



RECEIVED
BARBARA STATS

2020 JAN 31 AM 9:48

Town of North Reading
Massachusetts

Community Planning

TOWN CLERK
NORTH READING, MA

MINUTES

Tuesday, November 5, 2019

Mr. Warren Pearce, Chairperson called the Tuesday, November 5, 2019 meeting of the Community Planning Commission to order at 7:30p.m. in Room 14 of the North Reading Town Hall, 235 North Street, North Reading, MA.

MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Warren Pearce, Chairperson
William Bellavance, Vice Chairperson
Ryan Carroll, Clerk
David Rudloff
Christopher Hayden

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.

Minutes

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of October 1, 2019 as written.

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

that the Community Planning Commission vote to approve the minutes of October 15, 2019 as written

Amber Road - discussion

Mr. Rich Williams of Williams & Sparages stated that Mr. Sean Szekely is interested in purchasing the property at Amber and Priscilla Road. They met with the planner to discuss this property and were advised to speak to the planning board. There are two existing right-of-ways off of the road previously mentioned.

Mr. Hayden stated that they are not right-of-ways, they are access roads to the Harold Parker State Forest.

Mr. Williams stated that they are lay-outs which is the definition of right-of-ways. He knows that the construction of this particular property has been going on for some time and that is why he would like to get some input from the CPC. His understanding is that there was a court case that allowed the owner of the property to construct these roads, as their shown. There is also a superseding order that allows the work that's in the buffer zone and someone could come in and build these out, as shown on that plan. They understand that constructing those roads does not necessarily allow the construction of homes or pulling frontages off, dividing the lot would provide three lots. Again, they're aware that it's not a right-of way, according to zoning and would have to come back with a subdivision application to get approved for the improvements in those roads, so that they would qualify as roads and could support a subdivision and additional lots off. With the construction that was proposed and approved through the court process, these roads as they're approved in that process are different from the subdivision standards. Their layout width is greater than the town's layout. The town's minimum layout is 50" and these are 66". Pavement width is 28' and the towns are between 28' and 32', but these roads don't have curbing, sidewalks, street lights or street trees. The drainage is country drainage which is different than what is normally done in the Town of North Reading. There are some things that could easily be added, such as street light and street trees which would not affect the design of this and move on, but if the town and planning board

were going to require sidewalks, curbing and drainage then this whole idea that is before you tonight would have to change. They would need to redesign the drainage, it would not be LID (low impact development) drainage, it would be normal curbing, catch basins, and some sort of Stormwater Management.

Mr. Pearce stated that it would have to come in under subdivision, this was already decided. In order to submit a subdivision application for approval you need to show that you have the right to bring it in. Which should be a "Purchase and Sales" and he doesn't think that they're there yet. Do you have a release from the State saying that you have the right to bring this up to subdivision standards within the right-of-way, or do you have to put a road in another area and leave that road for access to the State park?

Mr. Williams stated that he doesn't know exactly, but he's fairly sure that if its built according to the subdivision it would be sufficient as proposed on this plan.

Mr. Pearce stated that normally what happens is if a property comes in under a subdivision and everything has been completed the town takes possession of it for a nominal fee and the town maintains it. He has read all of the letters and knows that the State has no intention of maintaining the road. So, the State would have to relinquish to some extent control or ownership to the developer initially and then perhaps to the town, ultimately. Because its State property he's not sure how that works.

Mr. Tom Romeo stated that the construction permit issued to the past developer was that he was to maintain the roadway until the end of time, including snow and ice removal, which he has not done.

Mr. Pearce asked if the town still takes it in fee because at some point the road will be built.

Mr. Williams stated that he does not have answer to that at this time.

Mr. Hayden stated that those two roads are longer than a 1000' because this is well beyond the regulations and there is also a sight distance issue – south on Haverhill Street.

Mr. Pearce stated that coming in under subdivision, initially, you would have all the rights and responsibilities that go along with the application.

Mr. Williams asked if the CPC would entertain a subdivision road that was low impact development without curbing and sidewalks, with country drainage.

Mr. Pearce stated that there is a very substantial wetland to the north of this property and not doing some level of treatment to the water that will flow off of the street might not be the best idea.

Mr. Williams stated that there is treatment there. The plan was designed with the Stormwater Management policy. They have different methods, such as grass swales, infiltration trenches, raingardens, bio-swales and bio filters. He hasn't gone through all of this, yet. But it looks like if you were in a town that allowed streets without curbing and sidewalks, it could be done in accordance with the Stormwater Management policy.

Mr. Bellavance stated that he has no knowledge of this property, but what is the difference with this property to any other property. Every other property out there has to construct a road. We may only have them construct one sidewalk instead of two. Why would it be different for this property? Is it going to be Low Income Housing? What is the benefit? Why is okay to approve for this property, but not other properties.

Mr. Williams stated that he's not here to answer that question; this is something for the CPC to consider. The proposal would be to build single family homes.

