Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Rafsky called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. and granted WestCat TV permission to record/videotape the meeting.

Present

Planning Board members: Steve Rafsky, Steve Olanoff, Jack Wiggin, Bruce Montgomery and Chris Pfaff. Staff members: Nora Loughnane, Director of Community & Economic Development and Janice Barba, Planning & Land Use Specialist. Also present, Special Counsel Dan Bailey.

Consideration of Conformance Determination for Not Your Average Joe's Restaurant (NYAJ) - University Station

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Paul Cincotta of NED, Dennis Mayer from Aria Group Architects, Nate Cheal of TetraTech, and Brian Dugdale of Goulston & Storrs.

Mr. Cincotta presented a display board with the Master Development Plan identifying the location of NYAJ's restaurant at the intersection of Station Drive and University Avenue.

- Plan reflects the site modification that came about with the submission of plans for NYAJ's and its relationship with the rest of the village area.
- The fundamental difference in the approved Master Plan and this modification is that NYAJ's parking lot layout calls for parking
 aisles perpendicular to University Avenue, as opposed to being parallel with University Avenue.

At this point Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Cincotta for an update on the status of the village area plans and whether a hotel is still proposed there. (Mr. Cincotta said that NED has been talking with a hotel developer and confirmed that a hotel will be located within close proximity of the two restaurants (NYAJ's Restaurant B and Restaurant C), in the same quadrant and expects a submission of PDR to be submitted with a goal to begin construction around April 1st and an opening around Labor Day. He said that he did not know of the other proposed uses for the area.

Presentation of Pre-Application Administrative Review Package – Not Your Average Joe's Restaurant by Dennis Mayer, Aria Group Architects

Mr. Mayer began the presentation by saying that they have reviewed and responded to Beta's recommendations and requests for more information regarding exterior materials; façade treatments and detailing.

- Schematic Floor Plan Sheet 2.0 was displayed depicting the largest interior areas include: kitchen, dining, bar/dining and exterior areas: patio and fire-pit; propose seating for 200 inside and 100 outside.
- Exterior Elevations Plan Sheet 4.0 was displayed depicting the enlarged East elevation (front of the building facing parking lot) and daytime and nighttime views of the East elevation were displayed.
- Design features were highlighted including skylight, canopy over the entrance, patio/fire-pit and private dining room.
- Exterior Massing Perspectives Sheet 6.0 was displayed depicting views from southeast, east, northeast, north, northwest and southwest.
- Mr. Mayer presented the Exterior Material Board Sheet 9.0 depicting cast stone; stained cedar shiplap siding; dark charcoal coping & miscellaneous exterior metal; painted white utility brick and medium gray ribbed metal panels with exposed fasteners.

Board Questions

- A board member requested clarification on which massing perspective was the view from University Avenue and whether this
 view would have a sign. (Mr. Mayer identified it on the Exterior Elevation Plan Sheet 4.0 as the West Elevation and confirmed
 that there would be a sign along University Avenue.)
- Ch. Rafsky commented that although Beta has created a large punch list of items to be addressed, he is confident that the items will be accomplished.
- A board member asked Mr. Cincotta to identify the precise footprint of the adjacent restaurant, its users and asked if this is the last restaurant proposed in the master plan. (Mr. Cincotta said that at this point he is not sure if the restaurant will be full-service, sit down style or the footprint but the parking layout will be modified slightly based on the user.)
- Ch. Rafsky commented that he is concerned that this area will have a disjointed review process and that the village look and feel in this area will not be accomplished. He requested the addition of language that says this is the first step of the creation of the village.

- A board member asked Mr. Bailey if it is problematic to grant a conformance review when restaurant C and the Village Area/Hotel Area are not completed. (Mr. Bailey said that this is not a problem and that the Conformance Determination will condition that further review of those areas will be required as well as a separate Conformance Determination.)
- Ms. Loughnane informed the board that she has prepared a draft list of ten recommended conditions to be included with and referenced in the Conformance Determination, in response to the peer review comments made by BETA Group. (A copy of this memo is included with these minutes.)
- Ms. Loughnane said that the planned hotel will be built but that the village area will be reconfigured and redesigned around these plans.
- A board member commented that he thinks this plan shows that there is clear erosion of the village concept plan and that the addition of 20% more parking spaces will now impact the future of the rest of this area.
- Ms. Loughnane acknowledged the board's comments and agreed that there will be a different plan for the village area.
- Several board members requested more information about the pedestrian connectivity and access to the train station. Ms. Loughnane said that the pedestrian connections are not yet known but will evolve with further development. Mr. Cincotta assured the board that pedestrian access is envisioned and is required by the development agreement.
- A board member asked questions about the proposed location of service yard and dumpster. Mr. Turner said that architect Mike Sinesi and the landscape architect have also requested more detail on this area and he will get back to the board with that information.)
- Ms. Loughnane expressed to Mr. Cincotta that the Planning Board expects to see the village plans with symmetry and cohesive design and the conditions of the conformance design will request this. She added that the revised architectural plans will be administratively approved by her as the town planner.
- Ch. Rafsky recognized and commented that the Planning Board and the Town of Westwood are being well served by BETA Group's findings and recommendations on the Conformance Review. Ms. Loughnane added that BETA's engineers and the Developer's engineers are working very well together.

