



July 20, 2022

Mr. Gregory Rondeau, Chairman  
355 East Central Street  
Franklin, MA 02038`

**Re: 230 East Central Street (Taj Estates of Franklin II)  
Site Plan Peer Review**

Dear Mr. Rondeau:

BETA Group, Inc. is pleased to provide continuing engineering peer review services for the proposed project entitled "Taj Estates of Franklin II," located at 230 East Central Street in Franklin, Massachusetts. This letter is provided to outline findings, comments, and recommendations.

This is the 6<sup>th</sup> revision and submission of this development. The last complete review of this site was conducted on April 15<sup>th</sup>. There have been several revisions relative to the design of the proposed retaining wall along the Hill Avenue Right of way, which has changed again in this submission. Three memos were issued by BETA in response to the subsequent revisions from April 15<sup>th</sup>. This review will present only those items that continue to be discussed relative to the filing.

## **BASIS OF REVIEW**

The following documents were received by BETA with this revision and will form the basis of the review:

- Plans (12 sheets) entitled: ***Taj Estates of Franklin II Site Plan & Special Permit*** dated November 11, 2021, revised 02/17/22, prepared by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. of Franklin, MA.
- ***Cover Letter*** from Guerriere & Halnon, INC. to the Planning board dated July 14,2022.
- ***Letter to Mr Gregory Rondeau, Chairman, Franklin Planning Board*** from Vanasse & Associates, Inc, dated July 08,2022 RE Traffic Volume Comparison, Proposed Mixed Use Development-230 East Central Street, Franklin, Massachusetts.
- ***Plan*** prepared by MF Engineering & Design Inc. dated May 25, 2022, no revision date.
- Letter addressed to Mirajuddin Ahmed, from MF Engineering & Design Inc. ***RE: 230 East Central Street-Franklin***, dated July 5,2022
- Architectural Plans (9 sheets), ***Taj Estates of Franklin 2, Taj Estates, 239 East Central Street, Franklin, MA 02038***, prepared by Dennis Colwell Architects, Revised 07/14/2022.

Previous submittals included:

- Stormwater Report, dated November 11, 2021, revised January 28,2022 prepared by Guerriere & Halnon, Inc.
- Application for Approval of a Site Plan and Special Permit, including:
  - Cover Letter
  - Application Form
  - Certificate of Ownership
  - Quitclaim Deed
  - Certified Abutters List

- Letter from Vignone & Vignone LLP to the Town of Franklin, Planning Board **RE: 230 East Central Street, Franklin, MA 02038**, Prepared by John P. Vignone, dated May 23,2022
- **Revised Memorandum in Support of Application for Special Permit to Allow Multi-Family or Apartment Residential Use Within the Commercial I Zoning District**, Prepared by Richard R. Cornetta, Jr., Esquire, dated April 25,2022

Review by BETA will include the above items along with the following, as applicable:

- Site Visit
- **Zoning Chapter 185 From the Code of the Town of Franklin**, current through July 2021
- **Zoning Map of the Town of Franklin, Massachusetts**, attested to October 7, 2020
- **Stormwater Management Chapter 153 From the Code of the Town of Franklin**, Adopted May 2, 2007
- **Subdivision Regulations Chapter 300 From the Code of the Town of Franklin**, current through March 8, 2021
- **Wetlands Protection Chapter 181 From the Code of the Town of Franklin**, dated August 20, 1997
- **Town of Franklin Best Development Practices Guidebook**, dated September 2016

## INTRODUCTION

The project site includes one parcel (#285-069) with a total area of approximately 1.005 acres located at 230 East Central Street in the Town of Franklin (the "Site"). The Site is located within the Commercial I Zoning District. Lots to the east and west of the Site are also within the Commercial I district, lots to the north of the parcel are within the Commercial II district, and lots to the south are within the Single-Family IV district. The area abutting the Site to the west is an undeveloped private road, connecting East Central Street to Hill Ave. A sewer easement associated with an 8" sewer line crosses latitudinally along the southernmost portion of the Site. Most of the Site is also within the Water Resource District.

