Attendance & Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 6:50 p.m. by Ch. Jack Wiggin.

Present: Planning Board members Jack Wiggin, Steve Olanoff, Steve Rafsky, Bruce Montgomery and Chris Pfaff; Town Planner Nora Loughnane; Special Counsel Daniel Bailey; Special Counsel Gareth Orsmond; and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba recorded the minutes.

University Station Proposal – Design Refinement Work Session and Status Report on Proposed Zoning Bylaw
Ch. Wiggin welcomed the proponent’s team: John Twohig from Goulston & Storrs, Paul Cincotta from N.E. Development; Ray Murphy from Eastern Development. Also present Town Peer Review Consultants Merrick Turner from Beta Engineering and Judi Barrett from Communities Opportunities Group. Finance and Warrant Commission subcommittee members and Selectman Hyde were also present.

On November 13th, board members received a draft of the proposed zoning bylaw and submitted comments on it to Mr. Bailey. Some of these comments have been addressed and included in the further refinement of this document and some items remain pending.

Status Report on Proposed Zoning Bylaw by Mr. Bailey:
- A lot of progress with the proponent has been made to advance this bylaw, although many details remain a work in progress.
- The Master Development Plan (MDP), with a minimally defined Core Development Area will be presented to Town Meeting for approval with the requirement that later phases of development will be subject to a two part determination: a consistency review with the MDP and process similar to a site plan review.
- If Town Meeting approves the MDP, the Core Development Area could proceed to development immediately following.
- Additional Use categories were requested by the proponent and board members responded to each, in italics:
  - Drive through bank, pharmacy and coffee shop by-right (OK, but design is very important; a special permit should be required.)
  - Fast Food – Bylaw needs to allow Panera and Chipolte type restaurants. (Care must be taken to maintain the right quality of uses.)
  - Warehouse/Light Manufacturing (Pre-existing warehouse is OK for now but new or expanded warehouse space is not be desirable.)
  - Self-Storage (No support for this: undesirable and unnecessary.)
  - Pet Store– board and groom pets as an accessory use. (No real objections; but there are questions about animals for sale or adoption?)
- Residential Phasing Restriction – The proponent prefers that these requirements apply only to the village area, and not to the townhouses off Canton Street. (Canton Street is not an appropriate use for townhouses; too far from the T-Station and other neighborhoods.)
- Reach Back Provision - Gives the Planning Board the authority to require the proponent to address unanticipated impacts, in connection with the approval of later phases. (Mr. Bailey said that the proponent would not accept a bylaw that puts fully constructed...
buildings with certificates of occupancy at risk. (A mechanism for mitigating impacts must be properly secured and easily enforceable.)

- Project Changes – this is a work in progress (Board must determine whether proposed changes would significantly alter the development and they would be required to be sent back to Town Meeting approval.)

- Other Issues:
  o Much higher level plans must be submitted in order for the board to consider recommending the MDP to Town Meeting.
  o Housing Phases and Caps – A lot of concerns. This is such an important issue that should be embedded in the bylaw.
  o Existing zoning bylaw definitions and terms should be used as much as possible.
  o Why is the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) 1.2 and not 1.0? This needs further discussion. Mr. Twohig said that the FMUOD bylaw allowed FAR 1.2 and that is why it was used here.
  o Flexible Use Area – How will retail work in an area that has always been better suited for offices?
  o Accessory Fueling Facility and accessory automotive, tire, battery – some board members are not in favor of this use due to its location in the Water Resource Protection District.
  o There should be a provision for open space and common areas or amenities to benefit the residents.
  o Connectivity within the Core Development Area – remains problematic.

Board Comments:
- Specific definition and more detail are needed for the retail use mix proposed in the Core Development Plan.
- Definitive traffic plans for the entire project and the two major intersections must be provided, and an affirmation on the part of the MA DOT that road improvements will be completed in a timely manner. (Mr. Bailey said that John Bertorelli has been participating in meetings with the State Department of Transportation. A suggestion was made that conditions could be added to the development agreement to build-in performance standards and if the town’s peer reviewer has a design that is acceptable by the State, the project could go forward.
- Height Limits – the plans should show the elevation above sea level; cross sections of abutting residences and neighborhoods should be shown on the plans. Mr. Bailey said that the proponent is required to show a profile plan with heights.

Public Comments:
M. Ross, Hillview Terrace - Does DWWD have enough water to supply this project?
J. Previtera, Dean Street – each phase of this development should meet all nine DEP Stormwater Management standards.

Motion/Action Taken:
None needed.

The discussion on the University Station proposal will continue on next Tuesday, December 4th.
Fiscal Impacts Discussion
Ch. Wiggin welcomed the town’s fiscal peer review consultant Judi Barrett, and Jeff Donohoe from Communities Opportunities Group, Inc. and the proponent’s fiscal review consultant John Connery of Connery Associates.

