

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

February 6, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held in the Town Council Chambers at 355 East Central Street, Franklin, MA, to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of attending the meeting live at the Town Hall, dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number, or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair (via Zoom); Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams; Jay Mello, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Amy Love, Town Planner; Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group, Inc.

7:00 PM Commencement/General Business

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

A. Limited Site Plan Modification: 160 Grove Street

Ms. Love stated that the applicant was before the Planning Board about one month ago with some field changes. The Planning Board requested that the applicant file a Limited Site Plan Modification with the changes. The applicant submitted an amended Site Plan narrative, amended Architectural narrative, and amended Limited Site Plan. She noted that BETA reviewed the plans and their comment letter is included in the meeting packet. She stated that a few questions were brought to her attention after the meeting as to whether this should be a special permit as well. Per Town Attorney Mark Cerel, since there is no change in the use, a Limited Site Plan filing is satisfactory; no special permit is required.

Mr. Maglio stated that we have no comments on what they are proposing. He stated that the applicant submitted a sewer extension application which will go before the Town Council.

Mr. Crowley stated that he provided a comment letter and the applicant addressed most items. He stated that detailed grading on the accessible ramps in the front of the building was requested. He noted that the applicant is providing 150 parking spaces and the special permit was for 138 spaces. The number of floors has been reduced from three to two; however, the overall height of the building is about the same. He requested the applicant confirm the height. He stated that the zoning table summary still indicates three stories instead of two.

Mr. David Choplinski, owner's representative, stated that if he can get the comments in writing, he will address them. He stated there is nothing that they have heard tonight that they cannot comply with.

Chair Rondeau stated that regarding the CO2 tank in the back parking lot, for safety purposes, he would like to push the tank in four or five feet and leave the bollards where they are. He stated that he would like to see a fence around the tank for safety. Mr. Choplinski stated that it is a regulation; they will have a 6 ft. fence around the tank, and they will do the bollards. Mr. David confirmed the applicant will be using 6 in. bollards.

Motion to Approve the Limited Site Plan Modification for 160 Grove Street, Rondeau. Conditions of Approval: To incorporate any outstanding conditions on the BETA memo dated February 1, 2023, along with adding spot grades to the plan for ADA ramps as noted in the discussion, and moving the CO2 tank, adding a fence, and surrounding it with bollards. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-Yes; David-Yes; Wierling-Yes; Williams-Yes; Power-Yes. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Final Form H: Amego – Washington Street

Ms. Love stated that the applicant filed a Final Form H. She reviewed that the Planning Board approved a Site Plan for 76 Grove Street on June 17, 2019. The Planning Board approved a Partial Form H for the Site Plan on August 22, 2022. The only condition was to complete the list of outstanding items listed in BETA’s review. She stated that BETA provided an observation report and submitted a comment letter.

Mr. Maglio stated that there is nothing outstanding.

Mr. Crowley reviewed that in August after a review of the site they had about 20 outstanding comments. BETA went out to the site again on January 30, 2023, and the overwhelming majority of items were addressed. He stated that one additional do not enter sign needs to be installed; the sign was on order and received and should be installed tomorrow.

Motion to Approve Final Form H: Amego – Washington Street. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-Yes; David-Yes; Wierling-Yes; Williams-Yes; Power-Yes. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

C. Street Acceptance: Maple Tree & Oak Tree Lanes

Ms. Love stated that the Town Council posted a public hearing on this for February 15, 2023. She stated that this is a subdivision from 1987. She stated that the Town has been slowly trying to take over old roadways that have never been accepted so they can improve the roadways.

Mr. Maglio stated that they have been trying to accept the unaccepted streets in Town. This subdivision was originally approved in 1987. He stated that everything has been done through the Town Attorney. He stated that for the process, it needs a recommendation from the Planning Board to accept it before it goes to Town Council.

Motion to Recommend to Town Council Street Acceptance: Maple Tree & Oak Tree Lanes. Rondeau. Second: Power. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-Yes; David-Yes; Wierling-Yes; Williams-Yes; Power-Yes. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

D. Discussion: Panther Way – Over 55 Development Study

Mr. Brad Chaffee, President of Camford Property Group, Inc., developer and builder at Panther Way; Mr. Gino Carlucci of PGC Associates, LLC; and Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Chaffee stated that his team met with the Town’s tech review board to discuss a potential senior village project on Panther Way. He stated that it was well received by the tech. board so part of the next step is to present it to the Planning Board with the concept. He stated that he provided a study of demand for age restricted housing units in Franklin and a conceptual layout proposing 46 units of 55+ senior housing with a portion being offered as affordable housing. Mr. Carlucci reviewed the highlights of the study of the demand for new, age-restricted housing units in Franklin which was provided in the meeting packet. He discussed that in Franklin in 2021 there were approximately 33,000 residents with the largest group being in the 45 to 54 age group. In the next 20 years, those in that age group will be over 55 years old. He noted demographic and housing market characteristics in Franklin and the current and future demands for age-restricted senior housing. He discussed that focus is placed on affordable senior units, including units that are designated as affordable and accepted as eligible for inclusion on the Subsidized Housing Inventory by the Department of Housing and Community

Development (DHCD), and units with a market value that long-time residents in and around Franklin who are trying to downsize can afford. He discussed housing stock and housing units available. He discussed income statistics as outlined in the provided report. He discussed the increased demand for senior housing.

Ms. Love stated that Mr. Chaffee submitted a color rendering, cover letter, and senior housing market study. She reviewed that Mr. Chaffee is looking to move forward with an over 55 community on Panther Way. Per Section 185-48.D(1)(g), the Town of Franklin is limited to a number equivalent to 2.5 percent of the existing single-family residential housing units located in the town; Franklin is over 2.5 percent. Mr. Chaffee has submitted a study for the Planning Board to determine if there is a need for an over 55 development. She stated that the applicant will be required to file a full Site Plan and Special Permit for the project to move forward.

