



RECEIVED

By City Clerk at 2:05 pm, Mar 04, 2026



Community Preservation Committee

<https://www.framinghamma.gov/3286/Community-Preservation-Committee>

Thomas Mahoney, Chair / Karen Margolis, Vice Chair /
Judy Grove, Clerk / Steven DeNicola / David Gudejko/
Robert Merusi / Kevin Swope / Mary-Anne Tratchel/
Ted Cosgrove

CPC Coordinator: Heather O'Donnell

AGENDA v1
March 9, 2026
Executive Conference Room
HYBRID (IN PERSON AND
REMOTE)

When: Mar 9, 2026 07:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Community Preservation Committee 3.9.26

Join from PC, Mac, iPad, or Android:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81220259926?pwd=UNNFI2fGQggJaxfRsgK3RpmCGU252a.1>

Passcode:418717

Phone one-tap:

+13092053325,,81220259926#,,,,*418717# US

+13126266799,,81220259926#,,,,*418717# US (Chicago)

<u>Time</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Presenter</u>
7:00	Call to Order – Record Meeting – Read Agenda	T. Mahoney
	Public Participation	T. Mahoney
Discussions/Hearings		
	All FY2026 Applications	
	Discussion of FY2026 Funding and Program Development (DOC 1,2): CPA26-003- JFS of Metrowest Emergency Rental Subsidies CPA26-005- Carlson Crossing East CPA26-006- First Parish in Framingham Meetinghouse CPA26-007- Emergency Rental Assistance for People Affected by Substance Use Disorder CPA26-010- Eastleigh Farm CPA26-011- Design Access for Simpson Park CPA26-012- Walsh-Dunning Softball Field Complex Improvements CPA26-013- ADA Entrances for Cushing Chapel CPA26-014- 43-45 Nixon Road CPA26-018- Construction Carol Getchell Middle Section CPA26-019- Edgell Grove Cemetery Tomb House (Phase 3) CPA26-020- FHC Academy- Fire Resistant Cabinets CPA26-022- Anna Murphy Park Water Fountain & Bottle Filler CPA26-023- Waushakum Beach Improvements	Committee

	Report from the CPC Coordinator	H. O'Donnell
	Report from the Chair/Vice-Chair	T. Mahoney
	New Business	Committee
	Approval of Minutes- 2/9/26, 2/12/26 (DOC 3, DOC 4)	J. Grove
	Adjourn	T. Mahoney
(DOC x) = Background Material		

DOC 1

FY26 Full Application Requests				
Project ID	Project Title	Original Amount Requested	Current Amount Requested	Current Total
Community Housing				
CPA26-003	JFS of Metrowest Emergency Rental Subsidies	\$117,000	\$117,000	
CPA26-005	Carlson Crossing East	\$600,000	\$600,000	
CPA26-007	Emergency Rental Assistance for People Affected by Substance Use Disorder	\$35,000	\$35,000	
				\$752,000
Outdoor Recreation				
CPA26-011	Design Access for Simpson Park	\$300,000	\$300,000	
CPA26-012	Walsh-Dunning Softball Field Complex	\$1,361,590	\$327,425	
CPA26-018	Construction- Carol Getchell Middle Section	\$215,000	\$156,784	
CPA26-022	Anna Murphy Park ADA Water Fountain & Bottle Filler	\$16,000	\$16,000	
CPA26-023	Waushakum Beach Improvements	\$300,000	\$300,000	
				\$1,100,209
Historic Preservation				
CPA26-006	First Parish in Framingham Meetinghouse Preservation	\$362,821	\$362,821	
CPA26-013	ADA Entrances for Cushing Chapel	\$165,000	\$165,000	
CPA26-019	Edgell Grove Cemetery Tomb House (Phase 3)	\$585,000	\$585,000	
CPA26-020	FHC Academy- Fire Resistant Cabinets	\$20,000	\$20,000	
				\$1,132,821
Open Space				
CPA26-010	Eastleigh Farm	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	
CPA26-014	43-45 Nixon Road	\$250,000	\$250,000	
				\$3,250,000
Total Requested				\$6,235,030

[Link to All FY2026 CPA Applications](#)

DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION

CPA 2026 Budget	PROJECT FUNDS Available, Current and Past Years for FY26 (Excluding Admin Budget)			CPC VOTE: FY 2026 Spending Limit:			
	\$3,872,855			\$2,672,855			
Project ID	Project Name	Original CPA Funding Request	Current CPA Funding Request	Category Sums	Thoughts on Funding	Worksheet Category Sums	Notes
COMMUNITY HOUSING PROPOSALS							
CPA26-003	JFS of Metrowest Emergency Rental Subsidies	\$117,000	\$117,000		100,000		discuss AMI
CPA26-005	Carlson Crossing East	\$600,000	\$600,000		600,000		
CPA26-007	Emergency Rental Subsidies for People Affected by Substance Use Disorder	\$35,000	\$35,000		0		
Total Community Housing				\$752,000		\$ 700,000.00	
OPEN SPACE & OUTDOOR RECREATION							
CPA26-010	Eastleigh Farm	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000		0		
CPA26-011	Design Access for Simpson Park	\$300,000	\$300,000		75,000		feasibility study/borings
CPA26-012	Walsh-Dunning Softball Field Complex	\$1,361,590	\$327,425		\$327,500		
CPA26-014	43-45 Nixon Road	\$250,000	\$250,000		250,000		need appraisal/boundaries of land
CPA26-018	Construction- Carol Getchell Middle Section	\$215,000	\$156,784		\$157,000		
CPA26-022	Anna Murphy Park ADA Water Fountain & Bottle Filler	\$16,000	\$16,000		16,000		
CPA26-023	Wauhakum Beach Improvements	\$300,000	\$300,000		300,000		
Total Open Space & Outdoor Recreation				\$4,350,209		\$ 1,125,500.00	
HISTORIC PRESERVATION							
CPA26-006	First Parish in Framingham Meetinghouse Preservation	\$362,821	\$362,821		363,000		
CPA26-013	ADA Entrances for Cushing Chapel	\$165,000	\$165,000		165,000		
CPA26-019	Edgell Grove Cemetery Tomb House (Phase 3)	\$585,000	\$585,000		300,000		
CPA26-020	FHC Academy- Fire Resistant Cabinets	\$20,000	\$20,000		20,000		
Total Historic Preservation				\$1,132,821		\$ 848,000.00	
Requests TOTAL				\$6,235,030		\$ 2,673,500.00	



