

1 PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
2 January 21, 2003

3  
4 Those present: Helen Lemoine, Sue Bernstein, Tom Mahoney, Larry Marsh, Ann Welles  
5 Also present: Jay Grande  
6

7 I. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Planned Unit Development,  
8 Villages at Danforth Farm, off Danforth Street, Traffic  
9

10 Helen said tonight's meeting was to focus primarily on traffic. However, the  
11 Board's consultant was not able to have his complete report ready at this time. The  
12 discussion on traffic will be postponed to February 11<sup>th</sup>. There will be some discussion  
13 but it will be in relation to the report generated by the applicant's report in response to the  
14 Save our Town's traffic consultant. Helen reviewed the policy pertaining to speakers  
15 wishing to address the Board. She also read from the rules of conduct to be maintained at  
16 meetings. Tom said he did not want to limit participation and would like to provide  
17 opportunities to speak for both proponents and opponents of a particular development.  
18 Helen stated there have been comments and concerns raised to the Board regarding the  
19 Board's policy of recognizing speakers. She said due to the length of some of the public  
20 hearings and the lateness of the hour, not all speakers might be recognized. In speaking  
21 with Town Counsel and on his advice, she suggested drafting language to allow policies  
22 for recognizing speakers from the audience. It was suggested to allow Framingham  
23 residents the opportunity to address the Board and if time permits, allowing opportunity  
24 to non-residents or non-resident officials to address the Board. She stated it was not the  
25 intent to disallow participation but an effort to be fair and equitable.  
26

27 **Motion by Ann Welles that the Framingham Planning Board change the**  
28 **regulations by adding at the end of 8.3 a sentence that reads, that public comment**  
29 **be structured so that Framingham residents be given the first opportunity speak**  
30 **and that time shall be reserved at the end of the public comment period for non-**  
31 **resident town representatives and then other non-residents to speak. Seconded by**  
32 **Larry Marsh for discussion.** Discussion: Larry asked on a substance question, if the  
33 Board allows non-residents to speak at the end, there should be a reference to "time  
34 permitting". **Larry offered a friendly amendment: comma, time permitting.** Sue  
35 stated she was in favor of the motion but in terms of when operating under that  
36 methodology, it might be helpful to ask how many were in attendance from another  
37 community. That would help determine how much time should be left aside for public  
38 participation. Helen said she could not vote for the friendly amendment and said that the  
39 public hearing process can not exclude people from speaking. She said there may not be  
40 equal time for non-residents and residents but non-residents should be recognized. Tom  
41 did not think anyone had ever been refused an opportunity to address the Board. There  
42 was discussion that often, hearings run past their scheduled end time to allow for as much  
43 input as possible. **There was no second to the friendly amendment. Vote on the**  
44 **original motion: 5-0.**  
45

1 Helen said several residents have asked to be recognized with comments and she  
2 will call on them at this meeting. There have been a number of questions relative to  
3 addressing a newsletter from Save our Towns. She said residents have asked the Board  
4 for comments to that letter. There is no formal response, she stated. However, Helen said  
5 she was concerned with the newsletter's suggestion that widening of the roads will be  
6 taken by eminent domain. She said that has never been an issue or discussion among the  
7 Board. Carol Spack distributed documents and asked that they be entered into the record.  
8 Andrea Carr-Evans, of Danforth Street stated she represented Save Our Towns and  
9 addressed the Board. She said there is a 5 page letter written to the Planning Board from  
10 their legal counsel. Andrea read from the letter. She stated that the by-laws of the PUD  
11 require the applicant own all the property and has legal access to the property. She stated  
12 they do not meet those requirements and asked that the Planning Board dismiss the  
13 application. She further asked that no further meetings be held until Save our Towns  
14 makes a presentation in full.

15  
16 Helen said in consultations with Town Counsel it was determined it was within  
17 the Board's authority to hold further public hearings and that the Planning Board had  
18 deferred to the Board of Selectmen, the issue of access to the property.

