

**Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes**  
**February 10, 2015**  
**50 Carby Street**  
**7:30 PM**

**Attendance & Call to Order:**

Ch. Rafsky called the meeting to order at 7:32 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 (who recorded the minutes).

**Draft Meeting Minutes for Consideration**

Copies of draft meeting minutes of the following dates were emailed to board members for consideration: 11-03-14, 11-10-14, 12-02-14 and 12-16-14.

**Board Comments:**

- Board members indicated that they reviewed the drafts of the above mentioned meeting dates and those members who requested edits emailed these to Ms. Barba who made the requested changes and had no further edits.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the Planning Board Meeting Minutes of 11-03-14, 11-10-14, 12-02-14 and 12-16-14, as edited and submitted.

**Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider Application by CRP, Development LLC for Proposed Senior Residential Development – Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables – 215 High Street**

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Proponents Jerry Rappaport and Matt Zuker of CRP Development with their Attorney Mike Terry.

**Presentation by Matt Zuker**

**Highlights:**

- The Proponent's engineer has been working on responses to items identified in the engineering review by BETA. Several items related to drainage needing clarification and additional information will be addressed over the next week to two weeks.
- The number of units has been reduced from 26 to 24 (3 - 2 story buildings each with 8 units with two-car garages)

**Presentation by Beta Group - Phil Paradis & Greg Lucas**

*Mr. Paradis acknowledged that the Proponent's engineer has provided revised and supplemental documents in response to the review update but responses for many items remain outstanding.*

- Rear Building Elevation - although the height was reduced from 35' to 31', it is still above grade at 38'
- After reviewing floor plans, BETA could not identify community space for an exercise facility, community meeting rooms and media rooms.
- Density has been reduced and is slightly lower.
- "AutoTURN" plan remains outstanding
- Documentation from Fire Dept. indicating that design provides adequate emergency access and water supply for fire protection has not been provided.
- Lighting plans have not been provided. (Ms. Loughnane noted that she recommended that the Proponents wait on submitting them until further along in the review process.)

**Greg Lucas – Traffic Impact & Analysis**

- Suggested another collection of gap data which the Board may want to have a third party conduct and verify in the field.
- Questions remain about whether the median will provide effective protection for a vehicle turning left.

**Phil Paradis – Stormwater Management & Erosion Control**

- Requested calculations and details on untreated stormwater remain outstanding.
- Flow paths and time of concentration calculations remain outstanding.
- Hydrologic group rating should be revised to show a more conservative approach.

## Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes

February 10, 2015

50 Carby Street

7:30 PM

- Documentation should be provided that implements a system that will prevent down gradient properties from being adversely impacted by a 28-30% increase in volume runoff.
- SWPPP should be submitted before construction.
- Sketch plan of BMPs requiring inspection and maintenance should be provided.
- Crosswalks and fire lanes should be identified on plans
- Snow storage areas should be identified on plans
- Low impact development techniques remain outstanding.
- Adjacent homes should be included on landscape plans in order to better evaluate screening.
- Construction details for all landscape design components are outstanding.
- Pavement marking plans remain outstanding.
- Trash storage facility location has not been provided
- Sign details have not been provided
- Specific design features to accomplish energy efficiency have not been provided
- Details of proposed storage and screening of on-site waste are missing
- Details of level spreaders described in erosion sedimentation control plan are missing
- Information on type of earth material fill to be imported is missing

### Board Questions & Comments:

- A board member asked a question about the square footage of units (1,500 – 1,850 s.f.) and how much each unit would likely be marketed at. (Mr. Rappaport said that units will be for sale at a rate of \$275 - \$355 per s.f. and this roughly translates to approximately \$400,000 - \$750,000 per unit.)
- A board member said that although the Proponent has materially changed the project since it first started, he remains unsure if this project meets the intent of the bylaw and if this development fits into this neighborhood.
- Ch. Rafsky reminded the Proponent that this Special Permit requires a favorable vote of four members of the board and that he is unsure that he could vote in favor of the project.
- Ch. Rafsky said he would love to see senior residential development in Town that meets the intent of the bylaw. He said that he is struggling with the density for this project and believes that no proposed building should be greater than 7,500 sq. ft., located on no less than two acres, and have no more than eight units. He said that this project is probably on the way to a denial.
- Ch. Rafsky said that several items remain open for this project. He asked the Proponent if they want to continue on with the process in order to complete the file or do they want the Board to consider what has been submitted as a completed file, and for the Board to deliberate and vote at its next meeting. (Mr. Rappaport responded that he did not want to close the file tonight.) Attorney M. Terry responded to Ch. Rafsky's comments about his desired idea for building square footage and the price per square footage but units like that would not be economically feasible.)
- Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane about outstanding items and about possible waiver requests.
- Ms. Loughnane noted that typically the board waives the submission of a model. As far as lighting – a photometric plan could be waived after detailed landscaping plans have been submitted and reviewed.
- Ch. Rafsky asked the Proponent how much time his engineer needs to respond to BETA's report. (Mr. Zuker said his engineer would need approximately two-three weeks.) (Mr. Paradis said BETA would need a few days or a week depending on the quality of the submission.)
- Proposed dates for a continuation of the public hearing were discussed. The Proponent requested that a date in April would be preferable.
- Ch. Rafsky requested comments from fellow board members.
- One board member said that he has a lot of comments and many questions on material that has been submitted that fall into a number of categories. He said that he has questions about stormwater management systems and the validity of the traffic study with regard to the number of trips and cueing gaps. (Mr. Lucas agreed with this comment and said that although the study was done by a reputable firm, he suggested that a third party should verify the gap data.)
- Two other board members requested needing clarification on the proposed use of a median island and questioned protecting the left-hand turning traffic.
- A board member asked why the plans do not specifically identify the community center (TV, dining, gym) in each building. (The Proponent said these areas have not been designed yet but the common areas have been identified and located on the plans.)

**Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes**  
**February 10, 2015**  
**50 Carby Street**  
**7:30 PM**

- A board member asked how the traffic data would be different if the proposed units were typical condos. (Mr. Lucas said that it is likely that the number of trips would be much higher.)
- A board member asked about the proposed use of a shuttle bus and asked if it would be funded by the residents. (The Proponent responded that the shuttle bus would be funded and shared by all three of their other residential locations including Norwood and W. Roxbury.)

**Public Comments:**

- A. Cannon, 10 Longwood Drive –said that she disagrees with traffic study results.
- J. Tierney, 232 Grove Street – expressed concerns about the possibility of increased traffic; safety concerns for kids at the school bus stop; drainage and run-off concerns
- L. Legere, attorney representing Westwood Citizens for Zoning Integrity –he agrees with Ch. Rafsky’s comments; said that the project is too dense and out of scale with the neighborhood; concerned about increased traffic effects on the secondary streets; the likely increases in stormwater, unrealistic pricing of the units; blasting effects and the lack of availability of sewer connection for the project.
- M. Washienko, 226 Dover Road – commented about the increased difficulty with traffic and getting onto 109
- S. Hayes, Foxhill Street – asked if this hearing will continue after Town Meeting with new Planning Board members

**Closing Comments:**

- Ms. Loughnane requested Traffic Engineer Greg Lucas to prepare an order of magnitude estimate for a third party independent traffic consultant, as suggested in his report.
- Ch. Rafsky requested that the Proponent submit all outstanding documents to the file by March 31<sup>st</sup> in order to conduct a timely review. (Reports from the Fire and Police Departments would be included with these documents.)

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, April 14<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

**Continuation of Public Hearing for Consideration of EIDR Application for Prime Dealerships – 375 & 411 Providence Highway**

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that the Applicant has requested the immediate continuation of this hearing to allow sufficient time for the issuance of a peer review memorandum on the proposed development.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to reopen and immediately continue this hearing without testimony taken to Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

**Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Far Reach Drive Definition Subdivision**

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that the Applicant has requested the immediate continuation of this hearing to allow sufficient time for the filing of an OSRD Application for the proposed development.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery the board voted unanimously in favor to reopen and immediately continue this hearing without testimony taken to Tuesday, March 10<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

**Discussion of Proposed Revisions to Various Planning Board Rules and Regulations**

Ms. Loughnane distributed a draft of this document for a brief discussion before the official public hearing for proposed revisions of various sets of rules, regulations, standards and guidelines and the adoption of the new sets of rules, regulations, standards and guidelines, scheduled for Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup>. (A copy of this document is available with these minutes.)

**Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes**  
**February 10, 2015**  
**50 Carby Street**  
**7:30 PM**

**Highlights of the Discussion:**

- Most of the Rules and Regulations have been combined and consolidated into one document for the following Special Permits (SP): General SP; Shared Driveway SP; Earth Material Movement SP, Major Business Development SP; Open Space Residential Development SP; Senior Residential Development SP; Wireless Communications Overlay District SP; Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District SP and Upper Story Residential Overlay District SP. (Site Plan Review, University Avenue Mixed Use Overlay District and Scenic Roads are not included in this document.)
- The section “Project Fees – Application Fees” was reviewed and questions were raised about the making this section easier to use with the addition of a table. *(A few board members agreed that creating a table may be helpful.)*
- The section “Required Plans” are separated in subsections for each type of SP.
- Regarding Section 6 “Plan Requirements” and Section 7 “Report Requirements”, board members suggested creating a table including all ten requirements and note whether required or not required.)
- A board member commented that he is in favor of a consolidated document as it will be easier to keep it updated.
- Board members suggested keeping the non-Special Permit Applications – UAMUD, EIDR, SCENIC ROAD, separate.
- A board member asked whether the content of the Rules and Regulations has changed much. (Ms. Loughnane mentioned the following changes: a decrease in the number of required copies, size of plan sheets, electronic file submittal; and the change to when the Inspection Fees should be submitted. Also discussed was the authority to waive fees and the lack of authority to refund application fees.)

**Motion/Action Taken:**

No motion needed.