Framingham Community Preservation Committee

[Community Preservation Committee Website](#)

Thomas Mahoney, Chair
Karen Margolis, Vice Chair
Judy Grove, Clerk
David Gudejko
Kevin Swope
Mary-Anne Tratchel
Robert Merusi
Steven DeNicola
Ted Cosgrove

MINUTES: February 9, 2026
Executive Conference Room
HYBRID (IN PERSON AND REMOTE)
7:00 PM

Committee Members Participating In-person: Thomas Mahoney, Karen Margolis, Judy Grove, Dave Gudejko, Kevin Swope, Mary-Anne Tratchel, Bob Merusi, Steven DeNicola and Ted Cosgrove
Staff Member Participating: Heather O'Donnell

CALL TO ORDER

At 7:00 PM, Mr. Mahoney called the meeting to order, began the meeting recording and read the agenda. Mr. Mahoney acknowledged Janice Rogers, Chair of the Framingham Housing Authority, as there was a quorum of the authority in the room. She called the meeting of the Framingham Housing Authority to order.

Public Participation

Ron Chick provided the CPC with a written response to the request to defer funding for the Construction of the Carol Getchell Middle Section. He stated that the Middle Section is the missing link that allows ADA improvements CPC has already funded. Delaying it would unnecessarily prolong incomplete access.

Applicant Presentations

Paul Landers, Executive Director of the Framingham Housing Authority, presented on **CPA26-005- Carlson Crossing East**. Mr. Landers stated that the Carlson Crossing development was built in 1953 as a federal public housing facility. The West Phase was renovated and completed in 2024. The North Phase was also completed in 2024 and includes one accessible building with three units. The East Phase includes four accessible units. The East Phase has 57 units in 14 existing buildings. The East Phase will have a new campus center, an accessible playground, a splash pad and a basketball court. The project has the support of the Mayor and the Framingham Disability Commission. The Housing Authority has a waitlist of 585 families for accessible units. The Massachusetts Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (HLC) required an accessible component of the project to provide funding. The money from CPC would be used for hard construction.

One CPC member asked about the cost difference between a regular unit and an accessible unit. Mr. Landers stated that the cost would be about 30% higher. The Housing Authority has limited land to build new accessible units. One CPC member asked for more details about the 4% tax credit financing of the project. Mr. Landers explained that this is the funding source for the Housing Authority, involving an equity partner. The Housing Authority borrows funds to do construction and then an entity buys the equity. The Housing Authority is trying to schedule a closing. This type of

project takes about six months to close. One CPC member stated that the total budget is \$2.6 million. Is that just the two accessible buildings? Mr. Landers confirmed that it was correct. One CPC member stated that the remaining cost will be made up of tax credits and bonds. How much does the current financing rely on CPC funds? The request is a large portion of the CPC budget. Mr. Landers stated that the deal has been fully developed. The Housing Authority will need to go back to the HLC if the CPC funds are not provided. The \$600,000 is needed for the deal to happen; it is not a luxury. One CPC member stated that the Committee provided funds in the previous year. The CPC cannot use funds for rehabilitation, but it can fund the construction of new housing units. The financing will close on the entire East Phase of the project, which includes the new accessible units. Mr. Landers stated that the entire project is \$33 million for construction costs. The accessible portion needs to be in the project. One CPC member noted that costs have gone up globally for the project. A CPA affordability restriction will be recorded on the property, preserving the units as affordable and accessible for Framingham residents in perpetuity. This is a step up in the Housing Authority's commitment.

At 7: 25 PM, Chairwoman Rogers thanked the CPC and adjourned the meeting of the Framingham Housing Authority.

Renee Vogel, Prevention and Outreach Specialist, Framingham Public Health Department, presented on ***CPA26-007-Emergency Rental Subsidies for People Affected by Substance Use Disorder***. The proposal is for a pilot program to assist people affected by substance use disorder. Ms. Vogel explained that residents in recovery need to complete clinic hours, which limits their ability to work and save funds for housing. The program will provide emergency rental and housing assistance to Framingham residents impacted by substance use disorder. The program would serve low-income individuals with less than 60% AMI. The program would offer up to \$5,000 per eligible housing for emergency rental assistance, security deposits and first month's rent in sober or recovery supportive housing. The program would use 100% of the CPA funds for direct housing assistance. Participants would be referred through local recovery and housing partners. Community partners would verify eligibility. Payments would be made directly to landlords. The program would track households assisted, housing stabilization outcomes and successful transition to long-term housing. The program will help enhance recovery, reduce harm, provide housing opportunities and prevent homelessness. The request is for \$35,000, which would be matched by \$15,000 in Opioid Abatement Funds.