19  
20 Rev. Peter Cook addressed the Board. Peter said the neighborhood and  
21 surrounding area would see a net benefit if the proposal went forward. He said the  
22 betterments would not be possible without the project. Peter said 700 housing units  
23 proposed would not come on line all at once but over 10 years. The number of units  
24 needs to be measured against other standards, i.e., the number of acres of which they are  
25 built. Peter said from his prospective, he was pleased that 10% of the 700 units were  
26 being set aside as affordable units. Richard Paul, Town Meeting member of precinct 3  
27 addressed the Board. He said he was at preliminary meetings. Dick said if access to  
28 Riverpath is denied for whatever reasons, the project would look to access from Hialeah  
29 or any other point. He read from a written statement and said it was unrealistic to think  
30 the project would not be developed. He said his major concern is the increase traffic by  
31 limiting access to only contiguous street. Dick thought there must be two continuously  
32 open access points off Danforth Street. He did not think the Board should limit use off  
33 any public street. Carol Caselman, precinct 3 Town Meeting member addressed the  
34 Board. She said she agreed with comments by Dick but thought the Board should think  
35 in terms of fairness when the project moves forward. She also spoke in favor of Danforth  
36 returning to a two-way roadway. Carol Spack stated concern with the motion taken  
37 earlier by the Board and said it was limiting public discussion on the project. Helen said  
38 that the motion does not preclude comments but prioritizes that those from Framingham  
39 residents are given first opportunity. Robert O'Neil, Town Meeting member, said that he  
40 hoped housing needs and accommodations of future generations would be accommodated  
41 by the PUD.

42  
43 Jay addressed the Board. Jay said the presentation he had prepared was geared  
44 toward the Board and was a review of what issues had been discussed in previous  
45 hearings and what issues were remaining. Jay said the Board has held 8 full public  
46 hearings on the project. There is a large volume of information submitted.

1  
2 Jay had prepared a summary document or “punch list”. He said by way of  
3 summary, traffic and access associated with the PUD has been addressed. A number of  
4 supplemental submissions were received from VHB and written comments from other  
5 consultants and the public in general have been received. The applicant expanded the  
6 intersections to 25 which was expanded from the original amount. Jay said the trip  
7 generation was increased by 50% and the traffic counts were adjusted upward. Journey  
8 to work data is not required by the board but was provided. The build-out period was  
9 expanded to 12 years rather than the 5 years which was originally proposed. They are  
10 looking forward to the Board’s consultants review, he said. A very detailed hearing on  
11 the various location of intersections was held. VHB and GPI were directed to flush out  
12 the mitigation options and prioritize the mitigation as a result of that hearing, he said.  
13 Adequacy of access, current density and comparison of existing townhouse development  
14 data was also requested. VHB and GPI recommended the elimination of Meadow St and  
15 Derby St. as access to the PUD. That included all the housing except the single family  
16 dwelling component of the development. Jay briefly reviewed individual comments that  
17 the Board had received either by way of a comment letter or speaker at a previous public  
18 hearing. He said it was not a complete list and if the Board had any other comments or  
19 areas they would like to direct further attention, they bring it to his attention to add to the  
20 informal “punch list”.  
21

22 Another point Jay said was the primary access points now would be from Hialeah  
23 Street and Riverpath. He said that directs the traffic from a residential sub-collector and a  
24 collector road (OCP). VHB has estimated that 75% of the traffic will access the drive off  
25 Riverpath and that is an estimate. Emergency access will meet the requirements of the  
26 Fire Department from Meadow Street and Derby Street if required. Other traffic issues  
27 that need to be responded to are evaluating the feasibility of making Danforth Street a  
28 two-way street. The applicant and the Board’s consultant is researching that. He said  
29 there was a comment on accident data and he noted the applicant has provided accident  
30 data but there is a need to follow up with the Police Department to ensure the most recent  
31 data is used. The bicycle coalition has reviewed the pedestrian access in the development  
32 and has made some comments. Those will be addressed further along in the process, Jay  
33 said. There was concern about using the private way that accesses the gravel pit. There  
34 was concern that it could not be made a viable access. Jay thought the new data  
35 adequately addressed weekend traffic vs. weekday traffic. Jay briefly reviewed  
36 comments received by the public. Larry said a lot of time has been spent on traffic  
37 issues. He said he thought it was 60-70% complete and some major decisions were  
38 made. He thought what was left was the Danforth Street issue of returning it to two-way  
39 access, deciding traffic mitigation and the dollars involved and prioritizing that list.  
40 Helen said the only traffic discussion which would be appropriate tonight would be  
41 questions addressed to Scott Weiss to the report submitted by Save Our Towns.  
42