The existing Site includes a single-family, two-story, 1,030 sq. ft. residence. Associated site features include a backyard shed, a paved driveway connected to East Central Street, and yard areas. The southern portion of the Site is predominantly woodlands. Existing utility services (water, sewer, gas) are provided via connections to the mains beneath East Central Street. A sidewalk is present along East Central Street, and a fire hydrant is in front of the Site within the street's Right-Of-Way.

Topography at the Site is generally directed to the east, though the Site is largely flat and localized depressions are present throughout the Site. The southwestern portion of the Site includes slightly steeper slopes (6H:1V). Much of the Site is within a Zone II Wellhead Protection Area. No wetland resources areas are known to exist on the Site. The Site is not located within a FEMA mapped 100-year floodplain, an NHESP-mapped estimated habitat of rare or endangered species, or any other critical area. NRCS soil maps indicate the presence of Sudbury Fine Sandy Loam with a Hydrologic Soil Group (HSG) rating of B (medium infiltration potential), Hollis-Rock outcrop-Charlton complex which varies to either HSG B or D, and Urban Land with no assigned HSG rating.

The project proposes to construct a 13,079± sq. ft. mixed use development consisting of office/commercial space and thirty-one 1-bedroom and 2 2-bedroom residential units. The project will include demolition of the existing residence and removal of the driveway, shed and utility services. The project will also include clearing most of the Site's woodlands. Associated site features include a paved parking area along the eastern and southern portions of the Site, a paved driveway connecting the parking areas to East central Street, a sidewalk along the eastern side of the new building which will connect to

the East Central Street sidewalk, landscaping areas, a white 6' PVC fence along the easterly and southerly property line, a retaining wall along the Hill Ave right of way behind the building, a 4' high chain link fence along the same property line, dumpsters, bollards, lighting, a transformer, and utilities (fire service, domestic water, electric, gas). Stormwater management is proposed via a closed drainage systems consisting of catch basin, manholes, and roof leaders which will convey runoff to a new subsurface infiltration system.

## FINDINGS, COMMENTS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### GENERAL

G1. There is a proposed 10' cut within the Hill Ave right of way at the southwest corner of the building. There are no test pits in this area to document depth to bedrock. BETA recommends that the applicant conduct some soil observations in this area to determine depth to bedrock and determine whether blasting and/or hammering will be needed to provide the grades as shown.

**BETA:** Test pits have not been conducted within the Hill Avenue right-of-way in the area of the proposed cuts. Comment remains.

**GH:** *Test pits will be performed prior to construction. The Town will be notified about the findings and if required blasting or hammering is required, the appropriate permits will be submitted at that time.*

**BETA 2:** Beta recommends that the test pits be conducted at the start of construction, they can take place at the same time as the test pits for the infiltration system. See Comment SW7.

**GH2:** *Test Pits were performed by M.F. Engineering & Design, Inc. and can be found in their correspondence dated May 25, 2022 and July 5, 2022.*

**BETA3:** BETA requests that soil logs and test pit locations be shown on the revised plans from M.F. Engineering & Design to verify results.

### ZONING

The Site is located within the Commercial I (CI) Zoning District. The proposed uses include a multi-use building with office and apartments. According to the Town of Franklin Use Regulations Schedule Parts II and the proposed uses are regulated as follows:

- Multifamily or apartments uses: Authorized under special permit from the Planning Board.
- Office: Authorized by Right. Additional restrictions are required depending on office classification and their location in the building

Z1. Clarify what types of offices are proposed and their location in the building. Medical, dental, or professional offices require a Special Permit from the Board of Appeals if the proposed project results in an increase in estimated water consumption of more than 15,000 gallons per day. In addition, Clerical, or administrative offices are not allowed on the sidewalk level in multi-story developments.

**BETA:** The proposed office location and area is now shown on the plans; however, the proposed use has not been established.

