

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

*Board members present:* Ch. S. Rafsky, S. Olanoff, B. Montgomery, C. Chafetz and J. Wiggin  
*Staff present:* N. Loughnane, Town Planner. Minutes were recorded by J. Barba.

*Chairman Rafsky called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M.*

**Joint Emergency Public Hearing with Tree Warden regarding Removal of Dead or Dying Trees from Scenic Roads – Woodland Road, Thatcher Street, Grove Street**

Todd Korchin, Highway Superintendent and Vicki Quiram, DPW Director were present seeking permission of the Planning Board for emergency removal of dead trees on Woodland Road, Thatcher Street and Grove Street. Mr. Korchin distributed photographs of the dead or dying trees on each of the streets. As Highway Superintendent he is responsible for fulfilling the duties of the tree warden, as the Town of Westwood does not have an appointed tree warden. Ms. Quiram confirmed that Massachusetts State law allow towns that do not vote to appoint a tree warden are allowed to assign those duties to the highway superintendent in conjunction with an opinion from a certified arborist. Ms. Loughnane confirmed this statement and read an excerpt from Massachusetts State law to provide further clarification. Ms. Quiram said that currently the town consults with a certified arborist, George Marcarian to review the health of trees on a case by case basis.

Ch. Rafsky asked for clarification about the subject trees and whether all are located on scenic roads.

Ms. Loughnane said that three of the four trees are on scenic roads and require a special permit from the Planning Board for their removal. It was explained that the trees were marked with orange ribbons for two weeks prior to tonight's hearing and letters were sent to residents of Woodland Road, Thatcher Street and Grove Street informing of the emergency public hearing. Due to the emergency nature of the hearing, there was insufficient time to publish a legal notice in the *Westwood Press*.

Mr. Olanoff said he looked at all three trees on the above mentioned streets and disagreed that all the trees are dead or dying, although he did not object to the health of the tree on Thatcher Street. He said the tree on Woodland Road is rotted, not dead and he suggested removing the additional rot in order to save the tree.

Mr. Korchin said he disagreed and said a serious wind or snow storm could cause these trees to fall, creating a dangerous situation.

Mr. Wiggin asked if the certified arborist gave the DPW a recommendation for these trees.

Mr. Korchin responded that although the certified arborist was not consulted for these trees, he strongly recommended the removal of these trees. He also said the fourth tree to be removed on Allan Road is a public shade tree, not on a scenic road.

Ch. Rafsky asked board members to make a determination whether or not to grant a special permit to remove the requested trees.

Upon a motion by Ms. Chafetz and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted four votes in favor and one opposed to authorize the removal of dead or dying trees from Scenic Roads – Woodland Road, Thatcher Street, Grove Street.

Ms. Loughnane asked Mr. Korchin to state the intentions of this outcome.

Mr. Korchin said that after holding this hearing and receiving permission of the Planning Board to remove the trees as discussed at this meeting, he will arrange for Royer Tree Service to safely

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

remove the dead or dying trees.

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to close the public hearing.

**Consideration of ANR Plan for Old Grove Partners - Summer Street, Longmeadow Drive, Stonemeadow Drive & Far Reach Road**

Ms. Loughnane explained that the proposed plans reconfigure four parcels, two of which are shown on Assessors Map 3, parcels 21 & 22, and two on Assessors Map 5, parcels 106 & 108, into a total of seven parcels. Board members reviewed the plans. The newly created Lots 1, 2, 3, & 4 have frontage on Stonemeadow Drive, Lots 5 & 6 have frontage on Far Reach Road and Lot 7 has frontage on Summer Street.

Attorney Chris Milton was present on behalf of the owner. He explained that currently three homes exist on Lot 1, 4 & 5. He said there are 6 lots that are just less than 46 acres, each having approximately 6 acres.

Ms. Loughnane said according to the Assessor's, this proposed ANR will create a total of 7 Assessor's Lots: existing Map 3, Lot 21 & Lot 22, existing Map 5 Lot 106 & Lot 108 and the three proposed new lots. She said all lots have sufficient frontage and access.