Mr. Bellavance stated that his answer would be no. He looks at every property the same and they all have to go through this process.

Mr. Pearce stated that there is still the question of who is going to maintain the road.

53 Old Andover Road - ANR

Mr. Carroll moved, seconded by Mr. Hayden and voted 5-0:

that the Community Planning Commission vote to endorse as "Approval-Not-Required", the plan entitled "Plan of Land in North Reading, Massachusetts, (Middlesex County); dated October 28, 2019; drawn by LJR Engineering, Inc.

Master Plan - Discussion

Mrs. McKnight stated that the last time they spoke about the Master plan they thought that it might need some simple language, CPC intro of what this means to us. She also spoke to the Town Administrator, Mike Gilleberto and they thought that the intro letter provided by Carlos Montanez might be a good place to put this information. She drafted the intro letter for the CPC and put it in the dropbox for their review.

The consensus of the CPC is that they are in approval of the changes made by the planner.

RFP – Main Street - Evaluations

The CPC discussed the proposals submitted by Abacus Architects + Planners with Onsite Engineering, Dodson & Flinker with Horsley Witten Group and Weston & Sampson.

Mr. Bellavance stated that Abacus is working for HKT and the Facilities Master plan just voted to recommend them as the architects for the Facilities Master plan.

Mr. Hayden stated that if they were only going to do wastewater, he would pick Weston & Sampson, but he doesn't see any planning or thought, about what could go there, how could it go or what the costs would be. Abacus hit all the points, their engineering people talked about if we did a treatment plant that all those pipes would be able to connect when sewer came down. Dodson & Flinker did not say that, but he believes that they could do it if asked.

Mrs. McKnight asked that they use the evaluation sheets in case it gets challenged, they will have a record.

Mr. Rich Wallner stated that they are working to get the Facilities Master plan completed within six to eight months.

Mr. Rudloff asked how they should score.

Mrs. McKnight stated that its 0, 1 or 2. This is more than we have to do for this type of procurement because it started off as a 30B process, under goods & services. It actually ended up being advertised under design services because Central Register called and said that it was more appropriate to be under design services, but we said that we were going to be scoring it in the RFP and that's why we're doing it this way.

Mr. Pearce stated that they should do one at a time.

Mrs. McKnight stated that they should go ahead and score and discuss all of them, but because Dodson & Flinker left out a few elements, such as, certificate of non-collusion, tax compliance certificate and acknowledgement of receipt) but this doesn't mean that they are automatically disqualified because this is no longer a 30B process.

Mr. Pearce stated that the engineers are going to be the ones to design the wastewater treatment plant. If they have good information, knowledge and experience and apply these properties with wastewater treatments to the application, that is what we should be looking at.

Mr. Bellavance stated that it is advantageous if they have prior experience.

Mrs. McKnight stated that they could take more time to review the proposals.

Mr. Rudloff stated that his first foot forward is not is not just wastewater, he wants creativity.

Mr. Pearce stated that Weston & Sampson knows that the town is big on wastewater and that is why they focused more on that.

Mr. Carroll stated that overall Abacus Architects is his choice.

Mr. Pearce asked if a smaller company might give them a more personal service.

Mr. Hayden stated sure, by telephone, they're at least 100 miles away.

Mr. Bellavance stated that we could also interview them to see what they are about.

Mrs. McKnight stated that there are 3 sealed envelopes in the town administrator's office, once they CPC decides which company they prefer they can open the envelopes and see what the pricing is.

Mr. Pearce suggested that they all put down their score to see which company is the one they would like to work with and can decide at the next meeting.

Planning Administrator Updates

Open Space & Recreation Plan

The plan is under way and a committee has been selected. Mrs. McKnight has been working with Maureen Stevens and some of the staff members of the Park & Recreation Department. The first meeting will be held on December 5, 2019 at Town Hall.

Riverpark Drive intersection

Mrs. McKnight recently heard back from the engineer who did the design for the land taking of the Cummings property that there is a land court issue that will prevent the town from taking the property. They are re-designing it, so that the piece of property is not affected and designing within the right-of-way.

Charles Street Ext.

Mr. Pearce stated that he has heard that the developer and owner are having disagreements at this time and therefore no work is being done.

25-29 Main Street

Mrs. McKnight has tried to reach out to the owner to see what is going on with the property and has heard nothing back.

Mr. Bellavance stated that he heard that a permit is being held up.

Eaton Circle

David Giangrande has been out to the site a few times and called her about the silt, to say that it has been cleaned out, but was having trouble understanding the nature of the concern and asked that she and Mr. Hayden meet him out on the site to discuss the issues.

Mr. Hayden stated that when it rained two weeks ago the street was flooded out and went into the driveway to the wet pond and all of the silt came out. He did go by yesterday and it was completely pumped out, but he doesn't know where they are pumping it. He went by today after it rained and it was filling with muddy water again.

Mr. Bellavance left the meeting.