43 Sue asked Jay to look into the monument at School and Concord. Without  
44 knowing the status of the monument, any traffic improvements could not be planned.  
45 She also suggested the middle driveway at the shopping center needed to be researched.  
46 Sue asked in relation to gap analysis studies, what was the normal time for an elderly

1 person to enter a main street from a side street. Scott said it is 7 seconds based on  
2 national standards. He said the average range is 4-5 seconds. Scott said there were  
3 different types of studies than can be used for unsignalized intersections and the gap  
4 study is only one of them. Scott said their study is a time based study in that the vehicles  
5 speed is taken into account in measuring the gaps between vehicles. Sue said in looking  
6 at VHB's data, it indicates more gaps than is dictated by experience. VHB's study does  
7 not look at traffic in anticipation of 3-4 traffic signals along OCP resulting in fewer or  
8 more gaps. Ann stated the data is reflecting gaps without traffic signals. She asked Jay to  
9 see that Art checks the gap analysis data to ensure its accuracy. She asked what effects  
10 signalization would have on the analysis. Sue asked that Board members time gaps in  
11 their own driving experience prior to the next traffic hearing. Scott said the gap  
12 information provided is based on existing conditions. He said the availability of gaps  
13 indicate there are gaps in the traffic stream passing in the intersection but it is not a time  
14 based study in terms of the delay in pulling out of the intersection. He said that  
15 information was evaluated in their level of service analysis. Sue asked that the data be  
16 combined to show the total amount of gaps per hour and the amount of time waiting for  
17 the gap.

18  
19 Ann thought the "punch list" approach to determining which comments or areas  
20 of concern had been addressed and reviewed adequately, was helpful to the Board. She  
21 asked that the idea of the PUD being a walking development and the role the public  
22 transportation should play should be included. She asked if it was appropriate to add a  
23 593 consultant to deal with those two issues. Ann thought they would also be picked up  
24 in the site plan review for the definitive. Helen and Jay agreed. Larry asked for further  
25 input from the Planning Department since they run the transportation system.

26  
27 Jay continued and said the preliminary design has been established during the last  
28 couple of hearings for water supply and waste water. Jay said they are providing  
29 continuous looping in conformance with what is being requested by the Town. He said  
30 they are also installing a new 8" water line in Danforth Street to supply the PUD. The  
31 Board does need updated letters from the Fire Department and DPW to review the flow  
32 test data. There was flow test data supplied to those departments but a sign off in terms of  
33 adequate volume flow and pressure, adequate water supply and residential use and fire  
34 protection is still needed. He did not anticipate those letters would be outstanding much  
35 longer. He said they are not definitive design plans but they would come in the definitive  
36 phase. He said the waste water disposal is similar. There was a lengthy discussion  
37 because of the forced main and pump stations and ongoing issues in the town with sulfide  
38 buildup in the system as well as the existing inflow and infiltration of storm water into  
39 the system. He said he has noted that the applicant would reduce the inflow and  
40 infiltration into the system by 700 gallons. He said that amount may not be realistic.  
41 Jack O'Neil said it was correct. Jack said it was 4-1 which is the town's requirement.  
42 They are replacing whole lengths of older clay pipes with ones of more up-to-date  
43 materials. Jay said Brossi Road and Birch Road still need to be followed up in terms of  
44 waste lines. Debby Cleveland said it was water lines as well. Jay said the permit that  
45 they will apply for is a separate review to the DPW and eventually the MWRA. Sue said  
46 a comment was made earlier that during the meeting with SEA relative to the wastewater,

1 they did not feel SEA had a lot of comment to make. She said the reason was SEA had a  
2 major role in designing the system after the applicant submitted their plans. SEA and  
3 DPW worked with the applicant and there were major modifications to the plans as a  
4 result of that. Sue said that was the reason why SEA did not have a great deal of  
5 comment because they had worked together in re-designing the PUD's plans. Jay said  
6 there was comment about updating the metering to a tele-metering system. There would  
7 be points of monitoring sulfide gases. Tom said at a previous hearing, someone had  
8 asked about the intent to irrigate the green spaces around the development and the impact  
9 that would have on the groundwater or wells. He thought that should be put on Jay's list.  
10 Jack said they are doing the study Tom was referring to and would submit the data to  
11 SEA.

