Town of Reading

16 Lowell Street
Reading, MA 01867-2683
Phone: 781-942-6612
Fax: 781-942-9071
Email: jdelios@ci.reading.ma.us

Community Planning and Development Commission

DRAFT CPDC Minutes 12/8/2-14

Present: Jeff Hansen, John Weston, David Tuttle
Attendees to be added.

The Chairman, Mr. Hansen called the meeting to order at 7:33PM. He told the public that some of the agenda items will be taken out of order and will start with the Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan for 197 South Street. The public hearing for 186-190 Summer Avenue will be opened after the remainder of the agenda items.

ANR Plan for 197 South Street

Mr. Jack Sullivan, Engineer for the owners of 197 South Street described the proposal. He said that the property in question is registered land and that he has filed with Land Court as required for the alteration to the lot. The goal of the project is to adjust some of the lot lines and separate out a portion of the lot in the rear, which will then be conveyed to the adjacent neighbor. A review of the plan by Land Court resulted in a few changes and he has supplied the updated Plan to the Planning Department. He also said he has Mylar copies based on Land Court approved plan for the CPDC tonight if they vote they endorse the plan. He said that the plan meets all zoning requirements and if the CPDC endorses the plan they will be closing at the end of the week.

Mr. Weston asked about the nature of the changes required by Land Court. Mr. Sullivan replied that Land Court had to make a determination in the discrepancies between the monuments in the ground and the deed information. No major changes to the boundaries of the lot were made and it did not affect compliance with zoning.

The Town Engineer reported that the plan may be endorsed as not requiring subdivision approval.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to approve the ANR Plan for 197 South Street as amended. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Mariano Drive Subdivision Bond Approval and Lot Release

Mr. Al Couillard, Developer, said that the Form K, which is the Tripartite Agreement, has been signed by the bank and it includes the amount of surety recommended by the Town Engineer.
Mr. Zambouras, Town Engineer, said that he determined the bond amount to be $262,579.90. The CPDC reviewed the documents and had no further comments.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to approve the bond amount of $262,579.90 as recommended by the Town Engineer. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to approve the Tripartite Agreement (Form K) as surety for the satisfactory completion of the subdivision known as Mariano Drive. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to release Lots 1, 2 and 3 from the restrictive covenants of the Covenant Agreement between Evergreen Real Estate Trust and the CPDC. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Minor Site Plan Review, 190 Haven Street – Subway

Ms. Wilson described the proposal. She said that Subway is proposing a fit-out at 190 Haven Street, for a 42 seat restaurant. She said that she submitted an email to the applicant with some questions regarding the proposal and did not receive written responses.

Mr. Hansen reviewed the email with the Applicant.

As to the question of deliveries, it was clarified by Mr. Pasquale Garracino, the project Contractor that deliveries will occur 2 times a week before 11AM. They will be taken from the rear delivery area for the site and will be using box trucks. The deliveries will be received through the rear door of the space.

To the question regarding employee parking, Mr. Pasquale said the owner has filed for 4 employee parking passes, which are the blue zone passes.

In regards to signage, he said that the sign company has been contacted and they intend to conform to the requirements in the Master Signage Plan. They do intend on filing for a blade and a wall sign.

Mr. Garracino also reported that Subway has the Board of Health Plan review packet filled out and will be submitting that upon receiving approval from the Planning Board. He also stated that trash will be collected in a 2-yard dumpster and emptied once a week.

It was clarified that the Trash Plan for the property has been updated and will reflect Subway as a tenant.

Mr. Tuttle moved CPDC to approve the Minor Site Plan Review Application for Subway at 190 Haven Street. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Minor Modification, 600-622 Main Street

Attorney Shaun Briere represented the property owner and told the CPDC that they are requesting minor modification approval for the landscaping. The approved landscaping plan identified a seating planter which is to be located in the courtyard. The courtyard has been constructed and the planter was not included. Mr. Briere is requesting that the planter be waived as they believe the courtyard is well designed without it. In addition, there is one birch three that was not planted. It was determined by the landscape architect that the area was too crowded for any additional tree plantings and therefore they are requesting that tree planting be waived.