One CPC member asked whether other communities have similar programs and how success will be measured. Ms. Vogel stated that she already has a strong partnership with programs. Participants would be successful if they find long-term housing and other basic demographics. One CPC member asked whether sober housing would include rent or other service fees as well. Ms. Vogel stated that the cost to enter housing is for the rent itself. The cost to enter sober housing is usually similar to market-rate rent, although this may vary by location. One CPC member stated that the CPA can't fund social service costs, while it can pay for housing. One CPC member asked about the recurring costs of treatment. Ms. Vogel explained that, in general, there is only a one-time fee to enter the housing. One CPC member asked whether sober housing was available to families. One CPC asked how the Public Health Department will be contacted by referring organizations. Ms. Vogel stated she already has relationships with the staff of referring organizations. Framingham doesn't have a human services component to its health department. The collaboration with organizations fills this gap. One CPC asked whether other cities and towns have programs similar to this proposal. Ms. Vogel stated that other communities do have similar programs. One CPC member asked how the referring organizations would handle intake and eligibility verification. Ms. Vogel stated that these organizations have relationships and would be able to provide referrals, while the department would provide the financial support.

One CPC member stated that clinicians have different skill sets than social workers or recovery coaches. How can a recovery coach do eligibility verification? There is no central entity to do the eligibility verification or intake process. There are so many different entry points, which may do the review process differently. Ms. Vogel stated that there is some level of centralization, as most of the participants will go through the Southern Middlesex Opportunity Council (SMOC). There are four sober homes in Framingham, which are all operated by SMOC. One CPC member asked whether any participant would contact the Public Health Department directly. Ms. Vogel said she did not expect that to happen. If so, she wouldn't be able to verify eligibility. She would direct the participant to SMOC. One CPC

member asked how Framingham residency would be determined. Ms. Vogel stated that participants are often transient individuals. The participants would be living in Framingham currently and have relationships in Framingham.

One CPC member stated that SMOC owns over 495 units in Framingham. SMOC could do this type of program on its own. Ms. Vogel stated that SMOC has fewer resources than the Public Health Department. Meghan Todd, City of Framingham Grants Manager, stated that the recovery community in the City of Framingham is a well-oiled machine. The service providers meet weekly and know the individuals in the community who need assistance. The City has opioid settlement funds. There is a responsibility to use those funds. One of the areas that opioid settlement funds should be used for is housing. The community partners do not have access to the opioid funding. One CPC member stated that there is opioid funding available, which is included in the project cost. The Public Health Department has not submitted a request to appropriate those funds. The pilot program could be started using solely opioid funds. Ms. Todd stated that partnership within the City makes everything stronger. Showing broader support will encourage the City Council to appropriate funds for this project. MAPC has done a needs assessment, which found that housing is a central need in the City.

Mike Welch, Chair of Framingham Youth Softball Operational Improvement Committee, presented on **CPA26-012-Walsh-Dunning Softball Field Complex Improvements**. Mr. Welch was joined by Matt Butler, President of Framingham Youth Softball, Alison Elliott, Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation and Jim Snyder, Director of Parks and Recreation. Mr. Welch stated appreciation for the CPC's previous funding for Framingham Youth Softball. The funding request has been updated since it was initially submitted. Framingham's Youth Baseball has wonderful facilities. However, Framingham Youth Softball's facilities are subpar in comparison. There are only two under-twelve fields and one full-size field. There is no storage, restrooms, dugouts, lighting, or flagpole. Framingham cannot host competitive softball tournaments. In FY2024, Youth Softball was awarded \$35,000 in CPA funds for concept design for improvements to the softball field complex. The concept design is now almost complete, which will inform the final design. The proposed complex improvements will include an additional field in the lower portion of the site, athletic lighting, scoreboards, fencing and netting, dugouts, batting cages, an amenity building, and ADA-compliant walkways. The School Department is a co-applicant for the project. There have been assurances that there are no plans to renovate Walsh Middle School in the near future. The updated request removes the lighting component and will include full design documents. The initial request was for \$1.6 million. The updated request is for \$327,425. Updated documents were received from Gale Associates last week. The current request will move from conceptual design to full construction documents so that the project is ready to build. This will help refine the request for construction costs. Mr. Welch recognized City Councilor Mary Kate Feeney, who has supported the project. Ms. Elliott stated that she approached Gale Associates to refine the estimate. The costs no longer include bidding services or construction oversight. It is design only.

One CPC member asked whether the project is in the capital budget. Ms. Elliott stated that the project is in the FY2027 Capital Budget. One CPC member stated that the project is perfect to do in phases. The design will look at the totality of the project and then the Parks and Recreation Department will decide what portions to construct first. Ms. Elliott noted that there are a number of different ways to approach design. There are efficiencies if the project is done all at once. One CPC member stated that it is important to see the big picture for this parcel. One CPC member asked what the FY2027 Capital Budget recommendation amount is. Ms. Elliott stated that the request is for \$500,000 for design. The Capital Budget was submitted last September, but funds won't be available until July, if appropriated. One CPC member asked why a request was submitted to the CPC if the project is also included in the Capital Budget. Ms. Elliott stated that she has been advised to list all CPC requests on the Capital Budget as well. This is only a request for design funds. The City doesn't want to rely on the CPC to fund the project; it is part of a long-range plan and needs to be in the Capital Budget. One CPC member stated that this is a City and School Department project. This is a large request, given that this is technically not recreation land. Although it may not be for a while, the School Department could construct a new school on the location of this project. The CPC could have a difficult time recouping its funds if the fields are removed. Mr. Welch stated that he has been involved in a number of projects

