

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

MINUTES PLANNING BOARD March 18, 2003

Those present: Helen Lemoine, Sue Bernstein, Ann Welles, Tom Mahoney, Larry Marsh.

Also present: Jay Grande

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p .m.

I. Miscellaneous Administrative

Motion by Sue Bernstein and seconded by Tom Mahoney that the Framingham Planning Board endorse the Planning Board meeting minutes of December 17, 2002. Vote: 5-0.

Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board endorse the Planning Board meeting minutes of December 3, 2002. Motion was seconded by Tom Mahoney. Vote: 5-0.

Helen said she had a letter drafted regarding open space to the Joel Lerner at OEA. She said it states that the Planning Board has reviewed the town's draft of the open space and recreation plan and that it represents the needs of the town and residents. Further it states that the Board looks forward to the implementation of the plan.

Jay said there is a draft decision for 222 Cochituate Road but no one had spoken to Steve Cosmos regarding the landscaping plan.

Sue said there was a meeting regarding the traffic signal policy. She thought there was good progress made and agreement on some issues. They liked the idea of getting a consultant to draft the standards, Sue said. There were 3 Selectmen at the meeting and Ann said it was stated that Jay would be asked to seek funding sources.

Motion by Ann Welles that the Framingham Planning Board instruct Jay Grande to begin to investigate funding possibilities for \$5-10,000 for the stated purpose. Seconded by Larry Marsh. Vote: 5-0.

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

Attorney Peter Barbieri, Frank Gemella, architect, Doug Strauss of National Development and Mike Tucker from VHB were present for the applicant. Helen said the focus would be a continuation of the last public hearing regarding the site design. The Board's 593 consultants were present.

1 Frank Gemella addressed the Board and showed the previously amended plan. Frank
2 said the new plan shows the main access of Riverpath and a secondary connection to
3 Hialeah. There are no longer connections to Derby Street and Meadow Street. Derby and
4 Meadow terminate in cul-de-sacs of single family homes. The plan has 2 driving design
5 ideas and one is to develop focal points in the form of green/common space. The other is
6 to connect to the 3 dominant entry points to the surrounding conservation areas and open
7 space. There are 3 primary new created green spaces. One is at the entry, another shaped
8 in the form of a town commons, and the third is more of an interior park around which
9 would be placed some of the condominium structures. Three major access points to the
10 conservation area were shown on the plans. He said the mix was changed slightly and
11 increased the number of age qualified and decreased the number of market
12 condominiums. The age qualified units have been increased to 167.

13
14 Doug Strauss showed a presentation for potential architecture and streetscape. Doug said
15 the scale of the buildings is representative of what would be in the plan. He said one of
16 the building types within the apartment area and toward the right side of the new entrance
17 is 2 ½ stories. The buildings on the right side of Riverpath are townhouses. On the left
18 side there are 2 ½ stories because the top story has rooms but fewer rooms than on the
19 floors below. They will not have an island down the center of the street. A large green
20 space is created at the entrance to the site rather than the island type green space. Sue
21 said the apartment buildings back up to one another with less separation and asked if that
22 could be addressed. Doug said they had some ideas regarding that. Frank said the view
23 looking up from the canoe landing, there has been no change on the amended plan from
24 the original plan. The streetscape within the apartment area is a typical streetscape, Frank
25 said. The 2 ½ story, multi-gabled look applies to many of the building footprints in the
26 rental area and some of the building footprints in the condominium area. The
27 condominium area also has attached townhouses. The tallest building in that area is 3
28 stories. The 3 story building will have an elevator and has more apartments on a given
29 floor. Frank said while they are in the site planning process and not building design, it
30 was more difficult to have a true visual.