**GH:** *The proposed commercial space has not been designated at this time. However, parking spaces have been incorporated in accordance with the Zoning Bylaws §185-21(B0(3)(b) Parking, Loading and Driveway Requirements.*

**BETA2:** BETA will defer this issue to the Board relative to compliance with the Zoning By Laws

**GH2:** *The commercial Area within the building has been expanded to two (2) 31.5' x 15' commercial spaces on the East Central Street facing side. One area will be used as a temporary leasing office, which will then be rented to another tenant when all units are occupied. Both units will be required to obtain site plan approval for a change in use prior to occupancy.*

**BETA3:** BETA will defer this issue to the Board.

## **SIGNS (§185-20)**

Provide details, sizes, and locations of any proposed signs on site if applicable.

## **PARKING, LOADING AND DRIVEWAY REQUIREMENTS (§185-21)**

Access to the Site is proposed via a 24' +/- wide driveway connected to East Central Street at the northern lot line. The driveway connects to a paved parking area located along the eastern and southern sides of the building. A sidewalk is proposed which will connect to the East Central Street sidewalk and run adjacent to the eastern and southern sides of the building.

As part of the proposed work, an existing curb cut will be removed. The proposed driveway entrance is approximately 35 ft east of the existing driveway.

The proposed parking lot will provide a total of 52 parking spaces, three of which have been designed to be accessible spaces. all of the proposed parking spaces are 9' wide and 19' long, with 24' min. access aisles.

For the proposed number of parking spaces, 3 spaces must be accessible, 1 of which must be van accessible. The 3 proposed accessible spaces will satisfy this requirement.

P1. In accordance with §185-21, C. (1). No off-street parking shall be located within 10 feet of a street right of way. At the rear of the building, the parking area is located within 10' of the Hill Avenue right of way.

**BETA:** Although unimproved, the Hill Avenue right-of-way still exists. BETA recommends that the applicant request the waiver or correct the spaces.

**GH:** *A waiver request has been added. See Sheet 1*

**BETA2:** Waiver request added. Issue resolved.

**GH2:** *The Town attorney has reviewed the letter provided by Vignone & Vignone, LLP with the prior submittal and is in agreement that a waiver is not required to allow parking within 10-feet of Hill Ave.*

**BETA3:** No further comments.

P5. In accordance with §185-21, C. (4). Loading areas and parking areas for 10 or more cars shall provide screening in accordance with §185-35. A 6' high white PVC fence is proposed for the

easterly and southerly edge of the parking lot which will satisfy this requirement for these areas. However, no screening has been provided for the westerly edge of the parking area behind the building adjacent to Hill Ave.

**BETA: There is no screening provided along the Hill Avenue right-of-way. Comment remains.**

***GH:** There is existing vegetation and a significant embankment within Hill Ave that provides a natural screening to abutters. No further action taken.*

**BETA2:** If no screening is to be provided than in BETA's opinion, a waiver is required.

**BETA3:** see SC1 below

P6. In accordance with §185-21, C. (5). Parking lots for 20 or more cars shall contain or be bordered within 5' by at least one tree per 10 parking spaces, ..... , with not less than 40 square feet of unpaved soil area per tree. No trees are identified in the Landscaping Plan to satisfy this requirement.

**BETA: Issue resolved on east side of the lot. See comment P5.**

***GH:** See response for comment P5.*

**BETA2:** See response for comment P5 above.

**BETA3:** see SC1 below

## SCREENING (§185-35)

The project proposes outdoor parking for 10 or more cars which must be screened in accordance with this section. The applicant proposes to use a 6' high white PVC fence to meet this requirement.

SC1. Provide screening for that section of the parking area at the southwest corner of the lot in accordance with this section.

**BETA: Comment remains.**

***GH:** There is existing vegetation and a significant embankment within Hill Ave that provides a natural screening to abutters. No further action taken.*

**BETA2:** If no screening is to be provided than in BETA's opinion, a waiver is required.

***GH2:** On behalf of the Applicant, we respectfully defer to the Board for a determination if a waiver is required as the use of screening in this area is not practical. Hill Ave is undeveloped which creates a natural buffer/screening to the abutting properties. GH2 response shall apply to BETA comment to P6 and SC1 in addition to P5.*

**BETA3:** BETA will defer this matter to the Board

## STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Stormwater management for the proposed site development will be achieved through a proposed Infiltration Chamber system (172 Chambers) beneath the parking lot along the east side of the proposed building. Runoff from the proposed paved surfaces on site will be collected by 3 catch basins located along the easterly edge of the parking area. The entirety of the existing lot currently flows primarily west to east across the lot. Although there is a localized depression east of the existing driveway that directs runoff

away from the abutting dwelling to the east towards the rear of the lot, there is no specific point source discharge emanating from the lot at the present. Excess runoff from the parcel flows east through the forested area at the rear of the lot onto the abutting parcel in no distinct pattern.