Planning Board members asked questions and made comments. Ms. Williams stated that she thinks there is a need in town and thinks it is great to start looking at this. She stated that she would have reservations about clear cutting a densely wooded site to create this type of development. Ms. Wierling indicated that there would need to be an open space and affordable component for this type of plan regarding the senior village bylaw. Mr. Chaffee reviewed that he had a landscape architect come up with this design. He stated that landscape is a big component of this; he does not plan on completely clear cutting. He discussed that the bus lot was not calculated in this. In response to Ms. Wierling's question about over 55 permitted units, Ms. Love stated that they have all been built except one on Chestnut Street that is 27 units. Ms. Wierling stated that there is a significant need for this type of housing. However, there should be more walking paths and open space. Mr. Chaffee explained the target audience, size of the bedrooms, and overall size of the units. He reviewed that the average cost would be mid 600s up to 700s, but it is a moving target with construction costs. He confirmed that the road would probably be over 600 ft. Mr. David noted that could be an issue. Chair Rondeau stated that he is not a fan of the road running parallel to the neighbors in the back. He agreed that there is a need for 55 and over housing.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 515 West Central Street
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney for the applicant Franklin Learning RE Inc.; Manoj Gandhi, applicant; and Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cannon reviewed that the Planning Board wanted the plan to be cleaned up which was done. The Planning Board's traffic consultant rendered a traffic report, and Stonefield Engineering took a look at that. He reviewed that the Town's counsel, Attorney Brian Winner, used the report by MDM to generate the more comprehensive draft conditions which he hopes the Planning Board has taken a look at. He stated that Stonefield Engineering had a chance to digest the MDM report, responded to that, and came up with a traffic management plan. He stated that essentially, we understand the contents, and the data will bear it out once it gets operational and the traffic management plan is in place.

Attorney Brian Winner stated that he agreed with Mr. Cannon's comments. He reviewed that they are working on a draft decision. He stated that the Planning Board gave us some parameters at the last meeting. He stated that his approach is to not censor anything before it reaches the Planning Board, but to set the table with all the options and choices to be picked from so they can see everything that was recommended. The Planning Board can decide how they want it to be when voted. He stated that he can walk the Planning Board through the draft conditions. He discussed the traffic management plan, a phasing plan, benchmark along the time horizon to do some studying and generate some data to report

back to the Planning Board, when and how the Planning Board would require the applicant to return, and what to do about it.

Chair Rondeau stated an email was received this morning about the traffic report. He requested to speak to the traffic engineer; however, the traffic engineer was not available at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Cavaliere reviewed the cleaned up plan. She stated the roads were labelled as well as the private way and the areas that would be paved and the pervious paver area. She stated that there are 33 parking spaces. The cul de sac is shown on the plans.

Planning Board members asked questions and made comments. Ms. Williams stated that she would need more time to review the materials. She noted that there were discrepancies between the original Stonefield report and the new one by MDM; however, maybe the traffic management plan would address some of the discrepancies. Mr. Power discussed the flow and the parking spaces. Ms. Wierling stated that she still needs to review the materials and response that came in and does not feel comfortable with a decision before she has reviewed it. She noted that regarding the draft decision, if they decide after the nine-month period that there is an issue, they can review it again, but asked what happens after they review it and the enrollment increases, can they review it again. Mr. Cannon stated the intent is to give the Planning Board time to be able to evaluate it at full capacity. He stated that the owner will alert the Town when they get to 90 students and the clock starts ticking on the first evaluation period. He explained that the conditions can be adjusted to reflect another evaluation at full capacity.

Chair Rondeau stated that the access road is going to be pavers; he would like to see a fire department access gate. He stated that at the adjoining parcel going to the Wendy's, he would like to see a fence and not just a gate. He does not want people parking at Wendy's and dropping off and using it as a source to get to the school. He wants to keep the two sites separated. He stated that he saw the conditions will do one week of traffic; he would like to see two weeks of gathered information once the 90 threshold is reached. Mr. Cannon reviewed that the draft conditions need to be adjusted and explained the 90 threshold and 100 percent capacity. Mr. Winner stated that he and Mr. Cannon are on the same page that there should be data collection at 90 and full capacity, and some tweaking and fine tuning of the draft is needed. Mr. David asked about sending cars over the pervious pavers. Ms. Cavaliere discussed the pervious pavers and stated that they are suitable for fire truck capacity; they are not a small size paver, they are fairly heavy duty. Chair Rondeau stated that this is considered a fire access road and asked Mr. Maglio if there are any objections about using the access road in the back.

Mr. Maglio discussed the pervious pavers. He stated that he does not believe it is in the bylaw that it is not allowed, but he does not think the Planning Board has allowed it in the past for everyday use, only for emergency access. Ms. Cavaliere stated that to pave the access road they would have to go back to the Conservation Commission. The pervious pavers were in the original submittal to both Planning Board and Conservation Commission. Ms. Wierling asked if it was shown on the Conservation Commission plans as a full drive and on the Planning Board plans as an emergency access road. Chair Rondeau asked the applicant to look into this. Ms. Love stated that she spoke with the current conservation agent as to why it was pervious pavers; however, the current conservation agent was not the conservation agent at the time this went through Conservation Commission. Ms. Love stated that the current conservation agent said it was better for the mitigation and the impact to preserve the wetlands.

Mr. Maglio stated that the trash truck was to go through the Wendy's for exit. Ms. Williams requested an exact example of where this has been executed. Mr. Gandhi stated that Littleton is very similar with the parking spots and a facility with a 46,000 sq. ft. building with 26 parking spots is running fine. Also, Foxboro is very similar to this. Discussion commenced on the proposed parking spaces, facilities with similar layouts, traffic circulation, access, monitoring of the parking by staff, and a gate for the trash truck

exiting through Wendy's. Mr. David stated that a trash truck driver is not going to open the gate, go through the Wendy's, and then close the gate; the gate will remain open. He stated that from the beginning the trash truck was not going to exit through Wendy's. He explained the original trash truck plan. He asked for a no left turn sign at the bottom of the driveway onto Rt. 140. Mr. Maglio stated that is a state highway. He stated that he does not believe it was a condition, but it was discussed. Mr. Cannon stated that has been the site of the dumpster all along. He stated that the applicant will put in as a condition an electronic gate so staff can open and close it. Mr. David stated that if the trash truck goes through Wendy's, does that change their site plan as now they are letting something exit through another site. Mr. Cannon stated that the site was designed that way with the access easements. Mr. David stated that was for emergency access. Mr. Cannon stated that it was for all access and he can provide that information to the Planning Board.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 515 West Central Street, Site Plan Application, to February 27, 2023. Wierling. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-Yes; David-Yes; Wierling-Yes; Williams-Yes; Power-Yes. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-Yes; David-Yes; Wierling-Yes; Williams-Yes; Power-Yes. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 8:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

February 27, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held in the Town Council Chambers at 355 East Central Street, Franklin, MA, to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of attending the meeting live at the Town Hall, dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number, or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair; Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams. Members absent: Jay Mello, associate member. Also present: Amy Love, Town Planner; Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Gary James, BETA Group, Inc. (via Zoom).