Board members asked if these lots were originally part of Far Reach or Stevens Farm subdivisions and whether this would be considered an amendment to the subdivision.

Mr. Milton said lot 6 was originally part of the Far Reach Subdivision.

Town Counsel was present at the meeting and offered his opinion on the matter.

Mr. Milton said there is preclusion against subdividing but this plan is just dividing lots.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to endorse the ANR Plans.

**Continuation of Public Hearing for Consideration of Environmental Impact Design Review (EIDR) Application for Ann's Lunch Building - 920 High Street**

Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane to provide the board with an update since the last hearing.

Ms. Loughnane said that at the last public hearing, the applicant submitted plans to demolish the existing building and reconstruct new two-story structure, reconfigured on the lot. The applicant was heard by the Zoning Board of Appeals to request a Special Permit, under *Section 4.5.3 Non-Conforming Structures*, as the structure is pre-existing and non-conforming. The applicant was granted a Special Permit subject to the Planning Board's EIDR approval and submittal of a traffic report. Just prior to going to the Zoning Board the applicant submitted to a newly configured site plan to Ms. Loughnane, with non-conforming parking plans.

John Andrews from Concord Lumber was present. He handed the board copies of the parking plans showing eight parking spots with a 22' turnaround.

Ms. Loughnane said the parking regulations require a 24' backup and therefore the plan is not conforming. The plans submitted at the last hearing showed the building jutting out into the parking lot and that these plans submitted tonight do show the curb now around the building, although this

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

still shortens the turning radius for the parking area. Ms. Loughnane said at the last hearing she suggested that angled parking may be an option the applicant could consider.

Mr. Andrews again said he would modify the parking to angled parking and reduce the parking spaces to six.

Ms. Loughnane said the restaurant could decrease the amount of seats desired in order to adjust the parking. She said these current plans create an unsafe traffic situation.

Board members suggested that the building could be relocated on the lot.

The applicant is scheduled to meet with the Land Use Committee on August 11<sup>th</sup> to discuss its plans, seek additional guidance and then return to the planning board with an amended plan and reconfigured parking lot.

The applicant asked Ms. Loughnane what other items need to be addressed for the Planning Board.

Ms. Loughnane said a complete site plan including parking, landscaping and drainage is necessary.

Ch. Rafsky asked the applicant to provide the planning board with its business model, specifically regarding whether this business will be a restaurant or a bakery. He said the Planning Board needs to evaluate parking and traffic based on that plan. He suggested that the applicant's traffic engineer will help identify any issues.

Mr. Wiggin commented that the board needs to ensure that this new business will not cause an unintended burden to the neighboring streets.

Ms. Chafetz asked what type of use the original parking calculation was based on.

Ms. Loughnane said the parking requirements were based on two separate businesses; a restaurant on the first floor and a catering establishment on the second floor. Since then, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a special permit for a single business with the baking operation on the second floor providing baked goods for the restaurant use and for sale at the counter on the first floor.

Ms. Chafetz asked if the parking calculation would be different for if this business was a retail establishment.

Ms. Loughnane said this has not been determined to be a retail establishment. The parking calculation is based on this business as a restaurant with takeout.

Ch. Rafsky asked how the parking would be calculated if this use was a retail bakery.

Ms. Loughnane said if this were a retail use the parking would be calculated by as one space for each 250 sq. ft. of floor area.

Ms. Dowlatschaki the owner of the property told the board that she is not planning on having a full-fledged bakery.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to continue the hearing until August 16, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

Ms. Loughnane gave Mr. Andrews a copy of the Parking Rules & Regulations.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

**Public Hearing for Consideration of an 11-buildable lot Definitive Subdivision to be known as Morgan Farm Estates Subdivision & for Consideration of the Modification of an 8-buildable lot Definitive Subdivision known as Powissett Estates Subdivision, and for Consideration of any Alternative Subdivision Plan submitted by the Applicant – Wall Street Development**

Lou Petrozzi of Wall Street Development and his attorney Rich Gallogly were present.

Town Counsel Thomas McCusker was also present.

