

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 February 25, 2003
--

Those present: Helen Lemoine, Ann Welles, Sue Bernstein, Tom Mahoney, Larry Marsh
Also present: Karen Margolis, Jay Grande

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. Zoning Discussion

Karen reviewed zoning articles and the timeline for including them in the Annual Town Meeting warrant. She said there was a possibility to call a special town meeting within the Annual. Karen recommended dealing with them at a special town meeting.

Providing 10% affordable housing component in the Mixed Use Zone

Karen said the language was similar to that in the Over 55 zoning language providing for the 10% affordable housing component. There was some word smiting by members of the Board. The requirement is in accordance with the federal and state standards.

Motion by Tom Mahoney that the Framingham Planning Board sponsor the affordable housing component requirement of the Mixed Use Zoning as shown in Document #206-03 as modified tonight. Seconded by Sue Bernstein. Vote: 4-0 (Larry Marsh was not present for this vote.)

Allowing residential use on the first floor of a mixed use complex

This will provide a process for discretionary requests for some residential units on the ground floor. Karen said the document needed further work. Sue questioned whether it should be a percentage of the whole parcel or a percentage of the linear street. Members discussed various scenarios with differing percentages. Jay suggested 10% of the total units not to exceed more than 1/3 of the gross floor area of the foot print of the building. Karen suggested 25% or not more than 6 units. Sue said it would be helpful to have the footprint of the Arcade which shows the resulting units on the first floor before refining this language. They are anticipating 200 units in the Arcade Building.

Over 55

Karen said there were some changes from the original language. The R-1 and R-3 originally allowed 4 units per acre. That has been reduced to allow 3 units per acre. Helen said she spoke to the Chairman of Planning and Zoning who said he would support this article at Town Meeting. Karen said some of the density calculations were changed as well. Because of that change, there were minor adjustments to some of the dimensionals. The horizontal dimensional is 150 which reflects the reduction to 3 units. The affordability component has been increased to 15%. Members instructed Karen to

1 continue to work on the language but concurred they would support the article at a future
2 special town meeting.

3
4 Planning & Zoning

5
6 Karen said she is working on several articles for planning and zoning. One deals with
7 putting in dimensional requirements for residential open space ratio. She said she is
8 drafting another article dealing with setbacks in parking lots and limiting driveways.

9
10 II. Pubic Hearing for Modification to a Scenic Road and Public Way Access Permit,
11 1057 Grove Street.

12
13 Jay stated this is a continued public hearing. Janice Hannert was present and represented
14 Winch Pond Trust. She said this is a two acre lot on the easterly side of Grove Street. It
15 is a single family lot. 1055 Grove Street is to the south of the lot. Dale (inaudible),
16 resident of 1053 Grove Street said the driveway to 1055 is to the south but the actual
17 house is east of the property. Janice said they are seeking to relocate two existing
18 openings in the stone wall. There is one on the southerly side of the lot and one on the
19 northerly side. The stone wall is a loosely placed wall and all of the stones will be reused
20 to rebuild the wall. Janice showed photographs and pointed out the openings in the wall.
21 Janice thought the project was eligible for an exemption because the by-law provides that
22 if there is not at least one cubic feet of stone wall per linear foot, this section would not
23 apply. Jay distributed a letter from the DPW that was received this evening. He said he
24 would need a certification from the applicant because he could not attest to the cubic feet.
25 He said it was not addressed in the DPW letter. There are no trees involved. There are
26 two curb cuts and they would like to utilize those curb cuts for the driveway. Janice said
27 they would like to put in a circular driveway. There is no existing driveway there at
28 present. Ann said some of the stones are larger than a foot and it qualifies as a stonewall.
29 Helen said it is in need of a scenic road permit. Ann asked about the posting on the
30 property. Janice said it has not been up for a week. Helen said due to that fact, the
31 hearing will not be closed tonight and the Board could collect additional data during the
32 course of the coming weeks.

