Attendance & Call to Order:
Ch. Wiggin called the meeting to order at 6:40 p.m. & acknowledged WestCAT TV is present to record the meeting and granted permission to do so.

Present: Planning Board members, Jack Wiggin, Steve Olanoff, Steve Rafsky, Bruce Montgomery and Chris Pfaff; Town Planner Nora Loughnane and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba, who recorded the minutes. (Mr. Pfaff recused himself from all University Station agenda items and related discussions.)

Ch. Wiggin welcomed the Proponent’s development team: John Twohig from Goulston & Storrs, Paul Cincotta from N.E. Development, and Ray Murphy from Eastern Development. Also present Town Peer Review Consultants from Beta Engineering, led by Merrick Turner; Proponent’s Consultants, led by Mr. Cincotta: Allevato Architects, The Hanover Company; JP Shadley, and members of the Town of Westwood Finance & Warrant Commission.

University Station Proposal – Design Refinement Work Session – Fiscal Impact Analysis Update;
Urban Design and Architecture Update
Fiscal Impact Analysis Update
Judy Barrett, Community Opportunities Group:

- School Department needs have been met through the Development Agreement, specifically with a $2.5 million mitigation fund for capital improvements to accommodate the additional school enrollment generated by University Station. In addition, there will be mitigation funds allocated for athletic field improvements at the Deerfield School.
- A $900,000 municipal mitigation fund will be created to offset one-time costs incurred by the Town.
- In general, the Town has done well in its negotiations with the Proponent and with the Development Agreement.

Board Questions & Comments:
- A board member asked for Ms. Barrett’s opinion on the town’s fiscal ability to cover hiring additional fire fighters. (Ms. Barrett said that based on her general knowledge of the Esce Fire Department report and the long-term, recurring fiscal benefits expected from University Station; she thinks town should be covered.)

Urban Design and Architecture Update
Lou Allevato of Allevato Architects presented highlights from the Retail Architecture Design Package, which was submitted to the Planning Board on March 21, 2013. Follow the link to the Town of Westwood website to view this document.
http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/pk/download/pid/28368/id/30451

Board Questions & Comments:
- Board members asked Mr. Allevato and the Proponent a number of questions about the views of the backs of buildings and commented on the unsightliness of fire escape stairs, bare walls, etc.
- Harvard/University Avenue intersection – questions were asked about truck access to building “C” and sight lines. Merrick Turner informed the board that truck access there is
ok and he would review the sight lines and report back to the board.
  • A board member identified pedestrian hazards at the same location. Mr. Turner said that these details have not been addressed yet.

Update from The Hanover Company on Housing Architecture
David Hall and Rick Stimson from The Hanover Company presented an update on architectural elements of the University Station Apartments:
  1. Schematic Site Plans;
  2. Building #1 – 10% affordable, Total Units: 130, 55 one-bedroom units and 75 two-bedroom units.
  3. Building #2 – 25% affordable, Total Units: 220, 166 one-bedroom units and 54 two-bedroom units.
  4. Roof Plans
  5. Building Perspectives Plans
  6. Building Elevation Plans

Follow the link to the Town of Westwood website to view these plans. [Follow link](http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/pk/download/pid/28368/id/30447)

Board Questions & Comments:
  • What is the purpose of the openings in the garage walls? (It is a building code requirement to keep the garage open to the air.)
  • Are the interiors of these buildings connected? (Yes, with the exception of the ground floor.)
  • Where will delivery/repair trucks park? (In the back, left parking lot where short-term parking is allowed.)

Urban/Landscape Design Update from J.P. Shadley
Mr. Shadley presented the following plans updating the Urban Design elements:
  1. University Avenue Landscape Intersection Designs
  2. Phase 1 Lighting Concept Diagram
  3. Updated Landscape Master Plan
  4. Open Spaces: Meadow & Corner Park Plans
  5. Streetscape Character Precedents
  6. Retail Core Plan – Sidewalk & Plaza Plans
  7. Streetscape Sections 1-6
  8. Streetscape Sections 7-11

Follow the link to the Town of Westwood website to view these plans. [Follow link](http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/page/Urban-Design/pid/29281)

Board Questions & Comments:
  • Is lighting installation planned near the water feature? (Yes, probably bollard lighting, although this has not been finalized yet.)
  • What is the height of the light poles in the parking lot? (27’ tall. Street light poles are 30’ tall, which by comparison are a bit brighter and closer together.)
• There are too few lights and the light poles are too tall for the parking lot. (Mr. Turner said that he and his team will be reviewing this lighting plan and examining the uniformity calculations.)