funded through the Massachusetts School Building Authority. These projects always include funding to replace athletic fields when buildings are moved. City Council Mary Kate Feeney stated her support for the project. As a former baseball player, she was unaware of the condition of the softball fields in Framingham. Girls deserve to have equal facilities to boys. This is an equity issue. Girls should be able to have the opportunity to do physical activity. Other communities have high-quality facilities for softball, whereas Framingham is so far behind. One CPC member asked how the amenity building would be divided. Mr. Welch stated that the building would be used for storage and replace the shipping containers that are currently used. The building will be used to sell concessions, but that would only be a shelf for chips, nothing cooked. One CPC member stated that CPA cannot fund a concessions stand. Bathrooms and equipment storage can be funded. An incidental use for concessions is allowed. Framingham Youth Softball has 200 families participating. One CPC member asked when the construction is to be funded. Ms. Elliott stated that there is a request in a future year's capital budget.

Paul Spear, Framingham High School Athletic Director, stated his support for the project. The project will provide equitable opportunities for girls. Mr. Butler noted that the fields would be used by the Framingham High School softball team as well as Framingham Youth Softball.

Liz Kaprielian presented on **CPA26-022- ADA Compliant Water Fountain and Bottle Filler at Anna Murphy Park**. The project will replace the existing water fountain at Anna Murphy Park, which is estimated to be about 25 years old. It is not ADA-compliant. The Coburnville-Tripoli neighborhood is supportive of the project. The new fountain will include a bottle filler, which can help reduce the use of plastic water bottles. The neighbors requested that the fountain include a dog bowl. The location of the new fountain will be different from the existing fountain, due to an outdated backflow device that is installed below grade. A similar unit was installed at Arlington Street Park in 2024. The installation will leverage existing water line infrastructure. A concrete pad for the fountain and an accessible pathway connecting the roadway to the fountain. The Parks and Recreation Department will handle the installation, consulting with the Water Department as needed. The project cost will include the unit itself, installation and materials. Some costs will be paid for by the City. This small-scale project can be done easily compared to some larger projects coming down the road. The project is expected to be done by Autumn 2026.

One CPC member stated that the cost of the unit itself is \$12,000. Work will need to take place on parkland and not on the right-of-way. The project is near the property line. Ms. Elliott clarified that the water fountain will not be on the right-of-way. Ms. Kaprielian noted that Anna Murphy Park is in good shape and major renovations will not be happening in the near future. This project makes a needed improvement that will benefit a lot of neighbors in the meantime.

Motion to extend the meeting to 9:30 PM made by Ms. Tratchel, seconded by Mr. DeNicola. No discussion and approved by unanimous vote, 9-0-0.

Alison Elliott presented on **CPA26-023- Waushakum Beach Engineering Design**. The project will benefit the neighborhood and Framingham residents as a whole. Design and improvements at Waushakum Beach have been done in stages. So far, a Mobi mat has been installed and stormwater improvements have been done. In 2026, the accessible dock will be installed and fence line improvements will be made. The project request has been modified. The project will now be focused on design and engineering for Waushakum Beach, including feasibility confirmation, structural geo-technical analysis and development of construction documents, all soft costs. As part of the 2024 conceptual design, the community was engaged for feedback. The main community concerns are the outdated playground, stormwater washouts, lack of shade, the bathhouse obstructs visibility and the need for improved accessibility. In 2022, the conceptual design of Waushakum Beach was done, with concepts ranging between \$5 and \$9 million, which included a menu of options. Ms. Elliott showed some shade and bathhouse design options. A pergola or a sail-type shade could be added. Modular bathrooms could be installed. These are pre-fabricated and installed on-site. A new bathroom building will be much smaller than the existing building. Ms. Elliott showed potential playground options, which would be incorporated into the beach. The project will include design

development, construction documents and bidding assistance totaling \$300,000. Ms. Elliott provided a memo to the committee to show the updated cost estimates.

One CPC member asked what would happen with the existing bathhouse. Ms. Elliott stated that the bathhouse will probably be torn down, costing about \$30,000 to \$50,000 to demolish. Removing the building will improve the ecological condition of the pond. One CPC member appreciated the changes that were made to the application, although the changes came late in the application process. Ms. Elliott stated that she has been meeting with vendors to determine options. One CPC member asked if the bathrooms can be locked automatically. Ms. Elliott responded that some of the options will indeed include that feature and even self-cleaning options. There would be no fixtures for people to damage. One CPC member asked if any zoning relief would be needed for the building. Ms. Elliott did not believe relief would be needed, but she will apply for permits as needed through the design process. One CPC member stated that the project shows the need for City departments to be involved in projects. Ms. Kaprielian stated that the original designs for Waushakum Beach were beautiful but too expensive. One CPC asked whether modifications would be made to stormwater on-site. Ms. Elliott stated that the site design may include some reduction in sand and adding different ground covers, which will improve the stormwater situation. There are multiple storm drains near the site. The storm drains are shallow, so they cannot be combined and must remain where they are located. One CPC member asked if the beach always had sand, or if it was different at some point. Ms. Elliott stated that she was unfamiliar with the history of the sand. One CPC member stated that the project is also on the Capital Budget. Parks and Recreation has submitted more than one CPC project this year, so they are competing with themselves in a way. Jim Snyder, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated that this will help ensure success. One CPC member said that the risk for the CPC is low for the Waushakum Beach project, as it will always be City-owned parkland.