The CPDC reviewed the material and had no questions.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to determine that the changes to the landscape plan for the seating and the removal of one birch tree is a minor modification. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Mr. Weston told the Applicant that he would have preferred to see the seating planted because it would have added to the pedestrian amenities in the downtown. He would recommend they keep it in mind for future improvements and thanked the Applicant for doing a great job on the building.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to approve the Minor Modification for 600-622 Main Street, the MF Charles Building. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

Mr. Briere told the CPDC that they had met with Staff and the Health Director a few weeks ago to discuss the trash needs for the building as the last tenants come into the Building. As a result of that meeting, the Plans have been updated to clarify the trash requirements. The Plan identifies each tenant's dumpster as well as a recycling dumpster for cardboard and another one for single stream recycling. In addition, they will be adding labels in the service area to ensure the dumpsters are being properly used by each tenant.

Mr. Weston asked if the trash plan is included in the tenant's leases. Mr. Briere replied that it is an attachment to their leases as well as the Master Signage Plan.

Mr. Tuttle asked if the recycling was shared. Mr. Briere replied yes. It was further clarified that the previous plan identified several more dumpsters to illustrate the space potential.

Town of Reading Charter Update

Ms. Delios provided a summary of the changes to the section pertaining to the CPDC. She noted there was not much substance to the changes and it was mostly re-worded. Mr. Weston expressed concern with the new section regarding associate members. He pointed out that the section states associate membership is supposed to be in accordance with any regulations contained in the relevant section, but he noted there is nothing mentioned in the CPDC section about associate membership. Regardless, he suggested that something be included to point out associate members. He recalled in the past they could have up to 2 associate members.

It was agreed that the CPDC would like to have 2 associate memberships available and would recommend the regulations reflect that in whatever document/section appropriate.

Mr. Tuttle move the CPDC to endorse the proposed changes to the Charter of the Town of Reading, Sections applicable to CPDC with a recommendation that a provision be made for associate membership in the appropriate document. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

DRAFT

Public Hearing for Site Plan Review, 186-190 Summer Avenue, Proposed Criterion Child Enrichment

Mr. Weston read the public hearing legal notice.

Mr. Hansen summarized the public hearing procedures, noting that the CPDC will hear a presentation from the Applicant as well as a presentation from the neighborhood preservation group. Then the CPDC will discuss the proposal, review comments from Staff and the Town Engineer, and then the hearing will be opened to the public. Mr. Hansen also summarized some rules for the public hearing.

Attorney Kenneth Margolin represented the Applicant spoke about the proposal. He also noted that he agrees with Town Counsel's opinion regarding the applicability of the Dover Amendment and continued to cite case law that supported this opinion. Mr. Jack Sullivan, Engineer for the Applicant described the proposal. He said the project is located at 186 Summer Avenue and consists of 3 parcels of land. The proposal is to demolish the rear portion of the existing house and to construct an addition. He said they surveyed all the large trees on site and there was an effort to retain as many as possible. The barn will be retained and used for storage. There are two existing curb cuts for the entire property and the plan originally called to use both. However, based on comments from the Development Review Team (DRT) they decided to revise that to a single 24-ft wide entrance. There are 39 parking spaces within the proposed parking area. There was an attempt to evenly distribute handicapped spaces between the existing home entrance and the new addition entrance. The site will contain vertical granite curb throughout and walkways will be concrete. Mr. Sullivan said they are proposing a playground area in the rear of the site. As for parking, most of the spaces in the rear will be for employees while the spaces up front will be for families and visitors. There are also on-site crosswalks to help with pedestrian passage. Trash and recycling will be collected into two separate dumpsters located at the rear of the site and will be enclosed with a wood stockade fence. As for the drainage plan, Mr. Sullivan said they have designed the system to have a reduction in peak rates and they will be utilizing porous pavement rather than any open basins. He has received comments back from the Town Engineer, one of which includes submission of an Operations and Maintenance Plan which he will be providing. For porous pavement, the key is to ensure it is vacuumed regularly. Other comments from the Town Engineer include adding a few curb inlets to infiltrate directly into the crushed stone. Mr. Sullivan said he will be addressing that comment as well.

Mr. Marc Maxwell, Project Architect further described the proposal. In general he said they believe they have addressed all the concerns from Staff. He said there was a change to the site plan since the distribution of the site plans which now includes a 6-foot stockade fence on the southeastern corner to help prevent headlight glare. As for the changes to the structure, he said the main portion of the home will remain intact, but that the existing breezeway and rear portion will be removed. The barn will be stabilized and used in the future for storage. The design and colors will be complementary of the historic house, but they intend to use modern materials.