7:00 PM Commencement/General Business

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

A. Endorsement: 160 Grove Street - Limited Site Plan Modification

Ms. Love stated that the applicant had been before the Planning Board for some site changes. The applicant provided the amended Limited Site Plan, architectural plans, response letter to BETA along with elevation response and memo from BETA.

Mr. Maglio had no comments.

Chair Rondeau asked if this was the site that was going to get a well. Mr. Maglio stated that the applicant has connection to the town water main for domestic and fire protection; they are before the Town Council for a sewer extension.

Motion to Endorse the Limited Site Plan Modification for 160 Grove Street. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Meeting Minutes: January 9 & January 23, 2023

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for January 23, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for January 9, 2023. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

C. Appointments: Master Plan Committee (2) & Davis-Thayer (1)

Motion to Recommend to Appoint Ms. Williams and Mr. Power to the Master Plan Committee. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Recommend to Appoint Chair Rondeau to the Davis-Thayer Committee. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM

PUBLIC HEARING – *Initial*

Prospect Hill Estates

Definitive Subdivision Plan

Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that this was originally before the Planning Board and it was denied; it then went to Land Court. She reviewed that Land Court remanded the subdivision back to the Planning Board with specific conditions which are included in her memo dated February 13, 2023. She stated that the applicant is requesting a waiver from Section 300-10.B(4)(b). She stated that the applicant included a second waiver that the applicant would like to be included in this decision from Section 300-10B(4)(d) that states road right-of-way including cul de sacs will be set back at least 20 ft. from Town lines. She discussed that the two waivers and agreeing to the subdivision need to be voted on.

Chair Rondeau asked if the roadway that will be built in Franklin will meet the Town's bylaws and standards. Mr. Maglio stated that based on the agreement, it will be a private roadway; the DPW will permit construction of that. The roadway will remain private and there will be no maintenance to be done by Franklin in the future. He stated that drainage is reviewed as part of the permitting process of the DPW. He stated that the DPW would inspect it for the work within the Prospect Street right-of-way, but not when it is on private property. He stated that the DPW will be looking at the drainage structures to make sure nothing is coming back onto Prospect Street.

Mr. Michael Legenza, Lake Street (via Zoom), stated that he attended the meeting the last time when this subject came up and there was denial for access to use the road into Bellingham. He stated that there were a lot of questions relative to how that area would be maintained in terms of plowing, police, and fire. He discussed that it seemed to get so complicated that it did not make sense to go that route. He stated that additionally, if you walk back into that area, which is Bellingham property, there are significant wetlands back there where the pond area is. He stated that we abut that area and there is a lot of flooding there; we have concerns as to what might happen putting those 11 units in there. He stated that it is his sense that the builder is not thinking about the neighborhood. He stated that he hopes the Planning Board is taking all this into consideration.

Ms. Love reviewed what was discussed with the attorneys. She stated that the roadway will always remain private and be maintained by homeowners and the Town of Franklin will never have any responsibility to maintain it. She stated that the developer will execute a private road covenant with the Town and establish a homeowner's association, both documents to be recorded. She stated that for the portion that is in Franklin, there are no wetlands; the conservation will have to be addressed in Bellingham.

Mr. Legenza stated that five years down the road when the people move into these homes, and they get tired of paying the homeowner's fees, how do we contend with this situation. He stated that there are a lot of moving parts to this that have frustrated the neighbors over the years. Chair Rondeau stated that there are public hearings on this in Bellingham, and Mr. Legenza may want to voice his opinion at those meetings. Mr. Legenza questioned that at the last Planning Board public hearing the request was denied, but it seems like that has been overturned. Chair Rondeau confirmed that it was overturned by the courts. Ms. Wierling stated that it is in the hands of the Bellingham Planning Board and Conservation Commission; she is not sure where they are in the process. Mr. Legenza stated that he understands the courts made a decision, and we have to abide by that.

Motion to Close the public hearing for Prospect Hill Estates Definitive Subdivision Plan. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Chair Rondeau stated that the Planning Board will vote on this at the March 13, 2023, meeting.

7:10 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
Zoning Amendment 23-891
Lincoln Street Map Amendment
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that they have been doing cleanups to the zoning map for a few years. She explained that several parcels end up having more than one zone from when the zoning map was created. She stated that a memo explaining this item and a map showing the proposed zoning map changes are included in the Planning Board’s meeting packet. Planning Board members asked questions. Ms. Love stated that property owners have been notified that this is taking place. She confirmed that this included about 30 properties. She stated that they are not making any parcels non-conforming. She explained that when they have been going through this process for zoning map amendments, they try to be consistent with the lot size and what would fit in with the area, and they try to be more lenient when assigning the zone. She stated that the majority are going to single-family III. She stated that they are trying to make it more compatible. She stated that some of the residents have come in to talk about their zoning and what is going to be changed.

Motion for a Recommendation to Town Council for the proposed zoning map changes for Amendment 23-891 for Lincoln Street Map Amendment. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 4-0-1 (4-Yes; 0-No; 1-Abstain). (Chair Rondeau abstained.)

7:15 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
704 Washington Street
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love reviewed that this site has been before the Planning Board for some time. DPW is all set with this and Mr. Crowley is available via Zoom. She reviewed that the applicant is proposing to demolish an existing house and construct two new group homes. The applicant is not required to file with the Conservation Commission. The applicant is exempt from zoning under the Dover Amendment which would allow one residential structure on a lot in RRI. She noted that comments from the January 23, 2023, Planning Board meeting include that the Planning Board requested less tree clearing along the back of the property which the applicant has provided, and the Planning Board requested the abutting structures be shown on the plan. She stated that it was not added to the plan; however, a map of our GIS showing abutting structures has been provided.

