

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

February 5, 2024 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 dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; Beth Wierling, Vice Chair; Jennifer Williams, Clerk (via Zoom); Jay Mello; Christopher Stickney; Mark Mucciarone, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Amy Love, Planner; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group (via Zoom).

7:00 PM **Commencement**

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.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
15 Liberty Way
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love suggested a continuance to February 26, 2024.

Motion to Continue 15 Liberty Way, Site Plan Application, to February 26, 2024. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 3-0-0 (3-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
100-110 East Central Street
Site Plan Application & Special Permit
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Mello. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Williams-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Mr. Rick Goodreau of United Consultants and Mr. Brad Chaffee, owner/applicant, addressed the Planning Board to construct a mixed-use three-story building with 20 residential units and 1 commercial unit. He stated that Mr. Chaffee's 94 East Central Street project is underway, the 70/72 East Central Street projects have been completed in the past few years, and the 122/138 East Central Street properties are under development at this time. He said that the current properties have a brick 10-unit apartment building at 100 East Central Street and a single-family residence at 110 East Central Street. The proposal is to continue to have the brick apartment building at 100 East Central Street and then a demolition and reconstruction of approximately 5,500 sq. ft. at 110 East Central Street for 20-unit apartment building with some commercial space on the first floor. He explained the plans included utilities and grading, town water and sewer, proposed stormwater system, tree planting plan, erosion control plan, construction details for the site, stormwater report, and photometric plan. He explained the two waivers that have been requested: use of PVC and HDPE pipe and some minimal light spillage. He said two review letters have

been received, and they will meet with the Conservation Commission this week. He said the two lots together are 56,329 sq. ft. He said they are two separately deeded properties that comprise this project. He said they hope to do cross-easement agreements for utilities and parking configuration. He explained that with this property there are density requirements. He said the lots have approximately 33,000 sq. ft. for the 100 East Central Street. There are 10 units which would require 22,500 sq. ft. by right. So, there is about 10,000 sq. ft. additional land. The 110 East Central Street property has approximately 22,000 sq. ft., and they are proposing 20 units there which could be allowed with a special permit from the Planning Board to increase that density. That would allow for approximately 10 units by right; we are requesting 20 units. He said we have 10,000 sq. ft. to transfer from 100 East Central Street to 110 East Central Street which would allow the density to go up from 10 units to 15 units by right on the newly proposed building. He said they did not do that because the 110 property is registered in Land Court and the 100 property is not. He said they looked at this at the global level for the entirety of the property.

Ms. Love said Mr. Goodreau gave a good overview of the site. She said the applicant requested two waivers. She said the Planning Board should note that the Town changed the zoning so that it is one unit per 2,250 sq. ft.; the lot they are proposing to add the 20 units currently allows for 10 units. The zoning says that by special permit the applicant can have additional units, and there is not a limit. She said the applicant will need to do cross easements. She said the applicant's attorney has reached out to her regarding the shared parking. She said the Planning Board must consider if 20 units is feasible under special permit.

Mr. Chaffee passed out pictures of the buildings.

Mr. Stickney asked about the three-story height and how it compares to the four-story building regarding the grade of the street. Mr. Chaffee explained the road has a bend, and the actual building steps down with the grade. He said he can bring pictures for the next meeting. He said he thinks height-wise it will fit in with what is there. He said the commercial space will be under 500 sq. ft.

Mr. Stickney asked about the tree replacement plan and noted abutters. Mr. Chaffee explained the back is a lot of rock with a big drop off. He said they can look at that further. Mr. Stickney said he would be okay with the five bonus units if they put a deed restriction or a covenant on the lot that it is not going to be improved and that it cannot be improved further beyond the existing density. Mr. Chaffee said he would be okay with that.

Mr. Mello said the retaining wall is too close to the infiltration unit. He said he understands the site is challenging because of the rock there. He discussed the drainage system and said they may need to look at just retaining and slowly releasing offsite instead of putting it back into the ground. Mr. Goodreau said the soils are not really conducive to retention. He said the stormwater regulations require them to infiltrate 1 in. of the runoff. Mr. Mello asked if the sidewalk will be ADA compliant and with wheelchair ramp. Mr. Chaffee said yes. Mr. Mello asked about the light spillage. Mr. Chaffee said it is along the sidewalk in the front, but they shield the abutters. Mr. Mello said he supports the density. He confirmed the parking density is 1.5.

Ms. Wierling said she appreciated the change of pace from the large square buildings that have no character. She said she appreciates this in the downtown. She reviewed the complexity of the lot and the request for the special permit for 10 additional units to increase the density to a total of 20 units. She confirmed they have two affordable units. She asked that the outlines of the abutting houses be shown on the site plans. She noted a typographical error on the plans regarding the address. She said she thinks it is a good project and a good area of town for it. She asked if the applicant was going to provide anything traffic related. Mr. Chaffee said he would provide that.

Ms. Williams said she thinks it looks great. She would like to see site sections latitude and longitude to understand the relationship of the proposed combined buildings in relationship to abutters and existing apartment building on the site. She asked about the curb cuts on the plans as to what is existing and what is new. Mr. Chaffee reviewed the curb cuts. Ms. Williams asked for the parking information on the existing apartment. Mr. Chaffee said about 12 or 14 depending on what they count. He explained that they want to clean up that parking. Ms. Williams confirmed there would be two affordable units. She said that overall, she echoes everything everyone else has said.

Chair Rondeau asked for the reference of the peak of the existing white house at 100 East Central Street. He asked about snow storage. He confirmed the proposed building is a footprint of just over 5,500 sq. ft. and three floors. He asked about the retaining walls and said he could not find top of walls on the renderings. He said they want the retaining walls built to design and overseen by BETA and the applicant's structural engineer. Mr. Chaffee said there would be 11 two-bedroom units, 6 one-bedroom units, and 3 three-bedroom units.