The comments noted below are from the previous review in April and have not been addressed. All resolved comments have been removed. Outstanding issues are highlighted in yellow.

### **MASSACHUSETTS STORMWATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS:**

The proposed development will disturb an area less than one acre; therefore, the project is not subject to Chapter 153: Stormwater Management of the Town of Franklin Bylaws. Compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Standards is outlined in the following sections.

**No untreated stormwater (Standard Number 1):** *No new stormwater conveyances (e.g., outfalls) may discharge untreated stormwater directly to or cause erosion in wetlands or waters of the Commonwealth.*

The project does not propose any new untreated stormwater discharges to wetlands – **complies with standard.**

**Post-development peak discharge rates (Standard Number 2):** *Stormwater management systems must be designed so that post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates.*

The project proposes an increase in overall impervious area via an expanded parking lot. The provided calculations indicate a decrease in post-development peak discharge rates and total runoff volumes compared to pre-development. All of the runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces on site will be directed through the proposed infiltration structure. Except for the peak of the 100-year frequency event, all the runoff generated on site is contained within the proposed infiltration structure.

**Recharge to groundwater (Standard Number 3):** *Loss of annual recharge to groundwater should be minimized through the use of infiltration measures to maximum extent practicable.*

The soil testing on site determined that the soils near the proposed infiltration structure are a Class I soil with a Rawl's Rate of 2.4" / hour. In addition, the observation test pits indicated that groundwater levels in the area were sufficiently deep to allow the bottom of the proposed infiltration structure to be maintained greater than 4' above maximum groundwater. As noted above, all the runoff from the proposed impervious surfaces on site will be directed through the infiltration structure.

SW4. The 2 test pits (#4 & #6) utilized for the design of the infiltration structure are located between the structure and the building. In accordance with the standards, 2 observation test holes shall be conducted on site in the location of the infiltration structure.

**BETA: Test holes should be conducted directly in the area of the proposed infiltration structure.**

**GH:** *Test pits will be performed prior to construction. Any deviations from current test pit data that would result in any modifications to the underground stormwater drainage system will be addressed at that time. We do not anticipate any major changes to the system design.*

**BETA2:** *BETA recommends that this be a condition of approval.*

**80% TSS Removal (Standard Number 4):** *For new development, stormwater management systems must be designed to remove 80% of the annual load of Total Suspended Solids.*

The project proposes one single treatment trains for the impervious surfaces on site. Both the roof runoff and the runoff from the other impervious surfaces are directed through the Infiltration structure. The roof runoff is exempt from pretreatment and thus will receive the 80% TSS removal rate associated with the infiltration structure. All the remaining impervious surfaces on site will be collected by a series of deep sump catch basins with hoods and directed through a "Separator Row". The combination of the catch basins and the separator row will provide the 44% pretreatment requirement prior to discharge into the infiltration structure.

**Higher Potential Pollutant Loads (Standard Number 5):** *Stormwater discharges from Land Uses with Higher Potential Pollutant Loads require the use of specific stormwater management BMPs.*

The project is not a Land Use with Higher Potential Pollutant Load (LUHPPL).

**Critical Areas (Standard Number 6):** *Stormwater discharges to critical areas must utilize certain stormwater management BMPs approved for critical areas.*

The project does not propose discharges to critical areas.

**Redevelopment (Standard Number 7):** *Redevelopment of previously developed sites must meet the Stormwater Management Standards to the maximum extent practicable.*

**Construction Period Erosion and Sediment Controls (Standard Number 8):** *Erosion and sediment controls must be implemented to prevent impacts during construction or land disturbance activities.*

The project will disturb more than one acre of land; therefore, a Notice of Intent with EPA and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required. The project proposes the use of erosion control barrier (12" mulch log), catch basin inlet protection, and stabilized construction entrance.

