

**Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday March 20, 2018
Downey Public School Cafeteria
250 Downey Street
Westwood, MA 02090 7:00 PM**

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Laubenstein at approximately 7:03 p.m.

Present:

Planning Board members present: Trevor W. Laubenstein, Steven H. Olanoff, David L. Atkins, Jr., Michael L. McCusker and Brian D. Gorman. Staff members present: Abigail McCabe, Town Planner, Nora Loughnane, Community & Economic Development Director and Jessica Cole who recorded the meeting minutes.

Mr. Gorman made a motion to recommend changing the order on the agenda so that #1 was followed by #4 relative to the zoning amendments on the agenda. Mr. Olanoff seconded and all Board members were in favor.

1. **266-278, 277A, 277-283, 280, 288, 291-295 Washington St., 9 School St., East St. Islington Center Redevelopment - Special Permit Public Hearing continued from 1/16, 2/13, & 2/27** - Request for FMUOD* Special Permit, Earth Material Movement, and EIDR* proposal for new mixed use building for first floor commercial with two floors of 18 condominium residences and underground parking at 288 Washington, to renovate building at 266-278 Washington St. for retail and childcare uses, relocate and renovate branch library to 277-283 Washington, new retail pharmacy (CVS) building at 9 School St., parking, landscaping and associated site improvements.

Applicant:

Peter Zahka, attorney for applicant, Petruzzello Properties, did a quick overview.

Mr. Petruzzello, developer, gave an overview of a recent meeting he had with about 40-50 residents on Saturday at Islington Pizza. The major topics were about: Traffic, Parking and the size of CVS. Mr. Petruzzello explained that there are traffic related options to be considered and he will be looking for guidance from the Board, the ballpark parking will operate in the same manner as today. He has negotiated with CVS and wants to keep the project financially feasible. CVS has agreed to be 9,500 sq. ft. but they would like to add a drive-thru for the pharmacy. If the Blue Hart Tavern is to be restored and reused he would own the building but if it is not successfully restored, the Town would be given that land.

Mr. McKay, project architect, added that the drive-thru is for prescriptions only. Asked to do a comparison drawing and showed a few drawing of proposed vs. current photos. Minimized third floor and changed details on third floor dormers on the mixed use (Building B).

Board Questions & Comments:

- A Board member suggested relocating the steeple to be closer to the East Street to more closely resemble the current location.
- Drive-thru - Is it 2 way? Yes, currently it is an entrance and an exit on School Street.
- Applicant is still working on the traffic details
- Choice is larger CVS or smaller with a drive thru, correct? That is the Applicant's proposal

Applicant Continued:

Mike Carter, GCG project engineer, summarized the submitted revised plans and they were reviewed by peer consultants. The plans have been revised to show the fire truck turning movements for the Fire Department's largest ladder truck which has been approved by the Fire Chief. The wetlands are shown on the plans and they have filed with the Conservation Commission, waiting to have the hearing. Modified plan with the smaller CVS.

Ken Cram, project traffic engineer of Bayside Engineering, reported that he is currently working on updates and responses to the Board's and BETA's previous comments.

Staff Comments:

Mike Walsh, Board of Selectmen, reported that the Selectmen and Petruzziello are actively negotiating the Land Disposition Agreement and it is not yet final. They are currently waiting for an appraisal of the land value and final numbers.

Ms. McCabe, Town Planner, informed the Board that the drive-thru is allowed by special permit and can be considered by the Board as part of this application and does not require a zoning change. The CVS over 10,000 sq. ft. requires a zoning amendment.

Peer Review Consultant:

Phil Paradis from BETA Group provided an updated traffic summary based on ITE analyses (Institute of Transportation Engineers), which are parking demands based on studies. Phil reported that BETA believes the proposed parking meets the demands of the project. Mr. Paradis summarized his memo to the Board dated March 15 that the projected demand for the CVS is 29 parking spaces and a total projected demand of 72 spaces on the School Street side while 85 spaces are provided, which provides additional parking spaces beyond the project demand and referred to as "surplus spaces" in this parking review. In conclusion, BETA believes as proposed the School Street side of the project has 13 surplus spaces above what is needed. BETA's analysis of the existing and proposed condition on the East Street side of the project find that the East Street side is more challenging but as proposed still yields a surplus of 2 spaces beyond the projected demand. The proposed uses on the East Street side for

