



RECEIVED  
BARBARA STATS

2017 AUG 10 PM 3:13

TOWN CLERK  
NORTH READING, MA

**Town of North Reading**  
*Massachusetts*

---

*Community Planning*

**MINUTES**

**Tuesday, July 18, 2017**

Mr. William Bellavance, Chairperson called the Tuesday, July 18, 2017 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:06p.m. in Room 14 of the North Reading Town Hall, 235 North Street, North Reading, MA.

**MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** William Bellavance, Chairperson  
Warren Pearce, Vice Chairperson  
Jonathan Cody, Clerk  
Christopher B. Hayden

**STAFF**

**PRESENT:** Danielle McKnight, AICP  
Town Planner/Community Planning Administrator

Mr. Bellavance informed all present that the meeting was being recorded.

**113 Haverhill Street – bond release**

Mrs. McKnight stated that all of the work has been completed, but the as-built plan has not been submitted to the planning department. The \$5,000.00 site opening bond will be reserved to secure completion of the as-built.

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

that the Community Planning Commission vote to accept the February 16, 2017 report from Design Consultants, Inc. and the following bonds for 113 Haverhill Street be released: Performance bond \$22,180.00, Letter of Credit 146,778.50 and Tripartite Agreement 146,778.50.

**400 Riverpark Drive – informal discussion**

Steve Cox stated that he is representing the owners of 400 Riverpark Drive. The proposal is to redesign the parking lot and add 77 parking spaces. In 1990 the Zoning Board of Appeals approved a variance of (9' x 18') parking spaces for 447 of the spaces. At that time the parking had 510 parking spaces, the property now has 520, 20 are exclusively for the adjacent building, so it has 490 and they are proposing to add 77 spaces and will also be (9' x 18'). This is above the minimum requirement. The redesign will remove 30 trees and add 40 trees, with the intent of doing a better screening of the site, from the road.

Mr. Pearce asked if the trees being removed are mature. If so, can they be replanted?

Tony Capachetti of Hayes Engineering stated that they are taking advantage of some of the existing island space, so they are removing trees from the rear of the site and adding darker trees to the front, along the driveway. They wanted to know if the board would prefer that they go to the ZBA for approval, before coming to the planning department and will the board be willing to waive some of the requirements because this is an existing site.

Mr. Bellavance asked how much greenspace would be lost.

Mr. Hayden stated that the trick is that you cannot see this from North Reading as residential area. In the rear it minimizes the heat load on the asphalt and allows a better place for the people that work there. This is one of the reasons that it was originally designed this way and it complies to the requirements. There are different requirements here, than were met originally for greenspace and he doesn't know if they are going to meet that.

Tony Capachetti stated that as an individual site, no.

Mr. Bellavance stated that Mr. Cody informed him that this work is within the 100' buffer and will need to file an application with the Conservation Commission. The board prefers that they file with the planning department before seeking approval from the zoning board. He is concerned with the drainage on the property because there will be less greenspace.

Tony Capachietti stated that a drainage analysis will be done and submitted with the Site Plan Review application.

Mr. Pearce asked if there were any 10' x 20' parking spaces.

Tony Capachietti stated that the whole site is 9' x 18'.

Mr. Hayden asked how many handicap spaces are there and are they located near the entrance of the building.

Tony Capachietti stated that there are two handicap spaces in the front.

Mr. Hayden stated that having 12 handicap spaces in the rear and 2 in the front does not make sense. He suggested that these spaces be split into two.

Tony Capachietti stated that most of the tenants prefer the rear parking because it is wider.

Tony Capachietti stated that they will review the handicap spaces.

Mr. Hayden stated that the trees should be reasonably spaced.

**10 & 12 Mt. Vernon Street – Definitive Subdivision – cont. P.H. 7:30pm**

Attorney Jill Mann stated that they have been working with Design Consultants Inc. and the town engineer to ensure that this project satisfies not only the State requirements for Stormwater Management, but also the local bylaw. Subject to DCI's review they did determine that they would need to request two waivers from the Subdivision Rules & Regulations.