33
34 Helen referred to a letter from the DPW dated February 11th. The letter states that the site
35 distance is acceptable but the travel width is proposed at 14' and the by-law states not to
36 exceed 12'. Tom said the plan indicates one opening. Janice said there is an opening
37 proposed where there are not any significant stones. Joe Gagnon, 1049 Grove Street
38 asked for background on the parcel of land and why it had not been developed in the past.
39 He asked where 1060 Grove Street was located in relationship to this parcel and the
40 proposed access to the Preserve at Emerald Valley. Janice said 1060 Grove Street is on
41 the opposite side of the street and to the south of the property. She did not know why it
42 hadn't been developed in the past. The driveway, in terms of the intersection of
43 Grove/Winch, is several hundred feet away. There is an existing driveway to 1060 Grove
44 Street which is approximately 200' to the south of the other side and had nothing to do
45 with this lot, she said. Mr. Gagnon mentioned a safety concern with regard to the area of
46 the driveway. There is a bend in the road at 1060 where the homeowner has placed

1 boulders on the west side of the road to prevent cars from crashing through his stone
2 wall. Janice was not aware of that particular issue. The driveway at 1055 Grove Street
3 are 20' right of ways. There are three driveways that are together at that point according
4 to the assessors map, Janice said. The roadway for the Preserve at Emerald Valley is at a
5 significantly different location, she noted. Janice was asked to show, at a future hearing,
6 a preference for placement of one driveway if that is what the Board chooses to allow.
7 Steve Orr addressed the Board. He said since changes in the scenic road by-law, he asked
8 about the status of a two entrance circular driveway. It is not precluded but it would have
9 to be acceptable to the Board, Helen said. Kathy Vassar asked if there was a possibility
10 of having a driveway with enough room to allow vehicles to turn at the front of the
11 residence without allowing two curb cuts. Dale asked if the long term usage of the
12 property was being considered. Helen said the by-law is specific with jurisdiction and it
13 has to do with the driveway and opening in the stone wall. There has to be a series of
14 permits before they can build on the lot, Helen said. Dale said the property goes through
15 a wetland and there are trees on the property that will have to be removed for the
16 driveway. The Board has jurisdiction at the right of way only under this by-law. An
17 opening can be granted but without further permitting they may or may not be able to do
18 anything else on the property. Jay said that ConCom and Police Department did not have
19 any issues with the application on the scenic road portion.
20

21 Helen said the hearing would be continued to April 8, 2003 at 7:45 p.m.
22

23 III. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Planning Unit Development,
24 Villages at Danforth Farm, off Danforth Street Traffic
25

26 Helen introduced Board members for those in the audience. The Planning Board's traffic
27 consultant from GPI, Art Scarneo, and his associate Heather were also present.
28

29 Art said this piece of property was zoned in the early 80's and allowed for office use. He
30 said it is helpful to remember there was a plan to build 1.5 million square feet of office
31 development. He said if 1 million was built out, there would be 2 ½ to 3 times more
32 traffic during the AM and PM peak hours than what is being proposed for the property at
33 present. Art said the issue of Danforth being one way vs. two way was considered. When
34 it was converted to a one-way, there was a lot less traffic going through the areas. To
35 return it to a two-way, the phasing that would be required would create longer queues and
36 "steal" time from the other approaches. He said McGrath Square is coordinated with
37 Central Street and Water Street and there would essentially be a third signal added at that
38 intersection. Art did not think Danforth should be made a two-way. He said there are
39 vehicles that making a prohibited left move onto Danforth Street creating a negative
40 impact on traffic. He would recommend cerated concrete to act as a deterrent for
41 vehicles who are trying to do that. He said another improvement for that location would
42 be a fiber optic no-turn on red signal and all updated equipment. Sue understood the
43 rationale behind the analysis in terms of the timing of that intersection but thought the
44 trade-off would be that it would take a lot of traffic out of the School/Hamilton
45 intersection. She thought some cross trips through the neighborhood might be eliminated
46 as well. Art said in his opinion, the traffic congestion on Concord Street would extend