**Operations/maintenance plan (Standard Number 9):** *A Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan shall be developed and implemented to ensure that stormwater management systems function as designed.*

A Long-Term Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Plan has been provided.

SW5. Per the MA Stormwater Handbook, provide the following:

Provide a sample inspection form to be used by the owners.

**BETA: Comment remains.**

*GH: A "Post Construction Inspection Report" was provided in the Supplemental Attachments, Appendix 11" of the Stormwater Report. Additional "Infiltration Chambers Inspection and Maintenance Log" forms were also provided.*

**BETA2:** The Appendix is not specifically noted in the O & M plan. The Long-Term Operation and Maintenance Plan should be a stand-alone document. Therefore, Appendix 11 should be directly incorporated into the plan and referenced. Along with the sample Inspection Form and a plan of the BMPs.

SW6. Incorporate Cul-Tec Separator Row maintenance requirements into this document.

**BETA: Include manufacturer's information as an appendix.**

*GH: A "Cul-Tec Operations and Maintenance Guide" was provided in the Supplemental Attachments, Appendix 11" of the Stormwater Report.*

**BETA2:** See response above

- SW8. **In conjunction with the Cul-tec system, BETA recommends that the manifold be eliminated and the inlet into the system be restricted to the separator row only. In addition, the inlet pipe should be increased in size to a 36" diameter culvert which will match the height of the chambers.**

*GH: The Stormwater management system design is in conformance with current stormwater management system standards as well as the manufacturers requirements. Therefore, no further action taken.*

**BETA2: BETA recommends that the manifold invert be raised to Elevation 278.95. This would provide an additional 12" of sediment storage in the separator row and further protect the long-term viability of the system.**

**Illicit Discharges (Standard Number 10):** *All illicit discharges to the stormwater management systems are prohibited. A signed Illicit discharge statement is included in the final report.*

## COMMENTS FROM JUNE 02, 2022 MEMO

The proposed retaining wall along the property line behind the building adjacent to Hill Ave has been modified as shown on the revised drawing and letter from M.F. Engineering & Design, Inc. The wall will now be 9-3/4" diameter piles concrete filled with a reinforced shotcrete layer between the piles supported by wood sheeting at the rear of the casings. In addition, a 4' high black vinyl coated chain link fence will be installed at the top of the wall. The outstanding comments from the previous review are:

1. The natural grades in the center section of the wall exceed 30%. The design engineer should be prepared to discuss and present to the Planning Board a construction means and method to access this portion of the site and install the sheet piling.  
**BETA3: Means and methods discussed in letter from M.F. Engineering & Design.**
2. The dimensions reflected on Sheet 4 of 12 of the record site plan drawings prepared by G & H, should reflect the dimensions from the building and the property line to the wall accounting for the width of the proposed sheet pile section.  
**BETA3: Sheet piling has been removed new section fits within dimensional limits identified in site plans.**
3. At 10' high, the wall will require a fence along the top to prevent accidental falls. BETA recommends that a detail be provided to show the proposed fencing, including height, type, and material and relationship to the property line and the sheet pile wall.  
**BETA3: 4' high vinyl coated chain link fence will be provided at the top of the wall along the property line. No further comments**
4. If the intent of the wall installation is to maintain a 9' wide access corridor around the structure than the width at the top of the wall between the wall and the property line will only be 0.8'. Installing a fence along this strip will require the use of the right of way for construction access. BETA recommends that the applicant's attorney address this issue regarding access rights beyond the property line within the right of way.  
**BETA3: See Response to 2 above. No further comments**
5. The test pits conducted on site were all outside of the steep grades towards the middle of the lot. The sheet pile sections near STA 1+0 will need approximately 20' of penetration into the



ground. Based upon the exposed ledge on the opposite edge of the right of way, what is the design engineer's contingency if you are unable to achieve the penetration depth due to ledge.

**BETA3: as previously noted provide test pit logs and locations.**

6. BETA recommends that the existing trees around the wall be located to see if any outside or on the property line will be impacted or need removal to install the sheet piling.

