

Letter: Wayside editorial needed research

Sunday, September 28, 2003

This letter is written in response to the editorial entitled "Wayside's proposal," which appeared in this newspaper on Sept. 18, 2003. The editorial chastised my neighborhood for "harassing" Wayside and concluded that the proposed development, between Lockland Avenue and Donna Road, would be a bonus for Framingham and should be welcomed by all.

Unfortunately, the editorial is a prime example of a newspaper with a predilection toward a certain outcome, creating its own set of facts in order to effectuate that outcome.

First, to set the record straight, the vast majority of my neighbors have never "insinuated" that the kids Wayside services "are a danger to the neighborhood." To the contrary, we have acknowledged in meetings with members of Wayside, Wayside's good work with kids.

Second, to compare my neighbors to those who move in next to a pre-existing nightmare (e.g. the Turnpike) who then request relief, is just plain spurious. The site in issue is zoned R-1, single family residential, and no one foresaw the possibility of a commercial development on it.

Third, the statement about "some neighbors" welcoming the development is true if the definition of "some" is two or three.

Fourth, you state that those of us who don't welcome the development raise familiar objections "that have been adequately addressed" by Wayside. In the seven or eight meetings we have had with Wayside during the past 20 months, I can tell you that Wayside has not figured out how not to destroy my neighborhood with excessive traffic.

Your assertion about matters being "adequately addressed" is just wishful thinking on your part as a proponent of this project. It is the Framingham Planning Board which should come to this conclusion after Site Plan Review.

Fifth, the Dover Amendment, which you extol, and the relevant Framingham bylaw work in tandem so as to exclude Site Plan Review. Who will look out for my neighborhood and the town if a \$14 million project is going to be built?

In conclusion, your paper is quick to lump together all "neighborhoods" and all "good for the people developments." You conclude that the neighbors are selfish people who stand in the way of others getting ahead, while the "good for the people developments" are heaven-sent. To your paper, it's obviously a black and white issue with no gray areas. It's certainly easier for you to write a good vs. evil story rather than do some serious, unbiased research.

STEVE WHITKIN, Framingham

© Copyright by the [Herald Interactive Advertising Systems, Inc.](#)

No portion of the Daily News Tribune or its content may be reproduced without the owner's written permission. [Privacy Commitment](#)