

1 MINUTES  
2 PLANNING BOARD  
3 March 25, 2003

4  
5 Those present: Helen Lemoine, Sue Bernstein, Tom Mahoney, Larry Marsh, Ann Welles

6  
7 The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

8  
9 I. Miscellaneous Administrative

10  
11 The Planning and Zoning Committee has voted to place an affordable housing article on  
12 the Town Meeting warrant. Helen said the Planning Board article deals with the mixed  
13 use zone only. She said it has been requested that the Board of Selectmen call a special  
14 Town Meeting within the Annual for the four zoning articles. The article proposed by  
15 Planning and Zoning was not included. Helen said they would make sure the P&Z article  
16 was included at the special Town Meeting as well. P&Z's article calls for affordable  
17 housing throughout the town and the Planning Board article deals strictly with affordable  
18 housing within the mixed use zone. Ned Price said the article proposed by Planning and  
19 Zoning acts more like a taking as set forth by Town Counsel. Town Counsel said he  
20 considered it a taking because you were not offering something in return. Tom O'Neil  
21 read from a letter from Town Counsel. Donna Jacobs prepared an article for the town of  
22 Stow and has not been approved yet but there is a lot more detail in that, Tom said.  
23 Helen said there is lot of direction given by state wide organizations on inclusionary  
24 zoning that the Board has been following. It is not authorized by state statute but a  
25 number of communities have done it, she said. Provisions in the proposed amendment to  
26 Chapter 40A would give cities and towns authorization for inclusionary zoning. Sue said  
27 she thought the downtown affordable housing component should be a Town Meeting  
28 decision but she felt given the number of units that are coming on as apartments  
29 downtown, if the opportunity is missed for the affordability component, those units  
30 would place the town out of compliance with Chapter 40B. Sue said in the article of  
31 Over 55 there is a 15% affordable unit and the PUD has a 10% affordable component.  
32 The original PUD article in 1989 required 10%. Sue said in general it is not prohibited in  
33 state statute to require 10% affordable. Ned asked if the density component could be  
34 enforced upon a developer. Larry said that the original vote of Town Meeting  
35 authorizing the PUD required 10%.

36  
37 Sue said there has to be uniformity in zoning so if it done in residential, it would relate to  
38 all residential. Sue said she agreed with the concept of the article but would prefer to see  
39 it done thoroughly and suggested holding it off until a fall Town Meeting. Tom said their  
40 meeting is next week but they have to come to a decision by April 3<sup>rd</sup>. As it stands  
41 currently, there will be two articles dealing with the affordable housing component,  
42 Helen said. Helen said the Planning Board will include their article in the advertisement  
43 that will be placed.

44  
45 II. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Planned Unit Development,  
46 Villages at Danforth Farm off Danforth Street

1  
2 Attorney Peter Barbieri and Jack O'Neil of National Development were present. Helen  
3 distributed copies of the draft decision. The document was prepared by Jay Grande and  
4 Peter Barbieri. Helen said the decision was for the Special Permit for the Planned Unit  
5 Development and also increased commercial space up to the 4,000 square feet limit if the  
6 Board decides to do that. Helen said Board members should refer to documents #354-03,  
7 317-03, 318-03, 319-03, 321-03, 322-03, 323-03, 324-03, 320-03, 338-03, and 337-03.  
8 Helen said the draft decision would be labeled document #355-03. Those documents are  
9 letters from Noah and Jeannette Berger, Fire Department, Tom Ryan, Save Our Towns  
10 and the Town Clerk's response to that letter, among others. Peter said he would make  
11 arrangements to get copies of the documents from Karen Margolis tomorrow. Helen said  
12 regarding the letter from SEA, document #354-03, Peter Sellers and National  
13 Development have scheduled a meeting for later this week to look at some of the issues  
14 raised. Attorney Barbieri said there are some things that are outstanding but he hopes  
15 those issues will be resolved and would result in a new letter with no issues outstanding.  
16 Tom Mahoney hoped they would receive a letter from DPW along with that letter stating  
17 all are in agreement. Sue asked that when the final letter comes forward, that there be  
18 some timelines indicated so the Board knows when DPW is anticipating the completion  
19 of the phases. Peter said he thought it would be done before the completion of the first  
20 unit in regard to the sewer work. Peter said the Meadow Street portion and those in the  
21 PUD the system has been designed and are on a gravity system and not part of the PUD  
22 sewer system.