Mrs. McKnight stated that she did meet with Mike Soraghan, Town Engineer and that he is satisfied with the changes made to the plan.

Attorney Jill Mann stated that they would like to ask that Lot 1 which is the existing home not be included into the Statutory Covenant. They do intend to sell this lot quickly, probably before the street is installed. The temporary driveway will be removed and eliminated, so that there is no access onto Mount Vernon Street, no later than the time that Lot 7 has access and a release.

Mr. Bellavance asked what type of improvement would be made to the abutter across from the proposed roadway.

Attorney Jill Mann stated that an agreement was made with the abutter to plant rhododendrons for screening.

Mr. Pearce asked if an ANR would be required to separate Lot 1 from the subdivision.

Attorney Jill Mann stated that under the Subdivision Rules and Regulations they are entitled to declare it as a separate lot.

Mrs. McKnight stated that there was mention in the DCI recommendations for conditions that the pocket wetlands needed to be constructed and planted under the supervision of a professional wetland scientist. Is this something that they will be doing?

Attorney Jill Mann stated that now that they have finalized the Stormwater Management with this board they will be returning to the Conservation Commission who typically makes this a condition.

Chris Sparages of Williams & Sparages LLC stated that DCI requested that this be added to the plan as a note, and it was done.

Mr. Hayden stated that there was a discussion about a post & rail fence being added to Lots 6 and 7.

Chris Sparages stated that when he responded to the town engineer's memo he asked if it would be okay to include it in the Conditional Approval because it was not yet added to the plan. It was agreed that it would be added to the Conditional Approval

Mr. Bellavance closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cody moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce and voted 4-0: (Mr. Veno absent)

Section 350-14.B(3) which requires a tangent of 150 feet in length to separate all reverse curves on principal and secondary street, and in place thereof, permit no tangent to separate reverse curves is GRANTED.

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

Section 350-14(D)(3) which requires a leveling area of at least 75 feet, with a maximum grade of 3%, in a residential subdivision where a grade is 5% or greater within 150 feet of the intersection of street right-of-way lines, and in place thereof, permit as shown on plan is GRANTED.

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

that the Community Planning Commission vote to exclude lot 1 from the Statutory Covenant for the subdivision.

Mr. Cody moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce and voted 4-0: (Mr. Veno absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the plan entitled, "Eaton Circle, North Reading, MA"; dated 2/10/2017; last revised 7/17/2017; drawn by Williams & Sparages. Subject to the terms and conditions of the Certificate of Conditional Approval dated July 18, 2017 as amended this evening.

**Nichols Street – Definitive Subdivision – cont. P.H. 8:00PM**

Mr. Cody recused himself from the public hearing.

Luke Roy of LJR Engineering stated that since they were last before the board they have submitted revised plans, stormwater analysis and a letter summarizing the changes.

Changes made:

- 1) Existing grade profile lines on the plan
- 2) Calculations added for the 5 and 50 year storm design frequencies
- 3) Specified sediment depth markers for the stormwater basin
- 4) Specified 3 in 1 slope
- 5) Slide slopes for the sediment forbay
- 6) Sediment forbay calculations to the stormwater analysis
- 7) Confirmed that there were no down gradient off-side slopes great than 15% within 50' of the stormwater basin
- 8) No off-site septic systems within 50' of the stormwater basin
- 9) No off-site wells within 50' of the stormwater basin

They also met with Mike Soraghan, town engineer to ask for waivers to the Stormwater Management bylaw. They were unable to do a side slope on the road because there was enough of a cut through the hill that there wasn't enough room to slope; this is why they needed the wall. The town engineer suggested eliminating the retaining wall so that the town

would not have to maintain it. The applicant approached the abutter and has a verbal agreement to get a temporary grading easement, so that it can be sloped. They added off-site roadway improvements to sheet 11 of the definitive subdivision.

Mr. Hayden asked if they were going to straighten the northern side of the road and have the two upper catch basins included in the review.

