

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

PLANNING BOARD March 6, 2003
---------------------------------

Those in attendance: Helen Lemoine, Sue Bernstein, Larry Marsh, Ann Welles, Tom Mahoney

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

I. Lot 13, Doeskin II, Carter Drive Extension, Review of modifications to the Grading Plan and Wall.

John Bertorelli, Town Engineer, Chris Petrini, Town Counsel Joe Mikielian, Building Commissioner, Carlos (inaudible) from Rizzo, and Peter Barbieri, attorney for Doeskin were present. Peter said last July grading plans were submitted. He said ultimately the plans were left for the Engineering Department to sign off. Subsequently a building permit was issued for a house on Lot 13. The house, with the exception of the garage, the building was proposed to be a walk-out basement with a concrete wall elevation of 508. He said that is still the proposed elevation. The plan was proposed to be a solid poured concrete retaining wall. The reason it stayed at that level was the cost necessary to build the wall beyond the 508. Carlos said the highest point in the corner was 14' high. The height of the wall at the lowest point was 9'. The plan state the top of the wall is at 520', Tom said. The bottom of the wall was 515' on the plan dated July 3, 2002. Therefore the wall was to be 5'. Ann said in watching the contour on the higher corner, it is at 518' on the plan and the contour that runs through the base is at 512'. That leaves a wall of 6'. Peter said that was the original submittal plan. Peter's plan was dated "revised July 11, 2002". Tom said his plan said revised 7-11-02 and the difference was they added construction notes but nothing about the grading. Joe said there were several plans submitted. Neither of those two plans was actually built, Joe said. The first wall was indicated as versalock but the detail sheet says cement/masonry wall. Ann said versalock wall is a proprietary name for a certain wall. On July 3<sup>rd</sup>, the plans left it at a 5' versalock wall. Sue asked if it was not appropriate engineering procedure that there was a note indicating the revision date of the plans. Peter said it was the case. Tom said usually it is shaded and numbered to correlate to the number of the revision. Carlos the plan that came before the Board was for the entire sub-division. A second plan was drawn that only dealt with lot 13. There is nothing to indicate that the plan was different from the first plan.

Peter said there was a meeting with the Board that indicated the change but he was unaware of the date of the meeting. John said version 2 of the plans show a reinforced concrete wall. Peter said the record plan (with the ivy) is based on a poured concrete. The differences between the Building Department plan (concrete wall) and what has transpired is the difference in the type of the wall. What has been done is more of a block, gravity wall. The type of wall has been certified by Carlos. It is not an issue of safety or construction point of view. Another change was that the wall as constructed, it was extended straight up instead of angled. The final difference is the top of the wall

1 itself, Peter said. The plan now calls for the wall to be out of the 30' setback requirement  
2 and calls for straight grading within that area, Peter stated. A chunk of the wall is coming  
3 out and it's being graded. The Schwartz' house was shown in relation to the wall and it  
4 was noted they can see the entire wall from their vantage point. Peter said he is asking  
5 the Board to recommend their approval or non approval to the Building Commissioner.  
6 The date of the plan proposed tonight is revision 2-28-03. It is still the same data, Peter  
7 said. It is revision #4. Carlos said from the original plan submitted to the Building  
8 Department ahs notes of the materials to be used for fill and site. There was a revision  
9 that they added the walls along the house itself for grading. Peter said the wall now, at its  
10 present height is 24' and 14'. The length is 200'. Peter understood the concern of  
11 aesthetics and he had no problem with planting along the perimeter, evergreens every  
12 25'. Sue stated concern with a wall that was approved for 5' and that in reality is totally  
13 different than what was indicated. Peter thought there was confusion over what  
14 jurisdiction the Board had. Peter thought from a viewpoint of height it has a greater  
15 impact and did not dispute that it should be treated. Chris Petrini said once the wall was  
16 discovered and no permit obtained for it, the Building Commissioner sent a letter saying  
17 a plan was needed to show how the wall was going to be removed. Because there was no  
18 response to his letter, the decision was made within the Building Department to go to  
19 court. The complaint was filed and continued to February 10<sup>th</sup>. Chris said his  
20 understanding was there was a \$1,000 fine imposed and agreed upon and they would  
21 submit revised plans. The agreement that was settled in court required the Planning  
22 Board approval, Joe said. His feeling was what was done was not authorized by the  
23 Planning Board initially. As part of the Building Department approval of the permit  
24 hinges on the Planning Board approval. Joe said the wall is different in terms of location,  
25 height and construction than what was submitted on the plan. John said he had made a  
26 recommendation that the top 6' be sloped at a ratio of 1-1 so the height would be reduced.  
27 He said he noticed the block wall going up in the field and it was not under Engineering's  
28 purview. He thought that was being handled by the developer and other routes. There  
29 were no inspections during the construction process. They are supposed to call for an  
30 inspection on any job, Joe said. Joe said the fill was never inspected so there is no way to  
31 tell what was used. The Town Engineer has not certified the wall. Carlos has certified  
32 the wall. He said he was present at the construction and excavation. It was constructed  
33 according to engineering procedures, Carlos said. Joe said a decision needs to be made  
34 by tomorrow. Sue asked about the procedure if Carlos determines they are not using the  
35 proper materials, etc. Carlos said his plan was designed to allow the client to accomplish  
36 what he wanted. He said there is a gap in what was shown to the Building Department  
37 and what was built but he thought it was the same plan. Ann said she thought Carlos did  
38 what he was asked to do but the ultimate responsibility lies with Mr. Kotsiopolous. Joe  
39 said the building code states that a wall over 12' high requires stamped plans. On the plan  
40 as submitted the wall did not meet 12' high so that was not required. When they were  
41 digging the footing for a wall, no inspections were ever asked for of the Building  
42 Department. That is the responsibility of the builder. Helen said she would entertain a  
43 motion for the Building Commissioner not accept the plan as presented tonight.

