

**Planning Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 10, 2016**  
**Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby St. – 7:30 PM**

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chris Pfaff at approximately 7:30 p.m. WestCAT was granted permission to videotape the meeting.

**Present:**

Planning Board members present: Chris Pfaff, Steve Olanoff, Trevor Laubenstein, Dave Atkins and Mike McCusker. Staff members present: Town Planner Abigail McCabe, Community & Economic Development Director Nora Loughnane and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba, who recorded the minutes.

**Board Administrative Items**

Chairman Pfaff thanked outgoing Planning Board Members Jack Wiggin and Bruce Montgomery for their many years of service and hard work for the Town. Chairman Pfaff welcomed the two newly elected Planning Board members Dave Atkins and Mike McCusker.

***Board Reorganization***

**Chairman**

***Motion/Action Taken:***

On a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to recommend Mr. Pfaff as Chairman.

**Vice Chairman**

***Motion/Action Taken:***

On a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Board voted unanimously in favor to recommend Mr. Laubenstein as Vice Chairman.

**Secretary**

***Motion/Action Taken:***

On a motion by Mr. Laubenstein and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to recommend Mr. Olanoff as Secretary.

**University Station – Project Specific Signage Alternative**

Paul Cincotta of New England Development (NED) was present and gave an overview of the University Station project from its beginning in 2012 to present, as a courtesy to the new Planning Board members, followed by a request under Zoning Bylaw Section 9.7.10.15 for a Site-Specific Signage Alternative:

Mr. Cincotta presented drawings depicting the Supplemental Sign Plan to the Board and explained that it is consistent with the Master Development Plan and will allow businesses within the core retail area of the University Station project to provide clear, adequate, and effective signage necessary for safe and efficient operations. These signs include:

**Sidewalk Directory Sign** – provide directory information to shoppers throughout the development. A maximum of fourteen signs are allowed on sidewalks. Signs shall be limited to approximately 24" x 30" (each side).

**Portable Code of Conduct Sign** – identify specific restrictions and regulations that will be enforced throughout the premises. There are a maximum of four allowed throughout the development. Signs shall be limited to approximately 30" x 48" (each side, if double-sided).

**Parking Directory/Control Sign** – assist drivers in identifying their parking locations while also identifying tenant specific rules and regulations, interspersed throughout various parking fields. Signs shall be unlimited so as to be reasonable or necessary to adequately direct vehicular traffic. Signs shall be limited to approximately 24" x 36" (each side, if double-sided).

Town Planner Ms. McCabe informed the Board that this request could be considered a minor modification to the previously issued

and previously modified Conformance Determination for the Core Retail Area or the Board could approve a new Project Specific Signage package.

**Board Comments:**

- Board members generally agreed that due to the late submittal of this signage alternative package, this discussion should be continued without any decisions being made this evening.
- A board member said that he disagreed with allowing temporary movable signs and said that he preferred permanent signs affixed to a structure.
- A board member was not in favor of the directory signs, as he believes these are more advertisement in nature.
- A board member suggested that the Code of Conduct sign should be a permanent sign.
- A board member requested more time to observe the Parking/Directory Control signs in person, expressing concerns about the safety of pedestrian movements and the sturdiness of the signs.
- A board member commented on the excessive size of the signs at the Cart Corrals at Wegmans.
- A board member suggested combining some of the signs such as the temporary now open and sidewalk director signs.
- One of the Code of Conduct signs at the plaza was suggested instead of the proposed four.
- A board member asked for examples of other similar developments that have the similar Code of Conduct type signs.
- The locations of the sidewalk directory signs were a concern as may interfere with pedestrian movement.

Mr. Cincotta responded that these signs are typically used in multiple shopping centers managed by NED. These signs do not interrupt the pedestrian flow of traffic, are not obstacles and are a fundamental element widely used. Mr. Cincotta stated that the signs are not new and have been in place for over a year; NED has 24/7 security to monitor the conditions of the development and any impacts the signs may or may not have had. He reported that all the portable signs and sign frames (without signs in them) have been removed until this sign package is approved.

*Action Taken:*

The Board continued the signage request until the Board's Meeting on Tuesday, June 14<sup>th</sup> in the Champagne Meeting Room to allow time for the board members to visit the property to view the proposed signs and fully consider the proposal since it was received earlier this afternoon.

**Anthony's Coal Fired Pizza (ACFP) – 119 University Avenue - Project Development Review Follow-up**

Town Planner Ms. McCabe reported that the May 2015, Project Development Review Approval for ACFP granted the following sidewalk configuration: *a waiver of 2 feet for 119 University Avenue of Zoning Bylaw Section 9.7.7.3, which requires 6 feet of clearance along all sidewalks (4 feet provided) for ~ 20 feet along the front (west side) of Anthony's Coal Fired Pizza outdoor window seating.* The sidewalk was approved with the condition that *the Planning Board shall review this sidewalk clearance waiver request to ensure accessibility for pedestrians and will review the surface paving material for adequacy in one year (May, 2016).*

Town Planner Ms. McCabe reported that no complaints about the sidewalk width were heard over the past year. She also noted that she did recently speak with ACFP management requesting that the outdoor fencing is removed during the winter to allow for snow removal and will make note that this should be done every year.

