

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

MINUTES PLANNING BOARD MEETING February 4, 2003

Those present: Tom Mahoney, Ann Welles, Sue Bernstein

Also present: Jay Grande

I. Miscellaneous Administrative

Tom Mahoney stated that due to the Chairman's absence, he would be chairing the meeting.

II. Informal Discussion, 1183 Worcester Road

Todd Ivanovich addressed the Board. He did not have an overall plan. This is the site of the Clean Machine. There is an auto parts supplier that works out of one of the bays and he is vacating the site. That is where they are proposing to put an ATM machine. The entrance will remain where the bay doors are. Part of the bay will be blocked, he said. Todd said the intent is to put in a window and a service door on the side of the building facing Route 9. He said currently there are 10 parking spaces, which will be reduced to accommodate a handicap space. Sue recollected that the two rows of parking spaces are almost always filled by patrons of the car wash. She stated concern that there may not be empty spaces for people to use to be able to walk to the ATM. There are currently sufficient spaces but the use may render them insufficient. Tom asked how the number of spaces comply with the zoning requirements. The applicant said the dealership would be gone but they would require 3 if they stayed. The bank would require 2 spaces. Sue thought the parking count needed to be redone. The applicant agreed it was a tight site. Jay asked about a special permit process for the car-wash. Sue thought the zoning pre-dated this application.

III. Informal Discussion, Architectural Team

Michael Lieu introduced himself to the Board. Michael said his firm does not do peer reviews or 593 reviews as a business but is in the business of working with designers in production of master plans. His firm has been in business for 30 years and employs 50 individuals. They have built over 35,000 units of housing and of that, 20 have been in large site, master plans. They have done historic/rehabilitation work. Most of their work is in New England. Michael showed pictures of projects they have worked on including a 156 unit project in Hampton, 400 unit in New Hampshire, 275 unit in Hingham, and a site in Arlington Center. He pointed to the site in Arlington, that was developed with 50 units per acre and noted the value of creating some density to allow greater common green space. Slides were also shown of projects in Duxbury, Hanson, Lakeville, Ipswich, Watertown, Boston, and others. Michael said they often super-impose another project on the footprint of the site to determine what might fit on a particular site. They have also collaborated on a site in Brighton in developing the master plan. Michael thought the more successful site plans were ones that created a variety of senses of place or varieties

1 of densities. The various projects were of varying architecture styles and housing and/or
2 office types. Michael said he has seen the master plan for the PUD.

3
4 Ann said the dominance of driveways and repeated units was a concern. Michael
5 said if possible, the entrances to the units could come from the side but said in looking at
6 the plan, there are a number of different building types. He noticed that there are variety
7 of street arrangements on the master plan as well. He said he would prefer not to see
8 dead-end roads but did not know if that was possible. He said he would like to talk to the
9 designer about some of the work behind some of the urban space to understand what the
10 idea is for the quality of the streetscape. Michael said he understood the site is on a
11 gravel yard, is 100 acres, 700 units and has looked at the site plan on their website. Jay
12 has given him some background on the working groups that he may be working with. He
13 did not know about the Edison power easement. Ann said that was one of the reasons for
14 the dead-ends.

15
16 Ann iterated for Michael what issues have been reviewed to date and what will be
17 reviewed in future hearings. She said the by-law requires a certain amount of open space,
18 a certain amount of affordable housing, public access, etc. She said the applicant is
19 contemplating a small retail component. Ann thought the goal was to have the project
20 blend architecturally into the community. Sue asked about their peer review component.
21 Michael said that some firms do that as a center of their business. They produce master
22 plans in the context of buildings so his point of view would be to participate actively with
23 the working groups. In terms of the specialties of the firm, Sue asked if they were
24 landscape architects. Michael said on staff, there are only architects but under contract,
25 they hire engineers and sometimes those are landscape engineers. Sue said the Board has
26 never undertaken a project like the PUD and the initial phase is to grant a special permit
27 for the overall site design/road layout, etc. Then under the definitive sub-division review
28 would be the phasing, etc. Sue said the first part is the special permit and said the Board
29 hoped to have a decision made by that point. She asked if Michael's firm could devote
30 time in the next 6 weeks to help finish that part of the permit. Michael said in his
31 proposal, he had outlined meetings and thought his schedule would allow his
32 involvement in the time frame suggested by Sue. Michael understood that they were
33 looking to complete this part of the project by April 1st.