Public Comments:

None

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Board voted unanimously in favor to approve with conditions, a Conformance Determination for Not Your Average Joe's Restaurant. (Full motion and memo of conditions are attached to these minutes.)

Consideration of Modification of Alternate Signage Package Approval for Bridges by Epoch Monument Sign – University Station Highlights of Presentation by Steve Senna, National Development

- Bridges will have a University Avenue address as opposed to an address on a named access drive leading to the building.
- Currently, the view of the approved monument sign (dimensions approximately 5' x 3') is hindered by the four, 6' high lighting and traffic control cabinets recently installed on University Ave. The proposed monument sign (dimensions approximately 8' x 4') allows for better view, sitting above the view of the stone walls and out of the line of sight with the lighting and traffic control cabinets.

Board Questions & Comments:

There was a brief exchange of questions and comments.

- Ms. Loughnane commented that although the sign is a bit larger, it is similar and consistent with the previously approved sign.
- A board member asked why Bridges has a University Ave. address and not named by the access drive. (Mr. Cincotta and Mr. Senna responded that the University Ave. address was created and assigned by the Fire & Police Departments for easy identification.)

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff the Board voted four votes in favor and one abstention to approve the modified Alternate Signage Package for Bridges, as drafted by the Town Planner. (The full motion is attached to these minutes.)

Consideration of Updated Graphic for Alternate Signage Package Approval for Chipotle Window Screening – University Station

Town Planner's Summary

Ms. Loughnane explained that the Board is being asked to consider acceptance of the updated plan for the Alternate Signage Package for Chipotle Window Screening. This plan will accompany the motion made on 12/16/14 to approve the graphic illustration of the referenced applied window screening for Chipotle.

Board Questions & Comments:

 Board members generally agreed that the updated plan reflects the Alternate Signage Package which was approved in December

Public Comments:

None

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the Board voted unanimously in favor to approve the updated graphic plan for the Alternate Signage Package for Chipotle Window Screening, previously approved on 12/16/14.

Discussion of Landscaping and Lighting Compliance Issues – 335 Providence Highway Town Planner's Update:

- It has been confirmed by the Building Commissioner that the height of wall mounted, light fixtures comply with Section
 6.4.6 of the Bylaw, which allows wall fixtures at a maximum height of 15 feet above grade. The building commissioner
 measured the height of the fixtures on-site and determined that the fixtures are at 14.1' high making them legally
 conforming.
- In response to questions about light levels on abutting properties, Ms. Loughnane reported that at the property line the readings were between .0 and .1 lumens; one small area in a ripwrap section measured between .2 and .4; street area measurement was .0 to .3.; and measurements directly under the fixtures was noted as high but still in conformance with the maximum allowed. One fixture on the rear (south) did have a higher output than permitted by the bylaw. Ms. Loughnane recommended that a shield be installed on this fixture and replacing the current bulb with a lower wattage bulb. She noted that two additional fixtures should also be shielded and that a motion detector light, similar to a residential light fixture should be turned/redirected or shielded away from the neighbors directly behind.
- Ms. Loughnane requested that the DPW director conduct another light metering test on the high reading fixture on the back of the building to confirm conformance with the Bylaw.

Public Comments:

- P. Kelly, 107 Willard Circle said that the wall lights were not supposed to be turned on even though the Planning Board approved the lighting plan. (He submitted photos showing existing conditions.) He said that even with the light shields installed the lighting is offensive to the neighbors.
- This summer neighbors noticed that these lights were suddenly being used as the ownership of the building changed.