*Board Comments:*

*No action was needed.*

**60-90 Glacier Drive – Special Permit Public Hearing for Major Wireless Communications Facility**

Attorney Chris Swinarski representing Applicant Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, was present before the Board. This proposal is for a 100-ft. monopole tower with the antenna array within the pole at a height of 95-ft. and accompanying ground level equipment cabinets, backup power generator and concrete pad within an 8-ft. height cedar plank fence proposed for the rear area of 60-90 Glacier Drive.

Mr. Swinarski gave a brief review of the application and narrative:

- Sector footprints and the gaps in coverage (less sufficient coverage and performance) were depicted on the RF maps indicating that there is a high demand for service at the proposed location.
- Photo simulations were presented showing existing conditions with the balloon tests and the proposed conditions with the 100" monopole.

- The Applicant requested that Planning Board consider allowing the diameter of the monopole to exceed the 3 ft. maximum diameter of a Major WCF antenna support system, according to Section 9.4.7.6 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Swiniarski stated that the newest technology required for this monopole makes it impossible to not exceed the maximum diameter due to location of radio-heads inside the pole, as opposed to older technology which has the radio-heads located in the equipment cabinet.) He stated that today's technology requires the radio units to be close to and directed towards the antennas, which is different than how they used to be designed. The antennas are 18 inches wide within the 4-ft. pole because the zoning bylaw requires stealth facilities.
- At the request of Ms. McCabe, the Applicant clarified that no part of the proposed monopole or proposed fencing is temporary, contrary to what the application references as "temporary", as these are mistakes in the document carried over from the previous application that was ultimately withdrawn.
- The applicant stated that no trees would be removed for this construction because the facility is proposed to be located on the paved/gravel area.

Board Questions & Comments:

- Board members had a lengthy exchange of questions and comments with the Applicant and the engineers relative to the coverage capacity maps, the tower's proposed width, the location of the antennas and radio units, the proposed height, and the views of the photo simulations presented with the balloon tests.

The Chairman opened the hearing to public comment and there were no public comments.

Town Planner Ms. McCabe noted that the Board should consider the following and must make positive findings for the following according to the zoning bylaw:

- Applicant's request to apply a the previously submitted and withdrawn \$1,500 application fee to this Special Permit application;
- That the location of the proposed facility would provide adequate screening and/or buffering such that the proposed facility would not be detrimental to the Town or to the general character or visual appearance of the surrounding neighborhood or abutting uses, and would be consistent with the intent of the Bylaw.
- And that the increase in diameter/width to 4 ft. of this major wireless communication facility antenna support system will have no significant adverse impact on the town and surrounding residential properties (§9.4.7.6).

On a motion by Mr. Laubenstein and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Board voted 5-0 finding that the proposed wireless facility with the increased width for 4 ft. does not have an adverse impact to the town or surrounding residential properties because of the location at the rear of 90 Glacier Drive, next to the train tracks, surrounded by commercial and non-residential properties, and the large distance between the nearest residential neighborhoods, and agreed with the Applicant's findings as stated in the application submission.

On a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted 5-0 in favor to grant the Special Permit Decision with the following conditions:

1. The 8-ft. fence shall be permanent and made of cedar plank as shown on the submitted plans, repaired as necessary, and remain in good condition while this facility is valid and in use.
2. The equipment cabinets, generator and any other equipment shall be screened from and not be visible over the 8-ft. fence as shown on the submitted plans.
3. The monopole shall be maintained with a flat white color as shown on the submitted plans and repainted or repaired as necessary to minimize fading or discoloration.
4. The Applicant shall verify, through post-installation monitoring and report of an independent radio engineering consultant, that there is no negative effect on the Town's emergency radio communications.
5. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant shall provide a bond, in a form acceptable to the Town, to cover the cost of removing the facility from the property. The amount shall be determined to be acceptable to the Town Engineer and Town Planner.

6. The Applicant shall not post any signs for advertisement or any other reasons on or in the vicinity of the Project, with the exception of a sign not exceeding four (4) square feet to display the name and telephone number of the person and company responsible for the maintenance of the Project.
7. Except as modified by the conditions and findings hereof, the Project shall comply with the Project Plans, and with all conditions of prior approvals, in all respects, and the Applicant shall pursue completion of the project with reasonable diligence and continuity.
8. The tower, all antennas, cabling, fencing, concrete pad, and accessory equipment shall be removed within six (6) months of abandonment or discontinuance of use. The Planning Board shall receive notification of any abandonment or discontinuance of use.
9. This special permit is valid for a period of five (5) years, at the end of the five (5) year period the Applicant shall renew the WCOD approval with an WCOD-EIDR from the Planning Board, an administrative EIDR from the Town Planner, or WCOD special permit with the Planning Board for an additional five (5) years, as outlined in Section 9.4.
10. A copy of this Decision and the Project Plans shall be kept on the Project Site at all times during construction.