31
32 Tom Ryan, 593 consultant for the Board distributed a preliminary memorandum. He said
33 his colleague Megan met with the Design Review Committee to obtain their comments.
34 Tom said a suggestion would be to utilize the existing road alignment on Riverpath. Mike
35 Duffy said based on the information from the traffic consultant, they are widening the
36 roadway within the existing right of way. Mike said they are working with NStar on the
37 widening but all of the roadway on both sides of the road are within the town right of
38 way. The widening will not occur on private property. The intersection at OCP will also
39 be widened to allow a left hand turn and right hand turn. Tom Lupian of OCP said his
40 rear yard faces Birch Road and there is an easement on Riverpath to access his property.
41 Tom said once the road enters the property, they suggest moving the entry road farther
42 into the project. He said there are 3 buildings on the right and then a gap and then larger
43 buildings around the green area. The reason that gap is there is because of the setback for
44 the well but he thought if the road was moved over, there would be space for a few more
45 buildings. That would allow some buildings to be reduced farther into the property and
46 the expansion of the green space. The clubhouse could be relocated closer to the green,

1 he said. There was a comment about possibly clarifying the fronts and backs of the
2 townhouse units and he said there was a possibly that could be made more consistent.
3 Tom said another suggestion was to increase the density in the northwest corner of the
4 property. Providing pedestrian connections could also be incorporated at Derby Street
5 extension and one at Meadow. They would suggest adding sidewalks on both sides of the
6 pipeline crossing. There is already is a sidewalk on one side. He said they looked at a
7 third connection but he did not know if that was possible with the MWRA. There was
8 some reaction to the footprints along the north side of the property and he said there
9 might be the possibility to put in different housing types to break up that footprint. There
10 is an access easement on an existing road and he suggested they explore the possibility of
11 abandoning that, Tom said. The tennis courts may be able to be relocated up against the
12 MWRA fences, he stated.

13
14 The ultimate height is capped at 3 stories and the commercial space is capped at 4000
15 square feet, Tom said. Sue asked about the area that is heavily treed. She asked if there
16 were other areas where there were trees and vegetation that was worth preserving. Tom
17 said the plan does reflect utilizing existing trees along the right of way. The development
18 fits within the existing disturbed areas, he stated. He said there is 80-90' of disturbed area
19 beyond the line of houses. Tom said he thought 6" of topsoil or organic material will be
20 need on the site. Larry asked about the appropriateness of the density. Tom thought it was
21 appropriate. He said overall the number of units was appropriate. Larry said realizing this
22 is a sand and gravel use with no trees, he asked what it would look like before new trees
23 really mature. Tom said the site will entail massive grading and part of the key to
24 marketing will be to enhancing the landscaping and green spaces. Tom thought the
25 Board would have another pass at the landscaping and architecture in future hearings.
26 Larry said he had trouble gauging how dense the site will look at the end. Tom said he
27 did not think the site was too dense but thought the plan was too much of the same and it
28 needed more variety. Larry asked if Tom was satisfied with the appearance of the access
29 roads. Tom said that was the next level of detail. He thought the entrance needs to be
30 attractive from the line of sight of the Texaco station and thought it would take on its
31 character through the design phase. Larry said if he could see some existing projects that
32 were done in the same scale, it would help him with the decision. Sue said at 9/90 there
33 was a landfill and a few years later based on the landscaping that National Development
34 did, it looks like a mature landscaped park. If using material that was substantial in size,
35 it can create a more attractive appearance.

36
37 Ann said in this rendition and in looking at the roofs of all the buildings in this area and
38 Saxonville and relate them to the age qualified area, you get a feeling for the density.
39 Ann asked about the sense of transition from the existing neighborhood into this
40 neighborhood. Tom thought the transition could occur off Riverpath if it was made more
41 with lengths through the woods into the new community, and the transition of density
42 was more toward the River and the west. Some of the existing grades with the buffers
43 could be mounded or planted out. Mike said originally a third crossing for vehicular
44 traffic across the MWRA was presented and they had declined that. It was not presented
45 as solely a pedestrian crossing.

46

1 Tom Ryan was asked for anything that was critical for the Board to consider. He thought
2 the alignment of the main entrance road, the possibility of a third crossing over MWRA
3 land and varying the housing type. Relocating the access easement was another issue and
4 decreasing the density near the tennis courts. He did not think that was as strong as
5 making the core denser.