Attorney Arthur Kreiger, representing 01867 Neighborhood Preservation made a few points regarding the proposal. He told the CPDC that when it comes to the Dover Amendment, case law is not clear and there is very little authority on the permissible topics under Dover Amendment. He said that the goal is to apply the standards rigorously enough to protect the neighbors but not diminish the ability of the

applicant to construct the project. He said he submitted a letter to the CPDC regarding the scope of the public hearing, which staff included in their packets. The zoning bylaw has 10 criteria for Site Plan Approval and all of those seem to be within the boundaries of CPDC's authority under the Dover Amendment:
a) Minimize the volume of cut and fill, the number of removed trees 6" caliper or larger, the length of removed stone walls, the area of wetland vegetation displaced, the extent of storm water flow from the site, soil erosion, and the threat of air and water pollution;
b) Maximize pedestrian and vehicular safety both on the site and approach/egression from it;
c) Minimize obstruction of scenic views from publicly accessible locations;
d) Minimize visual intrusion by controlling the visibility of parking, storage, or other outdoor service areas viewed from public ways or premises residentially used or zoned through the use of landscaping and fencing;
e) Minimize glare from headlights and lighting intrusion;
f) Minimize unreasonable departure from the character, materials, signage and scale of buildings in the vicinity, as viewed from public ways and places;
g) Minimize contamination of groundwater from on-site wastewater disposal systems or operations on the premises involving the use, storage, handling, or containment of hazardous substances;
h) Ensure compliance with the provisions of the Zoning Bylaw;
i) Maximize property enhancement through use of landscaping and other site amenities;
j) Minimize environmental impacts to adjacent properties through hours of operation, deliveries, noise, rubbish removal and storage

Mr. Kreiger said that the neighbors hope that the CPDC will apply these standards rigorously to protect and limit impacts. He said that the parking area is key. Based on the requirement under zoning the project needs 21 spaces and they have provided 39. He expressed concern over the high number of spaces and said that due to the large amount of parking there is a significant loss of trees and increase visual impact to the site.

In regards to signage, Mr. Kreiger said they would hope the sign could be appropriately designed, moved or resized to be more compatible with the neighborhood. He submitted color photographs of the sign to the CPDC to illustrate the existing views of the properties.

Mr. Hansen reminded the audience the topics under the limitation of Dover Amendment and also noted that the CPDC will be adjourning at 10:30PM.

Mr. Hansen opened the hearing to the CPDC for comments and questions.

Mr. Weston agreed that the parking area is key and will drive the impact to abutters. He is curious why so little parking. He added that he is unsure what the correct answer is but said that striking the balance will be important. He said based on the information provided, there would be three (3) classrooms with eight (8) children and two (2) or three (3) staff members in those classrooms, totaling 33 participants at a time. Assuming there is a car for each child and each teacher, along with vehicles for staff that are not necessarily working in the classrooms that number could reach to 39 very quickly. He added that there may be a case where more than one parents comes in more than one car.

Mr. Margolin replied that most of the complaints relate to not enough parking and he has been told by the owner of Criterion Child Enrichment that 39 parking spaces would prevent on-street parking. Mr. Robert Littleton, owner of Criterion Child Enrichment agreed and said that 39 is the greatest number they would need statistically, and said that they could downsize this a bit.

Ms. Mary Ellen O'Neil said they did not receive copies of the documents provided to the CPDC they are referencing. She said they would like copies as part of the public record. Ms. Wilson provided a copy and said that it came in late this afternoon. Ms. Debra Stackpole also said she wanted a copy of the letter from Mr. Kreiger. Ms. Wilson also said that came in very late in the afternoon and provided a copy.

Mr. Hansen asked about the proposed sign. Mr. Maxwell replied that it is a monument sign and is 32-inches in height and will be located near the entrance of the site. He said they could relocate it further away from the road, but the current placement will have limited impact on sight lines. . Also, the sign will be externally illuminated with the lighting fixtures on a timer. No signage is proposed on the structure.

