, Clerk