Mr. Maglio stated that all of his previous comments have been addressed; he has no further comments.

Mr. James stated that all his comments have been addressed. He stated that the basins have been modified as requested. He stated that the only thing they have left is perhaps a condition that they give the Planning Board a final layout of the grading.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney on behalf of Amego, Inc.; Mr. Andy Armington on behalf of Amego; Mr. John Randall, President of Amego, Inc. (via Zoom); and Mr. Adam Hunt of Level Design Group (via

Zoom) addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cannon stated that most of changes were plan changes. Mr. Hunt stated that there was nothing new to add. Chair Rondeau stated that one of the abutters is present and his concerns were tree clearing, infiltration basin, etc., and that has been corrected.

Mr. Mark Seifert, 7 Jefferson Road, stated that he appreciates all of BETA's work. He stated that he appreciated that the second bioretention basin is now more of a kidney shape meaning there is very little chance of runoff affecting his property. He stated that he has spoken to Mr. Randall many times. He stated that he and other neighbors wanted to continue the vegetative buffer between the properties and it seems that most of the plans allow that. He stated that he is wondering if during the process of construction there is degradation to our mutual properties, will there be replanting or some sort of mitigation after-the-fact that he can count on.

Mr. Maglio stated that as far as anything during construction such as erosion or if anything does get degradation, the main thing for him is it gets stabilized. He stated that he does not think there is any specific requirement for the applicant to replant trees; it might be more of an agreement between the property owners.

Motion to Close the public hearing for 704 Washington Street, Site Plan Application. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Chair Rondeau stated that he wanted to make a motion to vote on this. He stated that he thinks the applicant was requesting one waiver for a little bit of light spillage. Mr. James confirmed there was a waiver for a little bit of light spillage on the street. Chair Rondeau stated that he believed that if it was too much, it was going to get addressed later on. He stated that he thinks we just grant the waiver because the students there as well as Washington Street, I think can't use not enough lights sometimes because people drive awful fast on that road.

Motion to Waive light spillage as shown on the plan and if there are any complaints the applicant will address it, for 704 Washington Street, Site Plan Application. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion for Condition of Approval for 704 Washington Street, Site Plan Application, the final layout plan should be provided to the Planning Board prior to the start of construction. Wierling. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve 704 Washington Street, Site Plan Application. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:20 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 515 West Central Street
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love stated that the Planning Board has reviewed this several times. She stated that at the last meeting they discussed having the applicant come back with more concrete information. The two attorneys have worked together to come up with a special conditions plan and there is also a traffic management plan design that goes with this.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney for the applicant Franklin Learning RE Inc., stated that pretty well sums it up. He stated that he worked with the Planning Board's counsel to come up with a set of final conditions that are before the Planning Board now. He stated that he thinks the Planning Board's concern was what

happens when they get to 100 percent. He stated that they basically mirrored the earlier language so when it gets to 100 percent the applicant will notify the Planning Board and it will start the clock ticking and then the same process.

Town's counsel, Attorney Brian Winner, stated that is an accurate statement. He stated that they reviewed the special conditions one more time mechanically to make sure it flowed the way they wanted it to flow and he thinks they got to that point.

Ms. Wierling stated that she thinks there is a typo in the traffic management plan as it indicates 11 spaces and in the special conditions plan it spells out 12 spaces. Mr. Cannon asked Amanda or Josh to check this for whichever one is correct and he will rely on them for the answer. Chair Rondeau asked that whichever one it is, please make sure it is consistent. Mr. Cannon stated that he would make sure it matches.

Ms. Williams stated that she wanted to confirm that the hours are noted in the document and that normal operation is between 8 AM and 6 PM. She stated that she wanted to confirm that should those hours change for any reason whatsoever, that the traffic volumes during peak hours are adjusted accordingly and the Planning Board is notified of any operational hour changes. Mr. Cannon stated that they would have to come back to the Planning Board to modify that.

Mr. Power stated that he wanted to clarify the waste removal process and noted that they had talked about putting a gate there. He asked if anyone talk to Wendy's about cutting through their parking lot. Mr. Cannon stated that was a question that was raised last time. He stated that with the subdivision design, that is a right-of-way through there. Mr. David asked about the dumpster. He requested confirmation that the truck will enter through the Wendy's parking lot to pick up the dumpster, or is it going to come on the daycare property and then do it. He stated that he wants to see the road in the back stay as emergency access only. Mr. Cannon stated that there are two plans. He stated that the traffic management plan does state per the traffic consultant's recommendation that it is emergency access only, but per the plan for trash disposal all along it is to access around the building, get the trash, and then go right out through the Wendy's. Mr. David stated that he did not remember that the trash truck was going through the emergency access all along as they are impervious pavers; the Planning Board does not allow trash trucks to go over impervious pavers, only emergency vehicles. He stated that if it is going to exit through Wendy's, would not the Wendy's need a Limited Site Plan Modification because you are changing the use. Mr. Cannon stated no, not at all. He stated that from the early stages of this concept, it was settled on the trash disposal around the building to pick it up and keep going through the Wendy's. He stated that in terms of the access through the Wendy's site, that part of the approved subdivision, that is an access easement that is already in place. Mr. David asked if there is any way we can prove this as he does not recall that at all. Ms. Love confirmed the access through Wendy's is on the original subdivision plan that was approved in 2013 that showed an access to this property through Wendy's.