Mr. Tuttle expressed concern with the parking area and that he initially felt there was too much parking. He asked why the parking area was pushed back from the structure. Mr. Maxwell said that during the DRT review, it was suggested to shift the parking spaces away from the structure. In addition, he said that the alignment of the driveway that leads to the parking area is straight. This makes it easy for emergency vehicles to pull in and back straight out. Mr. Tuttle also expressed concern with the architectural details on the northern elevation. He felt there was not enough fenestration. Mr. Maxwell replied that most of the mechanical or utility rooms are located on that side of the building and they determined not a lot of windows were needed. Mr. Tuttle suggested adding false windows to create more interest in the façade. Mr. Maxwell said they could look into that.

Mr. Hansen asked if the project will be phased. Mr. Maxwell replied that the intention is to have the renovation of the existing structure happen at the same time the new addition is being constructed. They will also stabilize the barn and will likely have to include some fire protection. Mr. Tuttle asked for the structure type of the barn. Mr. Maxwell replied balloon frame, but that there is some post and beam design.

Mr. Weston asked about the proposed lighting. Mr. Maxwell said they are proposing pole lighting which is depicted in the photometric which will have reflectors to direct the light downward. As pointed out by the Town Engineer, there is less than a foot candle of spillover to the Summer Avenue roadway. They are also proposing bollard lights along the walkways which have louvers to help direct the light downward. The project also proposes wall lighting around the doorway entrances. They are not dark skies compliant, but are extremely low levels of light. And there are wall packs proposed on the barn and on various elevations of the main building. All the lighting will be on timers so they will be off when they have left the building.

Mr. Weston pointed out that the straight design of the driveway will help limit impact from vehicle headlights. He asked if there were any residential properties at the rear of the property. Mr. Maxwell

replied that the back of the site is along the school parking lot. The plan calls for a stockade fence on the southern side to help protect the Temple Street abutters.

Mr. Tuttle asked if there had been discussion with the school department because they could share parking. Mr. Littleton replied no.

Mr. Hansen asked if trees could be saved. Mr. Maxwell replied that they walked the site and there were a number of trees that are in poor condition and should be removed. He also said there was a number of Norway Maples that cause crowding and they recommended they be removed.
Mr. Weston asked about the Staff comment regarding the relocation of trees because of snow storage. Mr. Maxwell said they will be shifting a row of gingko trees to avoid issues with snow storage.

Mr. Hansen opened the hearing for comments from Staff. Ms. Wilson said that most of their comments have been addressed by Mr. Maxwell, however, Staff did recommend a Parking Demand study be performed to really understand what the right amount of parking would be for the site. Mr. Littleton replied that they have provided additional information, which is the peak demand for what they expect for the site.

Mr. Zambouras, Town engineer said that their information does not account for the overlap that will generate the peak number of parking spaces between class times.

Mr. Weston expressed concern over the material submitted and that it does not match up to what was prepared in the site plan application. He also expressed concern that there would be overlap between the classes.

Ms. Wilson said in the past with these types of facilities that have other locations, the CPDC does like to have information regarding parking demand from those other facilities. Mr. Weston agreed and said that the CPDC does like to have that information and understand what the 'typical' is. Mr. Hansen said that maybe the numbers need to be clearer to understand what the true need is for the site. Ms. Delios said that a typical class schedule may be helpful.

Mr. Littleton clarified that there are evening activities may occur 4 times a year. Ms. Delios suggested having more information on that.

Mr. Zambouras reviewed his comments.

Lighting - He confirmed there is zero spillage of illumination with the exception of the entrance of the property.

Signage - He did request two additional no parking signs at the entrance of the property.

Snow storage – Snow storage is identified on the plan and but he was not comfortable that there is enough. The narrow strips identified will be difficult for storage and that it will be required to be piled high.

Stormwater Operation & Maintenance Plan – It was requested they provide a Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plan for the drainage system. In addition, once the new MS4 Permit is issued, we will be required to obtain Stormwater Operation & Maintenance Plans.

Stormwater Management – He expressed concern regarding the use of porous pavement and that it is usually a supplement to the stormwater management system and not the sole method used. As such, he made the recommendation for curb inlets and suggested they be installed to catch the runoff if the pavement fails. Mr. Zambouras also said he is concerned regarding the calculations performed as they were done using a soil type that may not be found all throughout the site. There is an extensive area of pavement proposed and he is recommending that more test pits be done to determine the soil type for the site. As for the porous pavement, he said that it can fail instantly and he is not sure the applicant has considered that. If it fails, all of the pavement has to be replaced. Also, there is no pre-treatment with porous pavement.

