

Town of Franklin

355 East Central Street
Franklin, Massachusetts 02038-1352



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

PLANNING BOARD

June 6, 2022 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, 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. Decision: 341 Union Street

Ms. Love stated that the Planning Board closed the public hearing at the last meeting on May 23, 2022. This item is for the decision. The application is for a change in use at the property and the Special Permit is for brewery, distillery or winery production with tasting room. She recommended the following Special Conditions: No signage or exterior changes are permitted until filed with the Design Review Commission, and any future change in use will require a Site Plan Modification. She reviewed the requested waivers: 1. To allow less than "42 of cover over the RCP drainpipe, proposed class V RCP; 2. To allow the use of PVC and HDPE pipe for the roof drain, CB 1 to Pond 1, the outlet pipes and manifolds; and 3. To allow minimal light spillage as shown on the plan.

Chair Rondeau stated he wanted to confirm that the adjoining property has the shared parking and as such the following is added as a Special Condition: any change of use or ownership of that adjoining property would require the applicant to return to the Planning Board. He noted that any change of use for that property could trigger a change in parking for the winery. He stated that he wanted to make sure the two were tied together as it is a shared parcel.

Ms. Love stated that the adjoining property is not part of the application; a letter was sent in support of providing for overflow parking, but they are not part of the application to include in the decisions. She stated that she thinks at this point the Planning Board would need to feel comfortable allowing that overflow use. She noted that the applicant is not asking for a parking waiver at this time; they are meeting the parking requirements. Ms. Williams agreed that the applicant is meeting their parking requirements; therefore, the sites do not need to be tied together.

Chair Rondeau asked the applicant to confirm that they would not be selling tickets; he does not want this to be a nightclub. The applicant confirmed.

Motion to Approve the Waivers 1, 2, and 3 as stated. Wierling. Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the following Special Conditions: 1. No signage or exterior changes are permitted until filed with the Design Review Commission. 2. Any future change in use will require a Site Plan Modification. Wierling. Second: Williams. No Vote Taken.

Motion to Approve the Special Permit to allow the following at 341 Union Street: a. §185 Attachment 4, Section 3.13 – Brewery, distillery or winery production with Tasting Room. Wierling. No Second. No Vote Taken.

ROLE CALL VOTE:

Ms. Wierling read aloud the following.

a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

c) Public roadways, drainage, utilities and other infrastructure are adequate or will be upgraded to accommodate development.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

e) Project will not destroy or cause substantial damage to any environmentally significant natural resource, habitat, or feature or, if it will, proposed mitigation, remediation, replication or compensatory measures are adequate.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

g) Water consumption and sewer use taking into consideration current and projected future local water supply and demand and wastewater treatment capacity, will not be excessive.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

B. Decision: 158 Grove Street

Ms. Love stated that the Planning Board closed the public hearing at the last meeting on May 23, 2022. One of the conditions the Planning Board asked for is that prior to endorsement two of the outdoor seating barriers should be 44” apart with a gate. She reviewed that this Special Permit Modifications is to amend the Special Permit at 158 Grove Street to allow the following: 1. Expand hours of operation to include Tuesday – Sunday from 12:00PM – 10:00PM, and 2. Expand square footage of the tasting room. Ms. Love reviewed that the zoning bylaw changed; a tasting room is an accessory use and there is no limit on the square footage.

***Motion to Accept the Special Permit Conditions of expanded hours of operation to include Tuesday – Sunday from 12:00PM – 10:00PM, and expand square footage of the tasting room. Wierling.
Second: Williams. Vote: 5-0-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).***

ROLE CALL VOTE: to Approve the Special Permit Criteria a-g.

Ms. Wierling read aloud the following.