Ms. Loughnane requested that if board members have any additional edits and comments on the drafts to please email her as soon as possible so that she can provide a revised version of the document to the Board well in advance of the February 24<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing.

**Public Hearing for Consideration of Limited EIDR Approval for Proposed Addition to Xaverian Brothers School – 800 Clapboardtree Street**

Ch. Rafsky read the legal notice of public hearing to open the hearing at 9:00 p.m. and welcomed representatives for the Applicant, Brother Daniel Skala, Board of Trustees Member Maureen Bleday and J. Michael Sullivan from Beacon Architects.

Brother Skala stated that the project and proposed addition will include renovating some existing space and adding classrooms and science labs designed to enhance XBHS science, technology, religion, engineering, arts and math curriculum.

**Presentation Highlights – J. Michael Sullivan, Beacon Architects**

- Displayed Site Plans for a three-story academic addition with a proposed footprint of 2,200 sq. ft., total area affected is 2,600 sq. ft.
- Displayed Floor Plans – ground floor, first floor and second floor
- Displayed Exterior Elevations – illustrate height constraints and show maintenance of the height of the existing structure.
- The project will not involve any changes to the number of students or employees at XBHS.
- Vehicle circulation will be slightly affected as the emergency access drive will be pushed back toward the hill, including a retaining wall against the pedestrian egress path.
- Civil engineers Sherwood Consulting reports that the runoff from the realigned the emergency access drive and surrounding contributing area will be collected in a proposed catch basin outfitted with a sump for suspended solids reduction.
- A conifer buffer area will be planted on the side of the building addition closest to the neighbors.
- Building addition will be built with precast wall sections.

**Board Questions & Comments:**

- Ms. Loughnane reported that as this application has been submitted pursuant to the Limited EIDR section of the Bylaw, Phil Paradis’ review was restricted to a determination of compliance with dimensional and parking requirements, including requirements related to setbacks, building height, building coverage, impervious surface, parking and circulation, buffers,

**Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes**  
**February 10, 2015**  
**50 Carby Street**  
**7:30 PM**

screening, landscape, lighting and stormwater management.

***Town Engineer's Comments – Phil Paradis***

Mr. Paradis offered the following comments on Site Plan C-1

- Add catch basin to capture sediment instead of direct connection to infiltration system.
- Flat slope (0.3%) will not drain – ponding and icing likely – could be a safety issue. Recommend including additional drains and minimum slope of 1%.
- Flow does not appear to be directed to infiltration as discussed – verify and provide recharge for additional impervious surface.
- Consider a barrier to protect pedestrians from steep slope and pedestrian path
- Should path be made ADA accessible?
- Questioned whether an existing drain pipe beyond the rip-rap stabilization will be maintained. Requested matching existing pipe and adding drain manholes at bends.
- Details were requested for the slope w/dumped rip-rap stabilization
- Will the existing retaining wall remain?

***Additional Board Questions & Comments on Lighting and landscaping, parking:***

- Are all students now parking on campus? (Yes)
- Will parking lot across the street continue to be used? (There will be occasional use of Mercer's parking approximately five or six times a year for big events such as football games and graduation.)
- Is any additional exterior lighting planned? (No)
- Why is the footprint of the addition at an angle? (This is a design feature that is in keeping with the current building design.)
- Ms. Loughnane informed the board that she has received calls from abutters with concerns unrelated to this project and rather related to the prior project, about excessive noise from roof-top mechanical units. She reported that decibel levels were measured and have been found to be compliant with the noise bylaw. In addition, Ms. Loughnane said that she has received calls from Marshall Street residents with concerns about the parking lot lights abutting Marshall Street remaining on until late into the evening. (Brother Dan explained that parking lot lights are on a timer and shut off around 10:15 – 10:30 p.m. but said occasionally when there are with late night activities the lights do remain on until all staff and students leave, sometimes until 11-11:30 p.m.)
- A board member asked if the abutter is satisfied with the conifer trees planted between the properties. (Brother Dan said that Mr. Bean is satisfied with the conifer trees planted on both his property and those on the Xaverian Campus.)

***Final Comments:***

- Ch. Rafsky asked how much time the Proponent's engineer will need to amend the site plans according to the recommendations of Mr. Paradis. (Mr. Sullivan said only a short amount of time will be needed as they are looking to apply for a building permit as soon as possible.)

***Public Comments:***

None

***Motion/Action Taken:***

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Pfaff the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

***Adjournment:***

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 9:31 p.m.

***Next Meeting:***

Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street

**Westwood Planning Board - Meeting Minutes**  
**February 10, 2015**  
**50 Carby Street**  
**7:30 PM**

**List of Documents:**

Memo to Town Planner from Beta Group, Inc. dated 02-05-15 re: Sour Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables – 215 High Street, Senior Residential Development Peer Review Update	PDF
Draft – Planning Board Rules & Regulations of the Planning Board as Special Permit Granting Authority Pursuant to Various Sections of the Zoning Bylaw	PDF
Xaverian Brothers High School – 800 Clapboardtree Street Site Plans, Floor Plans and Exterior Elevations	PDF