• Will there be lighting in the well-head park? Concerns about public safety. (Not contemplated, because the well-head park will probably used by the residents. Mr. Turner said there will be more discussion on this, particularly with DWWD.)

• Why is there a break in the walking path at the assisted living area? (Mr. Shadley said that this has been corrected with new pedestrian pathways & dedicated crossings – this version of the plan in front of board has not been corrected yet.)

At this point, a break was taken from the review of University Station Design Refinement Work Session, in order to reopen a public hearing scheduled for 7:30 p.m.

Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaws for Recommendation to Special Town Meeting

STM Article 1: Proposed new Section 9.8 [University Avenue Mixed-Use District (UAMUD)]

Motion:
Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to reopen this public hearing at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Special Counsel Dan Bailey gave a presentation highlighting changes to the zoning bylaw since the last public hearing: [Click here to view the text of STM Article 1]

• Mixed Use District Overlay District Boundary Plan (Click here to view this plan.)
• Updated Master Development Plan (Click here to view this plan.)
• Section 9.8.3.2 – Core Development Area Requirements – additional submittals are required by the Proponent.
• Section 9.8.4.1.2 – Restaurant/Entertainment Use Type – many changes have been made to this section.
• Section 9.8.4.5 – Residential Use Requirements – many language changes have been made but material terms of the bylaw have not changed.
• Section 9.8.4.5.4 – The Special Permit Requirements – b. Decision and criteria 1-7
• Section 9.8.5.2 – WRPOD – a lot of work has been done on language, particularly with regard to hazardous materials storage and snow removal.
• Section 9.8.9 – Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – new section
• Section 9.8.11 – 9.8.11.18 – Design & Performance Standards – many changes and new sections have been added.
• Section 9.8.12.2.2 – Project Development Review – similar to Site Plan Review – the language has been strengthened, adding that the project components must result in net fiscal benefits to the town and that the Proponent has adequately mitigated any adverse fiscal impacts.
• Section 9.8.12.9 – Issuance of Occupancy Permit – added this new section.
• Section 9.8.12.11 – Post-Construction Development Review – an expansion of an existing building that increases the gross floor area of such building by 3,000 sq. ft. or more or by
10% or more of the existing gross floor area, whichever is less; ... not to constitute a minor modification...

- Amend Section 2 “Definitions” adding new definitions for: Commercial Parking Garage; Cultural Facility; Data Storage Facility; Educational Use, Exempt; Fast Order Restaurant; Fitness or Health Club; General Office; Medical Center or Clinic; Memory Care Facility; Office of Health Care Professional; and Shuttle Service.

Board Questions & Comments:
- A board member commented about Section 9.8.12.11 – Post Construction Development Review: he said this is not the way the Planning Board usually does business. He thinks that the Planning Board should have the opportunity to review changes and determine whether they are considered minor in nature.
- A board member disagreed with this comment and said this section is consistent with the direction that the staff and Proponent have agreed upon. He said that this could unnecessarily delay a project of this size.
- Ms. Loughnane said that minor changes can be addressed by the town staff, outside of zoning, and if necessary can be referred back to the Planning Board.
- A board member wants “hospice” moved into the definitions. Ms. Loughnane said that the legal notice of public hearing advertised applying this change only to the UAMUD and if the board would like to change this throughout the bylaw, then the legal notice would have to reflect this language, possibly at a fall town meeting.

Public Comments:
- R. Maloof, 197 Whitewood Road – stated that he wants the apartment building heights and hotel heights lowered. (These heights are consistent with the UAMUD.)
- E. Germano, Whitewood Road – commented about the large number of parking spaces at Target and Wegman’s and the lack of proposed open space. (The project also includes 18 acres of green space.)
- P. Peckinpaugh, 209 Whitewood Road – is concerned about noise and wants more information about the sound barrier around her neighborhood. (Beta Engineering will be adding comments on sound monitoring in the future and more information will be provided to the board. In addition, excessive noise would be monitored through zoning enforcement for conformance and if any aspect of the project is not in conformance, it will be subject to review by the Planning Board.)

Other comments:
Ms. Loughnane asked Mr. Bailey about the consistency of housing numbers in the zoning bylaw language and the language of the Development Agreement. She mentioned that the housing numbers submitted by David Hall is not in agreement with this language of the Development Agreement and should be checked before this proposed bylaw is submitted to the Finance Commission.