- a) Proposed project addresses or is consistent with neighbor or Town need.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- b) Vehicular traffic flow, access and parking and pedestrian safety are properly addressed.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- c) Public roadways, drainage, utilities and other infrastructure are adequate or will be upgraded to accommodate development.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- d) Neighborhood character and social structure will not be negatively impacted.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- e) Project will not destroy or cause substantial damage to any environmentally significant natural resource, habitat, or feature or, if it will, proposed mitigation, remediation, replication or compensatory measures are adequate.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- f) Number, height, bulk, location and siting of building(s) and structures(s) will not result in abutting properties being deprived of light or fresh air circulation or being exposed to flooding or subjected to excessive noise, odor, light, vibrations, or airborne particulates.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)
- g) Water consumption and sewer use taking into consideration current and projected future local water supply and demand and wastewater treatment capacity, will not be excessive.
Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

The proposed use will not have adverse effects which overbalance its beneficial effects on either the neighborhood or the Town, in view of the particular characteristics of the site and of the proposal in relation to that site.

Rondeau-YES; David-YES; Wierling-YES; Power-YES; Williams-YES. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No)

C. Endorsement: 72-94 East Central Street

Ms. Love reviewed that the Planning Board approved the Special Permit and Site Plan Modification on April 25, 2022, for a multi-family development at 72-94 East Central Street. The applicant submitted plans for endorsement. The Certificate of Vote and Conditions are included in the plans to be endorsed. The appeal period has ended, and no appeals have been filed.

Motion to Endorse 72-94 East Central Street. Wierling. Second: Rondeau. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

D. Limited Site Plan: 34 Saxon Street

Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon, Inc., on behalf of Downtown Sports, addressed the Planning Board for a Limited Site Plan change in use. She reviewed that the current building is utilized for a few businesses, one being Downtown Sports. They are applying to add a daycare/preschool-type use within the existing building for ages 2.9 years to 5 years old. This would include a before-school program and after-school program with hours from 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM. They do not plan to have any kitchen or food prep area; therefore, no grease trap would be required. The site has 50 existing parking spaces; 49 are on site. She stated that with the other uses and the number of parking spaces, they feel there is sufficient parking. She stated that based on the current hours of operation, there is minimal overlap with some of the other businesses. She stated that in the preschool setting, there will be one teacher for 10 children. She reviewed the employee parking needs and stated that there would be approximately 33 spaces for preschool drop off/parking.

Ms. Love reviewed that the applicant is requesting a change in use. The applicant is applying to add a daycare within the existing building. The applicant will need to file with the State for state regulations in operating a daycare. There is no exterior change to the existing building or parking areas. BETA was not asked to review this project as no exterior changes are being proposed.

Mr. Maglio stated that he reviewed the submitted materials for the subject project and does not have any comments at this time as there are no proposed exterior modifications being planned.

Ms. Williams indicated concern with the existing parking configuration regarding the safety of drop off/pick up of the children. She asked if there were going to be parking spots designated as drop off/pick up for the daycare use exclusively or if there is no plan change. Ms. Cavaliere stated that with the ages of 2.9 to 5 years old, the children would be walked into the daycare by their parents. She reviewed the businesses in the building and the current parking lot. Mr. Richard Frongillo, owner Downtown Sports, reviewed the parking spaces that he expects will be utilized the most. He stated that he does not expect it to be an issue. He noted that they will adapt their signage. Mr. David confirmed that the only entrance is in the front. Ms. Wierling asked where the children will be playing during the day. Mr. Frongillo stated that they have access to a 6,300 sq. ft. gymnasium. Chair Rondeau asked about dedicating the first three or four spots to the left when pulling in to the daycare center, or if they can create a drop off zone in front of the building. Mr. Frongillo stated that people are sent a map of the areas to park. Mr. Maglio stated that he has not heard of any issues with the current parking.

Motion to Approve Limited Site Plan, 34 Saxon Street. Rondeau. Second: Wierling. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

E. Meeting Minutes – April 25, May 9 & May 23, 2022

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for April 25, 2022. Wierling. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Motion to Approve the Meeting Minutes for May 9, 2022, and May 23, 2022. Rondeau. No Second Made. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:05 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 585 King Street
 Special Permit & Site Plan
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.
 TO BE CONTINUED

Ms. Love stated that the applicant requested the hearing be continued to June 27, 2022.