12  
13 Jay said on historic and cultural issues, the monument at Concord Street and  
14 School Street will be reviewed. He said protection of the aesthetic quality of the Sudbury  
15 River and suspended sewer line under the Danforth Street bridge was also on the list.  
16 The suspended line will be moved to the new bridge and not the historic bridge. MA.  
17 Historical is expected to sign off on the plans and the buffer zones. Larry asked about the  
18 disposition of the open space. Jay said that will be addressed. Jay said the stormwater  
19 management and environmental concerns and MEPA review is still being done. This  
20 project will be subject to local ConCom review. There are riverfront resource and  
21 wetland areas. Jay said not all issues will be resolved by the Planning Board. The Board  
22 will deal with certain elements in terms of water supply, i.e., well-fields. He noted there  
23 were comments raised about mitigating nitrogen loading. In addition, maintenance of the  
24 storm water management structures and controlled pesticides. He said at the appropriate  
25 stage, which is more the definitive, the Board will be reviewing Homeowners Association  
26 documents for the maintenance of the stormwater system and finalizing the storm water  
27 design. He said the Board requires developers to file the Best Management Practices for  
28 erosion and sedimentation control and retains jurisdiction over the development in each  
29 phase in terms of earth moving, grading and other aspects. A 593 review consultant will  
30 be utilized in that review.

31  
32 Ann said she would hope the 593 Site Review would provide an evaluation about  
33 the open space and their review should include how intensive the management of those  
34 spaces should be. Jay said there is some area adjacent to the Sudbury River that is being  
35 dedicated to open space. The applicant suggested they are considering a foot bridge over  
36 the River and there are other elements of common space including a community garden.  
37 The applicant is also suggesting an open space, larger than a football field in size, but Jay  
38 wondered if a 593 Review would be helpful in determining the placement of that field.  
39 Helen agreed. Jay said there are other concerns regarding the location and massing of  
40 structures. He said site density, set back requirements, trail system, and in general, public  
41 access areas contemplated, would require a 593 review. This will be covered in an  
42 upcoming hearing, he noted.

43  
44 Jay said there was a concern with public notification when construction of  
45 improvements begins, at an earlier hearing. He said he did broaden the concern to include  
46 both on-site and off-site improvements. He stated that the Board pays close attention to

1 the construction phasing for projects. For off-site road improvement, the Board would  
2 require a traffic control plan. There would be various public notification regarding  
3 various improvements. He said they could be detailed in the definitive plan review moves  
4 forward through each phase of the PUD. He assumed the specifics would relate to a  
5 specific phase of either off-site or on-site mitigation. Further, the various departmental  
6 reviews have been tracked and the comments are preliminary in nature. He said with the  
7 consultants the Board has hired, he thought they would be better able to provide final  
8 review comments on the project.

9  
10 Jay said that the Board needs to make specific findings in respect to this project.  
11 The location of all primary streets and ways, including access to existing public ways are  
12 all issues the Board will need to deal with. The Board also needs to establish the  
13 significant areas of public and common open space. The Board needs to establish the  
14 final boundaries of lots to be created within the development. Further, the Board will  
15 need to establish the overall project density based on the information submitted and  
16 determine the maximum number of housing units that can be built and the number of  
17 building permits that may be issued within any twelve month period. The development  
18 phases needed to be developed more than in a general way. A more detailed  
19 development time table will be established by the Board in their special permit process.  
20 The Board will need to finalize the traffic improvements and other mitigation measures  
21 that the applicant will need to undertake. There needs to be instruments establishing the  
22 rescinding of the prior approved project for zoning.