23  
24 Document #353-03 is from Ryan Associates with an overview of some of the issues Tom  
25 Ryan discussed with the Board. Sue thought some of the issues will need to be spelled  
26 out in the PUD permit and some in the definitive stage. Helen said another document  
27 will be coming from Tom Ryan and that will be his confirmation of the calculations used  
28 to determine density. Larry said Tom made a recommendation to remove the units in the  
29 age qualified component and move them someplace else and he asked if it affected the  
30 density. Helen said it did not because they were only being relocated. Peter said the  
31 schematic plan has not been changed. If the only way to achieve some of the objectives  
32 is to reduce the density, doesn't that have to be dealt with now, Larry said. Larry  
33 questioned what the Board would have the ability to change later on in the process. Sue  
34 said under planned review process in Tom's letter the only one she asked a question on  
35 was moving the main entry road west at the 400' well setback line and she remembered  
36 they saying they were considering doing. The general location of the access drive is not  
37 going to change. Tweaking the alignment is something they can do, Jack said. When  
38 referencing a set of plans, Sue asked if there was language that could be inserted that  
39 allowed minor road variations. Peter said they are going to try to incorporate comments  
40 on site and thought some modifications were bound to happen. Tom thought there could  
41 be something referencing the letter but knowing that they are trying to incorporate the  
42 issues as much as possible. Larry stated a concern with having to determine the density.  
43 Larry suggested that if you feel strongly that you want the relocation of the retail space,  
44 how will one deal with that if it requires elimination of some of the approved units.  
45 Members did not think that posed a problem. Ann said that accommodations can be

1 made in the definitive stages. The only way to get to that is to go through the by-law,  
2 Ann said.

3  
4 Ann said it is a known that the Board needs to have clean letters. She said in going  
5 through the outline, section 5 of the zoning by-law, it outlines the findings for a special  
6 permit in general. Ann briefly read from the by-law. She thought a lot of those  
7 requirements would be addressed in the clean letters or reports from the consultants. Ann  
8 said in the beginning of the by-law relating to the PUD states what the goal is. Ann read  
9 the 8 goals stated in the by-law. Moving to Section III.J.9.k.1-10 she said these are all to  
10 be conditions of the decision. It does not say anything more than that the Board has to in  
11 the special permit state they are addressing the 10 items, Ann said. Ann said #1 is dealt  
12 with in Tom Ryan's suggestion of creating an alley-system that would give rear access  
13 for parking and deliveries and preserve the street front. She said that is not a primary  
14 road way however. The Board is being asked to identify the roads in and out and if they  
15 meet what is expected of the developer. Ann said in regards to the second item and  
16 location and significant areas of public and common open space, the revised plan showed  
17 a 3 park system. Larry said if the question was if they were satisfied with the plan and  
18 proposal, he said he was. Another part of the PUD by-law that requires the Board to do  
19 something with the open space during the special permit process, i.e. turn it over to the  
20 town in terms of the ConCom. Larry said that discussion has not happened yet with the  
21 ConCom. He said in another project, Con Com wanted to take money if the Board was  
22 going to do that. Peter said the association will continue to own it and be responsible for  
23 the maintenance but it will be available for public use. The by-law does not require it to  
24 be handed over to the town, Peter said. Helen said it was included in the OSRD by-law.  
25 Tom thought it was also in this by-law. Jack said there was two different open space  
26 criteria. One is public and one is common. The public open space is everything within the  
27 wetlands. The other is the common open space and is the greens owned and operated by  
28 the Homeowners Association.

29  
30 Peter said language states it can be owned by the town or a non-profit organization for  
31 conservation purposes. Jack said it was not going to be conveyed because it would affect  
32 FAR but there would be a restriction. Sue asked if it was necessary other than to stipulate  
33 that one of those will occur. Larry thought if the Board decides that the town ConCom  
34 should hold the land, and the ConCom wants money for the maintenance, that money  
35 should be there during the special permit. Ann said that is dealt with in documents in the  
36 Homeowners documents. If at a later time the Board decides to turn the public open  
37 space over to the town and the town requires up-front money in order to guarantee  
38 money, how would National Development handle that. Jack said the concept of that is  
39 fine however if there is a conservation restriction, he did not know why they wouldn't  
40 just include that in an order of conditions. Larry was not satisfied with closure on this  
41 issue. Ann returned to the by-law and read from item #3, boundaries of lots. Sue said  
42 she understood the boundaries of the project as a whole but was less certain of the lot  
43 lines for the single family homes. She asked if they have to be called out in this decision.  
44 Peter said on Meadow Street when they do the extension, those 10 lots will be outside the  
45 PUD. He did not think the definitive plan needed to be done now. The Phasing Plan of  
46 submitting a sub-division plan on which they show the particular boundaries of a lot are