Chair Rondeau asked if there could be more commercial space than 500 sq. ft. to help the downtown. He asked about the retention basin and said that is where people are parking right now.

Mr. Stickney said that 1.5 ratio is great for multi-family only, but because there is a commercial unit, he thinks having a touch over 1.5 is important.

Mr. Mucciarone said he sees six spaces in one area on the plan, but the number seven is circled. Mr. Goodreau said he will look at that. He said they are looking at 50 spaces on both parcels.

Ms. Wierling asked where the retail space would be going. Mr. Chaffee said the front right would be glass. Ms. Wierling asked if they could accommodate an outside seating area. Mr. Chaffee said they can look at that.

Mr. Mark Minnichelli, 31 Longfellow Drive, said he strongly supports this request for proposed work and the special permit request.

Mr. Shawn O'Neill, 70 East Central Street, said he supports this project.

Motion to Continue 100-110 East Central Street, Site Plan Application & Special Permit, to March 11, 2024. Wierling. Second: Mello. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Williams-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Williams left the meeting.

7:00 PM **General Business**

A. Field Change: 515 West Central St – Retaining Wall

Ms. Love reviewed that the applicant was before the Planning Board on December 18, 2023, to allow for the installation of permeable pavement in place of the previously proposed Stormcrete pervious pavers north of the building and for changes to the retaining wall which plans are provided. She noted comments from the December 18, 2023, Planning Board meeting including that Chair Rondeau asked the applicant to have the Conservation Commission document with a letter the change of asphalts and make sure it is followed though, provide test reports and inspections for the back fill and back of wall, provide proof there are no sections that are higher than 8 ft., and add a fence on the top of the retaining wall and show it on the drawing. She said the Conservation Commission has agreed to the changes that the applicant made with the pavement. She said BETA has been working on the test reports and inspections needed. She said

the applicant said the retaining wall is not more than 8 ft., and they will be adding a fence on top of the retaining wall.

Mr. Crowley said that after the last meeting, the only remaining concerns were related to the permeable pavement. He said the designer has increased the thickness of the pavement as requested and provided requested infiltration. He said they are satisfied with that. He said BETA has a few things that the Planning Board can condition which he reviewed. He said there should also be a condition that if the pavement were to be replaced in the future, it cannot be replaced with conventional pavement unless it is permitted to do so.

Mr. Michael Hassett of Guerriere and Halnon said they have reviewed BETA's letter and have no objections to the conditions they recommended. He explained that regarding the dewatering issue, there is going to be an under drain behind the retaining wall that is lower than ordinarily seen.

Ms. Love said that Conservation Commission has already given a thumbs up. She said she can write up a letter to have the Planning Board chair sign with the recommendations and the conditions set in the field change.

Motion to Approve the Field Change for 515 West Central St – Retaining Wall, with any outstanding BETA items addressed or incorporated as part of the approval. Wierling. Second: Mello. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Chair Rondeau asked where do they stand with the existing retaining wall and the abutter's retaining wall with the excavation. Mr. Hassett said his understanding is that they were beginning to do the installation of the wall and then they wanted to make sure the shoring was correct and are working with a shoring company to make sure the excavation is safe. Chair Rondeau asked for an update because the existing wall at Presidential Arms could have potentially been undermined on this excavation. Mr. Hassett said he will have Mr. Ben Stone, project manager for Stukel Group, get back to Chair Rondeau.

Ms. Love explained that it is up to the engineer and the owner to provide structural engineer reports to the Building Commissioner when they pull their permit for the retaining wall. Chair Rondeau explained that he has done many of these walls. He said this is a public safety thing, and he wants to make sure it is done correctly.

Chair and Member Comments

Chair Rondeau said whether we put it in our rules and regulations, he thinks that any retaining wall coming to the Planning Board moving forward, four feet or greater of exposed space, the Planning Board has its discretion whether we want to have BETA inspect it as it is going in per the design, not to say that it is right or wrong, but just to have them as an oversight and take this off of the Building Commissioner, because like I say, he is not a structural engineer and BETA has a structural engineer and then the applicants will pay for this. He said, unfortunately, we are two for two right now, and I do not want to go three for three. Planning Board members said they agreed with this.

Ms. Love said they could do that. She explained that when projects get approved, we put that in the conditions. She noted this can be discussed in the pre-construction meeting.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
0 Upper Union Street Solar Project
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Agenda item not taken.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 25 Forge Parkway
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Agenda item not taken.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 Uncas Avenue
 Special Permit & Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Agenda item not taken.

Motion to Adjourn the Planning Board Meeting. Wierling. Second: Mello. Vote: 4-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Meeting adjourned at 7:50 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 26, 2024 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 dialing into the meeting using the provided phone number or participating by copying the provided link. Members in attendance: Gregory Rondeau, Chair; Beth Wierling, Vice Chair; Jennifer Williams, Clerk (via Zoom); Jay Mello (via Zoom); Christopher Stickney (via Zoom); Mark Mucciarone, associate member. Members absent: None. Also present: Michael Maglio, Town Engineer; Amy Love, Planner; Matthew Crowley, BETA Group.

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: 25 Forge Parkway

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board voted to approve the Site Plan for 25 Forge Parkway on February 5, 2024. She said the Certificate of Vote has been added to the Site Plans.

Motion to Endorse 25 Forge Parkway. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

B. Final Form H: 725 Union Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board approved a Site Plan for 725 Union Street on March 25, 2019, for a Special Permit for height of the building. She said it is for the hotel that was constructed at the site. She said BETA reviewed the as-built plans and submitted a comment letter. She said there were several outstanding items. She recommended a Partial Form H with the applicant fulfilling the items that BETA has requested. She said the engineer is on Zoom and Mr. Crowley of BETA is in attendance.

Mr. Crowley noted that at their site walk, there were still some minor items needing to be addressed which he reviewed including modifications to some of the plantings and there was not a no parking fire lane sign. He explained the applicant received a waiver for reduced number of parking spaces; however, there were only 99 spaces on the site. He said there is a ramp coming from the sidewalk on Union Street, but there is not a ramp on the sidewalk adjacent to the hotel.