Discussion: Debrief of Presentations

The CPC discussed **CPA26-022, Anna Murphy Park ADA Water Fountain and Bottle Filler**. One CPC member stated that the project is fine. Another CPC member agreed. The CPC discussed **CPA26-023, Waushakum Beach Improvements**. This is the next stage for this project. One CPC member stated that there are multiple projects within the category. There are many great projects this year. One CPC member stated that there were no unanswered questions. One CPC member stated it was problematic to receive updated information so late in the process. It would have been better to receive that update earlier in the process. One CPC member noted that the applicant watched the CPC meeting and responded accordingly. Although late, the application has improved. These applications take hours of work. One CPC stated that the projects are in the long-range plans. All projects submitted by department heads should be in the capital plan.

Motion to extend the meeting to 9:45 PM made by Ms. Grove, seconded by Ms. Margolis. No discussion. Motion fails: 3-6-0.

CPC members discussed **CPC26-007, Emergency Rental Subsidies for People Affected by Substance Use Disorder**. One CPC member stated that this was an important project. However, input will be from only one source. One CPC member stated having concerns about SMOC. SMOC could do this project on its own. What happens if participants fail? One CPC member emphasized the need for this type of program. One CPC member stated that the applicant is from the Framingham Health Department. There are similarities to the JFS of the Metrowest Rental Subsidies program. One CPC member asked where the department head was. The applicant is not the department head. The department needs to stick to its mission. Ms. O'Donnell stated that Bill Murphy, Director of Public Health, is supportive of the project. One CPC member stated being impressed with Ms. Vogel. One CPC member asked whether Stuart Saginor of the Community Preservation Coalition had been contacted regarding the project. Some of the elements, such as temporary housing, might not be eligible for funding. Ms. O'Donnell stated that she had not yet contacted Mr. Saginor.

ADJOURN

At 9:25 PM, a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Cosgrove, seconded by Ms. Tratchel. No discussion and approved by unanimous approval, 9-0-0.

Minutes prepared by Heather O'Donnell, CPC Coordinator

Respectfully submitted by Judy Grove, Clerk, Community Preservation Committee

Refer to the [Public Meeting Portal](#) for more information regarding Community Preservation Committee meetings, including full video recordings for remotely held meetings.



Framingham Community Preservation Committee

[Community Preservation Committee Website](#)

Thomas Mahoney, Chair
Karen Margolis, Vice Chair
Judy Grove, Clerk
David Gudejko
Kevin Swope
Mary-Anne Tratchel
Robert Merusi
Steven DeNicola
Ted Cosgrove

MINUTES: February 12, 2026
Ablondi Room
HYBRID (IN PERSON AND REMOTE)
7:00 PM

Committee Members Participating In-person: Thomas Mahoney, Karen Margolis, Judy Grove, Dave Gudejko, Kevin Swope, Bob Merusi, Steven DeNicola and Ted Cosgrove
Committee Members Participating Remotely: Mary-Anne Tratchel
Staff Member Participating: Heather O'Donnell

CALL TO ORDER

At 7:11 PM, Mr. Mahoney called the meeting to order, began the meeting recording and read the agenda.

Public Participation

None.

Applicant Presentations

Sarkis Sarkisian, Director of Planning and Community Development, presented on **CPA26-010- Eastleigh Farm**. He was joined by Doug Stephan, owner of Eastleigh Farm, Brendan Stephan and attorney Arthur White. The proposal is to preserve open space. Mr. Sarkisian hoped that the CPC could conduct a site visit. Eastleigh Farm has been a farm in Framingham for many years and includes 112 acres. The farm has upwards of 20,000 visitors each year. The farm is the largest piece of unprotected, privately owned land in Metrowest. Securing an agricultural preservation restriction will ensure that the land is undeveloped and also ensure public access to open space via a trail connection to Callahan State Park. The market value of the farm is \$8.55 million. Purchasing a conservation or agricultural restriction will cost \$7.65 million. A restriction will control the development rights of the property forever. The request of the CPC is \$3 million. The remaining funds are proposed to come from the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture (MDAR), providing a competitive grant, Sudbury Valley Trustees (SVT), federal funding and an Executive Office of Grants and Technical Assistance (EEA) Landscape Partnership Grant. The City needs to make a commitment to provide a match for the MDAR grant before the application process starts. MDAR needs to see a succession plan for the farm, which has not been completed. SVT has not yet committed funds. The project is still in process. Mr. Sarkisian asked whether the project could be bonded. The CPC funds would act as seed funding to get additional funding. Bonding has been done in other communities. For example, Wayland was able to preserve Mainstone Farm, over 200 acres of land. For that project, \$9 million was bonded. The debt service equaled 20% of the CPC funds each year. Mr. Sarkisian suggested bonding the project over 20 years, which would be approximately \$200,000 each year. An environmental assessment is currently underway.

Mr. Stephan stated his appreciation for Ms. Sarkisian's help. Mr. Stephan provided a letter regarding the project to the CPC. He received some questions about the project. One was: How much money will Mr. Stephan get to keep as a result of the proposal? He stated he will not keep any funds. The land is pledged to a mortgage. The funding that is being sought will equal the amount of the mortgage. If approved, the project will include a path for public access all the way around the pasture land. The funding amount will determine how much development will occur. While Mr. Stephan does not want to develop any of the land, the economic realities will determine whether or not development will occur. Bonding is a possibility, but it will impact future projects.