Motion to Continue 585 King Street, Special Permit & Site Plan, to June 27, 2022. Wierling. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Chair Rondeau called a five-minute recess.

7:10 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 Upper Union Street
 Site Plan
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Mr. Nick Dewhurst (via Zoom) of Bohler Engineering and Mr. Matthew Clark (via Zoom), owner/developer, addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Dewhurst stated that since they were last before the Planning Board there were a few minor outstanding issues needing to be addressed which included Conservation Commission approval which was received with an Order of Conditions. He stated that he would review a few minor plan changes. He discussed the pedestrian access doors leading to parking spaces and stated that some were relocated and striping added to avoid conflict with the doors and the proposed parking spaces. He stated that they added numerous shrubs and plantings along the parking area as requested. He stated that all of BETA's and DPW's outstanding issues have been addressed.

Ms. Love stated that she listed the waivers for the Planning Board to make a decision on. The applicant has provided adequate parking and they changed the curbing to concrete. She reviewed that the Planning Board requested certificate of ownership be submitted from the abutting property owner to allow to use the drainage system; the applicant has provided the easement deed. Mr. Maglio stated that all his previous comments have been addressed. Mr. Crowley reviewed BETA's comments.

Motion to Close the public hearing for Upper Union Street, Site Plan. Rondeau. Second: Power. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

7:20 PM **PUBLIC HEARING** – *Continued*
 Taj Estates – 230 East Central Street
 Special Permit & Site Plan
 Documents presented to the Planning Board are on file.

Mr. Richard Cornetta, attorney on behalf of the applicant Taj Estates of Franklin II LLC, and Ms. Amanda Cavaliere of Guerriere & Halnon, Inc. addressed the Planning Board. Mr. Cornetta stated that two of the owners of Taj Estates were present at the meeting. He stated that the structural engineer who has submitted information regarding a wall that is to be constructed on the western boundary of the

property was also present at the meeting. He noted that the last continuance request was a late notification and he apologized to the Planning Board.

Ms. Cavaliere stated that they have been before the Planning Board since late November. They have heard the concerns of the Planning Board and the residents regarding density, parking requirements, screening, layout of the site, constructability of the retaining wall, and traffic. She reviewed the original plan and the changes that have been made. She noted that they have reduced the number of units by approximately 20 percent. They have gone from 41 one-bedroom units to 33 units with 31 one-bedroom and 2 two-bedroom units. They have removed the parking from the sewer easement. She stated the one space at the rear of the building was removed as recommended by the fire chief. She stated that test pits were conducted onsite. She stated that they provided 52 parking spaces and they all accommodate to the required width and depth; no parking waivers are now required. She noted that they meet the 1.5 spaces per units. They have provided additional screening along the easterly side. She stated that there was a waiver request for parking within 10 ft. of a right-of-way. She stated that it was determined that Hill Avenue is not a public right-of-way; therefore, they do not need a waiver.

Mr. Cornetta stated that he submitted a revised memorandum which addresses the Special Permit criteria items in the bylaw. He reviewed criteria a-g and discussed how this project fits with each criterion. He discussed that housing is a huge concern in the town and this project creates more housing which is a benefit. He reviewed that Mr. Jeffrey Dirk of Vanasse & Associates, Inc. testified that there were no significant impacts to surrounding traffic that would be created by this proposal. He reviewed that all stormwater management has been handled adequately. He stated that regarding neighborhood character, this is a C1 zone and multi-family housing already exists in this area. He stated that there are no wetland resource areas on the site and they are not in a flood zone. He stated that the current building that exists is a dilapidated single-family house. They are proposing a building that meets all the dimensional setbacks; they have not asked for any variance or waivers. He stated that all the mechanicals will be inside; none will be outside making noise. He stated that the proposed is a residential building. He stated that the town has a voluminous capacity of daily water; this project will be under 5,000 gallons per day of water consumption which is .2 percent of the total capacity of the town.