Ms. Wierling said she had no issues voting to approve a Partial Form H as long as they correct the items noted by BETA. Ms. Williams said she was okay with approving a partial. Mr. Stickney said he agreed, and he would like to see the hundredth parking space given it is a hotel.

Brian, site superintendent in charge of building the project, explained one of the parking spots was moved and located to another area; however, there are 100 spots which did not change. Mr. Crowley said they could work that out. Brian said the signs would be done this week. He said the ramp cannot be done due to the elevations. Mr. Crowley explained the location of the ramp that was not there.

Mr. Maglio said that where there is a ramp on one side and the crosswalk there, with the ramp missing on the other side, it might be an issue with the architectural access board at the state level. He said maybe it is something they can get a variance for; it is something that probably needs to be addressed to comply with state regulations.

Motion to Issue a Partial Form H Certificate of Completion for 725 Union Street, addressing all of the outstanding items noted in BETA's February 21, 2024, letter and confirming parking spots as well as ADA access for the crosswalk. Wierling. Second: Mello. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

C. Final Form H: 340 East Central Street

Mr. Joe Halligan, project owner, stated he was here for a Final Form H. He stated that he believes all issues have been addressed.

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board approved a Site Plan on October 5, 2020, that included two residential buildings and commercial/retail space. She said the applicant has submitted a Final Form H for the entire site. She said a Partial Form H was approved in December 2023 for the residential building at 332 East Central Street, also referred to as Building B. She said BETA reviewed the as-built plans and submitted a comment letter.

Mr. Crowley said this site was previously before the Planning Board three times for various Partial Forms H. He said the BETA report is for the entire site. He said there are a couple of punch list type things including moving a silt fence, some of the residential signage has not been put up yet, and they are waiting for the electric vehicle charging stations. He explained a concern regarding a ramp and noted that the applicant solved the issue. He said they noticed the patio in front of the residential building looked steep; he asked the building commissioner to take a look at it to make sure it complied with accessibility guidelines. He stated the applicant is going to fix a section that is not in compliance.

Ms. Wierling said she wanted to chat about the patio area. Mr. Halligan reviewed that there was an issue with what the cross pitch would be, and there cannot be more than 2 percent. He said the whole patio complies. He said the building commissioner was out there today; they found the tan area is 2.2 percent. He said rather than break up all the concrete and just repour that, it was figured that they would put rod iron chairs facing the building, rod iron seating, and some plantings in the area which will also give some screening from the intersection. He said there is more than sufficient patio area there.

Ms. Wierling confirmed that the beige area on the provided diagram will be fenced in and have landscaping in there so folks will not be going in. Mr. Halligan said yes. He said the rest of the patio is 2 percent or less and passed.

Ms. Williams said she is wondering when the rest of the EV charging stations will be installed. She said she wonders how they can monitor that. Mr. Halligan said their current company installed two stations, and they will only install more when the uses start to get better. He said as the building gets occupied and used, they will be adding more.

Chair Rondeau asked if the patio design and fencing would have to go before Design Review. Ms. Love said no, unless they change the landscaping. Mr. Halligan noted the dumpster gates. Chair Rondeau said he would like to see the signage. Mr. Halligan explained the location of the bollards in the middle of the parking lot. He said he would prefer to spray paint reserved/residential only on the parking spots. He said he thinks the bollards are going to be difficult in the parking lot. Chair Rondeau said you would not see the spray paint in the winter. Mr. Halligan said he could put them in.

Chair Rondeau said it was lavender trim on the building, not white trim as was agreed to. Mr. Halligan said Design Review approved all the materials and a board was brought in with all the samples that were approved. Ms. Love said she can ask Design Review for those. Ms. Wierling said it has to be the right color of what was approved. Mr. Halligan said he understands. Ms. Love said the applicant should show the colors that were provided, and she can go back to Design Review and show them to see if it matches up with the colors that were approved.

Chair Rondeau explained they would make this a Partial Form H with the balance of patio, Design Review with the trim, dumpster enclosure, and signage.

Mr. Stickney said he wanted to revisit the EV charging stations since they are going with a partial. He asked what happens if they are never installed or the electric company does not think they are feasible. He said he would like to keep that item open.

Ms. Wierling said to note outstanding items as noted on BETA's February 16, 2024, letter. Mr. Halligan said he thinks everything will be completed by the end of the week except the EV charging stations. He reiterated the company hired installs more stations based on use. Ms. Wierling requested an email update status in six months. Mr. Halligan stated he would.

Motion to Issue Partial Form H Certificate of Completion for 340 East Central Street, addressing all of the outstanding items noted in BETA's February 16, 2024, letter and addressing all items discussed tonight. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Mr. Halligan confirmed that this Partial Form H will allow him to get occupancy in the front building. Chair Rondeau said yes.

D. Discussion: 444 East Central Street – CH 40B

Ms. Love reviewed that DPCD gathered the following comments from the January 22, 2024, meeting for the Friendly 40B for 265 units: turn the clubhouse main entrance towards the street and provide parking behind the building; consider the 56-unit building located on the east side and closest to an abutter be three stories; apply with Design Review; use elevation on the site to hide the buildings or ways to make the buildings look smaller by providing an elevation study; provide a shadow study for the four-story building to see the shadow cast onto the abutters; suggested parking requirement of 1.35 seems low, and 1.5 would seem a little better; look to add more three-story buildings and fewer four-story buildings decreasing the unit count; drop off and pick up area for bus/GATRA; show the free-standing garages on the concept plan; and what is the total impervious coverage amount. She said the applicant has provided a response and revised Site Plans included in the submission. She said Conservation Commission provided a letter to recommend to Town Council.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney on behalf of the applicant Tag Central, LLC; Mr. A. J. Alevizos of TAG Central, LLC; and Mr. Brian O'Connor of Cube 3 addressed the Planning Board. Mr. O'Connor showed the plans and reviewed some of the changes to the proposed plan. He pointed out two buildings on the east side and said the plan was reworked. He said the buildings closest to the neighbors are now three stories. He said they also flipped the building and the parking increasing the distance from the neighbors' homes to the buildings. He said the closest of the three-story buildings is 430 ft. away from East Central Street; it was 310 ft. He noted that the four-story buildings on the top section of the plan are about 415 ft. away from the road. He said that locations of the proposed smaller garages are noted. He said they increased the total parking on the site by 25 spaces; they are proposing approximately 1.45 spaces per unit. He said they added the walking paths around the river. He explained the location of the clubhouse. He said most of the changes were at the requested of the Planning Board.

