

1
2
3
4

Planning Board Minutes

Monday, March 14, 2005

5
6
7

Memorial Building
150 Concord Street, Public Hearing Room

8 Those present: Thomas Mahoney, Chairman, Ann Welles, Vice Chairman, Sue Bernstein and
9 Carol Spack, Clerk. Andrea Carr-Evans arrived at 7:38. Also present were Jay Grande, Planning
10 Director and MaryRuth Reynolds, Administrative Assistant.

11 **Meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm**

12 **I. Miscellaneous Administrative**

13 a. Jay Grande reminded the Board that the back up material for the Annual
14 Town Meeting is due by March 17, 2005.

15 b. Ann Welles updated the Board on Metrowest Growth Management Meeting

16 **II. ANR Review ~ 1414 Concord Street**

17 Drew Rogers represented the applicant. Drew stated that this was a parcel across the
18 street from the industrial center in the Saxonville area and that the lot does meet all
19 the zoning requirements. The applicant wishes to divide the single parcel into 3 lots.
20 Tom Mahoney stated that the Town Engineer had recommended endorsing this
21 application. The Board was concerned about the safety of the driveway opening
22 position and asked that Jay send a letter to the Public Works Department
23 recommending that the driveway be off the curve. Carol Spack moved that the
24 Framingham Planning Board endorse the application for the ANR Plan by Eugene J.
25 and Peggy E. McCarthy with respect to the property located at 1414 Concord Street
26 dated November 4 2004, subject to the corrections to the plan (the addition of the
27 zoning district) and Jay will hold the plan until the correction is made. Sue Bernstein
28 seconded the motion. The vote was 5 in favor and 0 opposed.

29
30 **III. Discussion ~ The Arcade Project**

31 Mike Gatlin, Mike Perry and Roger Lehrberg attended the discussion. Mike Gatlin
32 explained that the project was having trouble getting financing for the project in its
33 original configuration. He stated that they wished to change the original 40 extended

1 stay hotel rooms to 30 residential apartments, which would also drop the parking
2 requirement from 60 spaces to 35 spaces. Jay gave a brief explanation of the
3 definition of the Mixed Use by-law and how this project fit into it. Roger Lehrberg
4 stated that they had been before the ZBA earlier that evening and that the hearing
5 was continued to April 4, 2005 to allow for the Planning Board to comment. Katie
6 Murphy and Kathy Bartolini spoke out in favor of the change. Kathy stated that the
7 Planning & Economic Development Department sent a letter to the ZBA in support
8 of the approval of the variance. They felt that this was a needed project and urged
9 the Board to support that change. Tom Mahoney stated that the board members
10 needed to come to a decision that would represent the Board's position. He
11 requested that they express their comments on the merits of the request, not on the
12 size of the project or whether they like the project so they can give the ZBA the
13 Board's position on the modification. Tom polled the Board, not a formal vote.

14 **Carol Spack** stated that she was not inclined to support this project because she felt
15 that the original proposal barely passed muster as it was presented last year and was
16 skeptical about whether financing would work. She was also concerned about the
17 level of public subsidy for the project or that the TIF is bring requested as a financial
18 benefit from the town is negative and that the need to change the use and obtain a
19 variance. She felt it a difficult position to maintain, and feels she needs to look at the
20 by-law to see if the Planning Board can grant the waiver at all. Also she would not
21 be in favor of going against the wishes of town meeting. Therefore she is not in
22 favor of the change.

23 **Ann Welles** stated she was not as negative. She felt that the two uses are fairly
24 interchangeable and feels that it is an equal exchange. She stated that she wished this
25 was anticipated sooner and thinks that the applicant could offer the town something
26 in exchange for the variance. She does want to see the project go forward and with
27 concessions she would say yes.

28 **Sue Bernstein** stated that this was not the type of project that she envisioned would
29 result from the by-law. She pictured something more like the Kendall building and
30 something not extending down the side street as this has ended up. She does want to
31 see the downtown-revitalized but felt it shouldn't happen at any cost. She stated that

1 if she had been voting on the project when it was before the Board before, she would
2 not have voted for it. She did feel that there is no philosophical difference between
3 the apartments and the extended stay hotel, but felt that it was not a well laid out
4 project, understanding why the applicant proposed it, but feels its not the best project
5 for downtown. Therefore she would not support the variance.

6 **Andrea Carr-Evans** stated that her biggest issue was going against the will of town
7 meeting. Her other concern was that when the mixed use by-law was written, first
8 floor apartments were not put in there and she's concerned of the precedent it will
9 set for downtown and that if that's what we really want to do is to have that many
10 first floor apartments in **downtown** in a mixed use, then we should go to Town
11 Meeting and make a variation to our by-law before this comes forward. Because of
12 the se concerns she has a problem with approving the modification.

13 **Thomas Mahoney** felt that the project is needed **downtown** and that they did a lot
14 of work on this project and got the best that they could come away with. He also
15 stated that he felt that there is not much difference between the extended stay unit
16 and a monthly apartment. He doesn't like going against Town Meeting but given this
17 particular project with the security of the building he doesn't have a problem with it.
18 He does like the idea that Ann came up with about a public benefit, like access to
19 first floor area or common areas. So with that in mind he would be in favor of
20 supporting the applicant's request.

21 The Board continued the discussion on the project briefly touching on monthly
22 rental fees and other possible alternatives. The Board will send a letter with the
23 minutes to the ZBA.

24 25 **IV. Update on Zoning**

26 Donna Jacobs, Director of Metrowest Growth Management. Donna updated the
27 L.I.D. (Low Impact Development). Felt that they had a great first week. They had a
28 really good conversation on what the team needs to look at. She stated that the next
29 team meeting is scheduled for March 24, 2005. Donna has received a wonderful
30 power point slide show from Andrea Cooper and will be providing copies of the CD
31 for Board Members to review. She discussed the resources available to her and the

1 committee for use.

2
3 **V. Update on the Active Adult By-law**

4 The Board reviewed the Active Adult Housing By-law. Jay Grande updated the
5 Board on doc# 335-05 the lasted revision noting some changes that were made. The
6 Board discussed the slope percentage criteria that should be allowed, density, open
7 space and configuration of the units. This discussion will be continued at the next
8 meeting.

9 **V. Meeting adjournment**

10 *Andrea Carr-Evans moved to adjourn. Carol Spack seconded the motion. The vote*
11 *was 5 in favor 0 opposed. Meeting adjourned at 11:30pm*

12
13
14 Respectfully submitted,
15 Mary Reynolds
16 Recording Secretary

17
18
19 ****THESE MINUTES WERE APPROVED WITH AMENDMENTS AT THE**
20 **PLANNING BOARD MEETING OF MARCH 29, 2005.**

21
22 _____
23 Thomas Mahoney, Chairman