One CPC asked about whether the agricultural preservation restriction would encompass the entire 112-acre parcel. The application materials show an agricultural preservation development. Mr. Stephan stated that if he does not receive \$7 million, the entire parcel will not be preserved. One CPC member stated that it seems additional grant funds are being sought. The CPC does not want to be in a position where \$3 million is committed, but development still happens. Mr. Stephan indicated that he is being pressured by his bank. He does not want to develop the farm, but there is a number that needs to be met to protect the entire farm. One CPC member stated that the application to MDAR includes 111.9 acres, but the APR would only be on 100.98 acres. This leaves 10 acres behind. Mr. Stephan explained that from initial discussions with MDAR, funding would be insufficient, so 10 acres were set aside for development as a hypothetical scenario. The 10 acres will be developed if there is not enough money generated to pay off the mortgage completely. One CPC member stated that the point of the restriction is to ensure that development does not occur at all. If there is a conservation restriction on 100 acres, there would only be some development rights on the remaining portion. The value of the property is based almost entirely on the development rights. If these development rights are retained, the value of the remaining land is low and there isn't much left for the CPC to buy. Mr. Stephan stated that if he can't release the mortgage, he wouldn't be able to put a restriction on the land.

Mr. Sarkisian stated that if Mr. Stephan can secure \$7 million, the entire farm will be protected. If Mr. Stephan cannot secure all of the required funds, the northeast portion of the property will need to be developed. One CPC member stated that the appraisal is based on the development of 50 housing units. This is based on the transfer of development rights, a Planning Board decision that was made in 2016. That Planning Board approval did not grant any development rights but allowed the transfer of development rights (TDR) associated with 50 units to another site, such as Shopper's World, at a higher density. The 50 units were not based on what can actually be built on that site. There were two findings in the Planning Board decision that are critical. The appraisal value of \$8 million is based on the transfer of development rights of 50 units. The Planning Board decision stated, "The number of lots determined by the TDR yield plan is not considered as developed lots for construction, but is determined merely to provide possible yield for transfer of development rights to development elsewhere. The owner/applicant could need to apply for a preliminary subdivision plan and a definitive subdivision plan or an agricultural preservation development by-law plan." Zoning review is needed to determine the value of the property. The 50-unit development plan requires two access points to the property. It included a second access from Walker's Way, which does not exist. The applicant claimed that there may be another street where access could be gained. The Planning Board agreed to that because the matter was only the transfer of development rights at that point. The concept yield plan dated 2016 shows a connection to Walker's Way. If the property at 1062 Edmands Road, the applicant would have to take the appropriate steps to acquire the additional property on Walker's Way or Angelica Drive, as stated in a letter from attorney Arthur White regarding the transfer of development rights. At best, with only one access point, 25 units could be constructed. Mr. Stephan stated that he hasn't sought approval. The situation could be different from what it was in 2016. Mr. Stephan stated that there is an encumbrance on the land that has to be paid off for it to be restricted. The CPC needs to consider whether the farm is worth saving for the community.

One CPC member stated that this is the first project that the CPC would bond. The payment would be \$227,000 a year if the bond is issued for 20 years. Does that include interest? Mr. Stephan stated that it did include the interest.

This will limit the available funds for future projects. One CPC member stated that bonding this project would utilize the entire open space funding for 20 years. It's important to address all questions before making a decision. Mr. Sarkisian stated that the land development will be limited by the septic system. ADUs could also be constructed, allowing 40 units. One CPC member stated that the funding sources include CPC, MDAR, SVT, EEA Landscape Partnership and federal funds. If all of these funds come through, the property will not be developed, but if one of the funding sources doesn't come through, some of the property will be developed. The CPC can make the funds contingent on other funding sources. The farm is valuable to the community, but there are many other valuable projects this year. The CPC will need to ask tough questions. The CPC wants to protect the entire property. One CPC member asked if there is not enough money to protect the entire farm, would the development of 10 acres only be a conventional subdivision? The remaining land would have already been paid for. Mr. Sarkisian stated that this was correct. He stated that multiple conditions would need to be included with any approval for the project. Could a cluster development be built? How many units could be built under an Approval Not Required plan? The site would require the construction of a road to create lots.

One CPC member stated that if the CPC keeps \$3 million, it will earn interest, so spending money on this project would forego those earnings. One CPC member stated that the farm does have value to the community. The farm was purchased for \$4 million. However, the current mortgage is \$8 million. The CPC hasn't seen documentation stating that \$7 million is actually still owed on the mortgage. The CPC cannot pay more than the property is worth. The appraisal that was done was based on a transfer of development rights of 50 units. The CPC must pay the fair value of the land. MDAR requires an appraisal. Where are they in the process? Mr. Stephan stated that the cost of the farm was more than \$4 million. While the deed is for \$4 million, other encumbrances were placed on the farm by private parties.

Linda Kirchman, member of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, stated that the committee has been working to help preserve the land for sustainable agricultural use, public use and to preserve its natural resource benefits. The property has been threatened for the past twenty-five years. She described the property's benefits. In other communities, farms have been preserved, including Dartmouth, Stowe, Middleborough, and Westport. In each of these cases, CPA funds were instrumental in saving farmland. If foreclosure occurs, the City will have no say in what happens to the property.

One CPC member stated that the transfer of the development aspect of the appraisal, because it doesn't actually reflect any value. The application included a proposal for the CPC to provide \$500,000 each year for six years. It isn't clear if that is still an option. The CPC wants to build up its funds to allow for acquisition. The project could be done with contingencies. One CPC member stated that funds would not be allocated until the closing of the property, when the agricultural restriction is placed on the property. The project would not get funds in advance. All funds would need to be available at the time of the closing. One CPC member stated that the CPC could create a conservation reserve fund to set aside funds for the purpose. One CPC member stated that the project would require multiple conditions. Agricultural restrictions don't necessarily include public access. The CPC would want public access to be included.