6
7 Doug said they had no problem with the Riverpath alignment. They have been looking
8 into bringing in the density. As far as the fire lane connecting concept, it falls under a
9 traffic issue and if it allows more traffic onto Hialeah, he suggested Art Scarneo may
10 want to look at that before it is incorporated. Tom Mahoney said he liked the idea of the
11 fire lane from a life safety issue. Circulation is critical, he said when the site is a long
12 way off from the main roads. Further, as for presentation, the larger green space at the
13 entrance was more agreeable. Sue said the significant grade changes where Hialeah is
14 and the new construction and she asked if thought was given to the appearance. Tom
15 said part of that was detail design. He thought there would be significant earth work
16 going on and some earth may be mounded up or planted to lessen the view from other
17 homes.

18
19 Helen asked for comments from the audience. Jeanette Berger addressed the Board. She
20 said she serves as the Chairman of the Design Review Committee and is an abutter to the
21 property. As the Chairman of the Committee she read a motion from the last meeting.
22 The motion read "The Committee will not file a formal report to the Planning Board at
23 this time due to the lack of timely notification and the breadth and complexity of the
24 issue." The motion passed with a unanimous vote. As an abutter, Jeanette asked if the
25 Planning Board received any new land use calculations based on the new site plan.
26 Further, she asked in regards to street parking, how many parking spots along the street
27 would be assigned to the units. She asked if a safety study was done with regard to the
28 parking and the access. If an additional road connection is allowed, it would change the
29 traffic flow and would require possible changes and Jeanette asked if that was considered.
30 She asked how many of the buildings are in the proposed site design would be in the
31 local river and wetland buffers. In advance of a vote on the permit, she asked if the
32 public would have a chance to review the final documents. Helen said there are no safety
33 studies conducted by the Board but it relies on reports and clean letters from the Traffic
34 and Roadway Safety Committee, Fire Department and Police Department. She said in
35 terms of documents the Board uses in terms of making its decision, they are available to
36 the public in the Planning Board office. Helen said when the draft document is ready
37 before the vote, it is available to the public and the hearings where the document is
38 worked on are open to the public. Helen said according to law, once the public hearing is
39 closed the Board is not allowed to accept any new information. She said the draft
40 document often goes through many numerations as it is wordsmithed. Jay said it was a
41 similar process to that of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Jeanette asked if there was 593
42 consultant type study was performed for safety issues. Ann said all developers are held
43 to the same standard. The Fire Department and Police Department has always been used
44 to set those standards, she said. Doug said he would provide a schedule of the parking.
45 Tom Mahoney said buffers do not preclude any development but they would have to file
46 with the ConCom for any buildings that are within the buffer. Mike Duffy did not know

1 the total number but believed there are two buildings proposed in the Riverfront and both
2 are in the disturbed area. Ann said in looking at the D.E.I.R. there are 5 that are within
3 the local wetland buffer. Mike said the zoning by-law defines developable land within
4 the PUD as the entire PUD area minus the wetland areas. The total PUD area is 127
5 acres and of that 22.2 acres are wetlands. He said under that guideline they are allowed 7
6 units per acre and the project is under that. The area includes the MWRA land which is
7 roughly 12.5 acres.

8
9 Carol Spack addressed the Board. She wondered if the applicant could prepare a massing
10 model. She said this would show the concept. When looking at the proposed concept it
11 looks like a traditional sub-division with looped roads and she wondered about
12 integrating the streetscape plan. Tom Ryan said the decision was made long ago to make
13 the development different from the surrounding neighborhood. He said that reinforces
14 necessitating the buffer to provide the distinction. Ann said she did not see the need for
15 the property to relate to what is existing today in the surrounding neighborhood. Ann
16 stated that when one drives down Pleasant Street and past Belknap, a portion of that is
17 fenced on the MWRA property and yet it looks very open. She did not think that the
18 fence proposed along the MWRA property on the site would necessarily be detrimental.
19 Robert O'Neil spoke in favor of the development for the housing needs in Framingham.
20 He said the density shown on the plan is what other urban areas are using to satisfy the
21 growth. John Stasik addressed the Board. He is also a member of the Design Review
22 Committee. He said his personal approach to the project has always been that it would
23 never be separate from Saxonville but more of an integral part of Saxonville. He hoped
24 that some of the style on Cottage Street and Danforth Street could be brought into the
25 project. John said having walked "The Oaks", there is a fairly noticeable defined pattern
26 because of its containment between the lake on one side and NStar easement on the other.
27 He said it was contained to a narrow strip but there are 3 major cross streets that provide
28 a grid. John thought a policy of the Board should be to integrate the project within the
29 fabric of the Saxonville neighborhood as much as possible. He thought closing off
30 Meadow Street as an access point was not the way to make it an integral part of the
31 community. John said from a design point of view and the part of the PUD that is
32 consistent with sub-division rules i.e. street widths, curbing, etc. he suggested the Board
33 be open to all issues. Sub-division regulations could be used as a starting point he said.
34 Regular granite curbing is not always necessary however. He said while bringing the
35 buildings closer to the street is not consistent with sub-division regulations, he was in
36 favor of utilizing that alternative. The interconnections with alleys was also a good idea,
37 he said. John said he was hoping the commercial center could be brought to the core of
38 the design. John thought it was too early for a report from the Design Review Committee
39 but they would provide a report in the future.