1 farther back and it would run more inefficiently. Unfortunately the only solution Art saw
2 was if a taking were to occur at the pizza shop or other businesses as necessary to allow
3 Danforth Street to be aligned to a "T" configured intersection, returning Danforth to
4 two-way would work. He said it would require substantial takings. A private person
5 could not do a taking so therefore the Town would have to do it. John Bertorelli, Town
6 Engineer was present and asked for his comments. John said he was comfortable with
7 the presentation and felt that Danforth should not be returned to two-way traffic. It was
8 moved to a one-way 27 years ago, he said.

9
10 Art said he reviewed the trip generation based on the multi-uses there. He agreed upon
11 the highest trip generation rate that could be applied to those uses and he thought it
12 important to note that. The highest rates possible were used to show the worst case
13 scenario. Trip distribution was determined by journey to work data and other means.
14 The study area was enlarged to 25 intersections and Art said that was an extraordinary
15 amount of work. He said it gave the opportunity to determine existing inefficiencies and
16 what could be done. The common practice is a 5 year design period and the applicant was
17 asked to provide a 12 year design period. Art said those were the issues that he reviewed.
18 Based on that, is how they came up with what should be the mitigation. Based on those
19 criteria, he determined the priority of the locations and the fee associated, during the
20 Phase it should be done and what the level of service change would be as a result of that.
21 He said the first priority is Old Connecticut Path/West Plain Street in Wayland. It is a
22 failing intersection. If that was signalized it would provide measurable improvements to
23 OCP. He said that was approximately \$400,000 and brings the level of service to "C"
24 from an "F". The next intersection should be Concord Street/School Street. He said that
25 would be a fully signalized intersection and would be a more standardized "T"
26 intersection. The level of service would be a "C-D" from and "E-F". It would provide an
27 additional left turn lane, exclusive right turn lane and exclusive through lane. It would
28 cost approximately \$420,000. He thought it should be done in the first phase of the
29 project. Sue asked if there would be a free right at School and Concord and asked about
30 compounding congestion. Art said there will be channelized left and right turn lane at
31 that location. If it proposed to be a problem and the queue from McGrath Square was
32 going back to School/Concord, there would be the ability to put it under signalized
33 control. He thought that the improvements, as recommended at McGrath Square, there
34 would be better flow.

35
36 The third intersection proposed is OCP/Riverpath. Art said it will be the entrance to their
37 site and he anticipates the majority of traffic will enter and exit via that route. He said
38 VHB associated a cost of \$145,000 to that intersection and since it services their
39 development, Art would not attribute any cost to the improvements. It is a level of
40 service of "F" with the methodology used. In looking at all the analysis, Art said the
41 reality is there will be gaps at West Plain Street and there will be no difficulty for any
42 vehicle making a right turn from OCP onto Riverpath. The left turn model is saying it is
43 a deficient maneuver. When the demand is minimal, it still states a level of service of
44 "F". He did not think that accurately represented the intersection. The level of service of
45 "F" is attributable to those vehicles exiting the development. Art said in looking at the
46 volume of some existing streets today are higher than what is being projected and the