Mr. Orsmond responded to Ms. Loughnane that the language about the number of units does not imply any inconsistency. In addition, he mentioned that he identified and fixed some final grammatical errors in the “Redline of Edits of the Zoning Bylaw".
Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to close the public hearing to Consider Amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaws for Recommendation to Special Town Meeting.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to recommend and approve the “Redline of Edits to Zoning Bylaw, April 2, 2013”, STM Article 1: Proposed new Section 9.8 [University Avenue Mixed-Use District (UAMUD)] to the Finance and Warrant Commission.

Upon motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to recommend and approve the Master Development Plan, prepared by TetraTech, last revised 3/22/13 and Official Zoning Map, entitled University Avenue Mixed-Use District Boundary Plan, prepared by TetraTech, last revised 3/28/13, to the Finance and Warrant Commission.

Upon motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to recommend and approve the “Definitions found on page 32 & 33 of Redline of Edits to Zoning Bylaw, April 2, 2013” of the STM Article 1: Proposed new Section 9.8 [University Avenue Mixed-Use District (UAMUD)] to the Finance and Warrant Commission.

Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaws for Recommendation to Annual Town Meeting

ATM Article 1:
- Section 9.4 [Wireless Communication Overlay District (WCOD)]

ATM Article 2:
- Section 4.1 [Principal Uses], Section 4.2 [Accessory Uses], Section 2.0 [Definitions] and Section 6.1.5 [Parking Requirements for Commercial Uses] related to medicinal marijuana
- Section 6.2 [Signs] and Section 2.0 [Definitions] related to temporary special event signs

ATM Article 4:
- Housekeeping amendments to various sections

Motion:
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to reopen this public hearing to consider Annual Town Meeting Articles 1-4.

A redlined version of edits made to ATM Articles 1-4 was distributed to the Planning Board and Ms. Loughnane gave a brief summary with board discussion. [Click here to view this document.]

Highlights of Changes & Board Comments:

ATM Article 1:
- Board members suggested creating maps to be shown at town meeting, illustrating the proposed new parcels.

ATM Article 2:
- Changes since the last hearing were corrections of minor typographical errors.
ATM Article 3:
- The following sections were created to replace existing sections: Section 6.2.3, Section 6.2.10.1.1, Section 6.2.10.6 and Section 6.2.10.7

ATM Article 4:
- Housekeeping Changes to replace language in Section 9.3.5.3 & Section 9.3.5.4 of the Water Resource Protection Overlay District (WRPOD), related to “impermeable cover and impervious surface, sufficiently designed to prevent the discharge prevent the discharge of contaminated run-off or leachate.

Public Comments:
None.

Motion/Action Taken:
Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously, in favor to close this public hearing to Consider Amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaws for Recommendation to Annual Town Meeting.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, in favor to approve and recommend Annual Town Meeting Articles 1-4, Amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaws, to the Finance and Warrant Commission.

***Resumed University Station Design Refinement Work Session***

Beta Group – Architectural Peer Review Update from KAO Design
Highlights of Presentation:
- Latest facades bring variation, interest and complexity to elevations.
- Target store design should share motifs, colors and scale with surrounding retail spaces in the project.
- Corner of Target store includes circular space with bench & flower bed, balancing the Café at Wegman’s
- Window display shadow boxes have been added.
- Corner seating space provides welcome place to define arrival.
- Façade elements have been integrated to sidewalk paved surfaces.
- Right elevation facing small parking area has been improved.
- Further review and ongoing coordination was requested of the following areas: materials; display boxes; parapet roof line; store entrance; proposed roof scape; sustainable roof scape development opportunity; improving human scale, site signage and site lighting.

Beta Group – Landscape & Lighting Peer Review Update from Don Leighton
- Work with Proponent has been going smoothly.
- Lighting elements are critical to the landscaping in the early stages of the development. Minor adjustments to size and type of lighting elements are necessary.
- Signage features with regarding to lighting needs to be addressed.
- Requests some creativity with railings, walls, back of the building components.
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- Pathway lighting could be bollard lighting or something lower. (Agreed with Board that perimeter lighting is a good idea.)

Board Questions & Comments:
- A board member had multiple comments about his preferred ideas for the best pedestrian access.
- A board member asked about a large increase in the amount of parking spaces added in a certain area of the plan, outside the Core Development Area. (This will be addressed in a later review by the Planning Board.)
- What is next for the Core Development Area Plans? (The goal between now and town meeting is to identify main items outstanding, finalize these items into final reports)
- Will there be a summary document created on the components of the project and a way for these components are referenced? (Mr. Twohig said that this is being worked on now. The intent is to create a set of multiple, three-ring binders that will be indexed, identifying all submitted documents, referencing what has been approved by the Planning Board.)
- A board member agreed that this set of binders is an important requirement of this process. (Ms. Loughnane said that this narrative is required that is referred to in the bylaw.)