23  
24 Helen said Jay will take all the comments and put them in final form and  
25 distribute them as an overview memo. Helen asked for comments from the audience. A  
26 gentlemen asked about the study of environmental implications and said he noticed  
27 vegetable matter growing in the lake. He said that may be due to fertilizers used and  
28 asked about the impact the project would have on the lake or river. Jay said Conservation  
29 is trying to correct some existing deficiencies in the lake and probably needs a more  
30 comprehensive look at the stormwater outflows. Ann said it was a matter of education of  
31 river abutting neighbors. Jack said the grade is down toward the river but it does not feed  
32 off to any lakes or brooks. Jack said they will have a controlled wastewater system with  
33 sedimentation basins. Betty Cummings of School Street stated concern about the traffic  
34 and effects on Police, Fire and Schools. She was concerned with the density of the  
35 project. In looking at the overall project, she wondered if the Board might consider to  
36 scale down the density. Helen said density is an issue the Board will make a decision  
37 after more hearings. Density is reviewed in relation to a number of other things, she said.  
38 The traffic consultants and site design consultant will also look at that issue. Ann said in  
39 relation to density, the Board needs legal reasons to change that. Larry said it is not the  
40 density but the impacts that are the real concerns. Larry said the Board's job is to do as  
41 much as can be done with mitigation, i.e., traffic controls, etc., and then gauge the overall  
42 impact after what the developer has been required to do. If the Board is successful in  
43 mitigating the impacts, the issue of density can be addressed. Charlene Feffary of OCP  
44 said the speed limits changes 4 times between the Wayland line and Hamilton Street. She  
45 asked at what point could the speed limit be made more uniform. Helen said the town  
46 determines the speed limits and is not an issue specifically for this Board. Charlene

1 asked if there is a formula in mandating sidewalks. Helen said it is not a simple number  
2 but there is a mandate in subdivision regulations. Charlene was talking about sidewalks  
3 outside the PUD. Helen said it would be a Traffic Committee and Roadway Safety  
4 question. She was concerned about additional traffic on the side streets close to the  
5 project and Saxonville where there are no sidewalks.

6  
7 Greg Doyle of Meadow Street stated concern with the traffic impacts. He said in  
8 order for the Board to make an informed decision in regards to density, they need  
9 information on average daily traffic on roadway segments. He said the applicant has not  
10 provided that data. He requested the applicant be asked to provide that information on all  
11 roadways that will be impacted. Helen said the request was made directly and to the  
12 Board's traffic consultant. Mrs. Wood, town meeting member, said 10 years ago when  
13 the issue of an office park came before the Planning Board, the residents were upset. She  
14 said at the meeting, Frank Generazzio made the comment of building houses. She said  
15 she thought this was a good area for building and was glad to see it moving ahead. John  
16 Stasik, member of the Design Review Committee, addressed the Board. He said in  
17 context of what was going on 10 years ago, there was concern about encroachment of  
18 local neighborhoods. A moratorium on development was tried. He said it was at that  
19 time that mitigation was introduced. Site plan review and special permit process was  
20 approved by town meeting around the same time. He said the intent was to maintain  
21 some restriction over commercial growth with respect to the residential development and  
22 keeping a distance between the two. He suggested that the town and Planning Board has  
23 done a good job in restricting the growth of commercial development but as far as  
24 encroachment is concerned, that was the context of which the PUD by-law fits. He said  
25 he remembered 10 years ago when the Planning Board granted the approval of the  
26 250,000 sq.ft. space. When the residential option came along, there was fair support for  
27 it. He said those were the choices at the time. He said the best use of the land is to bring  
28 the 150+ acres back into the context of the residential community that is already there.  
29 He said a significant amount of open space is being provided and restricts the commercial  
30 development. He said he strongly supported the concept of the PUD and encouraged the  
31 town to become involved.

32  
33 Norma Schulman of Forest Road and Design Review Committee member  
34 addressed the Board. She said she wanted to emphasize two points. She was involved  
35 when the zoning was first proposed. What prompted her involvement and acceptance of  
36 the zoning was seeing the office buildings towering over the residential homes and the  
37 traffic counts associated with the office use. She said ever since Danforth Street became  
38 limited to one-way, Saxonville has had serious roadblocks. She thought this was an  
39 opportunity to fix the traffic situations in Saxonville. She thought the problems  
40 mentioned of side street traffic and cut-through traffic, started once Danforth became a  
41 one-way. Norma said Framingham has not yet found a way to provide the Over-55  
42 zoning. She said this development would offer that choice.