residential, retail, and the MMO childcare use have different peak hours and are complimentary for parking. The peak time for retail is in the afternoon, the childcare use peak times are in the mornings, and the residential parking is provided in the underground parking garage and used largely in the evenings. In conclusion, BETA believes the project as proposed provides 15 surplus spaces beyond what is needed to meet the demands of the uses and therefore, the parking as proposed is adequate. A total of 85 new parking spaces more than what exists today is proposed and the uses are similar and the new uses (residential) have parking provided. BETA has not yet had the opportunity to review the proposed CVS drive-thru but will review and report back to the Applicant and Board. Mr. Paradis added that his latest review memo to the Planning Board dated March 16 asked for more detail on the proposed site lighting, more on the stormwater management, and request for landscaping changes.

Greg Lucas, Traffic Engineer from BETA Group Peer Review Consultant, informed the Board that not a lot has changed since the last hearing. A lot of factors exist regardless of this development. An addition of the drive-thru will not likely be a big impact and will likely result in only minor trip changes. The Planning Board's Rules and Regulations include an analysis for a very steep growth factor which is included in the submitted traffic analysis and the project does not exponentially worsen the traffic in the area.

Mike Sinesi, architect from DSK Design, the Planning Board's Peer Review Consultant, added that he supported the earlier request to adjust the location of the steeple, and reported that his earlier comments relative to the scale, height, and roof line adjustments have been addressed.

Staff Comments

Nora Loughnane, Community & Economic Development Director handed out documents that explain the issues brought up and explains how each have been resolved. This "issue resolution chart" will be added to the Town's and Planning Board's webpage. Another handout showing the project's before and after land comparisons was also summarized and distributed. The value of municipal exceeds current value after the development. The Project will bring up the value of the town owned properties. The spreadsheet shows the current costs, maintenance of the existing properties and the new properties will be more energy efficient.

Ms. Loughnane reported that the Town currently receives \$68K in taxes from the privately owned properties and the new property taxes will be over \$500K. The land comparison sheet demonstrates why this project is good for the town because it improves the land's value and thus creates higher tax revenues. The additional affordable units to be placed on the Town's Subsidized Housing Inventory is another significant impact for the Town to help Westwood stay above the minimum 10% required to protect the Town from unfriendly 40B projects.

Board Questions & Comments:

Chairman Laubenstein asked the Board members to weigh in on the proposed CVS drive-thru:

- Wetlands buffer, smaller CVS should be more compliant? Yes, and an increase of 9-10 spaces

- Disturbance to no touch zone, the Conservation Commission will weigh in but this seems more beneficial to move the building further from the buffer zone.
- Steeple for sure, front elevation. Columns.
- Analysis on drive-thru, neutral, but like the size.
- CVS, what is thinking behind big/small building? Don Caron- CVS representative, full analysis is not yet done, just out of conversation on Saturday.
- CVS is on board with the smaller building but only with the drive-thru, if the smaller size, Can't tell you specific volume.
- Will it increase the value, the bigger store? The product makes the store, one stop.
- A board member liked the idea of a smaller store, helps to avoid a zoning change for the increased retail size.
- ITE number, demand. The value that you came up with. How is it determined? Graph projects based on the particular use, suburban areas, shopping center, weekday, seasonal. Looked at studies that made sense for Islington.
- 85 additional spots PLUS additional retail, correct? Yes. Demand will be higher, but not as high as spots provided.
- Traffic, The Left into CVS, did you look at peak times? Applicant responded that they are working on a follow up response, we agree.
- Left out of CVS onto School Street. Did you look at that also? Previously it was one way, now both are concerning. Washington Street is more concerning.
- Will you walk us through the landscaping? Landscape plan is not the exact number the rendering is misleading according to the plan. Applicant response: Trees all along East Street, they are on the Landscape Plan.
- CVS, is it a 24 hour? No
- Ms. Loughnane answered questions regarding the financial analysis and land value comparisons. Ms. Loughnane explained that her projected estimates were from the Fiscal Peer Review report submitted by the Planning Board's fiscal consultant after review of the Applicant's fiscal report.
- Additional Housing, when are they counted on the SHI? Counted when they are permitted, then they can be counted.

Two board members held their comments on the drive-thru until BETA could review.