1 for purposes of financing rather than anything else. He said those 10 lots, while included  
2 in the count, fall outside the PUD proper. Sue asked if they are going to be considered  
3 individual house lots with association responsibilities. Peter said while they are included  
4 in the count, it is not their intent to include them in the Homeowners Association. The  
5 specific dimensions of those lots are not yet called out, Jack said. There will be a separate  
6 sub-division plan for Derby Street and Meadow Street, he said. The lot sizes will be  
7 conforming the R-1 district. Larry asked about the buildings at the end of Meadow  
8 Street. Jack said they are owned by a separate entity and are outside the PUD. Ann read  
9 from #4, overall project density. Helen said it was her understanding that the maximum  
10 number of building permits is not specified. Ann said that was correct.

11  
12 Ann said #5 speaks to the location and boundaries of each development phase and #6  
13 deals with the development time table. She said the Board has a rough idea but thought  
14 something more definitive would be helpful. Jack said they did prepare a phasing plan  
15 which shows 10-12 years to completion. Jack was willing to prepare a further detail of  
16 that plan. Tom thought that would be helpful. Peter said GPI's comment on mitigation  
17 phasing basically stated the project was two phases and while he agreed that the  
18 mitigation would be done at those intervals, the project was a lengthy one involving  
19 many years. Larry said dollars and work was agreed upon but there were questions on  
20 whether some of the things that were addressed for phase 2 being moved to phase 1.  
21 From a specificity of the phases, Larry thought it was important to find out what would  
22 happen at each phase regarding traffic, pumping stations, improvements, etc. He said the  
23 Board would then need to decide whether it wants to how those are tied, i.e. an  
24 occupancy permit, etc. Peter said it could not be tied to the water and sewer  
25 improvements/mitigation because they will be done before the start of the project. Ann  
26 said there is no option for temporary occupancy permits. Peter said it could be tied to  
27 occupancy permits. Tom said the phasing on the sewer, not necessarily water, is all  
28 related to the amount of units that are being built. Ann said it would be helpful to have a  
29 chart showing the number of units per phase, mitigation per phase, etc. Peter said by the  
30 time you reach each one of the definitive stages there will be a definition of conditions  
31 and timing would be addressed at that stage.

32  
33 Larry asked about the well preservation. Jack said the 400' buffer is part of the  
34 agreement approved by Town Meeting. The town has reserved the option to build a  
35 physical barrier. With regards to the commercial development, Sue said she would like  
36 to see it capped at 4000 square feet. Helen agreed. Larry said he was less concerned  
37 about the gross area as he was about the relocation. Larry asked if the considered  
38 relocating the retail space. Jack said he did not think there would be a problem with  
39 moving it. He said another suggestion to relocate the tennis courts closer to the aqueduct  
40 was made and while some might like that suggestion, he said there may be consensus to  
41 relocate the tennis courts around the common area. Jack said they would like the  
42 flexibility to make that decision. Jack said they would be willing to look at other  
43 alternative sites for the retail component. Ann said in the item dealing with off-site  
44 traffic improvements and environmental mitigation, she thought the Board had talked  
45 about how to tie that into a time table. Helen said she expressed an interest in having the  
46 applicant include in the traffic and safety measures, a sidewalk on the other side of OCP

1 from the Wayland border down to Lake Street as an opportunity for walkers from the  
2 PUD. It was her understanding that they were willing to add that into the traffic  
3 mitigation proposal. Jack said the feasibility, i.e. right of way issues, need to be reviewed  
4 before they commit to a final obligation. Restricting the use of pesticides and fertilizers  
5 could be incorporated into the document.