Highlights of Connery Associates Report: To view this report follow link:
http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/pk/download/pid/28368/id/29091

Mr. Connery stated that this report identifies the components of the project in general terms of revenue and costs to reach the major conclusions.

Retail Assessed Value – Comparable Shopping Centers
- Burlington Mall, Wayside Commons, Legacy Place, Derby Street Shops and South Shore Plaza – average assessed value per square foot = $224
- The following assessed values per square foot for University Station: Anchor Retail $125 per foot; Anchor Retail – Grocery Store $125 per foot; General Retail Stores $180 per foot; Restaurant & Bank $275 per foot; and Small Retail Stores $225 foot.
- The total assessed value of the retail component of the University Station at stabilization will be $126,975.

Office Assessed Value – the total assessed value of the office component will be $41,900,000 or an assessed value of $129 per square foot. The 325,000 sq. ft. office component will generate approximately $1,223,445 in annual property taxes at stabilization.

Hotel Assessed Value – $12,800,000

Assessed Value of Assisted Living/Memory Care Facility - $16,000,000

Residential Assessed Values – Rentals: $67,500,000 and Condominiums: $67,500,000

The Total Estimated Assessed Value for University Station is $332,675,000 and this project may take seven years to build out.

Andover, Needham, Canton & Newton were communities used in the comparables for schools. An equivalency methodology was created. He used .40 as the average number of students for each two-bedroom market rate residence. The 650, one and two bedroom residences will generate 55 students.

Education Cost and Student Enrollment at Stabilization - An increase in the number of students by 55 will generate a service cost of approximately $627,000 at stabilization.

Cost to Revenue Ratio and Estimated Fiscal Benefit 2013 - 2020
In 2013 – estimated annual service cost = $0, estimated annual revenue $2,338,000. In 2020 estimated annual service cost = $1,625,000, estimated annual revenue $7,525,000 and
estimated annual revenue = $5,900,000 with annual cost to revenue ratio = 0.21. The cost to revenue ratio will not fluctuate in any significant manner.

One Time Fees & New Growth Benefits
The building and associated construction fees, based on the scale of the Proposal and the mix of proposed uses, will generate between $2.5 and $3 million over the course of the construction fees. One-time fees will easily cover any of the Town’s project review responsibilities.

Sensitivity Test
Service costs may be lower than projected and revenues may increase more than anticipated after stabilization.

Highlights of Communities Opportunities Group, Inc. Report (To review this report, follow this link: http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/pk/download/pid/28368/id/29182 )
Judi Barrett gave a presentation in response to the fiscal impact analysis report prepared by Connery Associates. Community Opportunities Group’s report is based on the review of Connery’s report, the proponent’s architectural plans; the preliminary traffic impact assessment and the proposed draft UAMUD bylaw.

General Comments
- Methodology and approach were not addressed in Connery’s Final Draft.
- Limited source documentation, reliance on the author’s assumptions and the use of non-replicable methods of estimating costs and revenues are recurring issues in the Connery report.
- FY 2012 actual year-end revenues and expenditures, instead of FY 2013 operating budgets should have been utilized.
- A baseline analysis of Westwood’s municipal and school operations and facilities is missing.

Comments on Impact of Non-Residential Uses
- The Connery report makes incorrect use of methodology for allocating municipal service costs to nonresidential development. A coherent, systematic, peer-tested approach that can be followed and verified is needed.
- The report assumes that University Station will have a greater impact on municipal services than Westwood’s present commercial land uses but does not explained or documented the basis for estimating that.
- The use of case-study research on future assessed value and tax revenue for actual communities is suggested.
- Use of case-study research to assess public safety impacts is suggested.
- Estimated public works costs associated with University Station should be documented.
- More information is needed for determining the number of new public safety employees and the one-time costs associated with hiring and training new employees.
- The cost of employee benefits is missing from the wage and salary costs.
- There is no mention of the impacts of University Station on the town’s financial operations, notably, the Assessor.
- There is no mention of the impacts on the town’s existing municipal facilities to
accommodate additional employees and associated equipment.

- Costs and revenues of the assisted living facility should be separated from the proposed residential uses.

**Comments on Residential Uses**
- The report assumes that public safety is the only municipal service that will be affected by the University Station residential population.
- A worst-case assessment in which all 650 units of residential units are rental apartments should be used when projecting number of school students.
- Criteria used to establish comparability should be identified.
- Census Bureau data should be utilized in calculating the average household size in Westwood.
- Methodology for the student-per-unit equivalency calculations should be identified.
- A source for the “regional average of 0.40 students per bedroom affordable residence” should be identified.
- Analysis or commentary about whether Westwood Public Schools has sufficient space to support an additional 55 students is missing.
- Some effort to account for enrollment growth in Westwood’s allied school districts is missing.
- An explanation of Actual Net School Spending is necessary.