43  
44 Mr. Goldberg, West Plain Street in Wayland, and public official in Wayland,  
45 addressed the Board. He said he understood the Board's procedural motion earlier this  
46 evening but stated concern. He said he did not view the ability to address the Board as a

1 right but an opportunity. However, there have been 2-3 hearings that he has attended  
2 where he wanted to share a concern and was not able to do that, he said. He thought it  
3 important that the Board recognize the relevance of what residents of Wayland have to  
4 say. He said West Plain Street will be significantly impacted by the development. The  
5 fact that it is across the town border, should create any less relevance. He thought it was  
6 a matter of planning sufficient time for a hearing. Helen said there have been direct  
7 conversations with Mr. Laydon of Wayland and he has not been ignored. Mr. Goldberg  
8 said he was not suggesting Wayland residents have been ignored but if Wayland residents  
9 are relegated to the end of the hearing, there may not be enough time to hear their  
10 comments. Helen said it was not less relevant but it was out of the Board's jurisdiction.  
11 She said the Board has worked with the applicant to work with officials in Wayland. She  
12 said he has done that. Helen thought the applicant and the Board have made themselves  
13 available to officials of other communities. Helen said the Board normally exceeds the  
14 time limits on their agenda to accommodate audience participation.

15  
16 Rebecca Butler, West Plain Street resident addressed the Board. She said the  
17 Metrowest Growth Committee has an agreement to protect the character of the member  
18 towns with developments larger than 60 units and wondered how they were addressing  
19 this development. Helen said it addressed it early on, at the first presentation of this  
20 proposal. There are 9 cities and towns that belong to Metrowest Growth Management  
21 Committee. The next review is a Regional Impact Review. That is done toward the  
22 middle of the process, she said. Unfortunately, for this particular public hearing, there has  
23 been no Regional Impact Review for this project because there has been no director of  
24 the Committee until recently. That review will be done in the future. Rebecca said the  
25 developer had stated there would be on-street visitor parking and the PUD requires one  
26 space per 10 units. She wondered how visitor parking would be addressed if there was  
27 no winter parking allowed. Sue said the roads will be privately maintained and not  
28 plowed by the Town. On street parking would be up to the Homeowners Association and  
29 the applicant. The roads will meet all the subdivision requirements. Rebecca said the  
30 December 3<sup>rd</sup> traffic document says that even if all the mitigation is provided, the project  
31 expects a 861 second delay to enter the project in the evening at rush hour. She said she  
32 was surprised that GPI had signed off on VHB's traffic data. Rebecca said traffic in  
33 Wayland would be further impacted by long delays. Larry said as a Board member, he  
34 knew of no such delay that has been proposed. He said details of traffic were not to be  
35 discussed tonight.

36  
37 Larry said the question of pedestrian access and sidewalks around the site,  
38 perhaps the consultant could take a look at those issues and in particular, those paths that  
39 children may use to walk to school. Even if it could not be covered all in mitigation, from  
40 a town planning point of view, it would be good to get a sense of what is out there, he  
41 said. Ann agreed.

42  
43 Helen said the public hearing would be continued. Helen said it was not known  
44 until Friday that not all of the information would be available and timely enough for the  
45 Board's consultant to generate a report in time for the Board's review for the weekend

1 and that was the reason tonight's agenda was changed. Helen noted the hearing would be  
2 continued to February 11<sup>th</sup>.

3  
4 Jay said he would prefer that it not be limited to traffic but also include some  
5 items that were listed in the punch list overview. He said the goal should be principally  
6 traffic and mitigation. Larry agreed. Sue asked about commentary on the well situation.  
7 Jay said he could bring that forward at the end of the next public hearing as an overview  
8 if nothing else. Larry thought the Board needs to determine which 593 review would be  
9 hired for the site review and the Board should review the proposals. Helen suggested  
10 setting aside time for the PUD on February 11<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. Larry had concern with  
11 doing that because it made it difficult for other projects. Tom will not be present on the  
12 11<sup>th</sup>. Jay will not be present on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Larry suggested scheduling a hearing every 30  
13 days rather than setting aside time at each meeting. Board members discussed various  
14 hearing dates. The Chairman concluded the discussion and reiterated that the next public  
15 hearing would be February 11<sup>th</sup>.