Mr. Gorman: Need to look into the drive thru, but likes the smaller option

Mr. McCusker wants some more engineering, is it worthwhile? Yes

Chairman Laubenstein opened the hearing up to public comments and questions.

Public Comments:

C. Layden, 136 School Street – Mrs. Layden asked about loss revenue from the MMO, asked when material is available for the public, the Blue Hart Tavern, the Youth and Family Service (Y&FS) space, and about school impacts.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the fiscal report prepared by the Planning Board's fiscal peer review consultant, RKG, is available on the website and made available when received and finalized and included the revenue from the MMO. In regards to the impacts the peer review report projects this project would estimate three school aged children which is within the School's capacity and the two bedroom 18 condos are not expected to have a negative impact on the schools. The fiscal report included impacts to schools and town staff is in regular communication with the School Department including the Superintendent. Concept plans have been provided that show the community space with Y&FS offices, renovated library space, and a multi-purpose community space available for recreation and current users of the ICC. Staff including the Library Director and Youth & Family Services Director have meet and reviewed the concept plans are determined to be space that meets their needs. In response to questions about the Blue Hart Tavern, Ms. Loughnane noted that to get the building on Historic Building Register there would need to be request and a formal review.

B. Delay, 148 School Street – Asked if there would be compact and handicap accessible parking spaces. He also asked about the cost to relocate Wentworth Hall and the improvements for the community space.

Mr. Paradis, the Planning Board's peer review, responded that the proposed parking spaces are all standard sized and not compact and they are proposing the required number of accessible spaces.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the cost estimate provided is \$3.5-\$3.8 million dollar range to relocate the Wentworth Hall Library building, perform renovations on the library, construct the one store addition and the new lower level space.

J. Layden, 136 School Street – Questioned the proposed on street parking, where residents of the condos would park, questioned the floor area of the existing ICC, and asked about the \$1.7 million and the land disposition agreement (LDA).

Ms. Loughnane responded that the spreadsheet is to compare the values before and after the project, the Board of Selectmen is in the process of negotiating the full details of the LDA. She explained that there was a full capital needs assessment of the ICC building last year and estimates a cost of \$1.75 million in immediate repairs to keep the building useable but does not include an elevator to make the building fully accessible. The report estimates over \$4 million to make the ICC building fully accessible.

Selectmen Walsh added that the project proposes phased construction as to not displace current users such as renovating the retail building where CVS is currently to provide a new space for the MMO (Mother's Morning Out Nursery), relocating and constructing the addition the Wentworth Hall/Community Space, and then the ICC will be demolished in the third phase for the residential building.

H. Khuri, 11 Stratford Place – Commented that he didn't see a need for a large CVS or the drive-thru.

M. Lynch, 56 Parker Street – Suggested traffic signal adjustment to allow the left onto East Street at the same time as a left onto School Street. She also asked what specific businesses are proposed.

Mr. Petruzzello explained that it was too early to have tenants but is interested in restaurant uses.

Ms. Vanwagenen, 181 Canton Street – Commented that the CVS was too big and was not supportive of the drive-thru.

S. Raftrey, 33 Booth Drive – Commented on the size of the proposed mixed use building, the parking, and the size of nearby properties. She was also concerned about the parking and the possibility of the drive-thru.

D Conant, 21 Strasser Avenue – Questioned the impact to the schools and if the traffic report accounted for the proposed future school changes.

Ms. Loughnane replied that the Planning Board's regulations require the submitted traffic report to include a 4.5% increase in the traffic analysis which is a significant increase that is assumed in the traffic report. Essentially, the report assumes a high increase greater than what's expected to fully capture and mitigation any potential impacts.

P. Gopal, 102 Canton Street – Expressed concern with traffic impacts particularly during evening rush hour and questioned the Board's professional peer reviewer that found that the impacts will be minimal. She also questioned the parking regulations.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the Planning Board's peer reviewer found that there will not be a significant traffic impact but minimal impact, not that there is no impact but the project is not expected to have a significant impact on traffic. She also explained that the FMUOD Section of the Zoning Bylaw gives the Planning Board authority to look at a project holistically to make a determination as to the required number of parking spaces.

Board Comments:

A board member explained that the Board reviews the parking and the full traffic report which includes a full appendix and showed that there is a small numbers of cars coming off of School Street and massive numbers on East and Washington Street with many vehicles coming from Norwood to get to 128. Applying the 4.5% captures the conditions. On street parking is considered an enhancement because it acts as a form of traffic calming and is more in keeping with the village center feel.