40
41 Gerry Couto addressed the Board. He is also a member of the Design Review Committee
42 however was speaking as a resident and not member of the Committee. Gerry stated a
43 concern with the integration of the fabric of Saxonville as a whole. He thought the way it
44 could be done was the integration of the types of units and to break up the footprint.
45 Some of the buildings in Saxonville are mill buildings, row housing from the late 19th
46 century, single family capes from late 20th century and 18th century larger family homes.

1 He was hoping for a more integrated flow in the PUD rather than something that sets it
2 apart. Debbie Cleveland, a resident and member of the Design Review Committee
3 addressed the Board. She said she was speaking as a resident. There was a concern with
4 access and integration with the community. She said "The Oaks" has half the number of
5 housing and twice as many access roads. She said pedestrian walkways would help with
6 the flow of the PUD. Tom Mahoney said you could have a connection but it does not
7 necessarily have to be a traffic connection. The connection to Saxonville through biking
8 and pedestrian trails was important. Norma Schulman addressed the Board. She is also a
9 member of the Design Review Committee. Norma explained the context of the motion
10 which was read earlier by the Chair of the Design Review Committee. She said they
11 were unable to provide a report within the time limits and had anticipated providing
12 copies of minutes. She said in talking with the various consultants and representatives of
13 the developer, committee members were confident that their comments would be
14 reflected in the revisions and plans themselves. Norma said they have discussed a range
15 of topics such as open space, access, roof lines, pitches of roofs, height of the buildings,
16 pedestrian access and more. Norma will leave copies of their minutes with Jay for the
17 Board.

18
19 Greg Doyle addressed the Board. He is President of Save Our Towns and a resident of
20 Meadow Street. He distributed materials to Board members. Greg cited Wittenborg
21 Woods and the total land area of 200+/- acres with a proposed development of 20 homes.
22 He said in approving the project, there was recognition that there was a desire to
23 maximize the open space. He referred to Morency Street where there are 14 ½ acres and
24 the preliminary concept is for 4 units. Another example he cited was Mainstone Farms in
25 Wayland which is a planned unit development. Greg thought that project could be used
26 as a barometer for this PUD. Greg said the density is 5.7 per acre for the total land area
27 at this site, he said. He said there are 22 acres of wetland on the property and he thought
28 it was an illusion that there would be usable open space. He said he thought the
29 development represented a typical sub-division. Greg said if you use the density ratio of
30 Mainstone Farms, they would only be putting in 153 units. Being concerned with the
31 historical character of the neighborhood, he hoped that as the Board moved forward they
32 would consider more of a "farm feel" or section of the development. Greg said in
33 meeting with National Development last year, he recollected Jack's comment that if it
34 had to be less than 300 units it would not work for them. Greg thought it might be more a
35 matter of profit than bringing the density to a proper size. As a highway engineer, he
36 disputed the traffic counts of VHB and the concurrence of Art Scarneo. He said the Board
37 needs to reconsider the configuration of Hialeah to control the amount of traffic that will
38 utilize that road. Helen stated she thought Town Meeting's desire to maximize open
39 space was in the PUD by-law.

