Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chris Pfaff at approximately 7:04 p.m. The Chairman announced that Westwood Media Center is recording this meeting and asked if anyone else wished to record the meeting and no one responded.

Present:
Planning Board members present: Christopher A. Pfaff, Steven H. Olanoff, Trevor W. Laubenstein, David J. Atkins, Jr. and Michael McCusker. Staff members present: Town Planner Abigail McCabe, Nora Loughnane, Director of Community & Economic Development and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba.

60-90 Glacier Drive, Prime Motor Group/AMR Holdings – Public Hearing to Amend 2015 EIDR* parking plan and Special Permit request for parking reduction
Ms. McCabe reported that the applicant has requested a continuance of this hearing as they are working to update the submitted plan and provide more information.

Action Taken
Upon a motion by Mr. Laubenstein and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing without testimony taken, to Tuesday, February 28th, at 7:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

Canton Terrace Definitive Subdivision, 36 &44 Blue Hill Drive and 124 Canton Terrace – Public Hearing (Continued from 1/10)
Presentation
John Glossa of Glossa Engineering reported that in accordance with the Town Engineer and Peer Review Consultant’s review comments, the Definitive Subdivision plans have been revised, drainage calculations edited; an illicit discharge compliance statement has been submitted and he stated that he revised the Operations & Maintenance plan as requested.

Peer Review Comments
Tom Houston of PSC, Inc. reported that Glossa Engineering has satisfactorily met the suggested amendments to the Definitive Subdivision plans. The waivers needed are from providing the full traffic study, which seems reasonable given the minor impacts because this application is proposing two single-family house lots where three exist today, the curb radius is reduced, which is also acceptable at 25 ft. from the required 40-55 ft., the pipe from the detention basin has been redesigned as requested, and the LID alternatives considered were not part of the stormwater checklist at this time but the applicant has requested the LID alternatives considered during the Conservation Commission’s review.

Town Engineering Comments
Phil Paradis summarized that all of his initial comments have been addressed with the exception of providing an updated detail cross section for the proposed road that includes all items such as the pavement and gravel thickness (BETA Group, Inc.’s full report is available with these minutes.)

Town Planner’s Comments:
Ms. McCabe summarized the four waivers needed as submitted which are for the traffic study, smaller curb radii, drainage outflow design, and not providing the LID measures as part of the stormwater management plan. She provided the Board a list of 24 suggested conditions in her memo to the Planning Board dated February 3, 2017 but explained it would now be 22 conditions with the receipt of the items submitted since February 3 and summarized the
Board Comments:
The Board had the following request for plan changes to be included in condition # 1 of the final revised plan set:
  o Sheet 1 “Cover Sheet” be revised to accurately show the correct project parcels in the locus map;
  o The Double Grate Catch Basin detail needs to include a hood;
  o The existing stone wall at the rear of proposed lot 1 shall be noted to remain and a note added indicating the portion of the wall that will be removed for the proposed drainage easement;

The Board asked if the Applicant had a chance to review the conditions in the draft approval and asked if he was in agreement. The Applicant, Mr. Musto, responded that he had concern over the wording for #17 about the prohibition for the further lot division. The Board and staff explained this is a common standard condition to make clear that lot lines can change but no new lots created without returning to the Board for approval. The Board agreed to have the Applicant and staff reach an agreement on the final language to review the language used in other applications to be consistent.

The Chairman opened up the public portion of the hearing asked if there were any public comments, to which no one responded.

Action Taken
Upon a motion by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted unanimously in favor to grant the following waivers:
1. Section III.B.1.h - Traffic Study
2. Section IV.2.b.,d Requiring property lines at intersections to be rounded or cut back to provide for a curb radius of not less than 40 ft. (55 ft. if a major or secondary street) to allow for a smaller curb radius of 25 feet.
3. Section V.A.5 requiring the outflow system from the proposed detention basin to extend for at least 50 feet beyond the last lot in the subdivision or into an existing drainage system. The Board determined that the outflow designed to extend past the location of the proposed house location on lot 1 is sufficient.
4. Waiver from Section 8B of Westwood's Stormwater Management Regulations, requiring compliance with the MA Stormwater Handbook for the submission of low impact design alternatives considered for the project’s Stormwater Management Plan. The Board found the submitted information and the sewer laterals incorporated into the plan to be sufficient and agreed to defer submission of the low impact design alternatives as part of the Land Disturbance Permit to be filed with the Stormwater Authority, the Westwood Conservation Commission.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted unanimously in favor to approve the Canton Terrace Definitive Subdivision Plan with waivers and conditions as amended and discussed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to close this hearing.