Ms. Loughnane and Mr. McCusker explained that this hearing is for a court-mandated reconsideration of Wall Street's 2007 application for the proposed Morgan Farm Definitive Subdivision and 81W modification of Powissett Estates Definitive Subdivision.

In 2008 the Planning Board denied the application, noting that the right-of-way between Little Boot Lane and Shoe String Lane was originally approved with conditions restricting its use to emergency and pedestrian access only. The board found that the applicant had not demonstrated sufficient cause for the amending the definitive subdivision and special permit approvals for Powissett Estates to remove these restrictions and allow for a change in use and or construction standard of the emergency right-of-way.

The applicant appealed the Planning Board's denial and the denial was upheld by the Land Court. The Land Court decision was subsequently appealed by Wall Street Development. In March of 2011, the Appeals Court reversed the decision of the Land Court, finding that Wall Street Development has the right to use the emergency right-of-way, Shoe String Lane and Little Boot Lane. The Appeals Court remanded this application to the Planning Board and ordered the board to reconsider the modification, as if it were an original subdivision. The Town filed a further appeal to the Supreme Judicial Court, but the SJC declined to hear the case.

Mr. McCusker said that the Planning Board must now reconsider the original application on its merits and the board does not have the discretion to disapprove a subdivision plan unless that plan is found to violate its rules and regulations. Therefore, if the board finds that this application satisfies all of its rules and regulations, it will have no option to deny the modification of Powissett Estates and the Morgan Farm Subdivision. However, the applicant may propose, and the board may consider reasonable alternatives to the development of Morgan Farm, which may or may not include a connection to the emergency right of way.

Ms. Loughnane added that the applicant filed another plan in 2010 which was nearly identical to the original plans with the some minor changes that were more consistent with the subdivision rules and regulations. She asked that the Planning Board review the 2010 plan.

Mr. Gallogly commented that the SJC has already determined that the subdivision plans comply with the Planning Board's rules and regulations.

Mr. McCusker disagreed that this is not the same plan that is before the Planning Board today.

Mr. Gallogly said the plans have been submitted.

Mr. McCusker said the bottom line is that if the board finds that this application and plan satisfies all of the rules and regulations it must approve it. It must be reviewed as if it was like any other subdivision.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

Ch. Rafsky suggested that the Board only focus on the plans that were denied and have the Planning Board review that only. He asked Mr. Petrozzi if this is the plan he would like the Planning Board to approve.

Mr. Petrozzi said the only plan that he is allowed to submit is the one from 2010, that the Appeals Court has ruled on, in which no waivers were requested. For an alternative plan, Mr. Petrozzi said the first consideration of the Planning Board would be to consider a waiver for extending a dead end street as an alternative plan.

There was a general discussion about the roadway and its compliance with the subdivision rules and regulations.

Mr. Gallogly read from the Appeals decision that said "the Land Court expressly found that the modified plan would not require the grant of any waivers and that the board conceded in oral argument that if the right of way could be physically constructed in full compliance with the subdivision rules and regulations."

Mr. McCusker said he agrees with Mr. Gallogly and said the Board may be compelled to approve the plan that is before it. He said it would be a wise decision of the planning board to approve a waiver for extending the length of a dead end.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Petrozzi if this was the plan submitted, would he go forward with it.

Mr. Petrozzi again asked if the Planning Board would consider a waiver for extending a dead end street as an alternative plan. If not, he would go forward and build the plan from 2010.

Mr. Montgomery asked the public to comment about what the neighbors would like regarding the street.

S. Wilkins, Westchester Drive – stated she is disappointed with the court's decision about the through street. Her major concern is the impact on the character and public safety of Woodland Road.

T. Hiller, Little Boot Lane – said he would prefer a cul-de-sac plan instead of using the emergency access road. He is concerned about traffic flow.

Mr. Montgomery stressed that the road would no longer be an emergency road, but a full road.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue the hearing until September 27, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

Ch. Rafsky asked if Ms. Loughnane to send board members a PDF of the 2007 zoning bylaw, and plans submitted at that time.

**Public Hearing for Consideration of Reynold's Farm Senior Residential Development  
Special Permit Application – 1561 High Street – Ed Musto**

Ch. Rafsky read the legal notice opening the public hearing at approximately 8:35 p.m. He welcomed applicant Ed Musto and his engineer John Glossa to the meeting.