40
41 Ann said she did not know what the zoning was around Mainstone for acreage per house
42 but for Saxonville it is R-1 which is an 8000 sq.ft. lot. That translates to 5 units per acre.
43 The PUD as presented is 5.7 pre acre, she said. The PUD zoning as provided in
44 commonwealth statute was designed to give a density bonus in exchange for open space
45 and like amenities. Greg disagreed and said R-1 zoning provides a maximum of 3.
46 Members of the Board disagreed with Mr. Doyle. Carol (inaudible) said she did not

1 know the zoning of "The Oaks" but she said in her neighborhood it is approximately 1/3
2 acre per house. She asked if anyone knew the actual density on Meadow Street. Jay said
3 the newer sub-division on Danforth Farms are 8000 sq. ft. lots. Carol said that was
4 crowded. She said the perception is there are too many units in the PUD. Andrea Carter,
5 resident of Danforth Street said in respect to the open space, the large areas have
6 retention basins that seem to make it unusable open space. She questioned the feasibility
7 of using that as open space. Frank pointed to 2 green spaces that are intended to be level
8 fields and they are not envisioned as retention areas. If a water feature is in the green
9 space it is intended as a landscape area and not a retention area. The third area in the rear
10 which is designed more of a park space, it is envisioned to be rolling in it's design and as
11 the design is developed it may make sense to look at whether it makes sense to make it
12 work as also a detention area. That has not been designed or considered at this point,
13 Frank said. One of the green spaces is approximately the length of a football field and at
14 it's widest point is 150'. The distance between building edges is beyond that. Another
15 green space is just as long but a little narrower and the space between the building face is
16 about the size of a football field. The third green space is 3 football field lengths. Tom
17 said they have the opportunity to create a functioning body where they could control the
18 elevation of the water body through outlets. There could be enough room above a
19 constant water level to where it could be used as a stormwater management area and the
20 applicant has a couple of areas that have that ability. You could have a recreational
21 facility and provide enough room for stormwater management within the green space.
22 Carol asked where the URS wells are located and was concerned that buildings would be
23 placed over those monitoring wells. She said in 1989 when the PUD was accepted, the
24 land area was calculated at 115 acres. Doug said they will respect those monitoring
25 wells. He said the URS situation could be resolved before they build that phase 10 years
26 from now. The developable area is 105 acres. Doug could not speak to how the
27 calculations were engineered in 1989.

28
29 Betty Cummings, resident of School Street said in looking at the plans it was hard to
30 visualize what the density would look like. She was hopeful that the Board could reduce
31 the size of this project. Judy Bennett of Wayland addressed the Board. She stated
32 concern with Wayland wells that are in close proximity to the PUD. She said Wayland is
33 totally supplied by well water as they are not on the MWRA and there is a concern of
34 their water becoming contaminated. Judy had a question about traffic and Helen directed
35 her to copies of video tapes and written minutes of the previous 3 hearings on traffic.
36 Ann said in the draft EIR there is a layout that shows the border of the zone 2 for the
37 Wayland wells. It shows that of the buildings proposed (7 that are within the zone 2
38 protection area) residential uses are allowed. Fuel oil storage or garages are not allowed
39 in that zone. She did not think there was anything inconsistent with the rules surrounding
40 zone 2. Mike said the schematics show the pump station is close to the line but they are
41 exploring moving it outside the zone 2. It is not a man pump station.

42
43 Helen asked for closing questions from Board members. Sue said she understood the
44 concern about density but did not think it was always a negative component. She cited
45 Windsor Green which is far more dense than what is being proposed. She said relative to
46 Mainstone, while it is beautiful, they sell at \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 per unit and she was

1 hoping the housing provided in the PUD would be more reasonable. Larry said he would
2 not take a position on the density issue tonight but explained what he would take into
3 consideration. Larry said he looks at the baseline and the baseline created in the PUD
4 was the underlying commercial zoning and impacts that were originally perceived. Larry
5 said the problem is in the phasing of the site design and the special permit. The
6 developer's proposal and the Board's review is mainly on massing, layout and density.
7 After the density is determined, the Board sees the layout, etc. He said all those things
8 affect how the project looks and feels. Density issues have be determined before how the
9 site review process unfolds, he said. Tom Mahoney reiterated that the property is in the
10 R-1 zone. Tom said the opportunity is here to take a barren piece of land and put in a
11 nice development with all the amenities and landscaping. Ann echoed Larry's comments
12 regarding difficulty in determining the proper amount of density. She said she was less
13 interested in the numbers per acre however because that was not a fair representation but
14 was more concerned with the design.