14 Stonemeadow Drive – Earth Material Movement (EMM) Special Permit Amendment
Presentation
Attorney Ned Richardson was present on behalf of the Applicant Asaad Sayah, and gave a brief summary of the revised plans to the Board. Mr. Richardson explained that this proposal includes modified plans to change the wall design, which has a maximum height of 6 ft. with grading of a 2.5:1 slope. The plan revisions do not result in an increase in the proposed volume of fill but rather a slight decrease in volume.

Ms. McCabe reported that the Planning Board granted an EMM Special Permit in 2016 but what was constructed in the field differed from what was shown on the approved plan and the Applicant was asked to return to the Board for a modification.
**Town Engineer Comments**
Phil Paradis of BETA Group, Inc. acting as Westwood’s as-needed Town Engineer, provided a comprehensive review of the proposed plan amendments and provided the following comments and recommendations: C1. Revise plan to show location and limits of proposed wall section; C2. Provide section showing the wall and proposed maximum slopes on both sides of the wall; R1. He recommends that the wall be completely reconstructed in accordance with the proposed plan and detail; R2 and a condition to provide an as-built plan stamped and signed by the project engineer certifying that the wall was built in accordance with the approved plans now under consideration with this modification. *(BETA Group, Inc.’s full report with photographs is available with these minutes.)*

**Board Discussion & Comments**
Board members discussed conditions of approval: The retaining wall shall be completely reconstructed to be designed in accordance with the proposed modified plan prepared by George Zambouras, dated 12/22/16 and that three copies of a final as-built plan be submitted to the Planning Department certified by the Project Engineer that the project was constructed in accordance with the proposed plan and that the fill used is suitable for adequate drainage. All conditions of the 2016 approval remain in full force in effect.

**Public Comments**
R. Derubeis of 397 Far Reach Road: Expressed multiple concerns about the negative visual appearance of the current conditions of the block wall and concern about impacts to his property as the direct abutter. Mr. Debueis requested a copy of the decision and plans for this project.

A. Sayah, 14 Longmeadow Drive (property owner) Commented that the wall will be completely removed and reconstructed correctly according to this new plan.

**Action Taken**
Upon a motion by Mr. McCusker and seconded Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted unanimously in favor to consider this amendment a minor modification.

Upon a motion by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted unanimously in favor to grant a modification of the Earth Material Movement Special Permit at 14 Stonemeadow Drive, with the suggested revisions by BETA Group and conditions discussed.

**11 Stonemeadow Drive, EMM Special Permit – Public Hearing to bring in more than 8,000 cubic yards of fill, regrade lot for construction of single-family house**

**Presentation**
Project engineer John Bensley of Beals & Thomas was present on behalf of the Applicant Christie Dennis. Mr. Bensley gave a brief presentation on the project which is currently an undeveloped site that will include construction of a single-family house with a four bay garage. Grading work will bring in a net total of 8,300 cubic yards of earth to regrade the undeveloped lot including 2,800 cubic yards of earth/rock excavation and 11,100 cubic yards of fill for a net import of 8,300 cubic yards. Mr. Bensley reported that an Order of Conditions has been issued for this project by the Conservation Commission.

**Town Engineer Comments**
Phil Paradis of BETA Group, Inc. provided a comprehensive review of the plans and cut and fill analysis and suggested the following recommendations: Contractor should provide information on proposed rock excavation operations and whether a rock crushing operation will be utilized on this project; and BETA recommends monitoring the roadway for
sedimentation and damage from trucking operations and provide corrective measures as needed. (*BETA Group, Inc.’s full report is available with these minutes.*)

In response to the question asked by Mr. Paradis, Mr. Bensley responded that they did not yet know how the rock will be removed as that will be determined in the field.

Board Discussion/Staff Comments
Board members exchanged questions and comments with Mr. Bensley. Board members agreed to approve this Special Permit with the standard conditions for EMM Permits related to construction hours, truck routes (access Stonemeadow Drive from the east from Summer Street via Longmeadow Drive only. All trucks shall be prohibited from travelling on the emergency connector between Stonemeadow Drive and Far Reach Rd.), construction hours, and the Applicant shall coordinate a preconstruction meeting to coordinate work with Fire, DPW and Police Dept. to prior to construction due to the amount of fill being brought in.