Mr. Glossa gave an overview of the application.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

- *Existing Conditions:* single family house on 3.93 acres of land with 217 feet of frontage on High Street abutting single family house lots on either side. There is a small area of wetlands that discharges through a man-made ditch to a catch basin which connects into the municipal drainage system. Soil tests had mixed results with regard to water table elevation.
- *Proposal:* to build 12 senior residential housing units in five buildings at the site. There will be three duplex buildings and two triplex buildings. The buildings will be constructed toward the middle and westerly portion of the site. No land within 10 feet of wetlands will be altered. The buildings will be accessed by a 22 foot wide driveway which will extend from High Street approximately 380 feet and will end with a cul de sac, which will actually be 436' from High Street. Each unit will have an 11' wide and 24' long driveway as well as a single car garage.

Mr. Glossa explained that the required sight distance will be met through an easement from the abutting property to the east of the site, which is owned by Mr. Musto.

He explained that some of the setbacks for buildings 3, 4 & 5 may need to be changed as they are currently 28.77' and the setback requirement is 30'. Unit 9 & 10 will need to be changed to under 30' setback as well which will be better for unit 12.

Mr. Glossa discussed the municipal sewer and water connections and fire suppression lines extending from the triplex units.

Mr. Glossa explained that care was taken in order to design a drainage system for this site that not only drastically reduced the rate of runoff on the site, but also reduced the volume of runoff from the site. Two water mitigation devices will be constructed to assure that downstream flooding will not be caused by the site, and will also reduce existing downstream flooding conditions. The proposed drainage system will be connected to the drop inlet on High Street near the intersection of Stanford Drive. He discussed the catch basins and detention basins drainage systems on plan sheet 5 which reduces the amount of grading needed, putting the buildings in flat areas. He said this system will assure that downstream flooding will not be caused by the site and will also reduce existing flooding conditions.

Mr. Glossa discussed plan sheet 11 which details erosion control and temporary berms set during the construction sequence, ensuring runoff, silt and sediment will not run off into High Street, until the site is completely stabilized.

Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane to discuss the town's new engineering review process.

Ms. Loughnane explained that in the absence of a town engineer, the Director of Public Works has requested an initial review of the SRD application from its consultant, Beta Engineering Group, Inc.

Ms. Quiram said Beta Engineering provided an initial broad review and identified three minor omissions in this application: a narrative statement, earth material movement details and an exterior lighting plan. In addition Beta provided a cost estimate for a complete peer review. She stated that the major area of concern for the DPW will be the drainage issues and how the town will be involved in future maintenance of these systems.

Ms. Loughnane said she will review the recommendations from Beta Engineering with regard to completeness of the application.

Ch. Rafsky said he, Ms. Quiram and Ms. Loughnane recently met to discuss the engineering support needs of the Planning Board that they concurred that Beta's role in planning board matters should

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

mimic that of the town engineer's duties, as opposed to offering a peer review of the project.

Ms. Quiram asked the Planning Board to follow-up with feedback during the three month contract with Beta Engineering.

Ms. Quiram said Beta Engineering was chosen based on qualifications based selection. She said the firm has public works experience.

Ch. Rafsky opened the hearing to the public for comments.

P. Mullen, 1591 High Street commented that he was a resident during the previous application submitted by Mr. Musto. He also commented that he has concerns about a storm drain that runs down Stanford Drive that has been blocked for thirty years. He said is concerned about traffic safety on this curved section of High Street. He also commented that there are no sidewalks on this side of the street.

G. Moore, 1609 High Street asked if this development was a 40B.

Ch. Rafsky responded and said this proposed development is not proposed under a 40B application but a Senior Residential Development under the zoning bylaw.

J. Onderdonk, Town of Westwood Housing Department confirmed there are no affordable units that are being proposed as part of this development. She said she receives frequent inquiries about the availability of townhouses or condos for Westwood seniors, currently looking to downsize from their larger homes.