Ms. Wierling said she appreciates the changes made. She said the Planning Board is making a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals as they will make a decision on the plan. She said she still thinks there is more work to do on the plan. She said at this time, she can make a recommendation. Mr. Mucciarone said he agrees with the comments made by Ms. Wierling.

Ms. Williams asked why is fire access required on the west side across from the clubhouse. Mr. Alevizos said that in working with the fire department, that access road was required in case of an emergency; they wanted an extra path to get around to access the western portion of the site. He discussed that there is an existing easement with the adjacent property. Ms. Williams said she appreciates what they did with the east portion of the site for the neighbors. She said she would have liked the clubhouse or entry experience to be responsive to the immediate context of Central Street; otherwise, this is improvement overall. She suggested that she wanted to extend the access along the wetlands. She said she hopes the ZBA will consider these comments as well. Mr. Alevizos said this site plan does not have the level of detail that they will show in the future. They will have unimpeded pedestrian connections sidewalks connecting from the residential buildings all the way to East Central Street.

Mr. Stickney noted the four-story buildings now have 64 units instead of 56 units. He asked if the buildings were elongated as other building were decreased to three stories. Mr. O'Connor said the footprints were enlarged to make up the differential loss.

Chair Rondeau asked if the fire access road would be gated across from the clubhouse. Mr. Alevizos said yes. Chair Rondeau asked about the sewer and water discharge and if there is the capacity for the water; he would like to see paperwork. Mr. Maglio said they looked at the sewer capacity and it will be evaluated. Chair Rondeau said they will be looking at a full traffic study for this project.

Mr. Mello said he is okay with the clubhouse location. He said he hopes the ZBA looks at some elevations across the site. He said he is comfortable supporting this moving forward.

Chair Rondeau noted that this is a Friendly 40B. He noted that this falls under the ZBA. He said this is a recommendation by the Planning Board that will go to Town Council that will go to the ZBA.

Mr. Gino Carlucci, 1 Toni Lane, said that with the Franklin for All project and MBTA Communities, there is a lot of talk about walkability in Franklin. He said this project has potential to help with that; however, it does the opposite of that with the location of the clubhouse and the frontage consisting of a driveway loop and parking spaces. He said he recommended that the clubhouse be moved parallel to the street to help frame the street and screen the buildings in the back. He said a Friendly 40B is supposed to be a cooperative endeavor between the Town and the developer. He said that streetscape is a key component of walkability. He said he submitted a letter to the Planning Board with four points. He said he recommends that the Planning Board recommends to the Town Council that they support it as a 40B with the condition that the clubhouse be moved to the front.

Ms. Wierling provided a copy of Mr. Carlucci's letter to Mr. Alevizos. Mr. Alevizos said that in regard to moving the clubhouse, there is a small section of wetlands that exists in between the roundabout driveway, so they are very limited where they can put the building. He explained why it is set back further.

Mr. Maxwell Morrongiello, 127 Central Park Terrace, said he echoed the comments of Mr. Carlucci about walkability. He discussed an epidemic of loneliness nationwide. He said they have to design communities so people talk to one another. He said he does not see the ability for people to socialize and

talk and interact with the neighbors. He said he was wondering if there could be a common grill area or common yard or area to socialize. He discussed a pedestrian path to the Big Y.

Mr. Alevizos talked about the gathering spaces and amenities and said they will have multiple outdoor grilling stations, dog park, outdoor pool, and clubhouse. He discussed walkability and that they will be providing a connecting sidewalk to the sidewalk that currently ends at the medical building.

Motion to Recommend 444 East Central Street – CH 40B to Town Council and Zoning Board of Appeals as submitted; however, if any ability to include any of the items changes dated February 21, 2024 from the DPCD, and review of Mr. Carlucci's letter, and comments by Mr. Morrongiello. Wierling. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
Maplegate Solar South
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love stated that the applicant wanted to give an update. She said they are still in front of the Conservation Commission. She stated that her comment regards her special conditions which she will continue to put on her recommendation letter.

Mr. Greg DiBona of Bohler Engineering (via Zoom) said he feels they are making some good progress. He said he wanted to give a quick update. He said he knows BETA has not done a full review yet. He showed on the screen the latest drawings that were submitted. He said since the original meeting in fall 2023, he discussed some of the items they have been addressing with Conservation Commission including verifying the true limit of the wetlands. He said they had to reflag some areas in January. He noted about 19 flags were in areas where the wetlands had gotten larger. He discussed the plans on the screen showing the demolition plans. He noted the restoration areas all along the limits of the wetlands. He pointed out the wetlands crossing. He said the site plan set has about 40 sheets in it. He said he wanted to note some of the big picture changes. He said the access to the parcel is through the north project which got approved last year. He said the southern project is the phase 2 of the overall development. He said because of where the crossing came in and the restoration, the equipment pads, panels, and truck turnaround area had to be moved; he explained the location changes. He stated that in regard to stormwater mitigation, they added some infiltration stone trenches along the equipment pads to pick up the runoff from the equipment pads. He said he would like to wait for BETA's new letter. He said they are going through this same process with Bellingham as well.