Chair Rondeau commented about the dumpster location. He asked if it is something we can evaluate during the traffic study if need be. He asked if it feasible for the trash truck to exit back out through the daycare center. Mr. Cannon stated that it is something that can be considered as an option. Mr. David stated that the picking up of the dumpster as this abuts the condos cannot not be done before 7 AM. He stated that at one time he thinks there was an issue with trash pickup prior to 7 AM at the Wendy's. Ms. Love stated that Wendy's does have a special condition when they were permitted that the dumpster pick up was to be between 7 AM and 11 AM or mid-afternoon. Mr. David stated that he would like to see the same thing happen as it would not be fair to the abutters to have this place have trash pick up prior to 7 AM. Mr. Cannon stated that is no problem. Ms. Williams stated that if they were going to set that as a condition, it would have to be extremely specific to address the concern of the safety of the children in the parking lot. Chair Rondeau that stated this should be evaluated during the traffic study. Ms. Love asked how often the trash gets picked up at the daycare. Mr. Cannon stated that he did not know but could get

the answer. Mr. Josh Kline, traffic engineer (via Zoom), stated that it is typically one to two times per week. Ms. Love asked if it was possible to do trash pickup on the weekends when there are no children at the daycare center. Mr. Cannon stated that his concern would be the remote control gate which was going to be operated by the staff to make sure it closes. He stated that he is sure his client would be very accommodating. Ms. Williams stated that they could try to have it outside of the pick up and drop off hours. Chair Rondeau stated that this should be part of the traffic study to make sure it works.

Motion to Accept the document of the decision between the Town and the applicant and with the additional notation for the traffic and dumpster to be evaluated as part of the traffic assessment, for 515 West Central Street, Site Plan Application. Rondeau. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 7:51 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

March 13, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held in the Town Council Chambers at 355 East Central Street, Franklin, MA, to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of attending the meeting live at the Town Hall, dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number, or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair; Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams; Jay Mello, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Amy Love, Town Planner.

7:00 PM Commencement/General Business

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

A. Decision: Prospect Hill Definitive Subdivision

Ms. Love stated that the Planning Board closed the public hearing on February 27, 2023. She reviewed that the following was provided in the Planning Board's meeting packet: 1. Draft decision that includes conditions from the judgement, 2. two waivers that will need to be voted, and 3. the court stipulation judgement.

Motion to Approve the following waivers: 1. §300-10.B(4)(b) – Roads shall not provide access to undeveloped land in other towns. 2. §300-10.B(4)(d) – Roads right-of-way, including cul de sacs, will be setback at least 25-feet from Town lines, for Prospect Hill Definitive Subdivision. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Include the following conditions of approval: 1. Roadway will always remain private and be maintained by homeowners and Town of Franklin will never have any responsibility to maintain it. 2. To implement condition #1, Developer will execute a private road covenant with Town and establish a homeowners association, both documents to be recorded, for Prospect Hill Definitive Subdivision. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the conditions and waivers for Prospect Hill Definitive Subdivision. Wierling. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – Initial
Zoning Amendment 23-889
Multi-Family Density
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading for Zoning Amendment 23-889, Multi-Family Density. Wierling. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that this public hearing and the next public hearing coincide with each other. Ms. Wierling made a motion to waive the reading for the next hearing so the Planning Board could talk about both items at the same time.

Motion to Waive the reading for Zoning Amendment 23-890, Inclusionary Zoning. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love discussed that the Department of Planning and Community Development has worked during the last several months to develop zoning bylaw amendments recommended in the Franklin for All zoning project and the Town's 2022 Housing Production Plan (HPP). Recent work, including the two subject zoning bylaw amendments, address the following: 1.) Housing density allowed within Commercial I (CI) and General Residential V (GRV) zoning districts, 2.) By-right multifamily housing, 3.) MBTA Communities requirements outlined in Section 3A of the Zoning Act, and 4.) Inclusionary Zoning. The proposed changes will create a baseline from which to address additional zoning changes including the possibility of adopting a 40R Smart Growth Overlay District and accessory dwelling units.

Ms. Love reviewed Zoning Bylaw Amendment 23-890, Inclusionary Zoning. She discussed that the zoning bylaw amendment adds a new section to the Town's Zoning Bylaw: §185-51 Inclusionary Zoning. Multifamily developments with 10 or more housing units will be required to have at least ten percent of the housing units available for rent (or purchase) by eligible individuals or households making less than 80 percent of the area wide median household income. Additional specifics are included in the documents in the meeting packet.

Ms. Love reviewed Zoning Bylaw Amendment 23-889, Multifamily Housing Density. She discussed that the proposed bylaw makes several small changes to Part VI of the Use Regulations tables. Most importantly, it allows multifamily housing in the CI and GRV zoning districts by-right, up to one unit per 2,250 sq. ft. of lot area, and it allows the developer to apply for additional density by special permit. The following wording is included in the Use Regulations table related to multifamily housing of four or more units in CI and GRV: No more than one dwelling unit per 2,250 sq. ft. of lot area may be permitted, additional dwelling units may be allowed by special permit from the Planning Board. Another important change was replacing one row in the Residential Use Regulations table with two rows, which define two types of multifamily housing: 6.1 Multifamily or Apartment a. with four or more housing units, b. with three housing units. Splitting the use into two allows a three-unit development to be allowed in certain districts where other larger multifamily developments are not. Additional specifics are included in the documents in the meeting packet. She stated that the Planning Board can recommend these zoning amendments as is, recommend with changes, or not recommend to the Town Council.

Planning Board members asked questions. Ms. Wierling stated that there were many meetings with the EDC. She confirmed current density in CI and GRV is 1,000 sq. ft. per unit and it is looking to be changed to 2,250 sq. ft. She stated that she has a hard time with 20 units per acre and feels it should stay with what was originally recommended by the Planning Department which was about 15 units per acre. She stated that there is a provision to allow for more units by special permit by the Planning Board. She stated that the Planning Board should have this option if it is going to be more than 15 units per acre. She stated that regarding inclusionary zoning, she thinks 10 units is pretty high and would like to see it a little lower, such as eight units. Mr. Power asked what if the Town does not conform with the MBTA requirements. Ms. Love stated that if we do not conform with them, we will not qualify for grants. She noted that in the last two years, the Town has received over \$6 million in grants and stated that we would not be able to apply for those grants. Mr. Power asked about the Franklin for All meetings and asked what was the general tone of the feedback. He asked if most of the public was in favor of these zoning changes. Ms. Love stated that the people definitely wanted less housing. Mr. Power said that so we are going ahead

as a Town and wanting more housing; it is a conflict. Mr. Rondeau stated that this is encouraging more housing but on a smaller scale per se. Ms. Williams asked if a decision needed to be made tonight.