S. Tremble, 1531 High Street reiterated that there is no crosswalk access at this section of High Street. He is concerned about the Tresca Brothers cement trucks and their ability to stop in a traffic situation. (Not a resident during the last application.)

S. Stein, 1519 High Street (was a resident during the last application) concerned about the numerous changes in the plans at the last submission. She remains concerned about the traffic safety at the curve on the road. She asked what Mr. Musto will be doing with the house next door to the project.

C. Noone, (was a resident during the last application) 77 Blueberry Lane commented that she would like to see the development be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

C. Atkins, 1536 High Street (was a resident during the last application) wants the curve of the road removed.

K. Hoban, 1581 High Street (was a resident during the last application) is concerned about the drainage and flooding at her house.

D. Moore, 1625 High Street (was a resident during the last application) he is concerned about traffic safety.

T. O'Leary, 1568 High Street (was a resident during the last application) he is concerned about traffic safety.

S. Tremble, 1531 High Street asked if there will be any blasting.

Ch. Rafsky thanked the public for its comments. He stated the Planning Board shares similar

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

concerns with regard to this project. He said the majority of this board was not serving at the time when the prior project was submitted by Mr. Musto. This board will be looking at this proposal with this from an environmental impact perspective and from a design prospective. He said road layout in relation to traffic safety will be thoroughly reviewed.

Mr. Olanoff asked Mr. Glossa to summarize the differences between the prior project proposal and this new proposal.

Mr. Glossa said this project takes advantage of a site with good soil for drainage and maximizes the available space for an above ground water retention basin by reducing the number of housing units. He said the existing downstream pipes will be able to handle the volume coming from this site by reducing runoff. He said the Town of Westwood could correct the old, non-functioning pipes in the Stanford Drive area.

Mr. Olanoff asked what if any provisions will be made for sidewalks in front of the project.

Mr. Glossa said the proposal is being built with residents aged 55+ who are not necessarily in need of adaptation for special accessibility, although could be adapted through rental of ramps, etc. He said he could discuss this later if necessary.

Mr. Olanoff said the people who live here may not need special accessibility but may have different needs in the future. He said those people may have to move out because of a lack of accessibility.

Mr. Glossa said he did not disagree as some sloped areas may be more difficult but he also said he designed the project with minimal stairs and level driveways, etc.

Mr. Montgomery asked if there are accessibility requirements within the SRD bylaw.

Ms. Loughnane responded that there are not any accessibility requirements within the SRD bylaw.

Mr. Montgomery said therefore this is not under the planning board's review.

Mr. Olanoff asked about a shuttle bus, trash and mail components.

Mr. Glossa said these items are included in the application.

Mr. Glossa said in order to balance the residential appearance of the units he said each would have a light at each unit from dawn to dusk.

Mr. Chafetz asked if the 2005 traffic study sufficient or will be updated and if the town's engineering firm would review this study.

Ms. Loughnane said the applicant would normally provide this updated data to the town and the town's peer review engineer would review this data.

Mr. Montgomery said he did not review the previous application and asked about the difference in scale of the two projects.

Mr. Glossa said this project will have half the amount of units than the previous project.

Mr. Montgomery asked if the two proposed drainage structures will hold the water and infiltrate to prevent runoff to abutting properties. He also asked if the wetlands are "perched".



**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

Mr. Glossa said that he does not know why the wetlands are upland.

Mr. Wiggin suggested that the board review the largest issues of the project first; traffic and drainage and if compliance is a problem, then there is no need to for the board to discuss the other aspects of the project.

Sight distance was discussed and the hilled area of the property at 1545 High Street will be flattened to obtain the required sight distance for 1561 High Street.

Mr. Montgomery asked if there would be a second phase of the project.

Mr. Glossa said there would be no expansion of the project, or phase 2.

C. Atkins, 1536 High Street asked if visitor parking planned.

S. Smith, 20 Stanford Drive asked if past reports will be updated.

Mr. Wiggin said the police department and board of health have asked similar questions about these reports and the planning board will review this data.

Ch. Rafsky suggested a continuation of the hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue the hearing until September 20, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

Ms. Loughnane asked Ch. Rafsky if at the next meeting of the board on August 16<sup>th</sup> it would like to choose the peer review consultant and schedule a site visit of 1561 High Street.