Presentation of Proposed ANR Plan for 304 Clapboardtree Street for Planning Board Endorsement
Highlights of Presentation:
- ANR Plan divides the 9.24 acre parcel into two. One parcel will contain 1.84 acres, with 338’ of frontage, a single family house with several outbuildings. The second parcel will contain 7.4 acres, with 842’ of frontage.
- Both parcels will have access through their own frontage.
- The second parcel will constitute a new buildable lot, which will require Conservation Commission approval to create a driveway to the upland portion of the lot.

Board Questions & Comments:
- None.

Public Comments:
- None.

Motion/Action Taken:
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to endorse the plans as submitted.

Presentation of Proposed ANR Plan for Land off Morgan Farm Road for Planning Board Endorsement – Hale Reservation and Wall Street Development Corp.
Highlights of Presentation:
- ANR Plan will combine a portion of the Hale Reservation parcel (2.54 acres, “Parcel A”) with the parcel owned by Wall Street Development Corp.
Intent is to establish a parcel for conveyance and to create the initial condition necessary for the Morgan Farm Estates OSRD Definitive Subdivision.

Board Questions & Comments:
- None.

Public Comments:
- None.

Motion/Action Taken:
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to endorse the plans as submitted.

Request for Modification of USROD Special Permit for Colburn School Building - Coffman Realty
Ben Hartley was present on behalf of Coffman Realty. Click here to view proposed modifications.

Highlights of Presentation:
- Arborist evaluated existing trees on the property and advised the best way to save the trees.
- Requested a shift of the drive-thru lane, to be closer to the building.
- Reduce one-way lane from 12’ to 10’

Board Questions & Comments:
- Board members agreed with allowing the shift of the drive-thru lane in order to preserve the tree at the entrance.
- Board members and Mr. Paradis agreed that 10’ is too narrow for the one-way lane and suggested changing the width to 11’ and add sloped curbing.

Public Comments:
- None.

Motion/Action Taken:
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to consider this request as a minor modification of the USROD Special Permit.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve this minor modification of the USROD Special Permit.

Pre-application Conference for Proposed Senior Residential Development at 215 High Street – CRP Development, LLC
Ned Richardson was present along with developers, Gerry Rappaport of Chestnut Hill Realty, Matt Zuker of CRP, architect Gary Lowe and engineer Jim Decelle. Click here to view conceptual plans.
Mr. Zuker gave a brief introduction:
- Westwood has a strong demand for rental, senior residential development.
- Location is ideal.
- Seeking Special Permit under SRD.
- Cluster of two sets of townhouses and an apartment of flats in the rear of the property.
- Amenities include; walking trails, gardens, etc.
- Letters have been sent and meetings have been held with direct abutters to discuss proposal.
- Introduced architect and engineer.

Highlights of Conceptual Plan Presentation:
- One road to service two clusters of townhouses and one three story apartment building.
- Each one and two bedroom townhouse unit will have a both a one or two car garage and the apartment building will have parking under the building.
- Two bedroom townhouses will have the master bedroom on first floor.
- Pond at rear of property, located behind proposed apartment building will serve as a water feature.
- Rear of property is heavily treed.
- Townhouses will be configured with a courtyard, set back from the road and as much green space as possible. Buildings will be designed to fit the site, in accordance with the contours of the land.
- Diverse housing stock.
- Shuttle bus is planned.

Board Questions & Comments:
- How many units are proposed? (80 units are proposed in accordance with number provided in the SRD bylaw.)
- A board member said that the proposed density is way over with what he is comfortable with.
- The SRD was originally created to accommodate a need within Westwood and not the needs of the region. He has a concern that all the housing may not be marketable and there may be unintended consequence with this proposed density.
- Politically this may not be a popular project.
- Traffic on High Street is a major concern of the board for senior residents.
- A board member said that the current SRD bylaw is flawed and will be amended at a future town meeting.
- The board would like this SRD to be a community, with an internal and external community space.
- The board would have hoped to have an SRD within walking distance for residents and stressed the importance of buildings being fully handicapped accessible.
- The board is concerned about sufficient screening the homes in the rear of the property on Grove Street.
- The board recommended that the developers consider all the feedback provided tonight.

Public Comments:
None.

Motion/Action Taken:
None needed.

Adjournment:
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:50 p.m.

Next Meeting:
Tuesday, April 9, 2013, 6:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street