1 level of service. Larry said three intersections along OCP are being considered and they
2 are all failing presently and will fail with future improvements. However, two i.e.,
3 OCP/West Plain and OCP/School Street are being improved from a level "F" condition.
4 Larry asked why it would not be advantageous to add a set of lights at one of the three
5 failing intersections along OCP. Art said unfortunately you can not signalize all streets
6 where there is a level of "F" service. Some do not warrant a signal, he stated. He said the
7 locations do not justify the need for a signal. He said there is a problem with the program
8 and in reality the generation does not warrant a signal. Art said certain criteria is used in
9 standard engineering practice Scott explained that with the industry approach, the
10 analysis shows that one approach or one maneuver makes the intersection fail. Scott
11 explained that there are certain criteria used in standard engineering practice, i.e. peak
12 hour warrant, pedestrian warrant, 8 hour warrant. Sue asked about the consideration of
13 putting a light at Riverpath vs. West Plain. Theoretically you would be metering traffic
14 and provide gaps through the south, Art said. Sue expressed concern with placing signals
15 where there are heavy existing residential properties and that it has a detrimental impact
16 to those homes. She thought by considering signalizing Riverpath you would need fewer
17 signal heads and arms than at West Plain. Art however thought the appropriate place for
18 a signal was at West Plain Street. Helen asked as a fall back provision, if the Board had
19 what is needed to put a light at Riverpath and OCP if the town of Wayland does not
20 assent to a light at West Plain Street. Art said it would have to be a commitment under
21 phase 1 and require monitoring. Art stated that all the analysis has been done based on
22 the proposed mitigation.

23
24 Art said improvements in Phase 2 would be Concord Street/Elm Street, Center
25 Street/Water Street/Central Street, i.e. McGrath Square He said that consisted of
26 upgrading traffic signals, fiber optic signals to allow Elm Street south bound right turn,
27 right turn on red when possible. He said that was a substantial improvement and is
28 estimated at \$650,000. He said there will be much better levels of service. He said it
29 operates at a "D" level of service now and will operate at level "C". Larry and Sue asked
30 why this intersection was being done in Phase 2 if it was the worst intersection. Art said it
31 was not the worst location in his opinion. Art said it becomes a question of where you
32 "get the bang for the buck". In reality there is ½ million dollars in phase 1 for 350 units.
33 The impacts that that will have are not going to adversely impact this location in a
34 percentage, Art said. The improvements in phase 1 are a result of the impact of the
35 project and this intersection is a commuting route and not adversely impacted in that
36 phase. The new technology of fiber optic "no turn on red" allows it to be turned on
37 during designated hours, Art explained. The numbers are based on conceptual plans right
38 now, Art said.

39
40 The next intersection would be School/Hamilton Streets. They would close the driveway
41 to the plaza. While there is not an immediate benefit from the analysis there is a benefit
42 because of channelizing the right turns coming up School to Hamilton.

43
44 The intersection at OCP/School Street is a situation where the full build-out is not known
45 and Art suggested putting it under a full monitoring program. Upgrades may provide
46 additional gaps at OCP and Hamilton and the diversion of some traffic.

1
2 In regards to downsizing the project, Art said the scenario in looking at what was studied
3 and the magnitude of the higher projections and longer design year, the reality is if there
4 was another location for mitigation, it would have been on the list. Art said the
5 generation does not drop that substantially by downsizing. The numbers show whether
6 it's 600 or 300 units, the levels of service did not change. Art said the mitigation projects
7 set forth will mitigate the impacts.

8
9 Jay said on the scope that is identified and later on as it goes through design, drainage,
10 curbing, full overlay, opticom, etc. will have to be factored into the cost. Tom said that
11 whatever year phase 2 is developed and the dollars are inflated, it is still their
12 responsibility to do the work. Art said in regards to pedestrian and bicycle concerns,
13 proper lanes for bike lanes, shoulders, sidewalks, will all be taken into consideration
14 during design. Sue said mitigation is relative to the impacts of the project. If they are
15 creating more traffic, mitigation is supposed to address that situation. Usually mitigation
16 does not have to be in place until that project opens. Sue said in Saxonville there are
17 traffic problems regardless of future problems and she asked about worst cases in reality.
18 Art said with the recommended improvements, the impacts of the project will be
19 mitigated. He thought the conditions would be better than what they are presently.