M. Layden, 136 School Street – Questioned the traffic flow and direction on School Street.

J. Ferraro, 130 Phillips Brook Road – Asked about the size of the new Wentworth Hall and community space.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the library space is 2,000 SF, the YF&S is 2,000 SF, and the multi-purpose lower level is 4,000 SF for a total gross floor area of 8,000 SF with a net around 7,000 SF because that takes out stairways.

E. Rawlings, 86 Greenhill Road – Asked if the Planning Board can require more than the minimum of 10% affordable housing as a condition of the special permit. She also asked what other actions and steps the Town is doing to stay above the minimum for the 2020 census and what other options were there for the Wentworth Hall and ICC given the \$3.5-\$3.8 million cost with this proposal.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the Zoning Bylaw requires 15% of the proposed units to be affordable and with 18 units proposed three affordable units are required here. The proposal from the Applicant is three affordable units but as proposed it will provide more than three units to be added to the SHI (12 new SHI) units. She further explained that the Town is currently above the 10% based on 2010 census figures but the new total housing count will be updated in 2020 and the Town will need to account for all new units added. The Planning Board requires 15% for special permit applications for 8 or more units to help stay above but there are no requirements in by-right developments. Once a community drops below 10%, they are exposed to unfriendly 40B affordable housing projects.

S. Castaldini, 54 Birch Street – Not supportive of the drive-thru and would like to see the smaller CVS.

Mr. Petruzzello commented that CVS is an integral part of the project and they are requesting a larger CVS or a smaller one with a drive-thru.

F. Fusco, 20 Pine Lane – Not supportive of the drive-thru.

K. Winn, 10 Cedar Hill Drive – Expressed support for a new community spaces for Y&FS and programming, new space would have heating system that works, asked for playground protection other than jersey barrier for the MMO space, noted a drive-thru is helpful when you have sick children in the car.

Board Discussion:

Two board members were supportive of the reduced size retail building for CVS because it would eliminate the need for a zoning amendment and will pull building further from wetland area. The drive-thru circulation and traffic flow will be further reviewed. Another board member expressed support to pursue the small CVS building but though the drive-thru may need to be

one way to work. Two other Board members wanted to have more time to review and here from BETA Group before giving more input on the larger CVS or smaller CVS with drive-thru option.

Applicant:

Attorney Peter Zahka explained that CVS is an existing and proposed tenant of the project and to make the project work economically, with a higher rent, the original proposal for 13,000 SF with a drive thru proposed and later removed the drive thru in response to resident concerns. The Applicant is now request a smaller CVS with a drive-thru and is looking for the Board's feedback on how to proceed.

Board Opinion on Drive thru option:

- Chair Laubenstein: Yes, drive thru and smaller store
- Mr. Olanoff: Yes, believes traffic flow can be made to work
- Gorman: needs time to review traffic impact
- McCusker, needs more info and comments from peer reviewer

Ken Cram, the Applicant's Traffic Consultant from Bayside Engineering noted that he believed traffic will be comparable to current traffic, Saturday will be lower, but he needs to confirm.

Greg Lucas, the Planning Board's traffic consultant from BETA Group, notes that he will review and but notes that a smaller drive thru with vs. bigger store no drive thru has different parking requirements and a small store will demand less parking. The drive-thru may generate more trips and is more convenient but can be designed to work.

Ms. McCabe recommended continuing the hearing until next week on April 4 where the Conservation Commission will also hold their hearing on the same project so both Conservation and Planning Board can meet together.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Planning Board unanimously voted to continue this public hearing to Wednesday, April 4 at 7:00 pm in the Cafeteria at the Downey School, 250 Downey Street.

#2. Continued Public Hearing for Zoning Amendments submitted for Annual Town Meeting:

- . Zoning Map Amendments to Alter the Boundaries of the LBB District and the FMUOD 6 / Washington Street Business District Related to Islington Center Redevelopment
- . Amendments to Section 9.5 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw to Allow Retail Sales and Service Greater than 10,000 square feet by Special Permit in the FMUOD6/Washington Street Business District Related to Islington Center Redevelopment
- . General Zoning Housekeeping Amendments, none proposed

. Petitioner Article - Zoning Amendment to Limit Number of Residential Dwelling Units in FMUOD 6 & FMUOD 7

Staff/Board Comments:

Ms. McCabe noted that the Planning Board's articles and recommendations were presented to the Finance Committee on March 5 and their continued hearing is on March 26. Ms. McCabe will prepare a summary update of the Islington project to send to the Fin Com for next week's hearing.