44  
45 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board not recommend that**  
46 **the Building Official issue a permit for this wall based on the plans. Seconded by**

1 **Larry Marsh.** Discussion: Tom said if not recommending was the issue, did the Board  
2 have opportunity to request additional information. Chris said with this decision, the  
3 matter is closed. Larry asked what happens at this point. Chris said the town is  
4 evaluating its options. It's fair to say the Building Commissioner is going to move  
5 quickly to protect the town's rights. It is a legal issue at this point, Chris said. Peter said  
6 right now the developer can not do any work until it is figured out what happens at this  
7 point. The issue from the viewpoint of the zoning violation, they would have taken out  
8 that section of the wall but they could not do that because they were operating under the  
9 cease and desist order. Peter said they are ready to remove that violation. Chris asked if  
10 they were willing to take the entire wall out and thought if they were, it would be  
11 significant. **Vote: unanimous.**

12  
13 Sue said she would like the wall to be constructed as it was originally proposed.

14  
15 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Building Commissioner work with the applicant**  
16 **to reduce that wall to get it as close as they can get it to what was initially approved.**  
17 **Seconded by Ann Welles for purposes of discussion.** Discussion: Ann said the issue  
18 was raised if the developer was prepared to remove the wall entirely and start fresh and  
19 now we're entertaining reducing it to the 5'. Sue said the grading originally showed that  
20 the wall could be built as shown on the plans. Peter said there was further opportunity to  
21 improve the aesthetics. The motion is to bring it back to closer to what was designed  
22 Larry stated and asked how it would effect the site. Peter said the wall was approved  
23 within the setback and it would be a concrete visible wall with ivy on top of it. Ann  
24 remembered the wall to be shown as terraced and the ivy was meant to address the top  
25 portion of the retaining wall. She did not believe the Board characterized ivy on the top  
26 of the wall as mitigation to the design of the structure. Larry questioned why the Board  
27 needed to vote on this motion but rather leave it open to the Building Commissioner. Sue  
28 thought it gave a sense of the Board as to the direction they would like to see this go in.  
29 Kathy Vassar addressed the Board. She thought if the Board told them they could leave  
30 the 5' portion of the wall, how one would address the issue of fill. **Vote: 1-4-0.**

31  
32 Helen said while this is not a public hearing, she accepted comments from the Schwartz'  
33 lawyer. He said it is not just an aesthetic issue but also a matter of water run-off. He said  
34 it was an engineering issue and said they intend to hire their own civil engineer to go over  
35 the numbers. Chris said they had the right to whatever documents the town has.

36  
37 II. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Planned Unit Development,  
38 Villages at Danforth Farm off Danforth Street.