Mr. Mahoney noted that there were forty-five people online. Maria Paula Arenas, a resident, stated her support for preserving land on Eastleigh Farm. The farm provides value for Framingham residents and the surrounding community. Elys Rodriguez, a resident and member of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, stated her support for preserving Eastleigh Farm. Being able to preserve the history of Framingham is vital for young people. Meredith Houghton, Senior Land Protection Specialist with Sudbury Valley Trustees, stated that Eastleigh Farm has been on SVT's radar for years. SVT understands the complexities of the project and has been a partner for the project. They support the project. Annie Murphy, resident and former director of the Framingham History Center, stated that she supported the adoption of CPA in Framingham. One of the main reasons was to protect Eastleigh Farm. Mr. Mahoney asked for a poll of people online on how many were in favor of the project. Twenty-eight people raised their hands to support the project. One person raised their hand oppose the project. Audrey Hall, a Framingham

resident, stated she did not like the idea that residents were asked to vote for or against the project. There is so much information to be considered. Preserving land is important, but questions need to be asked. Mr. Mahoney noted that there will be a public hearing on March 23, 2026. At that meeting, the program for the year will be finalized.

Mr. Sarkisian presented on **CPA26-011- Design Access for Simpson Park**. The request is for design funds to create a parking lot at 499 Central Street. Previously, Mr. Sarkisian had requested CPA funds to purchase 499 Central Street. The property was purchased by the City through the use of Affordable Housing Mitigation funds. The property is being rented out at 60% AMI to a veteran. The CPC has discussed the need for an Approval Not Required plan for the site, as a portion is being used for housing and the remaining portion is proposed to be used for outdoor recreation. Mr. Sarkisian will go before the City Council on February 17, 2026. There is currently no parking lot for Simpson Park, which is one of the only parks in the neighborhood. The site has 300 feet of frontage. Central Street is undergoing a major construction project, which will need to be coordinated. A boardwalk or specialty pavement and guardrails will need to be designed to connect the parking area to Simpson Park itself. Once design funds are in place, the City could apply for a MassTrails Grant to pay for the construction portion. A survey will need to be done first.

One CPC stated that an email was provided from the City Solicitor's office. The email stated that there is no legal restriction on real property acquired with CPC funds. However, this response did not really address the question the CPC posed. For the most part, Simpson Park itself is in park use and is City property. However, 499 Central Street is not in recreational use; it is in residential use. The Department of Revenue (DOR) has provided guidance for CPA. Rehabilitation or capital improvements to municipally-owned recreation land that make the land or related recreation facilities more functional for their intended outdoor recreational use are allowed. A recreation project must be on municipally-owned recreation land. There is additional language for land that is not municipally-owned. The land on 499 Central Street is municipally-owned housing. Creating a path from one recreation site to another is allowed. Mr. Sarkisian will seek permission to subdivide the site before the City Council.

Motion to extend meeting to 10 PM made by Ms. Grove, seconded by Ms. Margolis. No discussion and approved by roll call vote: Ms. Tratchel, aye; Mr. Merusi, aye; Mr. DeNicola, aye; Mr. Gudejko, aye; Ms. Grove, aye; Ms. Margolis, aye; Mr. Cosgrove, aye; Mr. Swope, aye; Mr. Mahoney, aye, 9-0-0.

One CPC member asked whether there was space on the housing lot for parking. Mr. Sarkisian stated that that was the plan. One CPC member asked how many residents live within walking distance of this park. The park is near the Juniper Hill neighborhood, with many residents. One CPC member stated that the parcel needs to be designated for recreation. The project will require significant tree removal. Will the permitting be difficult? It will require Conservation Commission approval and Planning Board approval. Mr. Sarkisian stated that a Notice of Intent will be required. The permitting will be difficult. One CPC member asked whether the cost of permitting is included in the funding request. Michael Cannon, City Councilor from District 4, stated thanks to Mr. Sarkisian. District 4 is the only City district without a park. Improving Simpson Park was one of the reasons many in the community supported the adoption of the CPA. It is difficult to get to the riverfront in Framingham. In the short term, other funds can be used to improve the crosswalk from the pump station. The pump station does have space for parking. Traffic calming measures can be implemented.

Mr. Sarkisian presented on **CPA26-014- 43-45 Nixon Road**. The land on 43-45 Nixon Road is believed to have been owned by Henry Ford at one point. The CPC funded an appraisal of this property. The appraisal came in at \$875,000. However, the owner wanted \$2 million and negotiations stopped. There have been several development proposals on the site. There is no water or sewer in this area of Framingham. At one point, an 8-lot subdivision was proposed. Neighbors were concerned about the blasting's impact on their wells. Later, a 24-unit townhouse development was proposed. The land is the second-highest point in Framingham and connects to land protected by Sudbury Valley Trustees. The Bay Circuit Trail could be brought through this property. While the hope was to protect all of the land, that was not possible due to costs. The current proposal is to protect 9.46 acres of open space at 43-45 Nixon Road.

An additional 14.5 acres will be preserved as part of a 9-acre development. The entire project is contingent on a developer doing a low-impact development, but the project will require Planning Board approval. Sudbury Valley Trustees is working on an appraisal for the 9 acres. The proposal is conditioned on doing a low-impact development. One appraisal came in at \$675,000, so the request is below the appraised value. Mr. Sarkisian does not have a timeframe for when the development will be submitted.