Public Comments:

Ms. Vanwagenen, 181 Canton St. – Is against the over 10K size. Currently the zoning is 10,000 square feet. It's about the CVS building being bigger than 10,000 square feet. The Board is sponsoring it.

Ms. McCabe responded that it is the size of the retail size area, not necessarily the size of the building. And she discussed other retailers in town and their sizes.

Mr. Gorman is against the amendment to increase the allowable size for the retail and suggested lower to 11,000 SF.

F. Fusco, 20 Pine Lane – Asked if the CVS is revised to be under 10,000 sq. ft. would this amendment goes away and what happens in FMUOD7 for this zoning if it goes over 10,000 sq. ft.?

Ms. Loughnane explained that as written this amendment only applies to the FMUOD 6 zone only and not FMUOD7.

J. Layden, 136 School Street - Commented that he believes Islington should be subject to the same standards as High Street.

A board member responded that if the size of the CVS is revised to be less than the 10,000 SF limit then the Planning board could withdraw the article or if the Islington articles aren't approved by Town Meeting, the amendment related to the retail size could be withdrawn.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker the Board voted 5-0 to continue the public hearing to Monday, March 26 at 7 pm at the Library, 660 High Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Olanoff.

#3. 215 High St. & portion of 258 Grove St. Public Hearing - Preliminary Review of OSRD* special permit. Preliminary proposal to construct 19 single-family age-restricted residential dwellings in an Open Space Residential Development.

Applicant:

Mr. Michael Yanoff gave a history of his life in Westwood and how he wants to downsize. He has partnered with Mark Romonowicz, High Meadow Development to propose a planned development at 215 High Street. They are proposing over 55, maintenance free living. Preliminary plans will go into more detail. 3 affordable homes will be provided. The property is under the 400,000 Sq. Ft. minimum size and is working with the abutting property owner for some additional land. They are proposing 19 single-family homes and additional landscaping from feedback from neighbors. The size of the homes, will vary, there will be eleven detached and eight townhomes style with individual driveways and recessed garage doors.

Mike Terry, council to Applicant, added that they are seeking input from the Board on the affordable requirement to provide three affordable homes and are requesting the homes somewhere else in town because it is not feasible in the current location. Applicant is doing due diligence and looking into other properties for the units.

Board & Staff Comments:

- Ms. McCabe, vote to give applicant guidance. Applicant did meet with staff. Emergency access roads be paved, which the applicant will pave. Housing Agent was supportive of providing the three affordable units off-site to still meeting the 15% requirement, which would provide family housing rather than senior affordable.
- Affordable Housing: Try to make the homes be the same. The Board generally agreed there is a greater need for family affordable housing so three homes, or be creative with the housing, possibly more affordable units.
- Like to hear more on the landscaping: I assume a lot of current trees. Applicant: Can save most of the buffer trees, and enhance with evergreens. With gentle mounding. Lawn beds, perennial gardens. Street landscaping and will address more landscaping at the next meeting.
- Can it be pushed back more?
- It's about 100 feet back from 109.

Public Comments:

A board member read the letter from Kenneth Goldman aloud into the record.

Attorney Mike Terry responded that Westwood does have a master plan and the plan does include senior housing opportunities as a goal.

Board Comments:

- Can we save the trees? There is a lot of clearing already. It is in our interest to save as many trees as possible.
- Does it require any subdivision waivers? It complies with the bylaws, not to seek waivers.
- 500 feet for the emergency road.

- Will there be a community building? Community gazebo only, not a building.
- It needs to be an actual building for activities. This is not in walking distance of anything. Excise facility, it is a smaller project, only 19 families. In other facilities built, the building is not used. We have people in our homes, not to a community space. Ms. McCabe read: Bylaw: Community facility, unless the board determines it is not needed due to walking distances. Does it meet the need of the residents.
- Open space dimensions, distances to buffers. Sidewalks? 50 feet/ 100 feet, where wetlands, allowed having 5% paved roadway in the buffer. Currently no sidewalks, street water flows into the lawns. Narrow roads, no need for the sidewalks, a small community.
- A trail around the community, follow the setback line. Applicant: worries about the privacy because that is where family rooms and bedrooms are.