The Chairman opened the hearing up to public comment, to which there was none.

Action Taken
Upon a motion by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Board voted unanimously in favor to grant the Earth Material Movement Special Permit at 11 Stonemeadow Drive, with the suggested recommendations of BETA and the standard conditions.

Upon a motion by Mr. Laubenstein and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to close this hearing.

1055 High Street/1105-5419 Highland Glen Road – Highland Glen: Amendment to the ZBA’s Comprehensive Permit – for Planning Board Review & Discussion

Presentation
- Jamie Pennington of Beacon Communities, LLA (An affiliate of BC Highland Glen, LLC) was present on behalf the Applicants along with Attorney Ruth H. Silman, Esq. of Nixon Peabody, LLP. Mr. Pennington explained that the Applicants, the two new owners of the Highland Glen apartments, GC Highland Glen, LLC and CRHGI Residential, LLC have submitted an application to the ZBA (Zoning Board of Appeals) for an Amendment to the Comprehensive Permit. The Amendment proposes to subdivide the existing property to reflect two phases that are currently on one property today. Each of the new owners would like to own the building and land their buildings are located on to provide clarity to the obligations of each phase as largely independent properties under the existing approvals. Mr. Pennington added that no new physical modifications except signage are proposed but the creation of the lots allows for separate ownership of the two phases.
- Mr. Pennington explained that they have submitted the application to the to the ZBA for the ZBA’s February 15 meeting to modify the existing Comprehensive Permit by subdividing the property into separate parcels. Creating the separate lots will allow the operation of Highland Glen residences to be divided into two phases for the Phase II buildings and the Phase II buildings. They are before the Planning Board tonight to receive comments from the Planning Board in advance of the ZBA’s meeting.
- Mr. Pennington explained that they intent to preserve the affordable housing components of the property as required in the Comprehensive Permits.
- Nate Cheal of Tetra Tech, engineer for the Applicants, presented the technical aspects of the subdivision plan to the Board with the main purpose being to provide frontage for the existing buildings in the back of the lot. Mr. Cheal reviewed the requested waivers from dimensional requirements (front & side yard setbacks); off-street parking requirements and parking setbacks. There are no physical changes to the property but since the property exist today as one parcel there are waivers of the subdivision rules and regulations now come into play because they are creating three new lots (two for phase I and one lot for phase II), and the fourth lot includes the road that is to remain private.
Town Engineer & Staff Comments
Phil Paradis, BETA Group, Inc. as Town Engineer, asked about the responsibility of the maintenance of the road infrastructure. Ms. McCabe explained that the ZBA can take the authority of other local board’s for Comprehensive Permits and since the ZBA doesn’t typically review definitive subdivision applications, the Planning Board is providing comments to the ZBA for their review based on the Planning Board’s familiarity with the subdivision process.

Mr. Pennington responded that all existing obligations for ongoing maintenance as required by previous Town approvals will remain in effect. Mr. Cheal explained they are currently working to close out the open order with the conservation commission by completing the wetlands replication area as part of prior mitigation.

Board & Staff Comments
Ms. McCabe suggested the Planning Board send a recommendation to the ZBA that recommends approval of the requested waivers since no physical construction is proposed. She prepared a list of suggested conditions for the ZBA to consider, which are the Planning Board’s standard conditions for all subdivision applications.

Public Comments
N. Winn, 108 Wildwood Drive – commented that this project has created a negative impact on her as a direct abutter; asked how the open space requirement would change with this project; commented that she believed this subdivision is a gateway for future development; stated concern since the past approvals stated that no future building would be allowed; questioned the dormer on the phase II building closest to her property not being consistent with the approved plans; concerned about trees and screening maintenance; conservation commission requirements not completed; and objected to the Planning Board’s support for this application.

Board Discussion
Additionally, the Planning Board recommends the ZBA take careful consideration to review that all past approvals, conditions, and any agreements have been fulfilled. Specifically, screening for the abutting residential properties with landscaping or fencing should be reviewed for maintenance and compliance with past approvals. Changes to the number of lots to be created and references to the Planning Board should be changed to the ZBA. The Applicant agreed to the suggested conditions with amendments to reflect the correct number of lots and the language in #6 about no further lot division was agreeable.