Ch. Rafsky agreed that the board will discuss those items at its meeting on August 16<sup>th</sup>.

**General Zoning Discussion with Ned Richardson**

Ned Richardson was present to discuss a proposal for rezoning land at 529 High Street, immediately adjacent to the Colonial Building, from Single Residence C (SRC) to Local Business A (LBA). He said the proposal was initially included on the 2011 Town Meeting warrant, but was withdrawn prior to Town Meeting due to some controversy. He said he is looking for guidance about how to go forward with a rezoning of these two parcels.

Ch. Rafsky suggested to Mr. Richardson that the neighborhood abutters should be part of a process to discuss possible re-zoning of the parcel. He said the planning board could hold an informational meeting in order to obtain clarity from Mr. Lorusso about the future plans for this parcel, which may be helpful with the process.

Mr. Richardson asked the board if a covenant restricting occupancy on the lot may be helpful in resubmitting this article.

Mr. Wiggin said the traditional way of submitting a zoning amendment to the Finance Commission for this parcel is not the best way to accomplish this.

Mr. Richardson said he will find out just how much land he needs to create a Form A plan to create a non-buildable lot.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

**Public Hearing for Consideration of Revisions to Planning Board Rules and Regulations**

Ch. Rafsky opened the public hearing by reading the legal notice.

Ms. Loughnane explained that the initial revisions to the Planning Board's rules and regulations for Subdivision Control, General Special Permits, SRD Special Permits, MUOD Special Permits, Shared Driveways and Scenic Roads, and drafts of new rules and regulations for FMUOD Special Permits, OSRD Approvals, and EIDR Approvals have been completed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to continue the hearing until September 27, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

**Continuation of Public Hearing for Consideration of Special Permit and Environmental Impact Design Review (EIDR) for Wireless Communication Facility at Morrison Park – 300 Washington Street**

Ms. Loughnane said the applicant appeared at the July 12<sup>th</sup> hearing with insufficient plans for the board's consideration. She said the revised plans were received and distributed to Planning Board members by email.

Ms. Loughnane said the two locus trees (12" and 16") to the east/southeast of the equipment shed will be retained; the photo simulations, scale of the pole, concrete pad showing existing and proposed conditions have been corrected and all other outstanding items on the plans have been corrected.

Mr. Wiggin asked if the original pole will remain until the new pole is fully functioning. He asked if the applicant would take a picture of this prior to the removal of the old one.

Mr. Pare said the old pole will be removed after the new pole is fully functioning.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to close the hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to approve the corrected plans as submitted along with the standard conditions discussed at the last hearing.

**Other Planning Board Business GET MORE INFO HERE – REVIEW EMAILS.**

159 Canton Street – Destruction of stone wall

Board members discussed the stop work order that was issued at 159 Canton Street as the owner was removing a stone wall on a scenic road. There was some question about whether there was really a stone wall there or just a pile of old rocks. Ms. Loughnane said DPW was scheduled to look at it on the Monday following the Friday order to stop work. The owner said he has photographs to prove it was not a stone wall.

Board members asked for the pictures received from the owner at 159 Canton Street, review with Ms. Quiram, DPW Director to determine if there were 15' linear feet of stone wall.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:00 P.M.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

*The next meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, August 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 PM at 50 Carby Street, in the Champagne Meeting Room.*

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 26, 2011  
Champagne Meeting Room  
7:00 P.M.**

**List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits**

Letter to the Planning Board from BETA Group, Inc. dated 07-21-11, RE: Engineering Peer Review Scope & Fee for 1561 High Street – Reynold’s Farm Senior Residential Development

Memo to the Planning Board from Linda Shea, Health Director dated 07-12-11 RE: Comments for 1561 High Street – Reynold’s Farm Senior Residential Development

Memo to the Planning Board from Police Sgt. Paul Sicard dated 07-08-11 RE: Comments for 1561 High Street – Reynold’s Farm Senior Residential Development

Revised Plans – 300 Washington Street, pages T-1-G1