Chairman Laubenstein opened the hearing to public comments and questions.

Public Comments:

Ms. Vanwagenen, 181 Canton Street – asked about the size and prices of the homes.

Applicant responded that are two sizes 3000 sq. ft. to 3500 sq. ft. for about \$1.2-1.4M and the townhouses may be \$800-900K prices have been fully determined yet.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe explained that this is a Preliminary Review but the Board can make a motion to approve or approve with suggested modifications that could be incorporated into the special permit application. She noted that an approval does not let them start construction.

Planning Board suggested including a community facility, trails, and providing more on the affordable housing for review and consideration of the Board.

Action Taken:

Mr. Olanoff made a motion for the Planning Board to approve the maximum density for 19 dwellings at this site; the motion was seconded by Mr. McCusker seconded. All in favor 5-0.

Mr. Olanoff made a motion to close the public hearing on 215 High Street, Mr. McCusker seconded. All in favor 5-0.

#4 **690 Canton St., AT&T Public Hearing** - Request for WCOD*-EIDR* to add three antennas and associated equipment on roof of existing facility.

Applicant:

Nate Drouin was present to represent the Applicant, AT&T. Mr. Drouin explained the proposal for 3 sectors with 3 antennas 9 antennas in total. Increasing the height just slightly, for usage

needs of the customers, will increase by 2 feet. Space for another antennae. A couple of radio swaps. Final height will be exactly 10 feet. From building Commissioner: Do a structural and electrical analysis of the roof, of the AT&T portion of the building. We did a structural, it will be sent, no problem with it being a condition.

Board Comments and Questions:

- How far away are they? Applicant: A1 is not showing. Distance is still the same distance away.
- Any feedback from abutters? No
- Been several approvals: Verizon and Sprint.
- The roof will be structural and amount analysis.

Public Comment:

Vanwagenen, 181 Canton Street – Asked if health impacts were considered.

The Applicant and the Board responded that a Radio Frequency Report was submitted along with an emissions report, the site is compliant, it is deemed safe. FCC limits, making this change make it still compliant.

Board/Staff comments:

- Sector coverage map? Yes, it is in your packet.
- Adding more capacity, you can only have so many connections.

Action Taken:

Mr. Olanoff made a motion to approve with the four conditions prepared by staff and as modified tonight, McCusker seconded. All in favor
5-0.

Mr. Olanoff made a motion to approve all seven waivers, McCusker seconded. All in favor, 5-0.

Mr. Olanoff made a motion to approve the application, Mr. McCusker seconded. All in Favor, 5-0.

Mr. Olanoff made a motion to close the public hearing Mr. McCusker seconded. All in favor, 5-0.

Bicycle Parking Design Guidelines & Parking Design Standards - Rules and Regulations Amendment Public Hearing - Hearing to amend the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations related to parking standards and bike parking design guidelines.

Staff asked the Board to continue this to the April 10 meeting.

Mr. Olanoff wants to use acceptable bike racks. The Planning Board currently has bike rack standards and parking standards but he reviewed and is making some suggested edits to the style of some of the bike racks.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Atkins to continue at the 4/10 meeting at The Downey School at 7 pm, and seconded by Mr. Gorman, the Board voted 5-0 in favor.

Other Business:

- Various Committee Reports - none
- Signing of decisions from prior meetings or hearings closed on 3/20/18 – signed decision from Westwood Place/Pulte approved on 2/27

Approval of Minutes: 1/30, 2/13, 2/27 – Continued review to the next meeting.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Gorman and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted 5-0 in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:25pm.

List of Documents:

| | |
|---|------------|
| <p>Islington Center Redevelopment Public Hearing Applicant’s Presentation to PB 3/20/2018, CGCG Associates, Inc.,3/20/2018, 38 pages Islington Municipal Lot-Method 2 Risk Characterization and Class A-2 Response Action- December 2003, Geologic Services Corp, 12/3/2003, 92 pages Islington Center Redevelopment Public Hearing Applicant Response to Traffic Comments, From Kenneth Cram, To Westwood Planning Board, 3/6/2018, 4 pages Traffic Impact Study & Access Study, Bayside Engineering, Islington Village Redevelopment, 2/26/2018, 71 pages Traffic Study Appendix, Bayside Engineering, Islington Village Redevelopment, 2/26/2018, 673 pages RKG Fiscal Peer Review Report to Planning Board, RKG Associates Inc., Abigail McCabe, Town Planner, Peer Review Fiscal Commentary-Proposed Islington Village, 2/26/2018, 9 pages Applicant Response to BETA Comments, From Susan Harrington, GCG Associates, To Abigail McCabe, Town Planner, Islington Center-Mixed-Use Development Peer Review, 3/9/2018, 8 pages Revised Site Plan Set, GCG Associates, 12/12/2017, 17 pages Revised Elevations Building B Mixed Use, McKay Architects, 2 pages Landscape Plan, GCG Associates, 3/8/2018, 2 pages Autoturn Turning Templates, GCG Associates, 12/12/2017, 2 pages Stormwater Calculations, GCG Associates, 3/6/2018, 219 pages Stormwater Pre & Post Drainage Plans, GCG Associates, 12/12/2017, 4 pages Environmental Site Assessment 227-283 Washington Street, Environmental Consultants, To:</p> | <p>PDF</p> |
|---|------------|

| | |
|--|-----|
| <p>Mr. Alex Cavallini, Dedham Savings Bank, 2/6/2018, 312 pages BETA Peer Review Memo from 2/12/2018, From BETA, To Abigail McCabe, Town Planner, Islington Center-Mixed Use Development Peer Review, 2/12/2018, 18 pages Environmental Site Assessment 280-288 Washington Street, IES, Inc., 2/6/2018, 318 pages Renderings-Existing & Proposed Views, McKay Architects, 3/13/2018, 12 pages BETA Parking Summary 3/15/2018, From BETA, Phil Paradis, To Abigail McCabe, Updated parking Summary, 10 pages Memo to ICTF Islington: Project Summary, From Abby McCabe, To Islington Center Task Force, Islington Center Redevelopment Project Summary, 3/14/2018, 3 pages Islington Project Visuals, Supreme Development/McKay architects, 3/13/2018, 14 pages BETA Peer Review Memo for 3/20 Hearing, To Abigail McCabe, Islington Center-Mixed Use Development Peer Review Update, 3/16/2018, 21 pages Revised Autoturns Ladder Truck, GCG Associates, Inc., 12/12/2017, 2 pages Fire Chief Comments Revised Islington Plans, From John Deckers, To Planning Board, Islington Center Project, 3/20/2018, 1 page Issue Resolution Chart-Presented at Hearing, 3/20/2018, 6 pages Before and After Land Values-Presented at Hearing, 3/20/2018, 1 page Petruzzello Development Options-Presented at Hearing, 3/20/2018, 1 page</p> | |
| <p>215 High Street & 258 Grove Street Public Hearing Notice, 2/16/2018, 1 page Application and Plans, 1/26/2018, 14 pages Staff Recommendation from January 2018, Preliminary Review, To Mark Romanowicz and Michael Yanoff, From: Abby McCabe, 1/4/2018, 3 pages Aerial View 215 High Street, Google Map, 1 page</p> | PDF |
| <p>690 Canton Street, AT&T Public Hearing Public Hearing Notice, 2/16/2018, 1 page Application and Plans, 23 pages, 1/16/2018 Landlord Authorization, AT&T, 1 page Waiver Request, 1 page Environmental Impact Narrative, 2 pages Revised Plans, From AT&T, 10 pages Safety and Compliance Report, From Centerline Communications, 2/23/2018, 22 pages Coverage Maps, 3 pages</p> | PDF |
| <p>Zoning Amendment Continued Public Hearing Handout from Fin Com's March 5, 2018 Public Hearing-Full Article Text Included, 10 pages Planning Board Memo to Fin Com, 3/2/18, From Abby McCabe, To Jan O'Donnell, summary of Proposed Zoning Articles for Annual Town Meeting, 3/2/2018, 3 pages Planning Board Presentation to Fin Com, 3/5/2018, 6 pages Proposed Zoning Map, May 2018, 1 page</p> | PDF |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Board Rules & Regulations Public Hearing Current Bicycle Parking Design Guidelines, 8 pages Current Parking Design Standards, 5/18/1992, 3 pages Public Hearing Notice, 2/26/2018, 1 page Proposed 2018 changes to Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 1 page | PDF |
|---|-----|