Board Members discussed Ms. Winn’s comments with town staff and the Applicants. Chairman Pfaff explained to Ms. Winn that the Planning Board’s jurisdiction is limited to offering a recommendation to the Zoning Board with regard to the subdivision of land. Chairman Pfaff stated that it appears that Ms. Winn’s comments are related to the maintenance of Highland Glen.

Community & Economic Development Director Nora Loughnane explained that the Comprehensive Permits for this project set a limit on the number of units in the development and they are currently at that limit within the five buildings (with 282) and that no further units are proposed and that the what was constructed matched the final approved plans, which were revised throughout the appeal process.

Action Taken
Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff, and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to make a recommendation to the ZBA for approval of the Subdivision of Highland Glen with the conditions as outlined in the memo from Town Planner Abby McCabe dated February 7, 2017 as amended this evening.
740 & 800 Clapboardtree Street – ANR (Approval Not Required) Plan

Presentation
Ms. McCabe reported that the purpose of this plan is to exchange an equal amount of land between three lots on Clapboardtree Street, #740 (map 23 lot 083), #800 (map 23 lot 033), and map 23 lot 053 by reconfiguring property lines. No lot is left without frontage.

Action Taken
Planning Board members, Christopher A. Pfaff, Steven H. Olanoff, Trevor W. Laubenstein, David J. Atkins and Michael L. McCusker endorsed the ANR Plan for 740 & 800 Clapboardtree Street, as presented.

Proposed Zoning Amendments for Annual Town Meeting Work Session
Ms. McCabe provided the following list of proposed zoning amendments to the Board for discussion. The Public Hearing has been scheduled for February 28th and will remain open throughout the Finance Commission Public Hearings and close it just prior to Town Meeting.

Ms. McCabe provided the most up to date draft zoning amendments in the Board’s packet sent last week. Planning Board Articles 1-11 were edited as follows during the meeting. Citizen Petition Articles 12-14 were provided to the Board.

Article 1: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 2.0 [Definitions] to amend the definition for Other Marijuana Facility and add a definition for Marijuana Establishment and Marijuana Retailer, amend Section 4.0 [Use Regulations] and Section 4.1.2 [Table of Principal Uses] to regulate Marijuana Establishments, and any necessary amendments to Section 7.4 [Registered Marijuana Dispensary], or take any other action in relation thereto.

Planning Board edits:

To clarify the definitions and in the table of uses when referring to medical marijuana and non-medical rather than the RMD (Registered Marijuana Dispensary) name.

- Replace Registered Marijuana Dispensaries (RMD) with Medical Marijuana Establishment
- Replace Other Marijuana Facility with Non-Medical Marijuana Establishment

Article 2: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 8.5 [Accessory Apartments] to amend the limited number of special permits to be issued and in effect in Section 8.5.4 [Limited Number of Special Permits], or take any other action in relation thereto.

The Planning Board agreed to two percent so that the limited number of special permits is amended from 1% to 2% of the total one and two family housing in Westwood, that would mean 90 available special permits if approved. Staff explained that Westwood reached the maximum number of 45 accessory apartments over the last year, largely due to greater enforcement in 2015 and 2016. The Board asked when the 1% was first imposed.

Article 3: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 4.1.6.8 [Self-Storage or Mini-Storage Facility] in the Table of Uses, add a new Section 7.6 [Storage Facilities Special Regulations], and amend the parking requirements for storage facilities in Section 6.1.6.6, or take any other action in relation thereto.

The Board made the following changes:
• The Planning Board agreed to change the special permit granting authority for storage facilities from the ZBA to the Planning Board after reviewing all the new requirements it made sense because any new facility also needs to go to the Planning Board for an EIDR, which could be a combined special permit and EIDR review with the Planning Board.
• Not allow the long single-story buildings but be designed to be multi-story and have access to the storage units from the interior of the building
• Parking requirements based on the number of storage units rather than square footage because the units are more likely to determine the parking demand. Ms. McCabe informed the board that one space per 50 storage units was consistent with the industry's need and ITE (Institute of Traffic Engineers) findings for this use.
• Setbacks from Westwood’s major commercial roads were discussed and the Board agreed to list the names of the streets in the bylaw for which they could not front on (University Ave., Route 1, Everett Street, Harvard Street).

**Article 4:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 2.0 [Definitions], Section 4.1 [Table of Principal Uses] and Section 4.3 [Table of Accessory Uses], for amendments related to solar energy facilities, large scale solar and small scale solar, or take any other action in relation thereto.