20
21 Larry referred to a letter dated February 19th letter from VHB. He said it outlines the
22 traffic details and how they drew their conclusions. Larry said the developer has the
23 responsibility for the proposal and whatever it costs. Mitigation dollars are set by statute
24 in the by-laws and Larry asked if there was a standard for what the project value was. Jay
25 said on the application and in the development impact statement submitted by the
26 applicant, there is an estimated value of the project. There is also a fiscal impact analysis
27 on the property in terms of new taxes and value of the project as it goes through the
28 various phases of development. Jay thought it was a little over 89 million dollars. Larry
29 said in his experience on the Board, this was the most comprehensive traffic review that
30 was ever done. He thought the data was substantial and reasonable. In using the by-law
31 statute for the 3% it would be closer to 3 million than the 2.3 being proposed for the 7
32 intersections identified. Larry said there is some discomfort with the unknowns over the
33 development of a project of this size. He agreed with the analysis to leave Danforth
34 Street a one-way for now but was hoping that after the first phase is built, that might be
35 reconsidered. He also expressed concerns with McGrath Square. He hoped money
36 would be left aside for further work along that corridor. Larry said there are no other
37 projects along the horizon for that area that could substantially support major
38 improvements in the area. He thought the mitigation should be kept at 3%.

39
40 Helen opened the discussion up to those in the audience. John Stasik addressed the Board
41 and thought the history of why Danforth Street was changed to a one-way might be
42 helpful. John asked about the calculations going through McGrath Square and returning
43 Danforth Street to a two-way. Art explained the scenarios of with or without a signal. Art
44 said stopping the traffic and increasing the queue going back along Concord Street will
45 exacerbate that intersection. John agreed with Larry's earlier comments to re-visit
46 McGrath Square in future phases if the improvements do not work. Norma Shulman

1 addressed the Board. Norma attributed the traffic problems to turning Danforth into a
2 one-way. She said Danforth being one-way allows a cut through through all the
3 neighboring streets in the area. Lovering was made one way which in turn impacts the
4 following street, she said. She did not see any mitigation helping with that problem. Art
5 said under existing conditions, there are approximately 40 cars trying to make a left and
6 the reality is it is difficult to make a left onto OCP. Art acknowledged that you are
7 traveling north to go south but stated that there is not as much difficulty making a left
8 onto OCP from Pinecrest. Norma said she has used Brownlea to Springhill and exiting
9 at Pinecrest and was concerned about increasing the traffic on those smaller streets. Art
10 said it was important to note that independent of this project and there will continue to be
11 growth and impacts on the area. Larry said in the VHB submission, there are 3 pages
12 devoted to Brownlea. There are over 300 homes on the 3 streets coming in and out of
13 Brownlea. The volume on OCP is at its highest point as it goes past Brownlea, Larry said.
14 Larry asked if it was feasible to do a test of the two-way situation on Danforth. Art said
15 there would be a lot of money to put in the ground that would need to be ripped up if it
16 did not work.

17
18 Rene Mandel, resident of Springhill Road, addressed the Board. She stated that Pinecrest
19 is on a hill and is not easily traversed in bad weather. Ann suggested monitoring all the
20 mitigation intersections as part of the process. Monitoring does not do any good if there
21 are no funds to correct the situation, Larry said. Carol Spack addressed the Board. She
22 said she did not hear any discussion about return trips on Riverpath in the evening hour.
23 Art said the maneuver during the PM peak hour will operate with no deficiencies at all.
24 The left turn maneuver from Riverpath is what makes that operation fail. The left turn in
25 is not a deficient maneuver, Art stated. A left turn stacking lane is proposed for that site,
26 Sue noted. The analysis states there is a 14 minute delay. Scott Weiss of VHB states that
27 the 14 minute delay is a calculated number that is associated with the exiting
28 maneuvering. He said the calculation is faulty. He said when looking at Hamilton Street
29 and the queue that occurs is close to 6 or 7 times what is conservatively projected for
30 Riverpath. The queue that occurs northbound on Hamilton is only a few cars. Scott said
31 in talking about 500 cars making that turn in the northbound direction, there is not a
32 significant queue. Carol said she was concerned about the fact that they project no
33 takings for any of the roadway improvements. Carol was also concerned with the
34 projection of a value of 89 million dollars and the impact of devaluing the existing
35 homes. Helen disagreed that the value of the surrounding homes will be reduced by the
36 project. Helen said as a resident of OCP, there was concern with the impact of Super
37 Stop & Shop and the YMCA but those projects improved the value of homes along OCP.
38 Scott said they are confident and have based their data from the Town's Engineering
39 Department with regards to the right of way. There are no takings planned from the Town
40 and the improvements are designed to be within the right of way. If there should be
41 takings, they need to be taken by the town and approved by Town Meeting. There are no
42 takings planned or proposed, Scott said.