On a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted 5-0 in favor to close the hearing.

#### **Committee Selections**

##### *Motion/Action Taken:*

Planning Board members voted unanimously in favor to recommend the following Committee appointments to the Board of Selectmen.

- Housing Partnership Representative: Chris Pfaff & Alternate Mike McCusker
- MAPC Representative Steve Olanoff & Alternate Dave Atkins
- MBTA Advisory Board Designee Steve Olanoff & Alternate Dave Atkins
- Regional Transportation Advisory Council Representative Trevor Laubenstein & Alternate Steve Olanoff
- Three Rivers Inter-local Council (TRIC) Representative Mike McCusker & Alternate Steve Olanoff
- Long Range Financial Planning Committee - Chris Pfaff expressed an interest in this appointment.

#### **Board Member Signatures for Norfolk County Registry of Deeds & Land Court**

Board members signed the documents prepared for the Registry of Deeds and Land Court as requested by Town Planner Ms. McCabe.

#### **Update on Islington Center Task Force (ICTF)**

Mr. Laubenstein who is the Chair of the ICTF gave Board Members a brief update from its last meeting held in April where they broke into small groups and discussed various elements of Islington such as the strengths and areas for improvement.

- Updated Task Force on Pending FMUOD Special Permit Application for 301-323 Washington Street
- Discussed Draft Questions for Online Survey. *Ms. Loughnane updated that this Survey has now been finalized and will be opened 6/1, will be distributed on 6/15 in the Community Newsletter and then online. (Q's are specific, about 20, some fill in, some open ended.)*
- Reviewed the Draft Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Redevelopment of Property in Islington Center. *Ms. Loughnane updated that the RFP for the four town-owned properties in Islington was released this week and all interested bidders will be required to register through the town's website to receive bid documents.*
- Ms. Loughnane briefly summarized the RFP process - initial review of proposals will be by the ICTF; ICTF will make a recommendation to the Board of Selectmen; Board of Selectmen will review, may conduct its own interviews before selecting one or more preferred bidders; then the Selectmen's Office will negotiate disposition agreements with each preferred bidder; then each preferred bidder will apply for and pursue all necessary development approvals, including the normal permitting process with the Planning Board and any other relevant boards and commissions, such as Conservation and/or Zoning Board; and finally Town Meeting will be asked to authorize the Selectmen to proceed with each proposed property transfer. The RFP is intentionally open-ended to encourage creative responses. The response deadline will likely be approximately 4 weeks after the RFP release.
- The next meeting of the ICTF will continue with focus groups to discuss specific elements of Islington.

**Approval of Minutes:**

On a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Laubenstein, the Board voted three votes in favor and two abstentions, to approve the minutes of 04/12/16, 04/25/16 as written (Mr. McCusker and Mr. Atkins abstained).

**Planning Board Meeting Procedures:**

- Board members agreed with Ms. McCabe’s request to change Planning Board Meeting start time to 7 p.m. as of June 14<sup>th</sup>
- Board members agreed to establish a deadline of Friday morning for any submittals related to a Tuesday meeting.

**Other Business:**

- General Dynamics recently initiated a new bike share program called Zagster.com that designs, builds and operates programs for local businesses and communities.
- A board member expressed the need to promote the benefits of being a member of the Neponset Valley TMA to more Westwood corporations with greater than 250 employees about Massachusetts Ride Sharing Requirements. The Planning Board required New England Development to become a member of the Neponset Valley TMA and has a University Ave Shuttle - Eversource/ 690 Canton/ Station Drive: which connects Eversource employees, and employees located at 690 Canton St, and Station Drive to the 128 Commuter Rail Station and includes a lunch shuttle to the Shoppes at University Station.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Laubenstein and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:30 p.m.

**List of Documents**

• University Station, Project Specific Sign Alternative – Narrative, Site Plan and Photos	PDF
• 60-90 Glacier Drive – Narrative, Application, Maps, Photo Simluations, and Site Plans	PDF
• 60-90 Glacier Drive – Health Director’s Comments 04-27-16	PDF
• Memorandum from Town Planner, Abby McCabe, to Planning Board Members, Re: 60-90 Glacier Drive – Verizon Special Permit, dated 5/6/16 (3 pages)	PDF
• Memorandum from Town Planner, Meeting Summary for 5/10/16 meeting (2 pages)	PDF