Zoning Board of Appeals

9 Edgewood Terrace – On the petition of Karolina Costa & Felipe Moskorz for a variance for a retaining wall per the setback requirements.

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

- The CPC does not have any objections to the proposal.

199 Central Street – On the petition of Dennis Molla for a home occupation special permit for a general contractor business.

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

- The CPC does not have any objections to the proposal as long as the Home Occupation regulations in the Zoning Bylaw are adhered to.

435 Park Street – On the petition of Haibo Shang for a special permit to raise chickens.

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

- The CPC recommends considering any impacts to neighbors in its review.
- The CPC recommends restricting roosters.

Adjournment at 9:25PM

Respectfully submitted,


Ryan Carroll, Clerk

Abacus Architects + Planners with Onsite Engineering

Criterion	Highly Advantageous	Advantageous	Not Advantageous/Unacceptable	Score/Notes
Prior Experience	Reports similar projects of a similar or greater size. Has knowledge of and prior experience with wastewater package treatment plants.	Reports similar projects.	Reports no similar projects	<hr/> Notes:
Past Performance	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time, within budget, and with favorable feedback from client.	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time and within budget.	Poor record of experience with similar projects, or unfavorable feedback from client.	<hr/> Notes:
Current Workload and Ability to take on the Project	Demonstrates staffing capable of managing, and commits lead project manager and supporting staff.	Commits to having sufficient staff capacity to complete project.	Has insufficient staffing capacity to complete the project.	<hr/> Notes:
Staff	Commits highest level staff/partners, with more than the minimum required experience, to manage project.	Commits mid-level and some higher-level staff to manage project.	Few or no mid- or high-level staff available to manage project.	<hr/> Notes:
Project Approach	Describes in detail an appropriate project approach addressing how the project's goals will be met. Narrative clearly illustrates the consultant's capability to achieve all project deliverables.	Narrative describes the project approach in more general terms with little explanation as to how deliverables will be completed.	Few details provided about project approach, or approach seems unrealistic or poorly matched to the project's goals and deliverables.	<hr/> Notes:

Highly Advantageous = 2 points

Advantageous = 1 point

Not Advantageous = 0 points

Criterion	Highly Advantageous	Advantageous	Not Advantageous/Unacceptable	Score/Notes
Prior Experience	Reports similar projects of a similar or greater size. Has knowledge of and prior experience with wastewater package treatment plants.	Reports similar projects.	Reports no similar projects	_____ Notes:
Past Performance	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time, within budget, and with favorable feedback from client.	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time and within budget.	Poor record of experience with similar projects, or unfavorable feedback from client.	_____ Notes:
Current Workload and Ability to take on the Project	Demonstrates staffing capable of managing, and commits lead project manager and supporting staff.	Commits to having sufficient staff capacity to complete project.	Has insufficient staffing capacity to complete the project.	_____ Notes:
Staff	Commits highest level staff/partners, with more than the minimum required experience, to manage project.	Commits mid-level and some higher-level staff to manage project.	Few or no mid- or high-level staff available to manage project.	_____ Notes:
Project Approach	Describes in detail an appropriate project approach addressing how the project's goals will be met. Narrative clearly illustrates the consultant's capability to achieve all project deliverables.	Narrative describes the project approach in more general terms with little explanation as to how deliverables will be completed.	Few details provided about project approach, or approach seems unrealistic or poorly matched to the project's goals and deliverables.	_____ Notes:

Highly Advantageous = 2 points

Advantageous = 1 point

Not Advantageous = 0 points

Criterion	Highly Advantageous	Advantageous	Not Advantageous/Unacceptable	Score/Notes
Prior Experience	Reports similar projects of a similar or greater size. Has knowledge of and prior experience with wastewater package treatment plants.	Reports similar projects.	Reports no similar projects	_____ Notes:
Past Performance	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time, within budget, and with favorable feedback from client.	Documentation of similar projects being completed on time and within budget.	Poor record of experience with similar projects, or unfavorable feedback from client.	_____ Notes:
Current Workload and Ability to take on the Project	Demonstrates staffing capable of managing, and commits lead project manager and supporting staff.	Commits to having sufficient staff capacity to complete project.	Has insufficient staffing capacity to complete the project.	_____ Notes:
Staff	Commits highest level staff/partners, with more than the minimum required experience, to manage project.	Commits mid-level and some higher-level staff to manage project.	Few or no mid- or high-level staff available to manage project.	_____ Notes:
Project Approach	Describes in detail an appropriate project approach addressing how the project's goals will be met. Narrative clearly illustrates the consultant's capability to achieve all project deliverables.	Narrative describes the project approach in more general terms with little explanation as to how deliverables will be completed.	Few details provided about project approach, or approach seems unrealistic or poorly matched to the project's goals and deliverables.	_____ Notes:

Highly Advantageous = 2 points

Advantageous = 1 point

Not Advantageous = 0 points