43
44 Debbie Cleveland addressed the Board. She asked about the possibility of the trial of
45 returning Danforth to a two-way. She asked if the roadway could be re-striped to allow a
46 modest trial of that scenario. She said they asked the Roadway and Traffic Committee to

1 look at that about a year ago. Helen said returning that road to a two-way street would be
2 the decision of the Board of Selectmen. Marilyn (inaudible), resident of OCP expressed
3 concern with exiting her driveway or others on OCP. She did not see signalization
4 helping the congestion. Helen said the traffic light on OCP provided a gap and in her
5 personal experience, it has helped her get out of her driveway. Art said he did not
6 disagree with her concern but with the implementation of traffic signals there will be
7 more gaps and vehicles will be traveling slower.

8
9 Joe Laydon, town official from Wayland addressed the Board. He said they are assuming
10 that if there is a decision drafted by the Board, there will be stipulations that there be
11 public hearings during the process. He said in working toward the future, he hoped the
12 Board would consider the opportunity for a peer review with Wayland officials. Joe said
13 they are working on drafting a decision relative to this project and are allowing town
14 boards and officials to review the documents. A female resident of West Plain Street in
15 Wayland addressed the Board. She asked about the signal being placed at Riverpath in
16 phase 1. Art said the signal could be placed there but it probably would not be turned on.
17 She asked about mitigation at West Plain and if there was a concern of accidents on
18 Riverpath due to vehicles waiting to turn left onto OCP. Art said there is no concern with
19 that as a result of the analysis. She had questions with the dollar amount associated with
20 the work being proposed for West Plain. Sue said that the developer does the work
21 regardless of the cost. Sue said all mitigation is bonded in advance and allows for
22 contingencies. Art said the volume to capacity ratio is 3 ½ % over capacity at West Plain
23 and OCP without this project. The study area is more than adequate, Art said. In going
24 farther to the north, the traffic will disperse and will be negligible during the peak hour
25 generations. It has the highest accident ratio of all the intersections proposed. Helen
26 said that is why the Board is waiting for the town of Wayland to let the Board know if
27 they want the mitigation to be done there. The speaker asked if the Board is waiting for a
28 regional impact review before issuing a decision Helen said the answer was yes and the
29 Board will wait for their report. The review will be complete before the public hearing
30 closes.

31
32 Helen noted that the public hearing would be continued to Thursday, March 6th at 8:00
33 p.m. The land use consultant will be prepared to address the Board on March 6th.

34
35 IV. Public Hearing for Special Permit for Reduction in the Required Number of
36 Parking Spaces and Site Plan Review Approval, 281-283 Concord Street.

37
38 Attorney Peter Barbieri addressed the Board. Peter stated that the applicant seeks to open
39 a dry cleaning business on the property. Jay referred to document #192-03. Paul said the
40 document does reflect the changes. The previous document was #188-03 which talked
41 about site plan changes. It talked about where the fence would be located and the type of
42 fence. The standard landscaping language needs to be inserted in the document. The
43 ornament lights will be on the face of the building. Peter said this is not site plan
44 approval. Sue asked about the letter relative to the dry cleaning on site. That is addressed
45 in paragraph #23, Peter said. There is a letter from the Fire Department stating they can
46 not perform dry-cleaning on site. The letter is on file and is not specifically referenced in

1 the decision, Jay said. Sue suggested they alert the Building Commissioner to the Fire
2 Department correspondence. Peter said they are aware of that. The missing dates will be
3 supplied. There will not be a maintenance bond. It is a renovation of 1800 square feet.
4 Board members were aware there was no landscaping bond. The applicant will not
5 receive an occupancy permit if the landscaping was not in place, Sue stated.