**BETA3: Comment remains. Existing trees have not been located.**

### **COMMENTS FROM JUNE 10,2022 SOLDIER PILE WALL REVIEW EMAIL**

BETA performed a review of the proposed soldier pile retaining wall along the property line behind the building adjacent to Hill Ave. Those comments were:

1. The plan sheet does not include details of the drilled pile sockets. The May 25, 2022 letter from MF Engineer & Designs states that the piles will be drilled, and that the holes shall be 12" diameter. Typically, drilled sockets for soldier piles are of a sufficient diameter to fit the entire pile plus few inches of clearance around the flanges to allow for the pile to be fully encased within concrete poured after the pile is placed. The pile sockets should be completely inside the property line. Additional clearance to the property line may be warranted to account for the dimensions of the drilling equipment and to prevent drilling spoils from encroaching across that line.

**BETA2: The revised drawing and letter from M.F. Engineering & Design address most of this comment. However, the portion of the comment pertaining to the ability to contain drill spoils this close to the property line remains.**

2. There is a possibility of disturbance/settlement in the ground immediately behind the lagging panels as a result of migration of soils during the excavation and lagging installation process. The likelihood of this settlement is a function of the soil type and whether groundwater is encountered. The likelihood of settlement encroaching across the property line also depends on the distance from the lagging panels to the property line.

**BETA2: The revised drawing and letter from M.F. Engineering & Design addresses this comment. No further comments.**

### **COMMENTS FROM JULY 8,2022 TRAFFIC VOLUME COMPARISON**

BETA conducted a review of the *Traffic Volume Comparison* letter dated July 8, 2022. The letter provided information that compared the estimated trip-generation possibilities based on alternative commercial uses that could be developed on the site to the proposed residential site use trip generation. BETA concurs with the trip generation provided in the letter which indicates that the other commercial alternatives would be a more significant traffic generator than the currently proposed residential use in terms of both daily and peak hour traffic.

Mr. Gregory Rondeau, Chairman

July 20, 2022

Page 10 of 10

If we can be of any further assistance regarding this matter, please contact us at our office.

Very truly yours,

BETA Group, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Gary D. James". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "G" and "J".

Gary D. James, P.E.  
Senior Project Engineer

cc: Amy Love, Town Planner

# Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street  
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



Phone: (508) 520-4907  
www.franklinma.gov

## DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** July 18, 2022  
**TO:** Franklin Planning Board  
**FROM:** Department of Planning and Community Development  
**RE:** 230 East Central St – Taj Estates  
Special Permit & Site Plan

---

The DPCD has reviewed the above referenced Site Plan Modification application for the Monday, July 25, 2022 Planning Board meeting and offers the following commentary:

#### General:

1. The site is located at 230 East Central St in the Commercial I Zoning District.
2. The applicant is proposing to construct a three story building with 33 residential units and two commercial office areas. Multi-Family requires a Special Permit in the Commercial I Zoning District, under 185 Attachment 7, 6.1.

#### Comments from the June 6 Planning Board Meeting:

1. The Planning Board asked where windows, doors and egress will be located along the alley way.
2. The Applicant is to provide a letter from a structural engineer – letter provided. Board should determine if this satisfy the disturbance question on Hill Ave.
3. Abutters asked if the Applicant could reach out to them to discuss what's right for the neighborhood.
4. Asked about affordable units
5. Will there be run off from the top of the wall onto Hill Avenue.

#### DPCD Comments:

1. BETA has listed several comments that may require waivers for screening per §185-21 of the zoning By-Law.
2. Retaining wall added in place of grading. The retaining wall is on the property line.
  - a. An existing condition plan should be provided to determine if any trees are in the way of the retaining wall. From appearance, several stumps within Hill Ave would need to be removed in order to install the retaining wall.
  - b. BETA has also noted that an existing tree plan should be submitted.