16  
17 II. Public Hearing for Special Permit for Reduction in the Required Number of  
18 Parking Spaces and Site Plan Review Approval, 281-283 Concord Street

19  
20 The Chairman read the public hearing notice into the record. Jay said a staff  
21 review meeting is scheduled for January 28<sup>th</sup>. The site is for a dry-cleaning business.  
22 Peter Barbieri, attorney, represented the applicant. Scott Gonfrade is the proponent.  
23 Scott said he is in the process of acquiring the parcel. Peter said this is parking plan and  
24 site plan. It is a special permit for reduction in parking. Peter said the process was started  
25 based on the fact that presently, there is an existing auto repair station on the site which is  
26 grandfathered in for its use. They have sought ZBA approval and there was a member  
27 voted in opposition. As a result, the Board supported the zoning change in the parcel to  
28 make it more of a neighborhood business zone. The proposal is to upgrade the building  
29 and the entire site and convert it to a dry-cleaning establishment. It is a straight retail use  
30 and requires 10 parking spaces. He said as a result and due to limited size of the site, a  
31 special permit has been filed to reduce the spaces to 6 including one handicap. Scott has  
32 been in the business for a number of years, he said. Peter said they have an approved  
33 landscaping plan which was based on the old parking layout. He would propose the same  
34 landscape materials and construction. The parking layout is showing a single drive at  
35 Concord Street. Sue asked they provide a regular landscape plan showing plants and  
36 sizes. Peter thought the plan identified the proposed locations.

37  
38 Peter reviewed the plan. Currently the site is 100% paved. They are proposing to  
39 reduce the amount of impervious coverage and allow planting areas. The single entry  
40 will be renovated and upgraded. The parking has a space for one employee. Scott said  
41 they will be doing the actual dry-cleaning at his Marlborough site. There is a loading  
42 space at the building. There is no Laundromat within the building. Scott said it is a small  
43 lot in a residential area and he was sensitive to that. Sue questioned how vehicles would  
44 turn around on the site. Peter did not think movement was cumbersome. Jay will address  
45 that issue at the staff review next week. Scott thought it in the best interest of the site to  
46 eliminate the driveway access on Lawrence Street. There will be lighting on the building

1 and lanterns. Signage will be low profile. Sue asked that the lighting be shielded and  
2 aimed at the lot out of consideration to the neighbors. Scott said it was a glazed, shaded  
3 light bulb. There is low lighting on the building at night, perhaps on motion detectors.  
4 The wall packs need to be shielded, Jay said. They are proposing a colonial fence at the  
5 front at 3.6 and will be at the sidewalk. Scott intended to have the landscaping on the  
6 inside of the fence but said he could move it to the outside. Jay said it could be damaged  
7 due to the sidewalk plow. Sue said she hoped to see a landscaping plan. Peter said it is  
8 1700 sq.ft. Helen asked if a little more detail could be provided. Larry asked about  
9 access on Concord Street. The Dunkin Donuts is 200 yards away. The signal is farther  
10 down on Lincoln Street. Scott said the building will remain the same footprint.  
11

12 Helen asked for comment from the audience. There was an abutter present. He  
13 had received a legal notice. Peter said there was a concern that it would remain a gas  
14 station and neighbors and abutters were told that was not the case. He thought the  
15 abutters were agreeable to the dry-cleaning business. Ann said that turning radius need to  
16 be verified by DPW. Jay said they will receive input on the parking from the Police  
17 Department. Larry asked if ITE data was available for a dry-cleaning business. Jay said  
18 there is not enough data sources but there may be some available data. The abutter asked  
19 about the lighting. Scott said there will be a carved sign with a spotlight on it from the  
20 ground. The light will come on at a given time and turned off. Helen said the lighting is  
21 subtle. Larry said that the Board usually requires the lights be turned off an hour after the  
22 operation closes. Scott said the lamp posts in the parking lot are ones that could be found  
23 in a residential driveway.  
24

25 The Chairman stated the hearing would be continued to February 4th at 9:00 p.m.  
26 She advised him to move forward. Peter will prepare a draft decision for Jay to review.  
27 The applicant will be looking for a decision that evening. Helen noted she would not be  
28 in attendance that evening.  
29

30 **Motion by Larry Marsh and seconded by Ann Welles to adjourn the**  
31 **Planning Board meeting. Vote: unanimous.**  
32

33 Respectfully submitted,  
34

35 Nancy Starr-Ferguson  
36 Recording Secretary  
37

38 *\*These minutes were approved, with changes and or amendments, at the Framingham*  
39 *Planning Board meeting of September 30, 2003*  
40  
41  
42

43 \_\_\_\_\_  
44 *Helen Lemoine, Chairman*