Chair Rondeau asked where they are with Bellingham. Mr. DiBona reviewed the dates he is before Bellingham boards. Chair Rondeau asked if the fire department reviewed the last rendition. Mr. DiBona said he would follow up with the fire department.

Ms. Love said that when they addressed parcel 1, they were going to address parcel 2 with some type of walking trails and public access, but she sees nothing coming off of Bellingham. She asked what is the plan. Mr. DiBona said that he thinks the applicant is going to provide the land for the Town's use. They are not proposing anything specific. He said they show access easements. He said there is a gravel area to be utilized as parking. He discussed the access for parcels 1, 2, and 3. Ms. Love confirmed access is through parcel 1. She said that is 100 acres that are only accessed through one point. Mr. DiBona said for them, the access is needed for the construction; once it is built, the maintenance activities are observed four times a year and a car will come down the access road. Beyond that, there is no public access; it is all gated. He discussed what they are discussing with Bellingham.

Chair Rondeau asked if Franklin could work with Bellingham on the walkable space. Ms. Love said she thinks this entire site warrants some type of outdoor activity to walk around. She said she is concerned about 100 acres with only one entrance.

Ms. Wierling suggested a letter that says Franklin supports parcel 2 as a passive recreation facility. Discussion continued on the access and the three parcels. Ms. Love said there definitely needs to be a letter from the fire department. Mr. DiBona said he will follow up with fire and get a letter. Discussion commenced on when to continue the meeting. Ms. Love confirmed she has the bond for the north, but not yet for the south. Chair Rondeau said he would like to see the bond.

Motion to Continue Maplegate Solar South, Site Plan Application, to March 11, 2024. Wierling. Second: Williams. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
10 Kenwood Circle
Site Plan Modification
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love reviewed that the proposed application is for the circulation of the traffic at the site which is also a change in use. She said cars are lining up at the site as a delivery service. She said comments from the last meeting are to add dumpsters to the site plan, show cueing lines, show stacking of cars, provide signage on plans, and provide hours of operation. She said BETA has provided a review letter but does not have any outstanding comments. She said the Planning Board must determine if they are satisfied with what the applicant provided to resolve this.

Mr. Dennis Flynn of BETA (via Zoom) provided a review of BETA’s review letter of February 7, 2024, which was based on their review of VAI’s responses to BETA’s initial comments. He said the applicant issued another letter on February 21, 2024, with further responses. He said BETA reviewed that letter and BETA has no further comments. He noted one item for consideration about seeing vehicles parked along the roadway on street, and there was some discussion about that. He said at the last Planning Board meeting, there was a desire to not accommodate parking on street. He said the applicant responded that they are offering to provide some signage along Kenwood Circle to enforce no parking. He said this item may warrant a bit more discussion. He said the site plan they saw addressed all BETA’s comments and observations.

Mr. Daniel LaCivita of Vanasse & Associates (VAI) (via Zoom) said he works with Mr. Jeffrey Dirk. He said Mr. Flynn did a good job of summing everything up. He said that he agrees with Mr. Flynn’s comment on the restriction of onsite parking. He said the applicant has committed to restricting parking along Kenwood Circle.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney on behalf of the applicant, said they received the comments from BETA, and VAI went through them and pretty much agreed on everything. He said the no parking along Kenwood is at the Planning Board’s discretion. He said all of the recommendations are fine. He noted that when BETA did their review, it was one of the busiest weeks.

Ms. Wierling said the applicant is indicating they are going to put no parking signs along Kenwood Circle which would indicate that their parking is sufficient for accommodating the trucking and movements. She asked if in their busiest season this plan would accommodate that and that there will not be cars on Kenwood Circle. Mr. Cannon said exactly. He said that they are happy to put out no parking signs. Mr.

Maglio said that any signs within the public right of way will have to be permitted through the DPW. He said that any prohibitions on parking may also have to be approved by Town Council.

Ms. Wierling said this is assuming the signage works. She asked is there an opportunity for the Planning Board or BETA after a six-month time to review this to see if it is working. Mr. Cannon said it is always the ability of the Planning Board to review to make sure it is working. Ms. Williams said she wanted to make sure it is being overseen and there is enforcement. Mr. Stickney said the same. Mr. Mello said if we need to formalize it through signs, then it should be done. Chair Rondeau said he wants to put the signs up. He wanted a duration of time for this to be reviewed at six months or nine months. Ms. Love said nine months brings this to December. Mr. Maglio said once it is in place, they will know quickly if it is working.

Ms. Wierling noted monitoring any calls from folks that there is traffic on the street again. Mr. Mucciarone asked about parking on the other side of the street as he has seen aerial views with tractors on both sides. Chair Rondeau said there should be no parking on the other side. Ms. Love said the Planning Board can set a condition for a period of time for monitoring. Ms. Wierling suggested closing the public hearing and having Ms. Love draft that condition for the next meeting.

Mr. Maxwell Morrongiello, 127 Central Park Terrace, asked about what happens when cars go out into the community from a certain point, and said he is curious about zoning rules and if there is a zoning overlay district for commercial entities that have a lot of vehicles, and if not, is that something that can be implemented because he always hears from people concerns about traffic. Ms. Wierling responded and explained that traffic studies are done which help the Planning Board to review, but this instance it was an existing building that was looking to expand and did not qualify for a full traffic study, but the applicant did provide information about the site.

Motion to Close the public hearing for 10 Kenwood Circle. Wierling. Second: Mello. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love confirmed this item will be on the March 11, 2024, meeting agenda under General Business.

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
15 Liberty Way
Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Ms. Love said that most of the comments made from the last meeting on December 18, 2023, have been addressed. She said the engineer wants to give an update. She said they are still in front of Conservation Commission.

Mr. Daniel Campbell of Level Design Group on behalf of the applicant said through all the review, what they are presenting is very similar to what they presented in December. He said what they have done since then is multiple Conservation Commission hearings. He said he believes there are still a few outstanding BETA comments; BETA is to perform their next review hopefully next week. He said he hopes to be back to the Planning Board at the end of March.