15
16 Tom Ryan said he will issue a letter addressing particular points and how the application
17 meets the requirements in the ordinance. Larry asked that Tom point out particular
18 projects that might indicate a better sense of how the project will look to help Board
19 members visually. Helen said she attended a conference in Boston and one of the
20 seminars had speakers who worked on projects as big and bigger than this one. She said
21 there are some websites available and she suggested Board members visit the particular
22 websites.

23
24 Helen stated the public hearing would be continued to March 25th at 8:00 p.m.

25
26 III. Continued Public Hearing to Amend or Modify a Site Plan Review Approval,
27 Exceptional Auto Body, 88 Blandin Avenue

28
29 Jay said the applicant will provide an update on the status of the project. The prior
30 decision was distributed to members in their packet for reference that was for the storage
31 facility.

32
33 Attorney Paul Galvani, Robert Lopez of Exceptional Auto Body and Joe Sullivan were
34 present. Paul showed a photograph of the fence being proposed. It is basically a
35 residential fence. Paul said the building will look similar to the Grainger building. A
36 portion of the front façade will be a concrete block. The remainder will be corrugated
37 metal. The main concrete block part is 10' in height. It is a two level building. The
38 corrugated metal portion height of the building is 10'. The color of the corrugated metal
39 will be taupe. The fence is along the sidewalk edge and Sue asked why it wasn't behind
40 the buffer. Robert said it was because of the detention pond. There will be landscaping
41 in front of the fence. The detention basin in 4' in depth. Jay said in the prior decision,
42 the fence was intended to block the view of the paved area. Paul said if they moved the
43 fence, they would need another type of retention device at the detention basin. From the
44 edge of the sidewalk to the edge of the basin is 8' so a fence could be right at the edge,
45 Joe said. Members agreed that the fence should be in front of the detention basin with
46 landscaping in front of that. Jay said there were 593 Reviews on the prior decision.

1 There was discussion regarding the type of fence. The razor wire is being removed.
2 Members concurred to utilize black chain link fencing. A solid fence will wrap around
3 the corner. An adjacent property owner addressed the Board and stated he was agreeable
4 to what was being proposed. Lighting has not been changed. Joe did not see the reason
5 for why it would need to be changed. Jay said the Police Department has asked that there
6 be quite a bit of lighting. Joe thought the lighting was adequate for security needs. Sue
7 asked about the landscaping plan. Joe said it was not identical to the previous plan but the
8 biggest change was a larger area was landscaped that was not a part of the property. Paul
9 distributed a copy of the executed copy of the Brownsfield Agreement with the town.
10 Robert said all his plans are ready to be submitted to the Building Department as soon as
11 the Board closes the hearing.

12
13 Helen said that the public hearing would be continued to May 8th at 7:45 p.m.

14
15 IV. Zoning Discussion

16
17 Karen Margolis and Donna Jacobs, of the Planning Department, joined the Board.

18
19 Karen said there are several articles for review. One is the article where the language
20 was re-worked on the waiver of the ground floor (allowing units on the first floor). She
21 said another article is the Over 55 residential community which is similar to the language
22 from last year.

23
24 Karen referred to document #303-03 which relates to the mixed use affordable
25 component. She said the change was adding language under affordability standards. The
26 Board already voted to sponsor this article, Karen noted. Members agreed to the changes
27 represented. They have not pulled any building permits, Jay said and they are not
28 grandfathered. This applies to mixed use complex. Larry asked if the Housing
29 Authority takes control of these types of units. They do not. The Planning Board
30 assumes the responsibility for keeping the inventory.