Chair Rondeau stated that this is something the Town wants to move forward with, so a decision should be made by the next meeting. Ms. Love stated that this meeting could be continued, and if there are any questions that need to be answered, she can bring those answers to the next meeting. She stated that it was discussed heavily at the EDC and there has been a lot of back and forth with the plan itself.

Chair Rondeau stated that the Steering Committee consisted of Zoning Board of Appeals, Planning Board, and Town Council so there were a lot of different people involved and they came to a compromise. He stated that what we have in front of us is what we are hearing from everyone else and what the boards are looking for. He stated that he thinks that where we are is where we need to be. He explained that all the lots that come before the Planning Board will be irregularly shaped. Therefore, the sideline variances will close in the number of units. Ms. Williams discussed that every lot is different. Chair Rondeau asked if the Planning Board members were comfortable.

Mr. Mello confirmed that the ultimate decision for this is by the Town Council; the Planning Board is acting in an advisory capacity. He discussed that it would be a whole lot of grant money for us to lose. He asked if Ms. Love had a sense of what might be coming down from the state if we do not do this. Ms. Love stated that this meets the guidelines; she said that she cannot say that this change is going to get us there 100 percent as we are still working out the numbers. She stated that we have to comply by December 2024. She stated that this is a direction that the Town has wanted to go in for years and it does meet the model; these regulations would comply. Mr. Mello asked what else would happen to the Town besides loss of grant money if we did not comply. Ms. Wierling explained that the original proposal was 15 units per acre and this increases it to 20 units per acre. Chair Rondeau stated that he thinks this will help with the Master Plan.

Director of Planning and Community Development Brian Taberner (via Zoom) discussed MBTA compliance. He stated that it is true that we are supposed to have zoning in place within one-half mile of an MBTA station with a gross density of at least 15 units by right. He stated that the MAPC is working with the Town on the model. He stated that what we are proposing gets us in the right direction. He does not recommend a higher density allowed by right. He stated that he thinks this is good for developers as they know what they can get by right; if they want more, they can go to the Planning Board for a special permit. He stated that regarding inclusionary zoning, you do not need one until you get to the tenth housing unit. He explained that the version that is in front of the Planning Board tonight is a compromise in many ways; it gives us what we need for the MBTA Communities, and a developer does not have to go through the special permit process. He stated that it needs to be 15 per acre gross density meaning that you eliminate areas that are not developable and a variety of other things. He explained that these two zoning districts are not going to be all that we need to do to meet the MBTA requirements. This is giving us a good chunk of what is required, but we have to do more. He stated that downtown commercial is one of the zones that we need. He stated that we have to allow housing on the first floor in the downtown commercial zone for us to count that district which is something that I do not believe we should be allowed to. He stated that we do not want someone ripping down a block of downtown and putting up an apartment building with no commercial and no mixed use; it is bad planning. He stated that he did not want to overcomplicate tonight's meeting. He said that what we have is what we believe is in the best interest of the town to get us going in the right direction, and it allows developers to know what they can do by right and for a special permit. Chair Rondeau stated that this can be addressed in the future as well. Mr. Taberner stated that we should have done this five to 10 years ago and built upon it.

Ms. Williams stated that she thinks the inclusionary zoning is a huge win. She asked about GRV. She stated that she would hate to see the character of the neighborhoods be knocked down to make way for

what is being proposed tonight. Mr. Taberner stated that he would like to see Residential IV divided into two or three different subdistricts and Residential V could be done the same way. He stated that he thinks that allowing the Master Plan process to take a hard look at zoning changes like that should be done.

Chair Rondeau stated that it breaks down to about 19 units per 2,250 sq. ft. Mr. Mello asked what does it mean in terms of the size of the unit. Mr. Brad Chaffee, Camford Property Group, builder/developer, stated that if we are dealing with odd shaped lots, ledge, or wetlands, this is not easy to do. This is a very small scale. He stated that an apartment size in a one-half acre lot, you will get about eight units of 800-1,000 sq. ft. which is good for apartments; however, if you want ownership, that is too small. Ms. Wierling stated that she thinks we should be looking at a lower number as we are not going to get anything out of this. Mr. Chaffee stated that regarding inclusionary zoning, this is a boutique size. He stated that when you get into small, boutiquey stuff, it is crumbs and is not helping anything; when you get into the larger developments, you are getting decades of it at one shot.

Mr. Patrick Gallagher, 2 Cohasset Way, real estate and development attorney, Chair Conservation Commission, stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself. He stated that he represents many developers who are doing the 200- and 300-unit projects, and he represents a lot of developers who are doing 10- and 20-unit projects in Boston. He explained that adding an affordable unit to a six- or eight-unit project in his experience is not financeable which is a challenge the Town will run into if you are requiring a lower threshold to trigger the affordability requirement. He stated that he thinks it is important to balance this. He discussed the lower affordability by upzoning.

Ms. Melanie Hamblen, 70 Daniels Street, Town Council member, Chair of the EDC, Chair of Franklin for All Steering Committee, stated that we started in 2019 when MAPC did an economic development study, which was obvious that people want more housing, which is why we did the Franklin for All project to figure out how we could rezone things. She said that the changes before the Planning Board are just the beginning of the things we have been discussing in the Franklin for All meetings. She stated that we have discussed this for a long time. She said that we took into account what people said and what they wanted from the surveys, discussions with developers, different meetings, focus groups, as well as MBTA guidelines and Housing Production Plan. She stated that we agreed unanimously to move this forward. She discussed the action plan for Franklin MBTA Communities has been approved until the end of 2024. She stated that therefore, Franklin can continue to apply for Massport grants. She stated that as we save open space, we still have to allow for new growth especially in areas that already have infrastructure. She noted that new growth has slowed down which will have an effect on the budget, so we can allow increased density and builders can build by right. She said that we loosen up the regulations and allow for natural growth. She reviewed the inclusionary zoning bylaw. She stated that they found out that people really like 2, 3, and up to 12-unit buildings. She said that they like having commercial down at the first floor and units above.

Motion to Recommend to Town Council Zoning Amendment 23-889, Multi-Family Density, and Zoning Amendment 23-890, Inclusionary Zoning. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love noted that the public hearings had to be closed before voting to recommend.