Mr. Zambouras said that his other comments relate to permitting for utilities and sewer connections. However, he strongly suggests the Applicant revisit the stormwater calculations and consider additional storage for snow.

Mr. Sullivan said that if one portion of the porous pavement fails there are likely other parts of the pavement that will be operational. He made the point that MassDEP considers it a Low Impact Technology (LID) and that all stormwater systems require maintenance. He said he did model the calculations based on sand/gravel soil, meaning that it does not have high water table and is suitable for infiltration. However, he said they can do more soil testing to ensure it meets the model correctly. He also added that the calculations showed there is enough storage and he is amenable to gutter inlets.

Snow Storage – Mr. Sullivan said they can add more areas to store snow. He said the reason they were identified in narrow strips was to try and reduce the number of tree removals.

He also clarified that they will add the additional “No Parking” signs per the Town Engineer.

Mr. Hansen opened the hearing up for public comment.

Mr. Dennis Carr, 61 Temple Street, submitted a letter to the CPDC that contains four (4) primary issues. He said he resides in the lower corner off of Temple Street and expressed concern over the potential for snow to be stockpiled onto the fence. He would prefer to see a tree planted to help prevent that from happening. As for the water table, he believes it is much higher and would like to see additional test pits in the rear of the site. He also asked what mechanism the town has to force the Applicant or future owner to put in a new system should this one fails, or if they do not adhere to the maintenance plan. He also expressed concern that the rainfall events historically do not reflect current trends.

DRAFT

Mr. Jerry Lamb expressed concern over the snow storage on the main portion of the lot as he is a direct abutter to the site. He would also like to see the parking area closer to the house. Mr. Maxwell said that the paved area is about 10-11 feet from the property line at the rear of the paved area nearest the lot and more like 25 feet from the property near the entrance of the site. Mr. Lamb also suggested redesigning the rear portion of the lot so that there is no parking adjacent to his lot. He also expressed concern that there would be overlap between classes and that he hopes the parking demand study will address that. In addition, Mr. Lamb in general would like to have the site retain its residential look.

Ms. Susan Coccoluto, 195 Summer Avenue, expressed concern over the traffic and safety of Summer Avenue. She does not believe parking on the street is a good idea and that safety is her biggest concern.

Ms. Anne Goodwin, 189 Summer Avenue said the view of the barn is diminished by the new structure and that the parking area makes the site appear more congested. She would like to request more landscaping and also request the signage be moved back from the sidewalk. She also recommended the brackets of the existing roof be carried over to new building. She also asked if the new windows could be trimmed out to look the original home and whether the materials of the existing home would be carried over to new addition. Ms. Goodwin also expressed concern over the new proposed aluminum connector and feels it resembles more of a commercial structure. The same goes with the new entryway of the addition, in that it appears more commercial rather than residential.

Mr. Margolin requested the CPDC keep comments limited to the scope of Dover Amendment.

Mr. Stuart Leslie, 51 Temple Street, expressed concern over the lighting from headlights. He would also recommend the rear of the site and parking area be redesigned. He also asked why there would be lighting to illuminate the playground felt that was unnecessary to include. Mr. Leslie would also be interested whether or not the proposed class schedule would conflict with the Parker School.

Mr. George Katsoufis, Associate Member of the CPDC asked about the bulk and height of the structure. In the proposed floor plan, he counted four (4) classrooms and they intend to only have three (3) sessions. This needs further clarified. He also said that during the preliminary meetings, they heard there may be foundation problems with the barn. He suggested relocating the barn altogether where the playground is currently proposed.

Mr. Maxwell said there are 4 classrooms which gives the most flexibility and allows Criterion to have 8-12 kids per classroom. The two classrooms on the upper floor have a dividing line which can be opened to accommodate a larger group. This will be used for motor skill development. Mr. Katsoufis expressed concern over the future use of the property and that a future owner may see the future classroom as potential space. Mr. Maxwell replied that the Applicant is requesting approval for this use, for this site, for this owner. He said he cannot know what the future holds for the site.