Mr. Maglio said it looks like most of his previous comments have been addressed, but he has not fully reviewed the most recent submissions.

Motion to Continue 15 Liberty Way, Site Plan Application, to March 25, 2024. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion for a five-minute recess. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
 6 Forge Parkway
 Site Plan Application
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-DID NOT VOTE; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 4-0-0 (4-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed that the site is located in the Industrial Zoning district. She said it is a vacant lot. The applicant's proposed project includes the construction of a 36,000 sq. ft. manufacturing and warehouse building. The applicant has filed a NOI with the Conservation Commission. She said she is waiting for the fees for BETA and waiting for DPW to review. She said a fire department letter was received that wanted the side of the proposed building pavement to be extended. She noted comments including: 1. Per section §185-31.C(3)(i) – provide outdoor lighting, open space areas, snow storage. 2. Per section §185-31.C(3)(j) – provide location, size, and sketch of all proposed signs. 3. Per section §185-31.C(3)(l) – provide a photometric plan. 4. Applicant should provide when the lot was created to verify zoning compliance. She said she has reached out to the engineer for determination on when this lot was created and if it was created prior to the Town's zoning laws going into place or not. She said that if it was created after the zoning rules went into place, the applicant would have to go to the ZBA for a variance for the width of the lot. She recommended continuance as the applicant will have to come to the next meeting to provide whether it is or is not in compliance.

Mr. Michael Malynowski of Allen and Major Associates (via Zoom) said they are looking to develop the vacant lot. He shared his screen and showed the plans. He said the existing parcel is approximately 10 acres. He said it was created in 2000 with the subdivision of the land when the Residence Inn hotel was developed. He said this parcel remained vacant as part of that development. He said they will figure out the lot width as Ms. Love had mentioned. He reviewed the proposed warehouse facility. He said there are loading docks at the rear of the facility that would allow access for any fork trucks or smaller vehicles to come to the building.

Ms. Wierling noted that if the lot was created in 2000, then the zoning was in place. She said the zoning table shows that they are required to have 157.5 ft. for width, and they are only providing 43 ft. She said to provide a lot that complies, they would need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. She said the applicant needs to get their ducks in a row about whether this site can actually be developed as they are proposing before they do an in-depth presentation. Chair Rondeau said the applicant should finish their overview of what their thoughts are.

Mr. Malynowski said they are still waiting for BETA, and they are with Conservation Commission for an RDA as they have a small portion of wetland at the northeast corner of the property. He said they are providing a comprehensive stormwater package that was submitted to the Town for review. He noted utilities on the site and said there is an existing water stub and electrical that is stubbed in front of the hotel for the development of this proposal. He said they provided a landscape plan. He said they will review the lot width requirements.

Chair Rondeau said the Planning Board will defer questions until they get the lot width and the zoning squared away.

Ms. Love said if it requires ZBA, they are probably about two months out. She said she just received the check for BETA to start reviewing the project. She said she thinks the applicant would want the variance before they spend any money for BETA. It was agreed to continue the item to April 8.

Motion to Continue 6 Forge Parkway, Site Plan Application, to April 8, 2024. Wierling. Second: Mello. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:00 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Initial*
488 & 496 Summer Street
Special Permit & Site Plan Application
Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Motion to Waive the reading. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love reviewed her letter to the Planning Board dated February 21, 2024, which was provided in the meeting packet. The Special Permit under Senior Village titled “Autumn Hill Senior Village” dated January 26, 2024, was submitted with two Special Permits and Site Plan. The site is located at 488 & 496 Summer Street in the Rural Residential I zoning district. The site is 12.2 acres with two existing single-family residential buildings. The applicant is proposing to construct 44 multi-unit residential buildings for over fifty-five (55) in age, under the Town of Franklin Zoning By-law Ch. 185-48 “Senior Village Overlay District.” The applicant has not requested any waivers. The applicant still needs to file with Conservation Commission. A letter from the fire department has been received. She provided the following comments. As for Zoning By-Law §185-48 (D)(1)(G), the Town of Franklin has exceeded the 2.5 percent units for senior housing. Although the applicant provided a brief explanation for the need of the Senior Housing, DPCD recommends that the Planning Board require the applicant to provide further information proving that there is a “critical Senior housing need” for the Town of Franklin. If this waiver is not granted, then the project is denied. She noted the applicant should also provide verification that DHCD will accept the 7 affordable units to be counted towards the Town of Franklin’s total affordable units. The applicant has applied for Inclusionary Zoning. The Senior Overlay District already requires 15 percent affordable housing; therefore, the Inclusionary Zoning does not apply. If it were to apply, then Senior housing Overlay District plus Inclusionary Zoning would then require the applicant to provide 25 percent affordable housing. As for Zoning By-Law §185-48 (D)(2)(c), the applicant is allowed 18 units; however, they have proposed 44 units, including 7 affordable units. The applicant should show on the plans 30 percent of permanent open space, per the zoning regulations. The Planning Board should determine if they will grant the applicant all 44 units. The applicant should identify on the plans the affordable units and each location of the unit.

Mr. Edward Cannon, attorney on behalf of the applicant Suejo Corp., and Mr. Daniel Merrikin of Legacy Engineering addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cannon said this is their initial hearing, and they are going to introduce the project. He said their interpretation of the bylaw was that the Inclusionary Zoning piece was a requirement. He said if the Planning Board says it is not necessary, it is fine with them.

Mr. Merrikin showed the plans and provided an overview of the proposal. He discussed the location of the two parcels. He reviewed the proposed layout for the total of 44 units. He said they are proposing an additional 7 affordable units for a total of 10 out of the 44 units which is about 23 percent. He said in the back of the property there is a river, Uncas Brook. He said the wetland resource areas are in the back of

the property, and no work is proposed in any of those areas. He explained the entrance and driveway into the site with a circular access all the way around. He said there would be two parking spaces per unit. He said they provided comprehensive stormwater which BETA is reviewing. He discussed the private sewer system and said the applicant is proposing to extend the water main and a proposed booster pump station to increase water pressure. He said they are working with the DPW on this. He said they have open space proposed and are working on ideas for some walking paths. He said they are waiting for BETA's review.

Ms. Wierling questioned the base number of units and the additional units to calculate the affordable units. Mr. Merrikin explained the math related to the bonus provision in the bylaw for additional affordable units. Ms. Wierling reviewed the math for this from the notes on the plan. Mr. Merrikin said he can write the notes more clearly on the plan. Ms. Wierling asked about the two single-family homes that will remain on the property and if the residents will remain in those homes. Mr. Merrikin said those are going to become condominium units in the condominium complex, and at this time the current residents will remain there. In response to a question, he said there may be some work/renovations done on those homes. Ms. Wierling noted items that the applicant is missing on the plan. She said the applicant's answers to the special questions should be revised to provide more information. She said those two single-family homes are really not part of the senior village; they are just two homes in front of the complex. She said she would like to see cross-sections to see what the views would look like from the neighbors. She said the open space to her is like an afterthought. She said this is not a senior village. She asked where are the gathering spaces and the sense of community. She said this is just condos on the property. Mr. Merrikin said that leaving the two existing single-family homes is an advantage because it maintains the existing streetscape. Ms. Wierling said they were segregating these two properties to make this development work. She said the trails should be provided and asked what is the plan for the open space. She asked what amenities are being provided in the senior village. She said the open space is not contiguous, and she asked how they will make the open space more useable. Mr. Merrikin explained that the area is not contiguous as there is a utility connection proposed through there; however, a trail could meander through there. Ms. Wierling asked that the square footage to be provided on the plans for the open space areas. She asked for the plan on how the open space would be protected. She asked how many acres of trees are being removed. She asked why is this beneficial to approve 44 units when 19 are allowed; she said she does not see that it is feasible on this site. She asked that they really go through the bylaws. She asked the applicant to realistically provide the reasons why this development is happening.

Ms. Williams said she had some similar comments to Ms. Wierling. She asked about the density and the deforestation. She said there is over a 100 ft. grade range on the site from the street down to the town forest. She said it will change the experience of the town forest and walking trails as people will be looking up at the massive retaining walls and units. She said she would like to see trails on the plan. She said related to the significant grade change, they provided some driveway profiles. She said she is not sure how a driveway with an eight percent grade change is considered walkable for anybody, never mind an over-55 community. She explained what an eight percent grade change is like. She said it is the opposite of pedestrian friendly for walkability. She noted that there are icy winters and questionable weather and this does not feel like the safest pedestrian access. She said she would like to see site sections. She said she echoes everything Ms. Wierling said.

Mr. Merrikin said that they have chosen the areas for the site for development with the least grade differential. He said that eight percent grade for the driveway is consistent with the subdivision regulations.

Mr. Mello said it stands out that there is only one entrance to this; one entrance is not going to work. He noted the sidewalk through the site. He pointed out concerns with the sidewalk and two crosswalks on the site. He requested the sidewalk continue around the entire portion of the site and having one wheelchair ramp. He said he is familiar with the site as he redid the trails in the town forest. He explained the site is

steep. He said the retaining walls would be about 20 ft. He said the walls will need to be looked at with much intensity by BETA and a geotechnical engineer. He said he is not comfortable with the location of the drainage basins in relation to the large retaining walls. He asked for some groundwater contour modelling here.

Mr. Stickney said he echoed many of the concerns shared by his colleagues. He said often in this type of development there are many visitors; therefore, ancillary guest parking would be good. He suggested reducing the number of units and noted more than one entrance is needed. He said it is important to increase senior housing stock, but there needs to be modifications to some of these plans.

Chair Rondeau said he agrees with the previous comments. He discussed the two existing houses and suggested they be isolated and not part of the complex. He said the retaining walls would be 24 ft. to 26 ft. He noted there is no walkability. He said there are a lot of units for this lot. He said he would like to see a traffic study for the neighborhood. He asked where would the water boost station be.

Mr. Mucciarone noted the need for overflow parking. He said the open land should be accessible to the public, but there is no parking for the public. He noted the topography of the area. He said the proximity to the town forest concerns him. He said he agrees with a second entrance recommended by the fire department. He asked who has access to the swimming pool.

Ms. Wierling said she does not see a key or legend to the plan and would like that added. Mr. Merrikin noted where the legend is located on the plans.

Chair Rondeau noted that he is going to hold the audience members who wish to speak to three minutes and asked them not to repeat everything already said.

Ms. Kimberleigh Bearce, 493 Summer Street, said she lives directly across the street from one of the homes the project will be behind. She discussed that she and her family used to live on a busy street, and they moved here for a quieter area. She said that she and her husband believed they were purchasing their land in a rural residential neighborhood which would be single-family homes. She said this proposal is not about providing housing for aging seniors living on a budget, it is about the applicant making as much money as he can. She said the two parcels are zoned rural residential, and no one in the neighborhood feels these should be rezoned to a senior village overlay and to include inclusionary housing. She explained what inclusionary housing will allow. She said this project is self-serving. She said that if Mr. Bruce Hunchard is allowed to rezone his land, he would walk away from the housing project even wealthier than he is, while the rest of us are left to pick up the pieces and deal with the many years of construction, increased traffic on our street, and the possibility of even more wildlife on our property on a daily basis. She asked that the Planning Board visit the site to see what the project would look like and see all the neighbors who would be affected. She asked how the Planning Board members or their families would like to have such a development across from or adjacent to their home.

Mr. Kurt Lovell, 711 Summer Street, said he observed that if the two houses are taken out of this project, it would be about three or four acres. He said that there would be a lot of water runoff from the hill. Chair Rondeau said the infiltrations will pick up the rainwater.