One CPC asked what the timeline is for the appraisal being done by SVT. One CPC member asked if the 9 acres could be developed and whether this land includes a site named Ford's Folly. Mr. Sarkisian stated that the land could be developed and does not include Ford's Folly, but the original Henry Ford house is on the site. CPC members discussed that the entire 32-acre property was appraised at \$873,000 based on a six-lot single-family subdivision. The appraisal proposed 25 acres being preserved. That proposal is no longer on the table. Mr. Sarkisian stated that this land is the missing piece to allow trail linkage. One CPC member stated that the process before the Planning Board hasn't started yet. There is no Approval Not Required plan in place yet. The existing appraisal does not define the boundaries of the land to be preserved. Mr. Sarkisian stated that the appraisal being conducted by SVT will include the land's boundaries. One CPC member stated that the project could take a year or more to complete the development process. It would be better to go through the planning process first. The land could be protected regardless of whether or not the development occurs. One CPC member stated that the project could be considered outside the normal funding cycle if all pieces do not come together in time. One CPC member stated that the CPC could set up a conservation fund and set aside funds for this project. One CPC member asked whether it is correct that projects have three years to spend money. Once the time runs out, the funds are returned to be reallocated for other projects. Mr. Mahoney confirmed that it is correct. The CPC could provide a shorter timeframe to spend funds as a condition. One CPC member stated that all project funds are set aside in a specific account. Those funds can only be used for that specific project. The question is, does the CPC want to tie up funds for 3 years for a project that may or may not happen? One CPC member stated that the fact that SVT is willing to pay for half of the cost is beneficial.

John Mastrobattista, Framingham resident and member of the SVT Board of Directors, stated that there is a finite amount of land. SVT has had great success with Framingham in the past. Land deals are always complex and sequencing is difficult. Will Fox, a Framingham resident, stated the land is a keystone to an incredible trail system that Framingham has. If this piece of land is acquired, Nobscot will connect to Callahan State Park without going on the road. It would be an incredible resource for the City.

Debrief of Presentations

The CPC discussed the presentation for CPA26-010- Eastleigh Farm. One CPC member stated that the project would be a big decision. One CPC member stated that bonding the project would mean committing the entire Outdoor Recreation/Open Space allocation for twenty years. Other large projects will come up in the future. Ms. O'Donnell will speak to other CPC coordinators about how they have handled bonding. Mr. Stephan stated that he did not believe other large-scale land projects are likely to come up in the future. One CPC member stated that bonding does have costs associated with it. Instead of bonding, the CPC could allocate the \$1.2 million that was voted to be set aside to Eastleigh Farm. The CPC could commit some funds, but not necessarily \$3 million. One CPC member stated that the City has a capital budget. The CPC cannot meet all of the City's capital needs. However, the CPC can contribute. In the same way, the CPC can contribute to the Eastleigh Farm project. The City has a larger bonding capacity and could do that on its own. One CPC member stated that the City has done a poor job of maintaining properties. Likewise, the City could help with this project. The entire Parks and Recreation budget is only \$7 million. One CPC member stated that the parcel should be saved. It is too valuable to the community to lose. The entire northwest quadrant of Framingham is an asset to the community. Once lost, it is gone.

The CPC discussed CPA26-011- Design Access for Simpson Park. One CPC member stated that the project does not address the condition of the entire park. The project only addresses work at 499 Central Street. One CPC member stated that the engineering costs could be impacted by the borings and other finds. The condition of the bridge will impact the entire project. If the bridge needs extensive work, this could really drive up the cost of construction. One

CPC member stated that doing borings is not due diligence. That is part of the design itself. The CPC paid for a survey, but that can not include the borings. The assessment of the bridge could be considered due diligence. The bridge will need to accommodate vehicles. One CPC member stated that a bridge report did come back, with the condition being "fair." The report is unlikely to be sufficient. A full report will likely be needed. One CPC member stated that the project will be passive recreation. The planning that will occur under the proposal should be helpful. One CPC member asked about the size of the park. Ms. O'Donnell noted that she reached out to the City Solicitor's office, inquiring whether or not outdoor recreation properties need to be restricted. She forwarded the email to the CPC. One CPC member explained that since funds were not being expended to buy land, a restriction is not required. However, residential use does create an issue. The outdoor recreation portion should be joined with Simpson Park itself. One CPC member stated that the City Solicitor didn't really answer the question that was asked. The fact that the park itself is being used for outdoor recreation means it can be funded. One CPC member stated being concerned about the permitting for the project. The site is limited due to its state. The construction could end up being very costly. This a riverfront, so there is no buffer zone. The CPC appreciates that Mr. Sarkisian will continue to pursue the Approval Not Required.

The CPC discussed CPA26-014- 43-45 Nixon Road. CPC members agreed that they wanted to see the appraisal. One CPC member stated not understanding why the property couldn't be purchased outright. The purchase should not be dependent on development occurring on the other portion of the property.

New Business

Ms. Grove asked for an update on Temple Street Park. Ms. O'Donnell stated that the Parks and Recreation Department has been doing the design for the project, which is not completed. Once the design work is done, next steps will need to be determined.

ADJOURN

At 9:56 PM, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Margolis, seconded by Mr. Swope. No discussion and approved by roll call vote: Mr. Swope, aye; Mr. Cosgrove, aye; Ms. Margolis, aye; Ms. Grove, aye; Mr. Gudejko, aye; Mr. DeNicola, aye; Mr. Merusi, aye; Ms. Tratchel, aye; Mr. Mahoney, aye, 9-0-0.

Minutes prepared by Heather O'Donnell, CPC Coordinator

Respectfully submitted by Judy Grove, Clerk, Community Preservation Committee

Refer to the [Public Meeting Portal](#) for more information regarding Community Preservation Committee meetings, including full video recordings for remotely held meetings.