6
7 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board approve the**
8 **decision on the application of LC Realty Trust special permit for the reduction in**
9 **the required number of parking spaces and site plan review under Section 4.I.2.a.,**
10 **dated February 25, 2003 subject to the modifications that were made tonight and to**
11 **be verified by the Chair prior to signing. Seconded by Larry Marsh. Vote:**
12 **unanimous.**

13
14 Miscellaneous Administrative

15
16 Jay said document #220-02 from Costmos Associates for \$1,500 for 220 Cochituate
17 Road. Jay stated it requires the Chairman's signature. Members authorized Chairman to
18 sign.

19
20 Jay said there is a Certificate for performance for Holtham Lots. Those are two lots on
21 Edgebrook Road. The releases were never recorded. They do have the deed restrictions,
22 Jay said. There are two copies that require Board members signatures. He said this has
23 already been done but have been misplaced by the applicant.

24
25 Bickford's Restaurant is seeking a temporary occupancy permit. Since it did not go
26 through formal site plan review, the Board has no ability to collect a bond they posted
27 with the Treasurer for the landscaping they owe. Jay said it will be tied to the final
28 occupancy permit.

29
30 **Sue Bernstein moved to authorize the Building Commission to approve the**
31 **temporary occupancy permit for Bickford's Restaurant. Tom Mahoney Seconded.**
32 **Vote: unanimous.**

33
34 Garcia Sub-division. Jay had the covenant contract for the Garcia sub-division. Town
35 Counsel indicated that the Board needs to sign off the plan and covenant. Everything is
36 in order, Jay said. All mitigation promised to the neighbors is included. The Board
37 approved it and this is an administrative function only, Jay said. These are already
38 recorded instruments, he said. Helen, Tom and Larry signed the documents.

39
40 Route 9 CVS. Sue asked about the status. Jay will speak with VHB regarding their
41 negotiations with the state. Sue suggested that they make the lights at Salem End and
42 Temple operational and further, the lights on the side of the building are not shielded.
43 She suggested shielding. Larry said his recollection is they asked for a temporary
44 occupancy. The Board said no until the entrance and exit on Route 9 was resolved. If they
45 do not receive permission from the state for that exit/entrance, the Board said they would
46 re-open the hearing and look at the traffic impacts on Salem End during peak hours. He

1 said he was opposed to granting anything until they address the Board with where they
2 stand with the State approvals and what their intent is. The information they need to
3 provide is where they are relative to mitigation, the extra traffic pole and when they will
4 complete their site work, etc. Sue said it was in the newspaper that they are closing the
5 Franklin Street site and holding a grand opening on May 6th. Larry asked if something
6 should be put in writing to the Building Commissioner regarding the position of the
7 Planning Board. Helen did not think it needed to be in writing. Sue said the Building
8 Commissioner will not issue a permit unless the Board signs off.

9
10 PUD. Helen said the rationale for having PUD discussions on every agenda is to provide
11 consistency. Larry said there are other projects that were as large and as complex and
12 asked about the urgency.

13
14 Budget Recommendations: Jay said he is assuming the clerical help will be paid at an M-
15 1 level. Larry asked how long it would take a junior secretary to take the minutes. The
16 overtime will be reduced based on the person attending the meeting and the hours
17 included as part of regular pay. It roughly takes 5 hours plus transcription. It is intended
18 that the person hired would be full time and any time worked over 40 would be
19 compensatory time, Jay said.

20
21 Respectfully submitted,

22
23 Nancy Starr-Ferguson
24 Recording Secretary

25
26 **These minutes were approved, with changes and/or amendments at the Framingham
27 Planning Board meeting of November 25, 2003.*

28
29 _____
30 Helen Lemoine, Chairman