**Comments on Revenue Forecast**
- Additional documentation is needed to verify the significant increment of tax revenue suggested in the report.
- The estimates of value of the proposed improvements need to be explained and justified.
- Justification and backup for estimated assessed values of the proposed hotel is needed.
- Justification and backup is needed for the assessed value of $160,000 per unit for the assisted living facility is needed.
- Will tax increment financing agreements or other fiscal incentives be offered?
- The comparable example “Charles River Landing in Needham” is not a mixed-use development.
- Motor vehicle excise tax of $90 per vehicle needs justification and backup information.
- Justification and backup is needed for the one-time fees based between $2.5 and $3 million.
- The net fiscal impact and net benefit are unclear.

**Board Questions & Comments with responses from Fiscal Impact Consultants:**
- A board member agreed with Ms. Barrett’s comments that actual documentation is required and the consultant has an obligation to show information sources.
- The proponent should provide actual demands on police, fire, and emergency medical services.
- Is it appropriate to ask the proponent for a minimum amount of revenue? Ms. Barrett said that often times decisions about how revenue is allocated is often politically motivated.
- A board member asked who “we” is in Mr. Connery’s reports. Mr. Connery said that “we” was the Board of Assessors and the School Department.
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- Are the costs associated with building a new firehouse and cost of new apparatus included in this study? (Mr. Connery said that the fire chief did not think a new station was needed and the biggest issue is response time and geography. He said that this cost belongs in the development agreement. The fire chief recommended a new, three-bay station.)
- A board member disagreed with Mr. Connery and stated that a new public safety building and the necessary apparatus should be a part of the fiscal impact study.
- Ms. Barrett said that a cost associated with a new public safety building should be covered in the fiscal impact study. This will make the study more credible. If the development agreement doesn't cover something, it will have to come out of the operating expenses.
- A board member asked if the assisted living component might require an increased number of emergency assistance calls. (Ms. Barrett said that the fire chief has information on this.)
- A board member said the number "55" students should be reported as “plus or minus 55". (Mr. Connery said that his report said plus or minus 50 students with a 10% variable.) (Ms. Barrett said that a range should be provided based on census data.)
- The type of dwelling does not create a type of student but the type of services provided by a community does attract individuals to a particular community. How is the information balanced within a study?

Public Comments:
- B. Delisle, Finance & Warrant Commission – “one bedroom residences does not generate school kids” – Would like an explanation about this. (Ms. Barrett said that in a short term situation there may be a “housing emergency" and there may be one child in a one-bedroom residence although in the long-term computation, it would be generally unlikely.) (Ms. Barrett said one-bedroom units with lofts or studies might cause an increased household size.)
- B. Delisle – What will be the impact on classroom sizes in the schools? What will the impact on the school busing costs?
- M. MasiPhelps - Finance & Warrant Commission – a number of questions that have come up tonight have been related to the development agreement. She said that the Finance and Warrant Commission will need the full picture and will want all 33 comments that were identified by Ms. Barrett to be addressed by the proponent’s fiscal impact reviewer. In general the Town services have been squeezed over the years and the public safety staffing may not be comparable and whether current levels are adequate. State aid revenue may not increase. Will school projections take into account that empty nesters will create additional turnover of single-family houses? Will there be a higher amount of school age children? Questions about a past project in Lexington that Mr. Connery worked on and the unintended consequences of it. (Mr. Connery said that he did not expect middle-aged adults with kids to move to Avalon Bay in Lexington.)
- C. McKeown – University Station Project Manager – Regarding the Lexington project, he said the valuation was done at peak of real estate market and with the drop in the economy this may have affected it.
- P. Peckinpaugh, Whitewood Road - why aren’t kids aged 3-5 included in the population? What about transportation costs for students out of the district?
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- J. Fox, Whitewood Road – Why not cut the residential number back 20%?
- M. Ferrara, Philips Brook Road – is there enough time for a revised fiscal impact review?
- R. Rosen – Westwood Patch – When would University Station open? Will the Public Safety departments/staff be ready to handle the impacts of this project?
- K. Jordan, Strasser Avenue – How can all this be done before a February town meeting?
- J. Craine – Blue Hill Drive – what is the deadline to call Town meeting? (Mr. Jaillet said that 12/17 is the target date.)
- R. Maloof, Whitewood Road – When will sight line/profile plan be ready? What are the hours of construction? When will the noise impact study be done?

Closing Comments:
Mr. Twohig commented that Mr. Connery will review Ms. Barrett’s comprehensive comments and will address these. In addition, he suggested that Mr. Connery and Ms. Barrett should discuss items off-line, follow-up with department heads, etc. and produce another report.

Motion/Action Taken:
None needed.

The fiscal impact discussion of the University Station proposal will continue on another date, which has yet to be determined.

Next Meeting:
Tuesday, December 4th, 6:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

Adjournment
Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Rafsky the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:02 p.m.
List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits
Connery Associates, Final Draft Fiscal Impact Analysis University Station, November 18, 2012

Memo from Judi Barrett, Community Opportunities Group, Inc. – University Station Fiscal Impact Analysis, November 19, 2012