Motion to Close the public hearings for Zoning Amendment 23-889, Multi-Family Density, and Zoning Amendment 23-890, Inclusionary Zoning. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Recommend to Town Council Zoning Amendment 23-889, Multi-Family Density, and Zoning Amendment 23-890, Inclusionary Zoning. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
Zoning Amendment 23-890
Inclusionary Zoning
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

This public hearing was discussed along with the preceding public hearing; please see above.

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 7:56 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

March 27, 2023 Meeting Minutes

Chair Gregory Rondeau called the above-captioned meeting held in the Town Council Chambers at 355 East Central Street, Franklin, MA, to order this date at 7:00 PM. The public had the option of attending the meeting live at the Town Hall, dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number, or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; William David, Vice Chair; Beth Wierling, Clerk; Rick Power; Jennifer Williams; Jay Mello, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Town Planner; Gary James, BETA Group, Inc.

7:00 PM Commencement/General Business

Chair Rondeau reviewed the Zoom platform call-in phone number and the Zoom link which were provided on the meeting agenda. The meeting was audio and video recorded.

A. 81-P ANR: 585 King Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the applicant submitted a Form A application for an 81-P Plan review. The site is located in the Industrial zoning district. The applicant is proposing to combine five lots into one parcel. She stated that DPCD provided a map that outlines the parcels to be combined. The applicant meets all requirements for an 81-P approval not required.

Motion to Approve the 81-P ANR for 585 King Street. Power. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Limited Site Plan: 461 West Central Street

Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon Inc. on behalf of the applicant "Three" restaurant stated that they are requesting authorization to construct a trench drain that would go around the backside of the patio to improve the drainage. She reviewed the construction of the patio and stated that when it rains it adds to much water to the area and the trees do not grow. She stated that the applicant is looking to add seven light posts to the area to improve safety in the parking lot.

Mr. Maglio stated that they do not see any issues with adding lighting to the parking lot. He discussed that the proposed trench drain is shown connecting directly to a nearby existing manhole. He recommended installing a deep sump catch basin with hood after the proposed trench drain to provide water quality benefits prior to discharging to the existing manhole. He noted that all proposed drain pipes should be reinforced concrete pipe; HDPE or PVC is typically allowed for some connections such as the trench drain to catch basin connection, but their use should be limited under paved areas.

Chair Rondeau asked about lighting spillage onto adjacent lots. Ms. Cavaliere stated that the restaurant is located higher than the business below, so they do not see the little bit of spillage as excessive lighting. Ms. Wierling discussed the lighting and stated that even though it is not residential, it still seems too much and it could be brought down. Ms. Cavaliere stated that they could put some shields on some of the lights. She stated that it was more for the safety. Chair Rondeau stated that if they could cut back on the spillage, it would be appreciated. Ms. Cavaliere stated they could do that.

Ms. Love stated concern about the light spillage. She stated that the applicant is not required to file with the Conservation Commission, and BETA was not asked to review the plan.

Motion to Approve the Limited Site Plan for 461 West Central Street with the condition that light spillage is brought down to close to zero at the property line with some shielding, and the use of concrete pipe. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
15 Liberty Way
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that this site plan modification is for 15 Liberty Way located in the Industrial zoning district. The proposed project includes the construction of new pavement to expand the existing driveway and truck parking areas for the existing warehouse. The applicant is required to file an NOI with the Conservation Commission. She noted that review letters have been received from BETA, DPW and Fire. She reviewed her following comments: 1. Include the entire building with existing parking spaces on the site plan, 2. Provide on the Site Plan the curbing details, 3. Provide parking lot details, such as travel ways and spaces on the new proposed lot, 4. Provide snow storage, 5. Provide the square footage of the new parking area and striping on the plans, and 6. Provide a diagram showing fire truck access.

Mr. Maglio reviewed his letter to the Planning Board dated March 22, 2023, and noted that in addition to the MADEP Stormwater Standards, the project must also comply with the standards under the Town's Stormwater Management bylaw. He reviewed that in addition to not increasing the peak rate of stormwater runoff from the site, the proposal must also not increase the peak volume of runoff from a site. The applicant should include a table in the stormwater report comparing the pre- vs. post-runoff volumes to go along with the comparison of runoff flow rates. He reviewed that the proposed underground infiltration system appears to be designed to sit below the seasonal high groundwater based on the test pit data. While the design includes an impervious liner surrounding the system, he is concerned with the long-term water tightness of such a large system and its ability to safely separate the stored runoff from groundwater. He reviewed that the designer indicates that no recharge is being proposed due to poor soil conditions, but also indicates that the test pits indicate sand loam soils which correspond to an infiltration rate of 1.02" per hour. MADEP Stormwater Standards require recharge unless the infiltration rate is lower than 0.17" per hour.

Mr. Daniel Campbell of Level Design Group stated that they are proposing a parking lot at the rear of the 15 Liberty Way building, and they have addressed some of Ms. Love's comments. He stated that they have also provided a photometric plan and a landscape plan which addressed some of the questions. He stated that he has met with the conservation agent on site; the conservation agent feels that the existing detention basin is a wetland under Town jurisdiction. He stated that it is a drain basin inside of an existing drainage easement and is fully lined with riprap, but we are going to go through the steps. He stated that they have retained Goddard Consulting to evaluate the basin as well as the tributary swale to the basin, and they are going to file with the Conservation Commission and get that determination prior to making any modifications. He stated that the reason they do not have responses to BETA's comments is exactly that; they do not want to respond and have to start the process over again knowing the conservation agent has asked us to do that filing. He stated that he would address some of the comments made regarding the existing landscape buffer. He showed and reviewed the landscaping plan adjacent to the parking lot. He reviewed the DPW's sewer easement along the back of the site. He stated that they are intending to

expand truck parking. He stated that they will address all comments after they are done with the conservation process.