6  
7 Larry asked about the on-street parking. Ann said she would prefer to see that as part of  
8 the definitive. Once the location of the buildings are determined and streetscapes  
9 designed, it would be easier to deal with the issue of on-street parking. Peter said on-  
10 street parking will be in the interior of the site and in front of their units and will not  
11 create any difficulty to abutters. Jack said the design theme does utilize some on-street  
12 parking but is consistent with the Board's consultant and will be dealt with during the  
13 definitive stage. The waivers are dealt with in the definitive stage, Peter said. Ann  
14 stated that it was determined that if trees, fences, etc. are within the right of way and they  
15 are disturbed due to the improvements of Riverpath during phase 1, the applicant will  
16 offer to have those items replaced on their own property. Jack agreed and stated the  
17 Planning Board may become the arbiter in some cases where homeowners believe a tree  
18 was on their property and want it replaced when in fact it was on town property. Ann  
19 continued to read from the by-law and said #9 calls for the instruments and deeds to be  
20 defined and executed. Ann said a laundry list of those things should be spelled out and  
21 Town Counsel should be the final arbiter of what those items need to be. That was an  
22 issue the Board of Selectmen spelled out as well Jack said. Riverpath becoming a public  
23 way becomes exclusive to the PUD, Jack said. Sue said she would assume the gravel  
24 operation would cease at some point. Jack said while he does not have a date specific, but  
25 the gentlemen's understanding with the Generazzio family is as long as it does not hinder  
26 the construction of the PUD, the two will co-exist. Sue thought that needed to have a  
27 finality to it and needed to be looked at further. Sue said she would like to see some  
28 language in the document because the definitive may be farther along and the site work  
29 will need to be determined.

30  
31 Larry asked that Town Counsel's opinion be sought on various documents that should be  
32 required including homeowner's documents. Ann said item #10 is generic to the  
33 Planning Board. There are bonds and sureties that need to be provided and fiscal impact  
34 report are provided for in that item. Ann thought a synopsis might be helpful at this point  
35 to determine where they stand with MEPA, etc.

36  
37 Larry asked where they were in the process with MEPA. The public comment period for  
38 the draft EIR closes on Friday the 28<sup>th</sup> and the secretary then takes comments and reviews  
39 them and determines what needs to be done in the final impact report. There is then  
40 another 30 day public comment period and the secretary determines if the applicant has  
41 met the requirements. Jack thought it was 90-120 process by virtue of the statutory  
42 requirements for noticing of the monitor, noticing the public, etc. There have been other  
43 permits filed for, he said. Jack said they can not get any state permits until they comply  
44 with MEPA. If there is anything relative to the MEPA permit that is in conflict with the  
45 Planning Board, it would require the Board to have a new hearing. Regarding ConCom,  
46 the wetlands have been delineated on the plan and the vernal pool has been identified,

1 Jack said. Larry asked if the issue of trying to integrate the MWRA easements into the  
2 third overpass was conservation issue. If it is within 125' of the bordering wetlands, it  
3 would be a conservation issue. There are certain triggers and if the crossing was outside  
4 of that boundary it would be an issue with MWRA. If it is within the boundary, it would  
5 trigger ConCom and MWRA. Helen said standard provisions in the decision include the  
6 narrative and reports and letters, findings. Peter said there are general administrative  
7 items, site plan findings, i.e. traffic, etc., and specific criteria of planning and  
8 development included in the site plan. Peter said there are many documents referenced in  
9 the document such as the DPW letter, GPI and Ryan Associates letters are attached and  
10 other documents such as Police and Fire letters, etc., are referenced as incorporated into  
11 the decision. Sue said she thought the timetables and triggers was very key.