Ms. Kelly Corwin, 199 Summer Avenue, expressed concern over the playground and felt that it was oversized for the proposed number of children at the site. Mr. Maxwell replied that it is based on the

Department of Education Standards. Ms. Corwin asked if those numbers could that be tied into the parking study and make sure the ratios match up.

Mr. Mark Corwin, 199 Summer Avenue, expressed concern that the upper floor classrooms needed to have direct access from the first floor for children under the age of 3. Ms. Delios said that the Building Inspector would review that for compliance with any applicable building code. Mr. Hansen agreed that would be reviewed at that stage.

Ms. Mary Ellen O'Neil agreed that the classroom scheduling needs to be clarified. She also requested that all materials are shared with all parties and expressed concern over the confidential memo to the CPDC from Counsel.

Mr. Bob Salter, 247 Summer Avenue, wanted to clarify that church parking is only on Sunday and it would not impact school traffic. He added that there is no room from any on-street parking during the week and that it would not be safe. Mr. Salter also stated there is no on-street parking due to the nursery school. Mr. Weston clarified that there is a tradeoff that is being assumed with the site. More parking on-site reduces the ability to screen and has more impact on the site. He believed that some cars current park on Summer Avenue.

Ms. Coccoluto , 195 Summer Avenue, expressed concern over the fire truck lane and that it would block any other emergency vehicles from accessing or leaving the site. Ms. Delios said the Fire Chief provided a memo and has approved the site plan for access.

Mr. Coccoluto, expressed concern the impact from headlights at night, especially as they exit the site. He was also concerned about the site being used for other events in the evening.

In regards to the suggestion to relocate the playground, Mr. Zambouras said that the playground area could be shifted 90 degrees and that would free up a wider area for the rear parking area to be mostly located on the northern side of the site. He said that idea would need further review, but that it may work. Mr. Maxwell replied that they were attempting to stay out of the setback, but if allowed they could consider moving the playground area within the setback area.

Mr. Kreiger suggested that the Applicant consider reducing the number of parking spaces. Mr. Maxwell replied that they can take another look at the site plan with the suggestions from the meeting this evening.

Ms. Virginia Adams, 58 Azalea Circle expressed concern with the design of the new addition. She suggested lowering the roofline some and also adding plantings along the foundation to soften the site. Mr. Margolin replied that they are amenable to plantings around the building.

Mr. Kreiger suggested that the Applicant not propose additional snow storage on the front lawn area, nor propose to store it between the new gingko trees. He further stressed that it is important to manage the sessions to minimize parking impacts as well as understand the true need for parking.

Mr. Weston said that when it comes to parking, there is a minimum threshold, a 'safe' threshold, and the 'typical' threshold. He believes that additional information will help understand what the need for the site will be.

Mr. Hansen said that the CPDC will wrap up discussion for this evening. Mr. Margolin agreed to grant the CPDC an extension to the January 12th meeting to make a decision on the application, but will not plan on any further extensions beyond that date.

The CPDC summarized the action items for the Applicant to address for the next meeting.

- Parking Demand Study
- Updated Class Schedules
- Revised Site Plan
  - Parking
  - Snow Storage
  - Adjustment of the playground area
- Landscape Plan
- Signage
  - Any adjustments
- Architectural Drawings
  - Northern Façade and Fenestration
  - Trim to match – other architectural details, brackets, aluminum storefront
- Lighting
  - Wall packs for playground area
  - Timers – what times?
- Drainage
  - Additional Test Pits
  - Calculations
  - Address the Town Engineer's Memo
  - Gutter Inlets
  - Stormwater Operation and Management Plan

Mr. Carr said he would like to ensure there is a mechanism to ensure the on-going maintenance of the porous pavement. Mr. Zambouras replied that in the past the Town has required a financial surety for on-going maintenance. In addition, the Town will be required in the future to have bylaws and regulations requiring enforcement of stormwater management systems and operation plans.

DRAFT

Mr. Joe Lupi, 166 Summer Avenue, expressed concern that the oils and the gasoline will be directly infiltrated into the ground. Mr. Carr added that the CPDC should ask for the Applicant to provide a design to capture the solids in the stormwater system.

Mr. Tuttle moved the CPDC to continue the public hearing for 186-190 Summer Avenue, Criterion Child Enrichment, to January 12, 2015 at 7:30PM. Mr. Weston seconded and the motion carried 3-0-0.

DRAFT