Ms. Love noted the concerns from the Planning Board at the April 25, 2022, meeting. The Planning Board requested a letter from the Fire Department. The Fire Department provided a letter dated May 3, 2022. With the proposed changes, she asked if the Planning Board would need another letter from the Fire Department. She noted that as requested, the applicant provided a letter from a structural engineer; the Planning Board should determine if this satisfies the disturbance question on Hill Avenue. She stated that the abutters asked if the applicant could reach out to them to discuss what is right for the neighborhood. She reviewed her comments which included the following. The Planning Board requested that the height of the building, in square footage, be added to the plans. The retaining wall added in place of grading is on the property line. An existing condition plan should be provided to determine if any trees are in the way of the retaining wall. From appearance, several stumps within Hill Avenue would need to be removed in order to install the retaining wall. It appears the applicant will still disturb both abutters on east and west sides when removing stumps to construct the wall and install the fence. A letter has been submitted from a structural engineer; however, they indicated how the wall will be constructed, but did not say there would be no disturbance on Hill Avenue. As well as the fence that is to be installed, it should be proven that there is no disturbance on the abutting property. The letter from the structural engineer does not address how the fence will be installed on top of the retaining wall. She stated that DPCD recommends the retaining wall be moved 10 ft. onto the property to avoid any disturbance on Hill Avenue. There is still light spillage onto the abutting property line. A revised

lighting plan should be submitted to show no light spillage. DPCD received a public comment letter which is included in the meeting packet. DPCD still has a concern for the density of this project. As stated in previous letters, this project is the largest density project submitted for approval. The Planning Board has mentioned in past meetings that 20 to 25 units is more reasonable.

Mr. Carlos Ferreira, PE, of MF Engineering & Design Inc., reviewed his letter to Mr. Mirajuddin Ahmed dated May 25, 2022, provided in the meeting packet, regarding the retaining wall design, and he explained the process.

Mr. Maglio stated that all his previous comments have been addressed. He suggested that if the project is approved, the \$5,000 contribution to the signal timing plan on King Street and Chestnut Street be based on when the building is occupied and traffic is there. As well, the property line should be staked before construction happens so that the contractor knows exactly where the line is.

Mr. Crowley stated that they received the new information on the wall last week; as such, their structural team would like to take a look at the wall constructability again. He reviewed a few outstanding issues that still need to be addressed including some screening and final comprehensive stormwater plan.

Chair Rondeau asked that Town Attorney Mark Cerel confirm the work within the right of way.

Mr. Power stated that by right the applicant has the right to build something there. He reviewed that the applicant meets the bylaw requirements. He stated that with the recent approval of Franklin's Housing Production Plan, this addresses many issues and this is a perfect project to kick that off. He noted that neighbors have issues with this, but the applicant has the right to build something there. It makes sense to see if we can make this work for everyone involved. He stated that he thinks it can all be worked out.

Ms. Williams stated that she had questions. She stated that she has asked for a first-floor plan to see entries, exits, windows, etc., and architectural drawings with height. She stated that fundamentally, to her, this building is not meeting the spirit of mixed use with it being a leasing office. Calling is a mixed-use building to be exempt from some requirements seems a bit questionable. It is a small 800 sq. ft. of office space. She stated that zoning currently allows three stories with 40 ft. in height. They are showing a four-story building which is questionably higher than 40 ft. She would like to see drawings with elevations. She stated that she still questions how the retaining wall can be built and how it could be built without touching the adjacent property. She would like additional information on building mass, height, and setbacks.

Ms. Wierling stated that she is not understanding how they are getting mixed use in the true sense of mixed use on this property when using it as a leasing office. She asked why the applicant is including commercial space if it is going to be a leasing office.

Mr. Cornetta stated that they were struggling with the parking and the leasing office would allay some concerns about the parking. He stated that certainly, the applicant will change it from a leasing office.

Ms. Wierling stated that the town does need more affordable housing. She asked if the applicant is willing to put in an affordability clause in this building. Mr. Cornetta stated that he does not think the applicant is prepared to make that commitment. He stated that affordable is a somewhat subjective term. Ms. Love stated that a one-bedroom affordable under DHC runs from \$1,500 to \$1,600. Ms. Wierling stated that if the applicant is going to state that this meets the affordable criteria, it does not. Mr.