39  
40 Helen asked the applicant to address the general interior site design of Danforth Farms.  
41 She said that will be followed by questions and comments from the Board and then  
42 comments by Tom Ryan, 593 Consultant for the Board. The public may comment after  
43 that time. Doug Strauss, National Development addressed the Board.

44  
45 Doug showed the most recent version of the plans and referenced Danforth Street,  
46 MWRA property, and the Sudbury River. He said there are now two access points, i.e.

1 Hialeah Lane and Riverpath. He said the project is 698 units and two small R-1 sub-  
2 divisions which will be an extension of Derby Street. The project as shown has 140 rental  
3 units, 167 units of age qualified housing, 38 duplexes, 24 townhouses, and new  
4 residential homes. They have proposed a series of walking trails and parking area for the  
5 public as well as access to the river. He said the concept of the re-design was to create  
6 more usable open space in the form of green space. There are some community gardens  
7 and meandering green space connecting to the Sudbury River. There is also 4000 square  
8 feet of commercial use for dry-cleaning, ATM and groceries. He said there are various  
9 recreational buildings for each of the phases. There are tennis courts on site. Larry asked  
10 that he identify the proposed phases.

11  
12 Doug said the infrastructure of the sewer work would be done in the first phase. The 140  
13 rental units and a large portion of age qualified units will be done in the first phase as  
14 well as the commercial zone. In terms of traffic mitigation, it was talked about in phase 1  
15 and phase 2 and Sue asked how it related to the construction phases. Doug said traffic  
16 mitigation would coincide with the construction phases. Helen recognized the Design  
17 Review Committee members and thanked them for their participation in the process to  
18 date. Jeanette Berger asked what the law required for the build-out and asked how many  
19 years the first phase would take. Doug said it was market driven. The 167 age qualified  
20 units will not be done at the same time, he said. Helen said the Planning Board has not  
21 determined a specific requirement regarding following a certain number of build out  
22 units. Jeanette said she would like to see a gradual build out during the phases. Todd  
23 Robeck said they met with the developer a few weeks ago and discussed the design and  
24 would speak for the Committee. He said in general it was agreed that this plan is better  
25 than the original plan. A few of the aspects that were positive was the development of the  
26 more traditional common area spaces or traditional New England layout where there is a  
27 central green park area surrounded by buildings. He said it allowed for a lot of intensive  
28 maintenance and more formalized design and plantings. That differed from the areas  
29 closer to the River. As you move closer to the River, they felt the areas should be less  
30 dense and maintenance intensive which is in the current design. He said they were  
31 hoping for as many access and egress points as possible to integrate the project into the  
32 community. He said there was a concern with the middle unit of the rental apartments  
33 because it was at a disadvantaged location.

34  
35 Jeanette Berger, member of the Design Committee stated there was one meeting with the  
36 developer and they did not know how many stories the buildings were, the unit count or  
37 the revised calculations for the open space. She said in speaking as an individual and not  
38 for the Committee, she was not in favor of more access points. She said she had concerns  
39 that some of the local buffer zones near the River that will have buildings in them. She  
40 asked if the aqueduct was part of the PUD. Doug said it was part of the land calculations  
41 for common open space. She requested that updated calculations be presented by the  
42 applicant. She asked that the flood plains, local buffer zones, and all the area that is not  
43 build-able, be taken out of the calculations. Larry said while he did not object to an  
44 individual making statements, this portion of the hearing was intended to be a committee  
45 report. Jeanette said she would save her comments to later in the evening. The next site  
46 design review meeting is tentatively scheduled for March 18<sup>th</sup>, Helen said. Helen said it