Ms. Wierling asked what is required when submitting a site plan. She stated that she is not seeing the entirety of the site. Ms. Love stated that it requires that the entire site is shown on the plans. Mr. Campbell stated that it requires that the entire site is shown on the plans, but it does not require a detailed existing conditions plan of the entire property. He stated that they surveyed the area that they plan to work in. He reviewed the impervious is 57.8 percent of the total site area, so they are still well below the 80 percent. Ms. Williams stated that she would like to see the full site in its entirety so they can get a better understanding of overall impervious existing to proposed. Mr. Campbell stated they will have an existing conditions plan, but they are not providing topography for the entire property. He touched upon lighting and stated that they prepared a photometric plan based on fire department comments. He reviewed that it took time to meet with the conservation agent on site. He confirmed that this is for trailer storage for approximately 50 additional trailers. He stated that there would be no modifications to the building.

Ms. Love asked if May 8, 2023, would work for continuing the hearing.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 15 Liberty Way, Site Plan Application, to May 8, 2023. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
 25 Forge Parkway
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Rondeau. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Mr. Philip Cordeiro of Allen & Major Associates and Mr. Matt Clark, owner of TMC Holdings and the applicant on the project, addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cordeiro stated that the owner is the existing occupant of the building at 25 Forge Parkway. He reviewed that the application is for the construction of a 16,000 sq. ft. warehouse addition to the project and 17 parking spaces to support the warehouse use. He showed and explained the plans. He stated that they know who they want to market this toward, but they do not have tenants at this time. He stated that everything on the plans meets with industrial zone standards. He stated that they could talk about the required landscaping at an upcoming hearing. He noted that all stormwater will be in compliance. He stated that they have a conservation component and have started the NOI process and peer review process with Conservation Commission. He stated that they will address fire department concerns prior to the next meeting, and they look forward to working with Mr. James of BETA regarding his comments.

Ms. Love stated that the applicant is proposing the construction of a 16,000 sq. ft. bay building addition, 17 additional parking spaces, and a contractor yard. She stated that the applicant is required to file with the Conservation Commission. She noted that the applicant is providing cape cod berm which in the past the Planning Board has looked for concrete. She stated that the applicant should submit a landscaping plan and address the concerns of the fire department as they requested an access road north of the building addition. She stated that if they do not have a tenant, she does not know how that would affect parking such as office versus warehouse.

Mr. Maglio stated that regarding the stormwater, not to increase the peak rate of runoff. He stated that he had a concern with the location of the discharge point from the infiltration system right at the property line, and he wants to make sure it is not causing any problems on the adjacent property. He stated that the plans call for plastic drainage pipe and it requires reinforced concrete. He stated that there is one hydrant

proposed to be removed, and the applicant should coordinate with the fire department to see if there is an additional hydrant needed.

Mr. James reviewed his letter to the Planning Board dated March 13, 2023, regarding BETA's review comments which was provided in the meeting packet. He noted his primary/major points. He discussed that one issue is that currently there is quite a bit of cape cod berm, and they were going to continue that across; however, he recommended that on the backside where they have the 2:1 slope, they should have a 7 in. reveal associated with the vertical curb just for safety's sake. He noted his concern regarding the impervious. He recommended TSS/treatment prior to discharge coming out onto Forge Parkway. Mr. Cordeiro stated that they will look at those comments and noted the curbing safety aspect.

Mr. Mello stated that he looked at the infiltration chambers and relative to the test pit data it is getting close to groundwater depth. He noted hydraulic grading analysis and asked that in lieu of a further analysis, would they be amenable to raising the bottom of the stone. Mr. Cordeiro stated BETA raised this concern also, and they are looking to determine if a deeper test pit is warranted.

Planning Board members asked questions and made comments. Mr. David asked if there is going to be a contractor's yard. Mr. Cordeiro stated that it would be equipment and palletized materials, on-the-ground storage, and during business hours. Chair Rondeau stated that this should not interfere with parking. He confirmed that there would not be any contaminants or hazardous waste in the three dumpsters. He noted that this is a change of use. He stated that at the connection point at the front of the building to keep it cape cod berm, but he recommended granite and/or reinforced concrete for the balance of the parking lot. He asked if there would be any gravel removal. Mr. Cordeiro said there will be export of the material but not gravel removal for saleable purpose. Chair Rondeau stated that if it was going to be more than 1,500 removed, the applicant would have to go to ZBA.

Ms. Wierling asked about the equipment and storage area and if they can stripe a line to mark the area. Mr. Cordeiro stated yes. He stated that they will talk through the fire department's comments with the fire department.

Discussion commenced regarding the meeting date that this item should be continued.

Motion to Continue the public hearing for 25 Forge Parkway, Site Plan Application, to April 24, 2023. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Chair and Member Comments

Ms. Williams stated that our zoning bylaws say that they can have up to 80 percent impervious coverage by right. She stated that we just saw two projects that are clear cutting forests for parking lots, but they are allowed to do it by right. She asked can we propose a change to our bylaws that requires some sort of planting or additional way to make up for all of that impervious coverage or make up for all the clear cutting that is happening. She stated that it feels like it is not in the spirit of what our town is trying to get to being a Green Community by allowing this type of clear cutting to happened in various developments.

Chair Rondeau asked if Ms. Williams was thinking about a tree-to-tree situation or beef up the landscaping. Mr. Mello stated that he was being devil's advocate. He stated that we have to allow for use within the industrial zone and that is where the impervious number comes from; it is what is required for the full use of the property to make it economically feasible. He stated that secondary to that, in making a decision like that, he would want to see some data. He asked how much industrial property is left in Franklin that has not been developed to the full 80 percent and how is that relative to other undeveloped property in Franklin.

Discussion commenced on Ms. Williams's idea and how the impervious could be reduced or a requirement of tree replication. Mr. James stated that he could speak with BETA's climate resiliency officer and see what she thinks. Ms. Wierling suggested looking at the landscape requirements/planting schedule. Mr. Mello asked Mr. James if he has any experience with a forest replication bylaw, and he asked Mr. Maglio what type of effort it would be to overlay the industrial districts on a map. Ms. Wierling described a situation in another town that she was aware of where they had an arborist come in and count trees over a certain caliper size which then had to be replaced or the project had to pay into a fund to provide the trees elsewhere. Discussion commenced on where the trees were required to be replaced in this town, and suggestions were made as to ways to do carbon credits beyond tree-for-tree. Ms. Williams stated that the town, as a Green Community, should consider the impact. Mr. James said that he knows a community that has a tree bylaw, and he will copy it and send it to Amy so she can distribute it.

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 7:59 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary