

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

**Attendance & Call to Order:**

Ch. Montgomery called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. and asked if anyone present wished to record it. WestCat TV was present and was granted permission to record the meeting.

*Present:* Planning Board members, Steve Olanoff, Jack Wiggin, Steve Rafsky and Chris Pfaff. Also present, Town Planner Nora Loughnane and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba, who recorded the minutes.

**Reorganization of Planning Board and Assignment of Committee Positions**

*Board members briefly discussed the annual board reorganization.*

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to select Steve Rafsky as Chairman of the Planning Board, effective immediately, through the next Annual Town Meeting in May, 2015.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to select Steve Olanoff as Vice Chairman of the Planning Board, effective immediately, through the next Annual Town Meeting in May, 2015.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to select Jack Wiggin as Secretary of the Planning Board, effective immediately, through the next Annual Town Meeting in May, 2015.

*Board members briefly discussed reassignment of committee positions for the coming year and decided to take this matter up at its next meeting.*

*Steve Rafsky continued with the next portion of the meeting as Chairman.*

**Consideration of Proposed Minor Modifications to FMUOD Special Permit for Shields MRI – 40 Allied Dr.**

**Board Discussion:**

Steve McCarthy representing Shields MRI was before the Board to present plans for modification to the parking lot. These proposed modifications are intended to improve pedestrian circulation and ensure pedestrian safety between the main parking area and the front door of the facility. Mr. McCarthy explained that the pedestrian connections will result in the loss of four parking spaces, however the net loss of parking spaces as compared to the approved Special Permit is one space (253 spaces permitted, 252 spaces proposed).

**Public Comments:**

None.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to consider the proposed modification as minor in nature.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve this minor modification of the FMUOD Special Permit for Shields MRI, 40 Allied Drive.

**Opportunity to Provide Comment to the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) on Proposed Earth Material Movement (EMM) Special Permit Application - 245 Grove Street**

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

Ms. Loughnane gave the board a brief summary of this application.

- Proposed new home construction at 245 Grove Street requires a Board of Appeals (ZBA) EMM Special Permit.
- The ZBA is required to refer an EMM SP application to the Planning Board within ten days after receipt so that the Planning Board may, at its discretion, investigate and report in writing its recommendation to the ZBA.
- ZBA has asked Planning Board for guidance and a recommendation on a preferred truck route.

**Board Discussion:**

- A board member asked if the applicant provided a suggested truck route. (no)
- Board members generally agreed that the best truck route would be on the main roadways – Grove, Summer and High Streets.

**Public Comments:**

- D. Thomas, 10 Longwood Drive – How much earth will be moved?
- K. Goldman, Summer Street – How many truckloads will be moved and how many times per day?
- B. Singer, 10 Longwood Drive – Does this matter have anything to do with the project at 215 High St.?
- J. Tierney, 232 Grove Street – He does not want trucks travelling on Grove Street.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to authorize Town Planner Nora Loughnane to write a letter to the ZBA with the Board's recommended truck route: Grove Street to Summer Street to High Street and to additionally seek the approval of this route by the town engineer, for the EMM Special Permit for 245 Grove Street.

**University Station – Conformance Determination for Bonefish Grill**

Paul Cincotta reported that on May 7<sup>th</sup> TetraTech responded to Beta's Conformance Determination review memo; Beta issued a response memo on May 12<sup>th</sup>, outlining findings and recommendations, which have now been addressed. Highlights include:

- Vast improvements have been made to the rear/south elevation.
- The walkway circulation has been highlighted with a brick pattern.
- Other items addressed are more technical in nature.

**Merrick Turner – Beta Group**

- Reported that all members of the engineering team said that the issues remaining are ones to be addressed at a building department and engineering level. Furthermore, he said that the proposal is consistent with the previous approval and that he appreciates the effort with the changes that have been made.

**Board Discussion/Questions:**

- Has the building elevation changed? (No, the overall height did not change. The total height is 22', although the elevation was dropped down in the center.)
- Will the trees being planted in the front of the building block the Bonefish Grill sign? (Mr. Cincotta said that the trees will be planted in the landscape strip and will not block the Bonefish Grill sign.) (This motion will consider a change in the landscape plans to move those trees.)
- Will the exterior lighting on poles match the other proposed lighting in the parking lot? (Yes.)
- Why isn't the crosswalk elevated? (Mr. Cincotta said that elevating the crosswalk would present operational issues with snowplowing, drainage and street sweeping. Instead, texture and color changes were added to the crosswalk.)

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

- Is there an entrance from the sidewalk to the front door? (Yes, there is an entrance connection on the sidewalk on University Ave side to the front door of Bonefish Grill.)
- Will the parks and meadow be completed by the time the restaurant is ready to open? (yes)
- Has a lighting and photometric plan been submitted and if so will LED lighting be used? (Yes, it has been reviewed by Beta and LED lights will be used.)
- A board member commended Beta Group and specifically Mike Sinesi of KAO Design for the great design recommendations for Bonefish Grill.
- A board member asked about the status of compliance with Section 9.7.11.12 – Sustainability - and adoption of energy-efficient construction methods and technologies using a Tenant Energy Efficiency Manual. (Ms. Loughnane responded that the sustainability standards will be reviewed by the Town Engineer to be sure that these reflect current practices. Mr. Cincotta added that the Tenant Energy Efficient Manual will be provided to each tenant.)
- A board member asked about the use of secondary, emergency power use in the future. (Mr. Turner said that if applicable, this use would be regulated by the Building and Fire Departments, and that the O&M Plan would reflect the standards.)

**Public Comments:**

None.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

The Motion was made by Planning Board member Bruce Montgomery, as follows:

I move that, pursuant to Section 9.8.12.2.1 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw effective May 6, 2013, the Planning Board:

- (1) Vote to approve a Conformance Determination for Core Development Area 4, as shown on the plan entitled "University Avenue Mixed Use District, Master Development Plan," prepared by Tetra Tech, last revised March 22, 2013, which was approved pursuant to Article 1 of the May 6, 2013 Special Town Meeting and is on file with the Town Clerk and the Planning Board; and
- (2) Make the following findings:
  - a. The documents on file with the Planning Board and the Westwood Town Clerk and in oral and written reports and other documentation delivered by the Town's consultants and the Proponent's consultants, including without limitation plans entitled "Bonefish Grill Conformance Determination Submittal, University Station – University Avenue, Westwood Massachusetts," prepared by Tetra Tech, dated March 21, 2014 and revised through May 2, 2014; the undated document entitled "Bonefish Grill 'Greenfield' Exterior Finishes"; the memorandum dated March 21, 2014, from Nathan Cheal of Tetra Tech to Paul Cincotta of Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC regarding Bonefish Grill Stormwater Management Design; the memorandum dated April 14, 2014 by William P. Scoble, Fire Chief, to Nora Loughnane, Town Planner, regarding Bonefish Grill Conformance Determination; the electronic communication from Linda R. Shea, Health Director to Nora Loughnane, Town Planner, regarding Conformance Review for Bonefish Grill; the memorandum dated April 17, 2014 by Merrick Turner of BETA Group, Inc. to the Planning Board regarding Bonefish Grill at University Station Conformance Review; the memorandum dated May 7, 2014; from Nathan Cheal of Tetra Tech to Paul Cincotta of Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC regarding University Station Bonefish Grill Conformance Determination, Response to Peer

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

Review Comments; and the memorandum dated May 12, 2014 by Merrick Turner of BETA Group, Inc. to the Planning Board regarding Bonefish Grill at University Station Conformance Review, and the memorandum dated May 13, 2014, from Nora Loughnane, Town Planner, to the Planning Board (collectively, the "Core Development Area 4 Final Plans and Materials"), materially conform to the Master Development Plan and supporting materials on file with the Planning Board and the Town Clerk;

- b. The Core Development Area 4 Final Plans and Materials otherwise comply with the standards and requirements set forth in Section 9.8 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw; and
- c. Impose the conditions suggested in the attached memorandum dated May 13, 2014, from Nora Loughnane, Town Planner, to the Planning Board. (*Below in italics.*)

*In view of the peer review comments made by BETA Group, Inc., in its memorandum dated May 13, 2014, I recommend that the Conformance Determination for Bonefish Grill include the following conditions:*

- a. The architectural elevations shall be further revised to reflect the modification of the patio fence surround to a black rail in lieu of the canvas material originally proposed;*
- b. Details and sizing computations for the proposed grease trap shall be submitted for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issue of a Building Permit;*
- c. The drainage plans shall be revised to include STC 900 structures to ensure 75% TSS removal, and said revised plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;*
- d. Supplemental soils data, including a minimum of two saturated hydraulic conductivity tests at the bottom elevation of the rain garden, shall be provided for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;*
- e. A final Lighting and Photometric Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building permit;*
- f. A site specific Operations & Maintenance plan, consistent with the applicable sections of the University Station Operations & Maintenance Plan, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;*
- g. All issues related to Energy Efficiency, Water Efficiency, Sustainability, and Construction Solid Waste Management shall be effectively resolved to the satisfaction of the Building Commissioner and Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit; and*

*The landscape plans shall be further revised to reflect modifications to vegetation in the area of the south elevation as discussed at the May 13, 2014 Planning Board review session.*

**Motion was seconded by Planning Board Member John Wiggin**

**Record of Vote:**

The following members of the Planning Board voted to issue this Conformance Determination: Bruce H. Montgomery, Steven M. Rafsky, Steven H. Olanoff, and John J. Wiggin.

**Westwood Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 13, 2014**  
**Middle School Cafeteria**  
**7:30 PM**

The following member of the Planning Board abstained from voting on this matter to avoid any potential conflict of interest: Christopher A. Pfaff.

**Dan Bailey – Development Agreement – Covenant**

Planning Board members agreed to authorize Town Planner Nora Loughnane or Special Counsel Dan Bailey to sign the official deeds for Epoch Senior Living and Lifetime Fitness.

**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**

**Chairman's Opening Comments:**

- Re-opened the public hearing to continue the discussion related to consideration of a proposed 72-unit Senior Residential Development (SRD) at Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables, 215 High Street.
- Welcomed Proponents Jerry Rappaport and Matt Zuker of CRP Development, LLC and Attorney Michael Terry.

**Comments by Michael Terry:**

- Stated that Mr. Rappaport and Mr. Zuker are present tonight to continue the discussion on issues raised at the last hearing with the Planning Board. Added that CRP is not presenting an updated paper presentation tonight and its consultants are not present tonight.
- Stated that since the last public hearing he met with Town Planner Nora Loughnane who advised him that the Board would be retaining a peer review consultant and that the decision would be made tonight finalizing this choice.
- Since that meeting, Mr. Terry said that he received some comments and reports from town officials and from Ms. Loughnane who suggested that the Proponents might hold off on amending its plans until after this hearing so that it would respond comprehensively to the comments received tonight.
- Stated that Jerry and Matt would like to continue the discussion with the Board about comments made at the last hearing.

**Presentation by Jerry Rappaport, CRP Development:**

- Mr. Rappaport said that he appreciated the opportunity to again present the strengths of the Four Seasons Village proposal, to discuss some of the modifications that were made to the plan, and to see whether or not they (CRP) understood what the Planning Board wanted. Then he said that he wanted to raise some of the issues that the Board raised at the last hearing, have a discussion about what the Board meant by them and how to balance off the potentially, supposed conflict with the SRD bylaw.
- Mr. Rappaport said that with the Town's (Comprehensive) plan from 2000-2001 and his market study, he said that it was found that there is a significant need for senior housing in Westwood. He said that he would like to get into a discussion about this.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he believes that the proposal meets most if not all the criteria in the SRD zoning bylaw – a variety of housing types, a community center and activity center; and a commitment to compatibility of the variety of the uses that surround the site.
- He said that this proposal is not elderly housing or assisted living, but rather housing for active adults between the ages of 55-80. He added that the proposal will attract significant market acceptance because of the variety of housing that they offer, because of the community facility and the active enrichment programs that they have. He said that he believes that every single one of the Town Planning Board members would be proud to live at Four Seasons Village and/or to recommend that their parent live there. He said that he would be proud to live there or to have his mother-in-law live there.
- He said that they designed the proposal to conform to the site, to the topography, to meet the market demand, to provide the highest level of community amenities and to shield the homes from

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

the neighbors and the Route 109 traffic.

- Mr. Rappaport said that he'd like to raise points of clarification: he said that he thought they listened intently when last year the Board talked about reducing the density and during the rezoning hearings they talked about what the Board wanted to see – the community center and the variety of housing. He said that they also took Ms. Loughnane's advice to significantly reduce the density. He said that they reduced the density by reducing the number of units, albeit by only nine, the number of bedrooms and reducing the size of the units.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he would like to get into a discussion about 'what is density', and what it is the Board wants CRP to drop, and to discuss that.
- He said that he wanted to go over the changes that were made and to find out whether or not he presented the reduction in density clearly or that maybe he did not understand what the board really wanted.
- Mr. Rappaport said that the initial proposal called for 30, two-bedroom townhomes of 2,000 sq. ft. This proposal has 19, two-bedroom townhouses of 1,750 sq. ft. There were 2,000 sq. ft. townhomes and 1600 sq. ft. townhomes so that they could have a variety in price. He said that there were 42 bedrooms in the flat building and we now only have 22 bedrooms, and 12 one bedrooms with a study and 21 one-bedrooms. From 13 one bedrooms to 21 one bedrooms and 12- one bedrooms. So that they he went from 150 bedrooms and 120,000 sq. ft. to 111 bedrooms in 86,000 sq. ft., and from 166 cars to 117 cars. He said that this represents a 15-30% reduction in density depending on what you want us want to focus on. In addition, with the flat building and the underground parking, this saves 2/3 of an acre and allows it to be open space and the flat building saves an acre over the site.
- He said that he thought is how to reduce density. He asked the Board now, what does it mean to reduce density?
- Mr. Rappaport said that he had also heard that there was some question about whether there is a need and demand for senior housing. He said that based on the data he has seen, the answer is a resoundingly "yes". He said out of 5300 households in Westwood there are 2800 households over 55. This is 55% of the households in Westwood and it is projected that number will grow to 60% by 2017. The over 55 population has grown by 500 over the last five years and is expected to grow another 600 in the next five years. The current age restricted housing is more than 97% occupied and there is a waiting list of 85. There another 2500 households in Westwood, age 45-60, who have parents that would consider Four Seasons Village. He said that there is a demand for senior housing in Westwood.
- Mr. Rappaport said that they listened to the Board's feedback on its proposal at the last meeting and wants to discuss comments and concerns that they did either not understand or need further clarification on. He said that the topics include: (1) What are the least acceptable aspects of density and (2) what is the best way to reduce them? (3) Do they really believe that the demand or need for senior housing is diversity of type, size and pricing of our homes important or (4) should they have 35, two-bedroom townhouses? (5) How big is the right community center? (6) How do you determine the scope and characteristics of the surrounding area?
- Mr. Rappaport commented that these aren't easy questions, that he was listening to the Board and its concerns would like to engage a thoughtful discussion, conversation and opinions. He thinks they can engage in productive comments. He asked the Board if he should go question by question and get their comments on each.

*Ch. Rafsky thanked Mr. Rappaport for his comments and asked if the Board had any general comments.*

*At this point in the meeting, Ms. Loughnane suggested to the Board that before its gets into an in-depth discussion it may want to consider selection of the peer review consultant.*

**Choice of Peer Review Consultant:**

Ms. Loughnane gave a brief explanation of Project Review Fees and Peer Review Consultant selection

**Westwood Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 13, 2014**  
**Middle School Cafeteria**  
**7:30 PM**

procedures. She informed that both Site Design Professionals and Beta Group submitted proposals. Both firms have been used in the past for different types of project reviews, and while both consultants are very qualified, the diversity of engineering services, including traffic engineering services, offered by Beta Group would be more suited in this review. Ms. Loughnane recommended that the Planning Board consider choosing Beta Group as its peer review consultant.

**Board Discussion:**

Board members expressed agreement with Ms. Loughnane's recommendations on consultant selection based on the types and substantive services that will be needed in this review by Beta Group.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to select Beta Group as the Peer Review Consultant for the technical review of Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables.

**Board Comments in Response to Mr. Rappaport's Presentation:**

- Ch. Rafsky commented that Mr. Rappaport laid out some thoughts and raised some valid questions and asked Board members if anyone had any general comments in response to that.
- A board member commented that Mr. Rappaport has suggested that there is more than one way to measure density e.g., measuring the number of bedrooms. He said that while the board and proponent could discuss reducing the number of bedrooms as a measure of reducing the density, the zoning bylaw is very specific about measuring density in the town's residential districts; units/acre.. He said that the only way the Planning Board should review this project is according to density of the Senior Residential Development Bylaw.
- Ch. Rafsky commented that the Town and the Planning Board clearly have a desire to see senior residential development, that they support this concept and that the missing word is "appropriate". He said that this is not a debate about senior residential development but only about appropriateness of where to place it. The question is whether this board would support appropriate senior residential development. He said that he welcomes a discussion tonight with the proponent to try to figure out what the zoning bylaw allows for and whether a senior residential development belongs in this spot.
- Ch. Rafsky said that it is his view that that this is so dependent on what part of town we are talking about. How does it impact the neighbors? What is the topography? How safe is it for the neighbors to get in and out of it. He stated that he is conflicted about the location. The properties surrounding this proposed development are far less dense than the proposed SRD. In addition, he doesn't agree with comparing the proposed SRD at 215 High Street with Fox Hill Village, as it is so significantly different in so many ways, particularly as it is located in a commercial zone, it has a stop light, etc. The comparisons have nothing to do with this project.
- A board member added that this parcel is zoned for single residence lots of 80,000 sq. ft.
- Another board member said it's not the math but the subjective findings. He added that dropping this project into that particular neighborhood is a little "off".
- A board member said that the bylaw was written to suggest the appropriateness of this project in an area, not just because it abuts a residential area. The layout provided by the Proponent should show a cross section and a balloon test to demonstrate the project and its obtrusiveness to the neighborhood. He also suggested a reference point; line of sight demonstration. In addition, he requested more information on the capacity of the proposed community space and to show that there is adequate space for all residents. He said that he appreciates the fact that there are a variety of housing types.

**Dialogue between Mr. Rappaport & Planning Board:**

- Mr. Rappaport said that regarding compatibility – it is impossible to find a site that would be exactly

**Westwood Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 13, 2014**  
**Middle School Cafeteria**  
**7:30 PM**

compatible with a project like this. He said that he cares about the neighboring properties and so they will screen the living daylight out of this project. It will be nestled into the site.

- The current state of the property at 215 High Street has manure and rock refuge on it as well as work trucks and equipment parked on it. The proposed project will make it a beautiful place to look at. The project is compatible to the neighborhood, which already includes a senior living facility across the street; it will be extensively screened; and that the buildings are 35' tall, no taller than some of the homes in the area.
- Mr. Rappaport asked what the board wants: two stories instead of three stories in the flat building; no building at all; a different design; a smaller building or is it just 'no'.
- Ch. Rafsky commented that the Planning Board always suggests that a Proponent try to work things out with abutters prior to bringing plans to the Board. He asked if there was an attempt by the Proponent to talk to the neighbors.
- Mr. Rappaport said that CRP met with a few of the neighbors while walking the site and was contacted by an attorney representing the neighbors who said they were not ready to talk. He said he was then referred to one person, a representative of a group of neighbors. The neighbors were asked what they would like to see built at the site and they responded that they would prefer 3-4 bedrooms, \$1.5 million townhouses because of their value. Mr. Rappaport added that he mentioned this idea to a member of the Planning Board and the board said that you can only have two bedrooms and your study cannot have a window. He also said that the neighbors said that they did not want to see it.
- Ch. Rafsky said that he is not in favor of the greater than 500' length of the driveway/roadway, and agrees with comments made by Fire Chief Scoble and Police Sgt. Sicard that there is inadequate access to the entire project with only one way in and one way out. Ch. Rafsky said that the build-out for the project is at its maximum and there is no build-out so tight anywhere nearby this site. He said that to him, this area calls out for not having a maximum area and a need for another roadway going in and out. He said that this is a difficult project and would love to see senior residential housing in and around this area but said that the question is about appropriateness and wondered how small the project could be and still be profitable for the developer and safer for the community. He said that this is where the Proponent will start to get balance on this project.
- A board member added that the fire chief also said that there is no access to the rear side of the three-story structure.
- Ch. Rafsky mentioned that letters have been received from abutters in opposition to the project and will be entered into the record of the meeting.
- Ch. Rafsky commented that Mr. Rappaport is asking questions of the board that they are not necessarily going to be answered.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he almost knew what the answer was, that if you do two-story townhomes and do not have the variety of housing and do not have a community center, but a community room with a cupola, that this is a program that he could still make money on. He said that in doing so he is going against the social goals and community goals of the SRD bylaw because he believes that the project should have all the amenities and ideals that have been proposed and doesn't want to take anything away.
- Ch. Rafsky said that he did not believe that the Planning Board said that and that the Board is struggling with what Mr. Rappaport said and what the Board really wants.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he thinks the Board has brought up enough topics.
- Ch. Rafsky said that he did not think that anyone on Mr. Rappaport's team took the Board's signal seriously that it thought the first plan was an "F" back at its meeting last April. He said that the Board's signal was that this proposal was tremendously over-dense and this was not responded to.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he did understand what the board thought and that the board was very clear that the proposal was inappropriate.

*Before hearing comments from the public Ch. Rafsky informed the public of the policy that all questions*



**Westwood Planning Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**May 13, 2014**  
**Middle School Cafeteria**  
**7:30 PM**

*and comments should be addressed to the Planning Board, specifically to him as the chairman.*

**Public Comments:**

- Attorney Luke Legere, McGregor & Associates: legal counsel representing Westwood Citizens for Zoning Integrity (WCZI), read excerpts from a letter to the Planning Board expressing opposition to the proposed SRD. Highlights: density and design are incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood; sewer connections have not been addressed, project would add to existing traffic problems on High Street; blasting, excavation, cutting and filling, grading and tree removal will have unacceptable impacts on the natural environment. (A copy of this letter is available with these minutes.)
- J. Tierney, 232 Grove St. – expressed multiple opposing comments, particularly discussed watershed problems that may arise as a result of bedrock blasting.
- R. Cherry, 165 High St. – commented that he has spoken many members of the public, who are not direct abutters to this project were unaware of this project and are opposed to it. Why don't other members of the town know about this?
- B. Delisle, 96 Skyline Dr. – Does the ongoing bridge construction connecting Rte. 109 to Rte. 95 impact the proposed traffic impacts of the proposed SRD at 215 High Street? (Mr. Lucas said that he believes that the major concern is possible traffic backing up to the ramp. Signal timing will be very important here.)
- K. Sharifzdeh, 246 Grove St. – expressed disagreement with the proposed SRD project being compared to Fox Hill Village. Wants real factors and density discussed. Said that this is a great project but it is in the wrong place.
- B. Singer, Fox Hill Village – how is a gap in traffic determined on High Street? (Mr. Lucas said gap studies are based on actual recording the time between two vehicles. More study is needed.)

*Ch. Rafsky again reminded the public to address the Planning Board with its comments or questions as many of the questions being asked are seeking detailed answers for which study has not yet been done, at this stage in the review. Furthermore he said that the discussion and concerns should be directed around the subject of density. He said that discussing the obvious is not productive.*

- A. Cannon, Fox Hill Village – stated she is concerned about traffic and safety.
- D. Evans, Fox Hill Village – will this completed project cause even more traffic volume and has this been considered.
- B. Soule, High Street – this plan is not appropriate and not in the right place.
- R. Keller, Fox Hill Village – how many residents (people) do they plan to put in there?
- K. Manor-Metzhold, Longmeadow Dr. – residents throughout the town are concerned about further congestion of Rte. 109.
- L. Beal, High Street – 10:20 a.m., 57 cars later she could make a left turn out of her driveway; she is also concerned that project may impact the water pressure. This project should not be dragged out over the "cover of summer" and slip through.
- Attorney Luke Legere, McGregor & Associates – The loss of open space is a very big concern of

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

the clients that he represents.

- K. Sharifzdeh, 246 Grove St. – expressed the desire for the town's peer review consultant to be more impartial but yet keep the residents of Westwood in mind. This is going to destroy the neighbors view and create noise. The project is great but it is in the wrong place. It's not compatible and safety is a major concern. Continuing this project wastes precious resources. Why does this hearing have to continue?

*Ch. Rafsky responded that every property owner in the Town of Westwood is required to be given due process. In addition, this is not a financial burden to the Town. He said that the Board is listening to all comments.*

- W. Sabrosky, Fox Hill St. – what are the traffic signals proposed here?
- B. Soule, 235 High St. – commended the board for saying that it does support the need for senior housing and that the concerns associated with this project are related to its appropriateness to the neighborhood.

**Ch. Rafsky Comments:**

- Ch. Rafsky asked the board if it had any additional comments. (There weren't any.)
- Ch. Rafsky also asked Ms. Loughnane if she had any comments on process.

**Town Planner's Comments:**

- Ms. Loughnane said that the next step in the hearing process involves the transmittal of all submittal items for 215 High Street to Phil Paradis of Beta Group, who will then report back to the Planning Board. She said that to continue this hearing until the next Planning Board meeting (May 27<sup>th</sup>) would be an inadequate amount of time for the consultant to prepare a report for the Board.
- Phil Paradis of Beta Group agreed with Ms. Loughnane that June 10<sup>th</sup> would be an appropriate amount of time suggested that the Planning Board should decide what issues it wants to focus on first.

**Other Planning Board Comments:**

- A board member said that he agreed with Mr. Paradis and suggested establishing a hierarchy of issues that need to be addressed. He said that there is simply no point of going through the details of the project related to number of bedrooms and the community room, until the board gets to some resolutions to some of the bigger questions. He said that no one here in the audience or the Planning Board is talking about anything other than the density of this project. He added that until there is a serious discussion about that, the board is wasting its time. He wants the peer review consultant to review items that are not about stormwater and pipe diameters because this is not where board is at.

**Motion/Action Taken:**

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery, and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, June 10<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m., at the Thurston Middle School, Cafeteria.

**Other Business: - 1561 High St. Proposed ANR**

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that the Planning Office received an ANR Plan for 1561 High Street, but it will not be presented to the board for endorsement until after receiving a full set of revised SRD plans. It was suggested that this item be added to the May 27<sup>th</sup> agenda and considered at that time.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

***Adjournment:***

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:01 p.m.

***Next Meeting:***

Tuesday, May 27<sup>th</sup>, 7:30 p.m., 50 Carby St.

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2014  
Middle School Cafeteria  
7:30 PM**

**List of Documents:**

• 40 Allied Drive - Parking Revisions Concept – Option 1	PDF
• Bonefish Grill – rear/south elevation plans	PDF
• Letter to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Beta Group, dated 05-12-14 re: Bonefish Grill at University Station Conformance Review	PDF
• Email to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Fire Chief Scoble, dated 05-13-14 re: Conformance Determination	PDF
• Memo to Town Planner N. Loughnane from W. Scoble Fire Chief, dated 04-14-14 re: Four Season Village SRD	PDF
• Email to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Police Sgt. P. Sicard, dated 04-22-14 re: Four Seasons Village	PDF
• Letter to Town Planner N. Loughnane from L. Legere of McGregor & Associates, dated 05-12-14 re: Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables	PDF
• Letter to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Beals & Thomas, dated 05-13-14 re: Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables	PDF
• Letter to B. Montgomery from abutters and neighbors of 215 High St., dated 06-09-14 re: Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables	PDF
• Letter to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Beta Group, dated 05-12-14 re: Peer Review Scope & Fee for Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables	PDF
• Memo to Town Planner N. Loughnane from Health Director L. Shea, dated 04-14-14 re: 215 High Street	PDF