1 is not required but if the Design Review Committee wanted to present comments that  
2 would be the appropriate time. Todd said they could offer a majority and minority  
3 opinion. Sue said she had identified the rental building that Todd pointed out, as a  
4 concern as well. Doug showed an aerial photograph of the site with an overlay of the  
5 master plan. Doug said the site is an operating gravel pit and there is no top soil or  
6 vegetation. Everything has been stripped and there has been some fill and re-fill. None  
7 is natural vegetation. The majority of the project will be going over where the current  
8 gravel operation is. Ann said it would be helpful if the applicant showed a plan in what  
9 land would not be build-able. Peter said he thought the Board was looking at resource  
10 areas, and from the viewpoint from the ConCom or State or local boundaries, it does not  
11 say you can not build on that land, you just need permission to build on it. Peter said the  
12 land has been substantially devastated due to the gravel operation. Tom said the no-build  
13 is 30' from the wetland. Peter said they will need to get ConCom approval for the project  
14 within the buffer areas but he did not think the site required even one square foot of  
15 filling. John Bertorelli said in the Riverfront Act, it is incumbent on the developer to  
16 prove negligible or negative impact within the area. Sue said there is a definition in the  
17 by-law of what is calculable. Peter said they were meeting that. Carol Spack said she had  
18 a color coded plan which shows the land which is not developable. The plan was  
19 prepared by Jeanette Berger. Ann asked to what degree National Development would be  
20 able to landscape or cultivate the area owned by the MWRA. Doug said they are  
21 working with them. The majority of it is fenced currently.

22  
23 Tom Ryan from Ryan Associates of Arlington addressed the Board as the 593 Peer  
24 Review consultant. Tom said this is pre-architecture at this point. Tom pointed to the  
25 gravel operation and the footprints of the proposed buildings. He said there were a few  
26 areas where there are existing trees but said the areas are mostly disturbed. He said one  
27 of the strengths of the plan are the open spaces. He thought it lent itself to 3-4 open  
28 spaces with differing characters. One open space is defined by the rental units. He said  
29 there is a gap where there is a well and thought the gap might be better utilized. Tom  
30 thought the middle rental unit might be able to be placed elsewhere to address the  
31 aesthetics issue. Tom said there is one corridor that is denser than another and perhaps  
32 more dense units around the core would allow for less density around the perimeter. He  
33 thought one of the open spaces might be better designed. He said in a plan where there  
34 are front streets and back alleys, there needs to be more definition. Tom thought there  
35 could be further definition of the alley connection and possibly another road connection.  
36 Tom thought the property to nearby residents that are most potentially impacted on  
37 Hialeah and Jay Drive could be graded and plantings added. The existing houses on Jay  
38 Drive are at a substantially higher elevation than the rest of the project, Sue noted. She  
39 asked how that could be addressed. Tom said there was adequate room for substantial  
40 grading and thought it was feasible to take out some of the foreground and do some  
41 filling. He said that would take out a lot of the view and allow some of the area to be  
42 planted. Tom suggested more trees along the edges of the property and allowing the age  
43 qualified units to be more toward the middle of the project rather than an exterior  
44 placement. Tom showed some other projects that his firm has worked on. He said the  
45 retail component could be moved to a more interior site. Doug agreed with pulling the

1 density closer to the street and asked if creating the core for the retail space with awnings  
2 and outside table/chairs would create an advantage. Tom thought that was important.

3  
4 Jeanette Berger stated the need for a park and playing field. She said there was no effort  
5 to mitigate the damage or impact to the Danforth Park as a result of the development.  
6 She said she did not think assigned on street parking should be permitted as part of the  
7 site design. She said the project density was not suitable for the site and stated the  
8 abutting zones are R-1, R-3 and conservation lands. She asked that the Planning Board  
9 reduce the density. Carol Spack addressed the Board and commented on the color coded  
10 map prepared by Jeanette Berger. Carol was concerned with the intensity of the site. A  
11 gentlemen spoke and asked for the total number of units planned. Helen confirmed that  
12 this proposal is for 698 units. He thought that was out of proportion and preferred it be  
13 scaled down. A female speaker asked about the plan. Doug said it was the most recent  
14 plan and said there is a slight reduction in density on this plan. She asked where the  
15 monitoring wells are placed to make sure there were no buildings over those wells. Doug  
16 said they are all over the site and will not be disturbed. Ann said the Mass Historical  
17 Commission requires that developers investigate whether there will be an impact on  
18 archeological sites, Ann said. Generally speaking, the sites that are protected through  
19 covenants, MOA, their locations are not specified. When they are specified, people often  
20 dig them up, she said.