12  
13 Sue said since there is a "catch-all" provision for other conditions she suggested opening  
14 up the hearing for public comment. George Dixon addressed the Board and said he  
15 supported the PUD. He said he thought in terms of the access roads and roads within the  
16 PUD, and the open space needed to be laid out now and as stated, ConCom restrictions  
17 need to be provided. He was concerned that Town Counsel and possibly Town Meeting  
18 review all the concerns to ensure that the by-law requirements are being met. He was  
19 also concerned that all commercial activities should cease including the MWRA and the  
20 developer needs to file an agreement with the Board that the rights have been deeded to  
21 him and therefore the PUD is acceptable to the owner of the land. Helen said the Board  
22 is not waiving any requirements and they have asked the applicant to include various  
23 documents into the decision. Town Counsel has already been asked to review the first  
24 draft, she noted. Andrea Carter, resident of Danforth Street asked about MEPA and DEP.  
25 She said there is a ruling by DEP that you can not have a pumping station within zone 2  
26 of a well. Helen said that issue will be raised at the meeting on Friday. Andrea stated  
27 that the sand and gravel pit should be closed down and she asked for a definitive date of  
28 that operation closing down before construction in the PUD. Helen said they are waiting  
29 for a response from Town Counsel on that issue before commenting. Andrea said one of  
30 the access points is not presently a public way until Town Meeting approves it. Sue said  
31 a public way is not the same as an accepted street. A public way is a street that has been  
32 laid out according to a plan and all those streets have been. It does not mean that the  
33 town accepts the responsibilities of maintenance of them. John Stasik concurred with a  
34 previous speaker in that the Board is ready to issue the special permit for the project.  
35 John said an overriding issue for him was the integration of the project with the fabric of  
36 Saxonville. He thought the connections made through vehicular/pedestrian right of ways  
37 should be maximized as much as possible. He said he was looking forward to working  
38 with the Board and others on the specific design of the project. John spoke in favor of  
39 sidewalks on both sides of OCP and of using Riverpath as the access drive. He said he  
40 assumed that some of the waivers, in addition to on-street parking, was roadway width  
41 and curbing. Allowing the commercial space to expand to 4000 square feet was  
42 amenable and he thought it might be possibly higher. The by-law limits it to 4,000, Sue  
43 said.

44  
45 Phil (inaudible) addressed the Board. He said he supported the PUD and part of the  
46 monies for mitigation should be spent in the neighborhood. The impacts are going to be

1 local so the benefits should be local as well. Carol Spack addressed the Board. She said  
2 she was frustrated that the public was not given the opportunity to look at the draft  
3 decision. Helen said the Board has only seen the draft decision this evening. It is not  
4 being used in tonight's discussion, she said but the Board has gone through the ten points  
5 in the PUD by-law. Helen offered a copy of the decision for anyone who wanted to  
6 make copies for themselves. Carol read from section K of the by-law and asked that the  
7 Planning Board revisit the question of whether it has discretion to push the items to future  
8 phases. She thought the density issue should be addressed at this juncture rather than at  
9 future phases. Ann said she thought as stated, that the Board list the things that they  
10 expect to control as outlined in the b-law. She did not think she suggested that the Board  
11 would defer a density decision. That decision will be made prior to making the decision  
12 itself. Carol had concerns over comments made by the developer regarding the pumping  
13 station. Tom said regarding the pump and well that are proposed, there are certain  
14 engineering calculations to determine the size and flow for the number of times it will  
15 flush out the flow. The problem with the system now is that the wells are too large. If you  
16 have the sewage sitting in the wells too long, they begin to break down . That was the  
17 reason they were proposing installing a smaller pump under Phase 1 and increasing the  
18 size as the other units come on line. Carol asked about Riverpath being accepted as a  
19 public way. Helen said the Board is waiting for Town Counsel opinion.  
20

21 George Dixon echoed John Stasik's comments regarding sidewalks on both sides of  
22 OCP. He asked how pedestrian access would occur to McGrath Square. That has not  
23 been designed and Helen thought it would be part of the phases. Linda Seagal, Chairman  
24 of the Board of Selectmen addressed the Board. She asked for a copy of the draft  
25 decision and said the town of Wayland would put it on their website. It should indicate  
26 that it is a draft, Sue said. Linda asked if Board members had received the letter from  
27 Wayland. Helen said it was Document #320-03 and members did have a copy of that  
28 letter. She said the letter states the project was too large and dense and 5 traffic concerns  
29 were stated. She reiterated some of the comments in the letter. Helen said the public  
30 hearing will be continued but the date is not certain at this point. Helen entertained  
31 comments from the Board on the points within the letter from the town of Wayland.  
32 Regarding limiting construction traffic, etc., Tom said he thought that should be dealt  
33 with during the special permit phase. Peter said they were agreeable to using the tunnel  
34 route. Jack said they were agreeable to prohibiting construction vehicles traveling  
35 through Wayland and suggested utilizing the MWRA tunnel route. That has been  
36 conveyed to the town of Wayland, he said. The request by Wayland that the applicant  
37 preclude maintenance, landscaping and equipment vehicles from Wayland was not  
38 agreeable to Board members. It was generally agreed that Massachusetts residents work  
39 all over the state and it would be prohibitive to enforce that requirement. Another item in  
40 the letter was the request for signalization for OCP and main exit road stating no left turn  
41 during designated hours. Helen said that OCP and Riverpath is included in phase 2 of the  
42 mitigation package. She did not think signage indicating hours was not in the purview of  
43 the Board. Sue was not in favor of making it a requirement.  
44