34
35 Jay said he understood that the meetings proposed by Michael's firm were
36 working sessions. Members concurred. Jay asked if they would review the organization
37 of the site and not only the buildings. Michael said that was his intent and he was
38 comfortable with that. He was not comfortable with determining types of species of
39 plants, etc. Jay said that was something that would come farther in the process but not at
40 this point. Ann suggested making note of the architecture in Saxonville as it has a history
41 dating to 1900. Todd Robecki, Design Review Committee member said he was
42 concerned with the layout of the site, architecture and landscape. He said his concern has
43 been the aspect of a series of cul-de-sac roads. He said by having more traditional street
44 layout, it lends itself to more traditional architecture. He said he was pleased to see the
45 applicant's traditional style in the slides he had shown previously. Todd said in terms of
46 landscaping, this is land reclamation since it is an old gravel pit. He said the landscaping

1 will have to be newly created because of that fact. He said density is a controversial issue
2 in this plan and he thought the architect's approach for using design to overcome
3 prejudice against density was an argument that was not previously presented to the
4 community and residents. He said good design can overcome and enhance the density.
5 Jay said on the issue of landscaping, he thought that someone should assist with the
6 common areas and the open spaces to see if they were in the correct place with the
7 buildings. Michael said that was his intent. Ann said it was the intent to look at the site
8 to determine if the various components were developed in the most advantageous places
9 on the site. Tom said he hoped for the site that the landscaping was interactive.

10
11 IV. Public Hearing for Modification to a Scenic Road and Public Way Access Permit,
12 1057 Grove Street

13
14 Tom read the hearing notice into the public record. He noted the hearing would
15 be continued to February 25th at 7:35 p.m. This will be the first application under the
16 new by-law.

17
18 V. Public Hearing for Special Permit for Exemption from Parking Requirements and
19 Site Plan Review Approval, 58 Park Street

20
21 This public hearing was continued to February 25th.

22
23 VI. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Reduction in the Required
24 Number of Parking Spaces and Site Plan Review Approval, 281-283 Concord Street

25
26 He noted that the hearing would be continued to February 25th at 7:35 p.m. This
27 is the dry-cleaning site and the decision has already been drafted.

28
29 VII. Miscellaneous Administrative

30
31 Sue stated it was unfortunate that another architectural team was interviewed
32 during the day rather than at a Board meeting. Sue thought that Tom Ryan, the
33 afternoon's candidate, was more in tune with what the Board was looking for. Sue said
34 she would prefer Ryan. Ann agreed with Sue. Tom Ryan has no architects on his staff
35 and Michael Lieu has no landscape architects on his staff. They both have very similar
36 comments regarding what their criteria would be on evaluating the project, Ann said. She
37 said they both addressed increasing the density in some of the areas within the PUD to
38 allow more of a sense of place. Ann said she agreed that Tom was more prepared. She
39 thought he understood the 593 process better than Michael. Jay said he saw the process
40 more of working sessions and help with facilitating the Board in making the decision.
41 He said that is how it was done with Target, Wal-Mart and Boston Properties. Tom did
42 not see the process being a mark-up or letter report. Tom said he would like to sit down
43 with a plan and see alternatives. Jay thought Tom could help organize the site well
44 because of landscape but he did not have a great amount of experience with larger scale
45 projects. Ann thought Tom was articulate and saw a difference with their portfolios.
46 Ann said half of Michael's portfolio was based on high-rises. Sue said Tom had stated he

1 would contract with an architect to work with him but he was more landscape driven
2 rather than architecture driven. Sue was not impressed with the slides Michael had
3 showed. Jay asked if the scope is to have someone organize the site and not the
4 architecture of the building. Sue answered yes. Ann thought Tom's presentation was
5 better than Michael's. Jay disagreed with Sue and Ann and favored Michael.

6
7 Todd said the working sessions or forum should include an introductory level of a
8 planned unit development and the historical precedent they were looking at. He said they
9 are not addressing the plan. Todd said the entity the Board is looking at is different from
10 what the Design Review Committee is bringing to the process. He said their role is more
11 to educate the community. He stated he did like the presentation by the architect tonight.
12 Ann thought the presenter tonight spoke to density and architecture. Jay said he knew the
13 Board would look at massing, natural features, etc.

14
15 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board hire Tom**
16 **Ryan to provide peer review services for the PUD and to negotiate a price and**
17 **scope.** Tom asked if he was acceptable to National Development. Doug Strauss stated
18 that Mr. Ryan was acceptable and there are no conflicts. **Motion was seconded by Ann**
19 **Welles. Vote: unanimous, 3-0.**

20
21 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board adjourn this**
22 **evening's meeting. Motion was seconded by Ann Welles. Vote: unanimous.**

23
24 Respectfully submitted,

25
26 Nancy Starr-Ferguson
27 Recording Secretary

28
29 **These minutes were approved, with changes and or amendments, at the Framingham*
30 *Planning Board meeting of June 29, 2004.*

31
32
33
34
35 _____
Thomas Mahoney, Chairman