Board Questions & Comments:

- Board members agreed that all the light fixtures should be shielded as the glare is disturbing, including the motion detector light.
- It appears that there was a difference between the lighting plan approved by the Planning Board and what was actually installed and approved by the building inspector.
- Ms. Loughnane suggested that the Board consider amending the Bylaw regarding the definition of a diminimus change in lighting.
- A board member agreed with contacting the property owner to change the wattage of bulbs and to shield all the fixtures.
- Ms. Loughnane added that she will recommend that the property owner follow through on the promise to replace the landscaping materials on site that have died.

Motion/Action Taken:

None needed.

Discussion - Choice of Peer Review Consultant -EIDR APPLICATION for Prime Motors - 375 & 411 Providence Highway

- Three proposals were sought for peer review services for the review of the Prime Motor Dealerships from Site Design Professionals, Beals & Thomas and BETA Group, Inc.
- Site Design Professionals responded that the firm was too busy to submit a thorough proposal, Beals & Thomas and BETA Group, Inc. submitted proposals which were reviewed by the town planner and forwarded to board members for review.
- Board members generally agreed that the two engineering firms are equally qualified, that proposals were similar in initial estimates but did have differences in the number of attended meetings included in the review and additional costs associated with reviews of additional submittals.
- BETA is readily equipped to provide an architectural review in-house who has worked with the Board previously, and Beals & Thomas would outsource this review.

Discussion of Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment Articles for Annual Town Meeting

Article 1: Zoning Amendments Related to Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map related to Section 9.5 [Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District (FMUOD)].

<u>Article 2:</u> Zoning Amendments Related to Senior Residential Development

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map related to Section 8.4 [Senior Residential Development (SRD)].

Article 3: Zoning Amendments Related to Accessory Apartments

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 4.4.2 [Accessory Apartments].

Article 4: Zoning Amendments Related to Earth Material Movement

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 7.1 [Earth Material Movement (EMM)].

Article 5: Zoning Amendments Related to Definitions and Principal Uses

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 2.0 [Definitions] and Section 4.1 Principal Uses.

Article 6: Zoning Amendments Related to Enclosure, Screening, and Buffers

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 6.3 [Enclosure, Screening, and Buffers].

Article 7: Zoning Amendments Related to Height Regulations

This article is intended to make certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw related to Section 5.4 [Height Regulations].

Article 8: Housekeeping Amendments to Zoning Bylaw and Map

This article is intended to make housekeeping amendments to various sections of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map as may be necessary to correct errors or inconsistencies and to clarify such sections.

<u>Article 9:</u> Proposed General Bylaw Related to Demolition Delay

This article is intended to implement the Comprehensive Plan objective which recommends the adoption of a demolition delay period to allow for the consideration of various preservation alternatives for properties deemed to be of significant historical value to the Town. This article proposes a demolition delay procedure with a 6-month face value to be applied to structures built before the end of 1910, as well as to all structures located within any designated Local Historic District or listed on the State or Federal Registers of Historic Places.

Board & Town Planner Discussion:

- Proposed Articles 1-8 are amendments to the Zoning Bylaw, all sponsored by the Planning Board
- Proposed Article 9 is an introduction of a new General Bylaw, and would be jointly sponsored by the Planning Board and the Westwood Historical Commission.
- There was also one untitled article requested of the Board of Selectmen to be reserved to allow for a revisions to and submission of Section 7.5 [Street Access Special Permit] which was approved at the November Special Town Meeting, in case the original amendments are disapproved by the Attorney General's Office.
- Ms. Loughnane gave a brief explanation of each article.

Public Comments:

None

Motion/Action Taken:

None needed

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:20 p.m.

Minutes Recorded by: Janice Barba

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, January 27th at 7:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street

List of Documents:

Site Plans for Not Your Average Joe's – Pre-application Administrative Review Package	PDF
Restaurant B&C Site Plans	PDF
LED Site Lighting Plan – Restaurant B	PDF
Fire Truck Turning Plan – Restaurant B&C	PDF
Memo to S. Rafsky from M. Turner - BETA Group 01-09-15 RE: Conformance Review - Restaurants B&C	PDF
Memo from N. Cheal - TetraTech 12-08-14 RE: Restaurant B&C Stormwater Management Design	PDF
Draft memo to PB re: Recommended Conditions to NYAJ's Conformance Determination	PDF
Bridges Sign Location Site Plan	
Bridges by Epoch Monument Sign Design	PDF
Chipotle Window Graphics	PDF
Proposed Zoning Amendment Articles for ATM - DRAFT	PDF