31
32 Karen said another article is the mixed use residential use on the ground floor. She said
33 this provides a process and parameters to allow exemptions for residential use on the
34 ground floor. Karen briefly read from the current by-law and the addition of the new
35 language. She said it was consistent with what was voted at the last Town Meeting and
36 allow the Planning Board to waive the prohibition of the residential use in mixed use on
37 the ground floor up to 25%. The site design provides for the internal connection of the
38 ground floor uses. Basements can not be converted to apartments. Sue asked if the
39 threshold of 25% was defensible or if it would change according to applicants. Members
40 did not want a denial component. Ann suggested language saying the site design shall
41 provide significant separation and emphasize it by saying architectural features will
42 assure distinctions and that may not leave it so open. Sue said there will be developers
43 that want more than the 25%. Jay thought it was not something that should happen
44 everywhere but the 25% worked for the Arcade Building. Jay said a provision for
45 requiring adequate parking facilities and on-site circulation to eliminate vehicle and
46 pedestrian conflict between commercial and residential uses could be added. Members

1 concurred. There is a statement in the by-law preventing the applicant from applying to
2 the Zoning Board of Appeals.

3
4 **Motion by Ann Welles that the Framingham Planning Board sponsor Draft #5 of**
5 **the mixed use article, document #302-03 with the additional language that was**
6 **previously discussed. Seconded by Sue Bernstein. Vote: unanimous.**

7
8 Karen referred to the article requiring minimum landscape open space surface ratio which
9 tied the open space to the acreage rather than the square footage of the building. The
10 Standing Committee on Planning and Zoning has voted to sponsor this.

11
12 **Motion by Larry Marsh that the Framingham Planning Board co-sponsor, with**
13 **Planning and Zoning, the above stated article relating to landscape open surface**
14 **ratio. Seconded by Tom Mahoney. Vote: unanimous.**

15
16 Karen referred to the Over 55 zoning. The article has been redrafted to incorporate the
17 changes. Karen reviewed the changes. The percentages and slope were changed and the
18 reference to significant other was removed. The dimensional requirements were changed
19 in the R-1 zone for 3 units for this use. She said the affordable component is at 15% for
20 this use. It does require sub-division regulations. Karen said it was different from a
21 cluster because it is all on one parcel.

22
23 **Motion by Sue Bernstein that the Framingham Planning Board sponsor the senior**
24 **residential community as drafted in document #300-03 and modified here this**
25 **evening. Seconded by Tom Mahoney. Vote: unanimous.**

26
27 There are two ZBA articles and Karen said one is for limited accessory structures. That
28 is on the current warrant, she said. The ZBA will be sponsoring it. Public hearings will
29 need to be scheduled. Helen said it would have to be before Town Meeting. Town
30 Meeting is scheduled for April 22nd. They are talking about a special Town Meeting on
31 May 1st and Karen thought the special would occur before these articles in the Annual
32 Town Meeting. Helen said a public hearing would be held on April 15th to discuss all the
33 zoning articles. Board members decided to re-schedule 3 weeks of meetings to Monday
34 nights to accommodate Town Meeting scheduling.

35
36 Donna said Document #297-03 is the report to Town Meeting and 2 Selectmen on the
37 Housing Partnership said there needs to be an article on the town meeting warrant so they
38 could give this report. Donna asked that if the Planning Board is doing an article in
39 special town meeting, they would like to include the report at that time. Helen said they
40 did not have a problem with that but the Board does not request the report be given.

41
42 Karen said in closing that there are 4 articles: mixed use affordable, mixed use open
43 space, open space residential and over 55. Standing Committee on Planning and Zoning
44 may come forward with an article and that would need to be included in the advertising,
45 Karen said.

1 Miscellaneous Administrative

2

3 Tomorrow evening the Board of Selectmen will discuss the PUD. Helen said the Board
4 will be asked for a report and members discussed preparations for answering questions
5 and addressing comments at that meeting.

6

7 Respectfully submitted,

8

9 Nancy Starr-Ferguson

10 Recording Secretary

11

12 **These minutes were approved, with changes and/or amendments, at the Framingham*
13 *Planning Board meeting of May10, 2004.*

14

15

16 _____
17 *Thomas Mahoney, Chairman*

18