45 Another item in the letter was monitoring traffic, etc., prior to the commencement and  
46 completion of phases of construction. Larry thought the issue was already discussed by

1 the Board and monitoring after the build-out was included. Sue said this was not a town  
2 of Wayland decision. Larry thought it should be flagged in the event that monitoring is  
3 not provided for. Item #6, regarding water, states the project shall obtain its water from  
4 the MWRA system. Tom said it should state Town of Framingham system. Peter thought  
5 it should be left to the definitive decision to obtain any permits and approvals that are  
6 required. Regarding item #7, Jack said they are required to do that study as a matter of  
7 course. As part of the definitive, the DPW will review it, the ConCom will review it, etc.  
8 The applicant will have to comply with the DEP best management practice as well as the  
9 new EPA requirements for construction projects. Linda said the town of Wayland is  
10 under a consent order from DEP as of last August to reduce the amount of water they are  
11 drawing out of the ground. She said this is a big issue for Wayland. The Wayland wells  
12 intersect with the PUD, Linda said. Sue asked if they drew from the same aquifer. Jack  
13 said they do. Regarding item #8, Jack said he talked to the Conservation Agent in  
14 Wayland about a management plan and stated they were empathetic to their cause and  
15 talked about funding an impact study. They were looking for a firm commitment Jack  
16 said and he thought it was too early to make any commitments. Item #9 was something  
17 that Framingham ConCom would require. Item #10 dealt with emergency services being  
18 provided from Wayland. Larry asked if Wayland was first response in the area presently.  
19 Linda said there was a general agreement for mutual response and she believed Wayland  
20 was the closest response. Sue said the Framingham Fire Chief should weigh in on that  
21 issue. The closest station is Saxonville. Larry echoed those comments. There is a clean  
22 letter from the Fire Department but it does not address this issue, Helen said. Chief  
23 Smith always issues his clean letter indicating everything he would like include and there  
24 is nothing of that nature in his letter.

25  
26 Sue asked if there was a sufficient definition of affordable in the decision. There is a  
27 section where it states it will be turned over to the Housing Authority. Jack said there has  
28 not been discussions with the Housing Authority but specific definition could be provided  
29 before finalizing the decision. Peter said there will be a rental affordable and sales  
30 affordable. Town Counsel would have to agree to the sales affordable language, he said.  
31 John Bertorelli was present and said Framingham intends to pursue activating the wells  
32 on Birch Road. He did not agree with Wayland that the PUD would affect their wells. He  
33 did not think it would be too difficult to re-open the Birch Street wells and in speaking  
34 with DEP, they thought there was plenty of capacity.

35  
36 Larry said two key issues in coming to terms with the special permit are the definitive  
37 discussion of phasing and what happens in each phase. Larry said it would be helpful if  
38 the traffic and site design consultants were available at next week's hearing to answer  
39 questions on unresolved issues.

40  
41 Helen said the public hearing would be continued to March 31, 2003 at 7:45 p.m.

42  
43 III. Continued Public Hearing for Special Permit for Definitive Subdivision Review,  
44 Brimstone Subdivision, 287-333

45  
46 Helen said the hearing would be continued to April 15, 2003.

1  
2 IV. Miscellaneous Administrative  
3

4 222 Cochituate Road. John Bertorelli was looking for approval. Sue said that the  
5 landscaping language is missing and the landscaping as shown is not what will be  
6 planted. Sue said the Board is only reviewing the landscaping that is going to actually be  
7 installed. John said he has made application to the ZBA. Ann will draft a condition.  
8 John recommended that if he does not receive a decision within 6 months from the ZBA,  
9 he has to prepare a landscape plan for the Planning Board.

10  
11 Lot 13, Carter Drive Extension, Doeskin II. John said they have come to an agreement.  
12 He will reduce the existing wall to a height of 4' and come back 10' horizontally and  
13 install a stone terraced wall of 6' height and reduce the size of the house.

14  
15 Respectfully submitted,

16  
17 Nancy Starr-Ferguson  
18 Recording Secretary

19  
20 *\*These minutes were approved with changes and/or amendments at the Framingham*  
21 *Planning Board meeting of May 10, 2004.*

22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 *Thomas Mahoney, Chairman*  
26  
27  
28