- c. It appears the Applicant will still disturb both abutters on East and West side when removing stumps to construct the wall and install the fence. A letter has been submitted from a Structural engineer, however, they indicated how the wall will be constructed, but did not say there would be no disturbance on Hill Ave. As well as the fence that is to be installed, it should be proven that there is no disturbance on the abutting property.
  - d. BETA has also mentioned the ability to contain the drill close the property line and disturb the abutting property.
3. DPCD recommends the retaining wall be moved 10ft onto the property to avoid any disturbance on Hill Ave.
4. Applicant is proposing 10% affordable units.
  - a. Note these units will not be on the Town's Affordable Housing list and will not be monitored by the Town or State.
5. DPCD received a public comment letter which is included in this packet.
6. The Building Commissioner has submitted a letter.
7. DPCD still has a concern for the density of this project. As stated in previous letters, this project is the largest density project submitted for approval. The Planning Board has mentioned in past meetings that 20-25 units is more reasonable.
8. The parking meets the minimum requirements. The applicant has not provided parking for visitors.



# Town of Franklin

## Inspection Department

Building Inspection • Division of Wires • Division of Gas  
Division of Plumbing • Sealer of Weights & Measures  
355 East Central Street  
Franklin, MA 02038-1352

Lloyd "Gus" Brown  
Building Commissioner  
Zoning Officer

Office (508) 520-4926  
FAX (508) 520-4906  
gbrown@franklinma.gov

Franklin Planning Board  
355 East Central Street  
Franklin, MA. 02038

Re; 230 East Central Street Franklin, MA.

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I have been approached by the attorney for the above referenced address requesting the definition of a retaining wall.

In this case I resourced State Building Commissioner Reynolds, for her interpretation.

Ms. Reynolds stated that a retaining wall is not an accessory structure, a detached garage or outbuilding would fit the definition of an accessory structure.

Lloyd Brown  
Building Commissioner  
Town of Franklin



Amy Love <alove@franklinma.gov>

---

## Fwd: Proposed development at 230 E Central Street

1 message

---

**Beth Wierling** <bwierling@franklinma.gov>  
To: Amy Love <alove@franklinma.gov>

Mon, Jul 11, 2022 at 3:40 PM

Amy,

Forwarding to include as part of the public record.

Beth

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **James Hagy** <jamesdhagy3@gmail.com>  
Date: Mon, Jul 11, 2022 at 2:07 PM  
Subject: Proposed development at 230 E Central Street  
To: <grondeau@franklinma.gov>, <bwierling@franklinma.gov>

Dear Planning Board,

I have recently become aware of ongoing deliberations related to proposed redevelopment of the property at 230 E Central Street. I am writing to support the eventual approval of this development. In particular, I believe that this is the kind of development that is most needed in Franklin to advance our interest in several areas. Most apparent to me is that this development will contribute to both the business and residential development for the downtown area because it is on the edge of downtown. Those interested in promoting a vibrant downtown with healthy businesses must consider having people living nearby. I view this development as adjacent to the commuter rail downtown, although I noticed that arguments have been advanced about whether it is within 0.5 miles or not, or if that matters. It's closer than a lot of the housing alternatives in Franklin and thus I see this as a plus regardless. It's also on a major road, close to grocery shopping and other needed amenities. The traffic study seemed to indicate to me that traffic impacts will not be severe. This project advances sustainable community development interests compared to building on the outskirts of town, converting a farm or forest, etc. Along those lines, the proposed development also will not create expansive water-thirsty lawns and landscaping.

I recognize that abutters may not welcome new neighbors. However, owners of homes on the edge of downtown, adjacent to a commercial zoned property, cannot expect that property to forever remain partially developed with only a single house on it. That would be contrary to overall community development goals that I think many members of the community embrace. Yes, people like me are less personally interested than the abutters and perhaps not willing to engage at a contentious meeting. Know that I am out here. We ... people thinking like me ... are out here, and we know that Franklin needs housing, and this is the kind it needs.

Sincerely,

Jim Hagy  
[76 Brandywine Road, Franklin](#)

---

This email is intended for municipal / educational use only and must comply with the Town of Franklin and Franklin Public School's policies and state/federal laws. Under Massachusetts Law, any email created or received by an employee of The Town of or Franklin Public Schools is considered a public record. All email correspondence is subject to the requirements of M.G.L. Chapter 66. This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact the sender and delete all copies.