Cornetta stated that it meets a housing need. Ms. Wierling discussed affordable housing units. She read aloud from the provided traffic study and stated that more traffic will be added to an already failing intersection. She stated that the project will not help the traffic. She reviewed items that are still needed on the site plan. She stated that PVC fence is known to fail as has been seen at other sites in Franklin. She stated that she recommended a wooden fence or something to that effect. She stated that trash pickup, snow removal, backup noises, and headlights are all things the neighbors have never had to deal with. She stated that she finds it hard to believe that there is any retaining wall that they can put in that will not have an impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Ferreira responded and reviewed how the wall will be built and the excavation process. Ms. Cavaliere responded to Ms. Wierling's question about wall constructability. She stated that there is a stamped letter regarding the design in the meeting packet materials. She requested a plan that shows the height of the building.

Mr. Power asked for confirmation that this project is not attempting to meet the MBTA requirements. Mr. Cornetta stated that the project is not a 40R. He noted that what is affordable for someone may not be affordable to someone else. He noted that as they will be renting 31 one-bedroom apartments all at once. They need to be competitive; the market will dictate that rate. He stated that the approved Housing Production Plan indicated a need for affordable housing in the community. He stated that the traffic study is subjective as well; there is traffic in general in the town.

Citizens' questions/comments and applicant's responses. ► Ms. Jennifer Lawrence, 216 East Central Street, stated that she is the person with rights to Hill Avenue that abuts her property. She stated that she has complete right to that space. She stated that she declined an easement opportunity from Joseph Halligan. She stated that she thinks the point of the traffic is being missed. She discussed traffic and crosswalks. She asked where visitors for the project will park. She noted school bus stops. She stated that in May 2022, there has been one accident per week in that strip which she reviewed. She stated that it is not pedestrian friendly. She asked how the lights would be synchronized. She reviewed a project that the owner of this property did in another town; the units are rented out as 40B. She stated concern about having a Section 8 situation at this project going up against her property. She stated that she researched the wall they are proposing. She stated that it is installed with impact and vibratory hammers. She asked what will that do to the ledge. She reviewed the property area that she owns. She stated that there will be vibrations. She stated that she understands something is going to go there; it just needs to be appropriate for the residents and the community. She stated that safety is of great concern; it is not safe there. She stated that with the sun setting at night and the glare off the windows of the three-story building, it will melt the siding on her house. ► Mr. Mark Mucciarone, 87 Hill Avenue, asked what minimal impact to the abutting properties means. He discussed that Rt. 140 is not pedestrian friendly. He asked if a traffic study was done for the neighborhood behind the proposed project. He stated that people bypass the lights through the neighborhoods. He asked for the width of the alley between the building and the wall that is going to be built; he asked if it is wide enough for a fire truck. He noted that there are special needs children in the neighborhood. He stated that he would like to see a single-family home there. This is not the project for that location. ► Mr. Ferreira stated that the construction hours would be 7 AM to 5 PM. He stated that the piles will be drilled, not driven. He stated that this system is what is used in Boston with zero lot lines. He stated that there will be no equipment on Hill Avenue. He reviewed the excavating procedure for the wall. ► Chair Rondeau asked Mr. Ferreira to bring some pictures of the operation to the next meeting. ► Ms. Christine Mucciarone, 87 Hill Avenue, stated that in each unit there could be two people with two cars which is over the 1.5 cars per unit. ► Mr. David stated that he believes in previous meetings it was explained that when you lease one of these units, you can have two people but only one vehicle. ► Ms. Mucciarone asked if the top of the retaining wall is