21  
22 Robert O'Neil addressed the Board. He said there is another project proposed for 500  
23 units in Ashland and he spoke in favor of the density. He thought the design takes  
24 advantage of "smart growth" and said the addition of tax revenues and improvement of  
25 traffic and sewer would be a great benefit to Framingham and Wayland. Dave Longden  
26 addressed the Board. He said the overall density was still a problem. He said there were  
27 too many two bedroom units. He said he favored the revised location of the retail space  
28 and age qualified units. He asked that they make sure there was sufficient parking for  
29 delivery trucks to the retail space. Dave said he was in favor moving the more dense  
30 buildings to the center of the area. Steve Cosmos addressed the Board. He agreed with  
31 Tom's analysis. He said he lives close to Natick Village and there are a lot of wetlands  
32 interwoven which separate a lot of the buildings. That provides a distinctive character to  
33 the buildings, he said. He thought providing the greater density in the middle made a lot  
34 of sense. Steve thought playfields and parks could be better utilized within the site.

35  
36 Jackson Madnick, resident of Wayland addressed the Board. He said the town is very  
37 concerned with the quality of the water. He said he thought the scale was out of place for  
38 the site and surrounding community. He thought the traffic numbers were too  
39 conservative. In terms of having some of the infrastructure, he thought it good to have  
40 play/ball fields and a small retail facility on site. He said he would like pesticides and  
41 chemicals to be prohibited from use on the site because of the impacts on Dudley Pond.  
42 Ann said the issue was raised before and the Board is aware of that concern. She thought  
43 when the water supply/drainage issues were addressed, there would be great thought  
44 given to controlling those effects. John Bertorelli said if the developer goes with the  
45 recommendation of the consultant to pull the concentration of the site toward the center,  
46 the DPW would support that. Mike said it was the intent that the roadways remain

1 private and they would provide plowing. A Selectman from Wayland addressed the  
2 Board. She said she was concerned with the process. She asked what standard the Board  
3 uses to determine if the project was too dense. Helen said there are two measures. One is  
4 traffic. At the last meeting, there was a report from the traffic consultant and he stated  
5 there was no rationale nexus for reducing the density and seeing a higher level of service  
6 with the mitigation proposed. The baseline for actual site design is based on the vote of  
7 Town Meeting for approving the PUD. It states the Board may reduce but it does not say  
8 it will or it has to reduce, Helen said. The Wayland Selectperson asked about other  
9 processes that are running concurrently with these hearings and if the Board was keeping  
10 themselves aware of other documents generated. Helen said all documents that pertain  
11 to the issues that are jurisdictionally within the special permit will be considered in the  
12 decision. John Bertorelli said with regards to the RAL Document, the town has met with  
13 SEA Consultants and has sent out a letter asking for certain dates of the URS and the  
14 correlation of the opening of wells.

15  
16 Larry stated that the Board should discuss a public park and playground to upgrade the  
17 area if it is not done within the project. Larry said when looking at other sites and  
18 density, it is difficult to decide whether this is too little dense or too dense. He asked how  
19 far one goes in the special permit process before asking the applicant to show something  
20 a little more definitively to allow one to picture the development. Tom said density is a  
21 measure of housing units per acre. Where that line is drawn is what determines the  
22 density, he said. If the line is drawn inclusive of the open space, the density decreases, he  
23 stated. Peter Barbieri thought it was more a massing to scale. Tom thought it was a  
24 process and the need to retain a certain amount of review capacity. Larry said he needed  
25 to see something of more detail to show what it would look like. Tom said there is no  
26 way to determine the exact components. Larry said in doing Shopper's World  
27 development which was done in phases, there were some schematics provided along the  
28 way that showed at least a visual conception of how it would before passing judgment.  
29 Sue said should the Board move forward with this and the design of the specific phases,  
30 she would hope the Board would do a detailed and thorough architectural review. She  
31 said she had problems with density however, when looking at the development in  
32 Maryland presented in pictures by Tom, she was impressed. Tom said when you place  
33 units closer together, the space in between counts for more. Tom referred to some of the  
34 pictures from the development in Maryland. The houses are closer together but there is  
35 separation of space so they work, he said.