Luke Roy stated the road will be straightened. They have not proposed any work to those basins. He knows that there was a question in regard to the run-off on the road, but this is old and undocumented. There is an outlet from one of those, it could be leaching basins, but is unclear, so they did not want to contribute to that.

Mr. Pearce stated that he is glad that they are fixing the road, but they should probably check with the DPW to see if they want to raise and/or fix the basins before the road is paved.

Frank Moda Jr. of 45 Spruce Road stated that at the least meeting there was concern about the water pipe coming into the development.

Luke Roy stated that with the proposed project the dead-end water main on Nichols Street will be extended to a total of 1120 linear feet, from the edge of Main Street to the center of the cul-de-sac. They will be requesting a waiver from the requirement to loop the water main. He has discussed it with the water department and no objections were made.

Mrs. McKnight stated that the water department does not really like the cross country mains and prefer not to see them, but in terms of the decision to loop it or not, they didn't have specific concerns about water pressure and will leave it to this board to decide whether to waive the looping requirement.

Mr. Hayden stated that the thing about looping is if there is a break, you can disconnect the section and continue to feed other places.

Luke Roy stated that there was a discussion about the looping, but then they discussed how they could make improvements to Nichols Street.

Mr. Hayden moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce and voted: 3-0 (Mr. Cody abstained, Mr. Veno absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested continuance of the public hearing for the Nichols Street subdivision until August 1, 2017 @ 8:00PM.



**104 Lowell Road – Site Plan Review – cont. P.H. 8:30PM**

Mrs. McKnight stated that Mr. Veno has been absent this and the last meeting on this project and therefore will be unable to vote on it because only one meeting can be missed to use the Mullins rule. Mark Mastroianni (from Pulte) agreed to go forward with four members.

Matt Leidner of Civil Design Group, LLC stated that at the last meeting they were still waiting for the peer review from Design Consultants, Inc. They have since received the Stormwater and traffic review. Last week he met with Mike Clark of Design Consultants, Inc. and Mike Soraghan, Town Engineer to discuss the peer review. They discussed the Stormwater peer review and were able to reach a resolution on how to address most of the comments. They have been working in the interim with Mrs. McKnight and the Town Administrator, Mike Gillberto on a subdivision plan which is intended to divide off the existing Edgewood leach field. The project that they are proposing has an area set aside for a future leach field for the town associated with the other parcel. Their proposal is to subdivide those two areas off so that the Edgewood leach field and town property are their own separate parcels. The subsequent plans that will be submitted to the planning department will reflect this proposed subdivision.

Mr. Hayden asked if this would affect the setbacks on the buildings.

Matt Leidner stated that it will not affect the setbacks.

Robert Machaud of MDM Transportation stated that DCI's peer review specifically focused on areas that related to site lines and did identify a couple of clarifying points as related to safety and crash analysis. For all intense purposes, it's a non-issue and has been documented in their response to the DCI review. The driveway that currently serves Edgewood was built in anticipation that there would be potentially, not only residential uses supported by the intersection, but eventually commercial component. So, the driveway was designed to the standard that it may someday be signalized. The designer of record provided a design that is fully conforming to applicable site line criteria and engineering standards that was approved locally. They have gone out and measured available site lines that exist at this intersection and this was a point of discussion, generally and through the state level MEPA due process as well. If you are at a stopped position, at a position most people stop at, at the driveway, there is more than ample site visibility for either on-coming vehicle to perceive that a vehicle is leaving the driveway or for a vehicle to attempting to leave the driveway to see an on-coming vehicle to make an appropriate gap selection to make a right turn or a left turn from the driveway is called an intersection site distance. Intersection site distance has to at least equal the stopping site distance. The ideal standard would have a longer distance that would allow someone travelling Rte. 62 to maintain a travel speed within 10 miles per hour of their speed. What's interesting about the intersection is that there is an exclusive right turn lane into the driveway, so technically the position that those people actually park at is beyond the stop park. This is not illegal, or uncommon.

Design Consultants Inc. comment had to do with looking to the left, the westerly site line. Their suggestion is that an easement area be established that would allow for clearing defined by the blue line, at the edge of the road. This is a small piece of vegetated area that should be maintained on a regular basis. This is town property and it would be in the best interest of DPW to mow it occasionally, there is no reason to establish an easement.

Mr. Pearce asked if there was a way to prepare this area so that maintenance is minimized.

Robert Machaud stated that mulch would minimize the growth.

Mr. Hayden asked if it was possible for the Pulte Group to maintain the area, when they are maintaining areas around it. It will benefit the residents of the condominiums.

Robert Machaud stated that another issue has to do with the North Street intersection. The site line approaching that travelling west bound or looking left. The property on the northeast corner is state-owned property and trees were recently removed which has enhanced visibility and site line, that could be furthered enhanced by removing more vegetation.

Mr. Pearce stated that they could ask DPW to look at this and remove the vegetation.

Robert Machaud stated that the intersection that borders Wilmington with a signal light. It currently operates on a three phase operation, 90 second cycle; it is an actuated signal which means that it detects the presence of vehicles and provides green time when needed. They are aware that the westbound approach is a wide signal lane approach and believe it is this way for a reason. To try to formalize a lane structure would tend to cement how that westbound approach functions. They would not advise physically marking or delineating exclusive lane structure. It is there professional opinion that it could be enhanced, the operations could be improved. The detection is programmed in a way that may not be as sensitive to the commercial activity along the border. The loops in the road and westbound approach, if they are not activated within one second the signal does detect another vehicle passing over the loop, it automatically assumes that there are no more vehicles and goes back to minimum assignment of green. Because trucks have different acceleration characteristics tend to cause this to gap out, so the amount of green time that could be assigned to the westbound could be better and more efficiently assigned if the gap time were changed in the computer for the light control.

Mr. Bellavance asked if he would recommend a time.

Robert Machaud stated that timing could be adjusted for the time of day operation. Right now it operates on a 90 second cycle, maximum amount of time for the side streets is 20 seconds, the main movement is about 50 seconds, plus a lead of 20 seconds for the eastbound movement. They may be able to time this in a way that is more efficient for the time of day.



They could identify and recommend these changes to the Town of Wilmington and they would anticipate that the town through their own signal contract would actually implement those types of changes.

Mr. Pearce stated that he is very familiar with this intersection and this is probably what needs to happen.

Mark Mastroianni of Pulte Homes of New England stated that they did reach out to Wilmington and they have no objections to this project, but they are concerned with the traffic. They have received all of the information and will review it and get back to them.

Mr. Hayden asked if adding a lane going west, past the Woburn Street light, would make it better.

Mr. Pearce stated that by leaving it vague, it allows people to go around to the right, if a person is making a left hand turn. He believes that changing the timing of the light will make it better.

Matt Leidner read the Town of Wilmington's concerns and comments, documented on letter dated July 11, 2017.

Mr. Cody moved, seconded by Mr. Pearce and voted 4-0: (Mr. Veno absent)

that the Community Planning Commission vote to grant the requested continuance of the public hearing for 104 Lowell Road until Tuesday, August 1, 2017 @ 8:30pm.

#### **271 Main Street – Site Plan Review – P.H. 8:45PM**

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

David Webster of Federal Realty Investment Trust stated that the proposal is to add an area containing up to three 40'x8x9' shipping containers, to grow lettuce and herbs very efficiently. At this time one container has been leased to Freight Farms.

Mr. Bellavance asked if this is going to minimize the parking spaces on the site and how are the containers to be powered and use of water.

David Webster stated that an electrician has been hired and is working with Eversource to install service. The water will be taken from a hose attached to the building's water supply. There is extra parking on the site and will not change the requirements needed for spaces.

Mr. Pearce stated that this is in the Aquifer Protection District and will require a special permit.

Mr. Bellavance closed the public hearing.

Applicant will return on August 1, 2017 when there will be a vote on a Conditional Approval.

Adjournment at 9:34PM

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan Cody, Clerk