level with the land that is right there, what happens to the runoff coming from the ledge on Hill Avenue, and is there enough drainage to handle that. ► Mr. Ferreira reviewed the drainage and said it was not an issue. ► Mr. Cornetta addressed the leasing issue and said that this particular project is going to be owned by the applicant/developer; it is not going to be a condominium. He stated that the owner would be in the unique position to continue to control the occupancy at the site and along with that also be able to control the vehicles parked on the site through the leases. He stated that he feels strongly that given the bedroom counts proposed, 1.5 spaces per unit is more than enough. ► A citizen on Zoom asked that with Chair Rondeau and Mr. Power both fighting so hard for this project, why is Attorney Cornetta needed. ► Ms. Mucciarone asked about parking. She stated that as it was discussed that they would be eliminating the leasing office to make it commercial space, how many parking spaces would that need. She asked about the drilling. She noted that when drilling was done for another nearby development, she got a crack in her foundation. She noted that it is all ledge in the area. She asked if someone would do a foundation inspection for all the neighbors prior to the drilling. She stated that the properties in the area are very old and some have stone foundations. She thinks the residents' foundations should be checked. ► Chair Rondeau stated that two parking spaces would be dedicated to the commercial space. ► Mr. Ferreira stated that foundation inspections would probably be done by the contractor who executed the work. He stated that he does not think they are going to find ledge. Their drilling does not have a lot of vibration. ► Chair Rondeau stated maybe that can be addressed with BETA and a pre-blast survey can be done. ► Ms. Wierling asked how wide is the wall. ► Mr. Ferreira explained the size of the wall and beams. He confirmed it would be no wider than 1 ft. ► Mr. Mark Rovani stated that his mother is a direct abutter. He stated that other projects did not have residential houses on three sides. He noted that his mother has a daycare. He stated that he has a safety concern if cars are parking facing his mother's house; he would like something installed to keep the cars from coming through. ► Mr. Michael Glennon, 94 Hill Avenue, noted traffic concerns. He stated that looking at traffic data, in the past there has been a fatal accident at the intersection of King Street and Rt. 140. Last year there was a fatal accident at the intersection at Big Y. He noted there are 16 children between Hill Avenue, Lewis Street, and Uncas Avenue under 11 years old. Everyday people in vehicles race down and cut through the streets to avoid traffic. He noted someone on a bicycle was almost hit by a car in the area. He stated that he has a child with special needs and the cars are driving through very fast. He discussed how dangerous it is to walk anywhere in that area. He stated that he is supportive of building in the area, but not this project. ► Ms. Margaret Heydecker stated that she used to live in Franklin; she moved out a few months ago. She stated that she lived past the Big Y; she knows the traffic nightmares. She discussed the lack of safety considerations in past projects for the pedestrians and children in that area; this is not something new. She stated that you should not penalize the people who are trying to improve the area. ► Mr. Cobi Frongillo, 140 Maple Street, stated that there have been many valid comments. He discussed parking and affordability. He stated that generally, as a town, we are interested in reducing impervious coverage and vehicle traffic and increasing town revenue and the diversity of our housing stock. He stated that on parking, it feels at times hypocritical to be both hyper-worried about traffic and at the same time increasing parking. He discussed studies he has reviewed about parking. He stated that we as humans overestimate the parking that is needed. He explained the principle of induced demand: if you build more parking, it breeds more cars. He stated that he thinks that they have already replaced eight apartments with eight parking spaces. He stated that he loves the push for mixed use and reevaluating the commercial space. He stated that affordability includes both the type of housing and the location of the housing. He discussed housing needs in Franklin. ► Chair Rondeau suggested the Police Department go down and patrol the area a little more. He recommended that the Police Department be called more frequently regarding traffic. He stated that traffic has been tough in town for the past 40 years. He stated that there is still a lot of homework to be done by the applicant. ► A resident asked when are we going to stop the contractors from taking single-family homes and throwing 30 units in

there. She reviewed the number of apartments recently built in Franklin. She stated that this should remain a safe location for the children who live in the area of the proposed project.

Motion to Continue Taj Estates, 230 East Central Street, Special Permit & Site Plan, to June 27, 2022. Rondeau. Second: David. Vote: 5-0 (5-Yes; 0-No).

Ms. Love stated that the Strawberry Stroll is this Friday; Franklin for All will have a booth there.

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Lizardi,

Recording Secretary

******Planning Board voted on August 8, 2022 to approve the Meeting Minutes***