36  
37 Helen said there has been discussion about density and it's relationship to the  
38 surrounding neighborhood. Her opinion was the scale of this was not meant to be the  
39 intent of the surrounding neighborhood and that was why a Planned Unit Development  
40 zone was presented to Town Meeting. The PUD zone was designed to be at a different  
41 scale, she said. Todd said on a personal note, this is a distinctive different approach than  
42 the standard sub-division. He agreed with the comments of the positive aspects of  
43 density when it is pulled tighter together. He thought the complex would bring vitality  
44 and contrast to the neighborhood. He said this stage of the process is the abstract stage  
45 and therefore members may have a problem with visually seeing the concept and density.  
46 Norma said when talking about scale and density and the 1989 decision by Town

1 Meeting, what prompted the support for that, was seeing the architectural drawings of the  
2 office buildings which were approved. She said the scale and density is not the same as  
3 the single family zoning but is a much better alternative to an office park. Norma said  
4 she would like to see an emphasis on solar, reusable materials, environmentally friendly  
5 products. Tom Mahoney said he thought this project in concept conforms to the open  
6 space plan.

7  
8 Ann said the Board's 593 consultants review the plan to see that it meets the  
9 requirements of the by-law and she was interested in the issue of pedestrian circulation  
10 throughout the PUD. Other issues were whether the commercial is located in the best  
11 possible location, the location of the age qualified units, the snow removal potential, car  
12 circulation. She thought the parks were good but wanted to make sure they worked. Ann  
13 said it if was going to be isolated, she thought it had to have a sense of place and identity.  
14 Sue asked Tom Ryan to recommend any change to the street layout if he thought it was  
15 warranted. Tom Mahoney said the dead end cul-de-sac at the age qualified housing was  
16 a concern.

17  
18 Helen said the public hearing would be continued to Tuesday, March 18, 2003 at 8:00  
19 PM.

20  
21 III. Skater's Paradise, Blandin Avenue

22  
23 The temporary occupancy expires tomorrow and the Building Commissioner has asked  
24 for the Planning Board's recommendation before issuing a permanent occupancy permit.  
25 Dave said the additional lighting and bollards are in, the safe area is roped off in front of  
26 the park,. The stripping was done in the fall and has worn off and will be redone in April.  
27 All the signs for maneuvering through the site is in place. There are three signs that tell  
28 the vehicles to move in a one-way fashion around the facility. Initially the Fire  
29 Department had wanted sprinkler heads under the ramps but that was determined not  
30 necessary. Those discussions created a two month delay, Dave said. There are bollards  
31 with chains and roping to deter vehicles from driving down to the loading docks at the  
32 front of the facility. Dave said a 90 day TCO will allow them to construct a cement  
33 handicap ramp. Sue suggested when the Building Commissioner verifies that the ramp  
34 and painting are done, the Board agrees to issue the permanent occupancy.

35  
36 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board recommends**  
37 **favorable action on extending the temporary occupancy permit for 90 days or**  
38 **whenever the work is done, whichever is sooner and once completed, a permanent**  
39 **occupancy permit to be issued at that point. Seconded by Tom Mahoney. Vote:**  
40 **unanimous.**

41  
42 Miscellaneous Administrative

43  
44 Mylar plans for 546-560R Edgell Road were signed by Board members.

1 Wayside at Lockland Avenue Tom said the applicant is asking for state money and a  
2 waiver of a number of thresholds. It was determined that there was a 21-E filed on the  
3 site and in the old MEPA filings, it states in the order of conditions that only clean fill  
4 should be used on the site. He said that is not the case. Members discussed changes to a  
5 draft letter to MEPA regarding concerns. Tom will make some edits to the letter and  
6 forward copies to several members. Tom said it needs to be mailed tomorrow. He said  
7 the letter addresses issues the Board would normally review rather than the Planning  
8 Department. Tom said the size of the development and because they are seeking state  
9 funding and the fact that it was non-profit, may make it trigger MEPA review. Members  
10 concurred to include language stating that the traffic could have safety impacts at the  
11 intersection of Route 9 and Lockland Avenue.

12  
13 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board endorse the**  
14 **Planning Board meeting minutes of December 10, 2002. Seconded by Larry Marsh.**  
15 **Vote: unanimous.**

16  
17 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board adjourn this**  
18 **evening's meeting. Seconded by Tom Mahoney. Vote: unanimous.**

19  
20 Respectfully submitted,

21  
22 Nancy Starr-Ferguson  
23 Recording Secretary

24  
25 *\*These minutes were approved, with changes and/or amendments, at the Framingham*  
26 *Planning Board meeting of June 1, 2004.*

27  
28  
29 \_\_\_\_\_  
30 *Thomas Mahoney, Chairman*  
31