Mr. Michael Bahtiarian, representative of Camp Haiastan of the Armenian Youth Federation, at 722 Summer Street, said they have been owners of the property for 80 or 90 years. They have run a summer camp there for 70 years. He said the stormwater runoff goes down to their property which is about 100 acres. He said they take care of their own sewerage, and they have their own well for water. They are concerned about runoff for this project affecting those. He said he will look forward to seeing a copy of

the full report from the peer reviewer. He said he stands with the rest of the community that this project is out of character for Summer Street.

Mr. Stephen Foley, 480 Summer Street, said he moved there from South Boston four years ago which he left because of overdevelopment which is exactly what is happening here. He said that if anybody thinks Mr. Bruce Hunchard is going to stay there after the development with eight properties overlooking his swimming pool, somebody is deceiving somebody; it is nonsense. He said Summer Street from King Street to the Wrentham town line has approximately 45 homes, and now they want to double the number of the houses on Summer Street, and then it will not be a rural zoned area. It will look more like a public housing development.

Mr. Maxwell Morrongiello, 127 Central Park Terrace, asked about the open space and what percent of space complies with the rules. Mr. Merrikin said they are working on a concept of how the open space could be used. Mr. Morrongiello asked why this was not submitted as a Friendly 40B. He asked if this were to make it through the process, would it be possible to put a traffic light at King Street and Summer Street. Chair Rondeau said it is not considered an affordable housing project.

Ms. Kim Spelman, 6 Great Pond Road, said she does not think anyone in this room thinks this is a senior village. There is no cohesive center, no walking paths, no open space. She said this is about the developer and the owner making money. She said that it is the burden of the owner and the developer to establish the need outside of the existing zoning. She said she does not see it and neither should the Planning Board.

Resident, 490 Summer Street, said his property is in the middle of the two properties. He said when he bought the property, it was a nice quiet place. Looking at the 44 buildings scheduled to go up, by the time the project is finished, his six-year-old daughter would have grown up. He said they would be devoid of any privacy and quietness that they currently have.

Ms. Sally Winters, 486 Summer Street, provided photographs to the Planning Board. She explained the location of the development in relation to her property. She discussed that the applicant has been planning on doing this development for seven years. She said there is nothing senior about homes that will be for sale for \$850,000 to \$900,000. She said somebody should be building affordable housing for the seniors. She said she believes this is a disguise of the cluster home development that the applicant wanted to build seven years ago. She said her house faces the entire development. She said her older-aged mother is living with her, and she does not want her to have to listen to construction for five years. She said the whole development slopes down into her property and the town forest. She said the applicant has a right to build on his property, but she does not believe the applicant has the right to rezone property and build 44 units plus. She discussed that the traffic is a concern. She said to allow this development is unfair and unjust to change a rural residential neighborhood so dramatically for the pockets of one or two people.

Mr. Christopher Woolf, 489 Summer Street, said he lives opposite the proposed site. He said everyone has already mentioned most everything he was going to say. He asked if the developers would consider subsidizing or paying entirely for a sidewalk into town; currently it is very dangerous.

Mr. Shane Kurtz, 11 Squibnocket Road (via Zoom), said he echoes all the concerns mentioned. He said his road has already seen erosion probably due to development in the area. He said he has concerns about water and drainage to support this development. He said there is no way there will not be environmental impact from such a development.

Ms. Cynthia Honcharuk, 403 Summer Street (via Zoom) said she had spoken to Mr. Bruce Hunchard the first time he tried to do this seven years ago. She said the town forest has become a glorified dog park.

She said there is a lot of traffic on the street. She discussed the storm in December with torrential rains and said it washed away her side and front yards. She said the DPW cannot even maintain it currently. She said she has had to call the DPW numerous times. She said she is still experiencing water issues from Palladini Village. She said that for Mr. Bruce Hunchard to even consider this again is really sad.

Mr. Mark Minnchelli, 31 Longfellow Drive (via Zoom), said he is a strong advocate for Franklin to have more affordable and more senior housing units available; however, if you look at this proposed development and the topography of the land and the current zoning of the land, he does not think the Town should misuse the characterization of senior housing and affordable housing to try to push through a development that really should not be done. He said this proposal does not make any sense at all. He is against this proposal.

Ms. Sarah Dacko, 483 Summer Street, said her yard is so flooded. She said she echoes Ms. Cynthia Honcharuk's comments. She said this is a congested complex. She said usually 55 and above are looking to downsize, not upsize. She said most 55 and above prefer living on a single floor.

Mr. Roger Boisvert, 812 Summer Street, said he has lived here for 30 years. He asked when does it end if someone can just change the zoning. He said it is rural when you bought it, but if someone who has money can change it, that is disturbing.

Chair Rondeau said he wanted to make sure Ms. Kimberleigh Bearce's letter gets in the record.

Ms. Wierling thanked all the abutters for coming to the meeting and articulating what she would have liked to have said. She said she agrees with the abutters 100 percent. She said that this property is not being developed with the intent of the senior village bylaw. She asked the applicant how they went from 19 to 44 units. She said it does not work here. She suggested the applicant find a way to make this work within the bylaw.

Ms. Love said it seems like a lot of work has to be done. She recommended a continuance to April 8. Mr. Cannon agreed.

Motion to Continue 488 & 496 Summer Street, Special Permit & Site Plan Application, to April 8, 2024. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Roll Call Vote: Rondeau-YES; Wierling-YES; Mello-YES; Stickney-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Chair and Member Comments

Ms. Love announced that regarding the Master Plan, this weekend at the library, from 9:30 AM to 12 PM, the Sustainability Subcommittee and the Land Use Subcommittee will be there for open comments. She said the public is welcome. She said there are more activities on March 23 at Dean College. She said there is more information on the Master Plan on the website.

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

Meeting adjourned at 10:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,
Recording Secretary