Amend the bylaw to distinguish between ground mounted and roof mounted facilities, allow for roof mounted on principal buildings by-right but on accessory structures and ground mounted facilities by special permit from the ZBA.

**Article 5:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 7.1 [Earth Material Movement (EMM)] to change the type of permit from a Special Permit to an Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) in Section 7.3, or take any other action in relation thereto.

The Board agreed with the proposal for the EMM special permit to be changed to an EIDR review and to clarify the purpose of the Planning Board’s review with the focus on the actual transportation of earth because the Conservation Commission is the stormwater authority.

**Article 6:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 6.4 [Exterior Lighting] to clarify the height limit for wall mounted fixtures for nonresidential properties, limit the hours for exterior lighting at nonresidential properties, and identify security and non-security lighting on the exterior lighting plan, or take any other action in relation thereto.

Add that light shall be turned off an hour after the close of business. Clarify the language that the lighting requirements only apply to commercial, institutional, and industrial properties and not single-family homes. Staff explained that if approved, the zoning amendments only apply to new projects and that any properties that are not in compliance now are grandfathered.

**Article 7:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 2.0 [Definitions], Section 4.5 [Nonconforming Uses and Structures], or take any other action in relation thereto.

No edits made to the article as drafted.

**Article 8:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 5.5.5 [Corner Clearance] to prohibit fences from being located within a certain distance from intersections, or take any other action in relation thereto.

The Board changed the set back from 30 ft. to 15 ft. and added in the “along the edge of pavement”:

5.5.5 **Corner Clearance.** No building, structure, fence, planting or other similar obstruction greater than three (3) feet
in height shall be located within fifteen (15) feet of any corner street intersection measured from the pavement from their point of intersection so as to interfere with traffic visibility and sight lines across corners.

**Article 9:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 10.1.6 [Penalty for Noncriminal Complaint] to increase the penalty for a violation from $100.00 to up to $300.00 for each offense, or take any other action in relation thereto.

No edits

**Article 10:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 9.7 [University Avenue Mixed Use District (UAMUD)] and Section 9.7.5 [Water Resources Protection Overlay District (WRPOD) Requirements] to amend the allowable snow and ice removal products and approval process, or take any other action in relation thereto.

The Board reviewed the bylaw where the “no sodium chloride” should be removed under the uses allowed by special permit from the planning board and under where it talks about the calcium chloride alternatives that can be considered.

**Article 11:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain housekeeping amendments to various sections of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map as may be necessary to correct any errors or inconsistencies, including without limitation the correction of one or more erroneous section references, update the footnotes in Section 4.1 [Table of Principal Uses], and update the Official Zoning Map to remove an area depicted as a road without a zoning designation.

No changes.

*The three petition articles were forward to the Planning Board in their packets. No changes to the Petitioner Articles.*

**Petitioner’s Article:**

**Article 12:** To see if the Town will vote to approve a zoning amendment a moratorium related to demolition and rebuilding of new houses under certain conditions.

**Petitioner’s Article:**

**Article 13:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to Section 9.5 [Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District (FMUOD)] to eliminate multi-family residential uses within the FMUOD-6 (Washington Street Business District) and FMUOD-7 (High Street Business District) and remove reference to the percentage of Residential Units in Section 9.5.13, or take any other action in relation thereto.

**Petitioner’s Article:**

**Article 14:** To see if the Town will vote to approve certain zoning amendments to Section 9.5 [Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District (FMUOD)] to remove the footnote marked 1 relative to “minimum project area” in Section 9.5.9 [Alternative Dimensions], or take any other action in relation thereto.

**Other Business:**

Committee Reports – Mr. Olanoff reported that the Pedestrian Bike Safety Committee met last week and discussed a new state law. Towns that accept the new laws can lower the default speed limit in non-posted thickly settled areas from 30 mph to 25 mph. They can do this town wide or street by street. These changes would not affect any streets with posted speed limits. Following appropriate engineering studies, towns can also create special 20 mph speed zones, (much like a school zone) in front of senior housing, playgrounds etc.

**Approval of Minutes:** 1/10/17, 1/17/17
Upon a motion by Mr. Atkins, and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to approve the minutes of 1/10/17 and 01/17/17 as written.

Adjournment:
Upon a motion by Mr. Atkins, and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:40 p.m.
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