

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Rafsky called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. WestCat TV was present and was granted permission to videotape the meeting.

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

Consideration of Approval Not required (ANR) plan for 126 Fisher Street and 45 French Street

Summary:

- Co-Applicant/resident Ryan Leonard of 45 French Street was present.
- Ms. Loughnane gave a brief summary to the Board of the purpose of ANR plan: Divide a 5,048 sq. ft. lot known as AP 21, Lot 268 into two halves, and to combine one half with the adjacent parcel AP 21, Lot 267 (126 Fisher Street), and to combine the remaining half with parcel AP 21, Lot 269 (45 French Street).
- The proposed plan will result in the elimination of one existing non-conforming non-buildable parcel (AP 21, Lot 268) and will also decrease the non-conformity of AP 21, Lot 269.

Board Discussion:

There were a few questions and answers exchanged between the Board and Town Planner.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

The Planning Board endorsed the ANR plan as submitted.

Consideration of Minor Modification to Reynolds Farm SRD Special Permit and Proposed ANR for Reynolds Farm and 117 Blueberry Lane

Town Planner's Summary:

- In advance of the meeting, Planning Board members were provided with a copy of the ANR plan and the revised Special Permit plans for Reynolds Farm.
- Ed Musto was present to request that the board endorse the ANR plan and grant a modification to the Reynolds Farm Senior Residential Development Special Permit to replace the prior plan set revised through 10/10/12 with this new plan set, revised through 6/6/14.
- Ms. Loughnane reviewed these plans and found both to be in conformance with applicable Zoning Bylaw requirements and recommended that the board endorse the ANR plan and grant the requested minor modification of the special permit approval.

Board Discussion:

- There were a few minor questions and answers exchanged between the Board, Mr. Musto and Ms. Loughnane.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted four votes in favor and one abstention, to consider the requested modification as minor. Mr. Olanoff abstained from this vote.

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted four votes in favor and one abstention, to grant a modification to the Reynolds Farm Senior Residential Development Special Permit, to replace the prior plan set revised through 10/10/12 with this new plan set revised through 6/6/14.

A majority of Planning Board members endorsed the ANR plan as submitted. Mr. Olanoff abstained from endorsing the plan.

Ch. Rafsky recommended that in the future, the board may wish to delegate the town planner as a signatory to sign ANR's so as not to hold up a meeting.

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

At the last hearing, the Planning Board and members of the public exchanged comments and expressed opinions with the Proponent about the high density of the project; traffic impacts and public safety concerns; and the compatibility with and appropriateness of this project compared to the existing neighborhood.

Chairman's Opening Comments:

- Ch. Rafsky re-opened the public hearing to continue the discussion related to consideration of a proposed 72-unit Senior Residential Development (SRD), Four Seasons Village at Harlequin Stables, at 215 High Street.
- Ch. Rafsky stated that at the last meeting the Board and the Proponent went back and forth a little bit about what would be considered appropriate development at this location.
- Following the meeting and over the past two weeks, Peer Review Consultant, BETA Group, Inc. has begun preliminary work to analyze the existing conditions at 215 High Street and to review the Proponent's traffic analysis.
- In addition, Town Planner Ms. Loughnane met with the Proponents and their attorney to discuss various concerns about the project.
- Ch. Rafsky welcomed Proponents Jerry Rappaport and Matt Zuker of CRP Development, LLC and Attorney Michael Terry.

Presentation by Jerry Rappaport, CRP Development:

Mr. Rappaport began by thanking the Planning Board for giving CRP Development another chance to discuss their vision for the Four Seasons Village, Westwood's premier senior housing facility and to present potential changes to their program and site plan.

Highlights:

- CRP heard the Planning Board at the last meeting, that you support the need for active, senior residential housing for Westwood senior citizens and the parents of current residents.
- CRP understands that the Planning Board encourages the provision of independent living accommodations for seniors and that it remains to be conflicted by the density implied by and inherent in the SRD Bylaw or as seen in their plans.
- CRP heard the Planning Board loud and clear that the reduction was not enough.
- CRP has redesigned their Program reducing it by an additional 35-50%, depending on what measure you use and would like the Board's feedback on what it likes and doesn't like and what direction it should go in.
- Mr. Rappaport said that in the first revision they have redesigned and revised the flat building by reducing it 35-40%, keeping the underground parking, the centralized full-service community room, the elevated living opportunities and the variety of housing types and pricing and also maximizing the open space. They explored the feasibility of two stories but they reached a dead end with too much surface parking. They will continue to explore how to reduce the height and mass more consistent with the neighboring mansions with potential step back, full roof lines and gables.

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

- In the second version they reduced density by 50% with a town-home plan that would reduce the number of units and car traffic to 37 units, consistent with the per unit density with prior SRD approval. Upon reflection, you will see that this revision takes up too much open space and has limited product and price point variety.
- Mr. Rappaport said that CRP's architect is out of the country so they have not been able to accommodate in the sketches some of the suggestions made by Ms. Loughnane, like relocating the turnaround to the eastern end of the site, thereby reducing the length of the dead end road much closer to 500' and to investigate ways to reduce the perceived height of the flat building.
- Mr. Rappaport said that they will present two options for the flat building: one with fewer units with all two-bedrooms and one with more units that include some one-bedrooms and some one-bedrooms with dens. He said that they wanted to discuss the merits of all townhouses vs the flat building that increases product diversity and open space and the merits and demerits of a fewer units of all two bedrooms.
- Mr. Rappaport said that they are proposing to significantly reduce density, increase the buffer between them and the neighbors and still conform to the letter and intent of the SRD Bylaw.
- Mr. Rappaport said that he hopes that the Planning Board thinks that CRP has made progress in reducing density and asked Mr. Zuker to walk the Board through the alternative plans.

Presentation by Matt Zuker, CRP Development:

- Mr. Zuker greeted and thanked the neighbors, Town Planner and Planning Board for their combined feedback over the past meetings regarding the project.
- Presented and distributed copies to the Planning Board of a revised sketch showing the existing site plan, the townhouse-only site plan and site plan with the reduced-sized flat building and the existing townhouses.
- Mr. Zuker said that after the last meeting when they heard about all the comments about the appropriately developing the site, he said he took those to heart and he stepped back and looked and saw, believed and agreed with the Planning Board and the neighbors that the "flat" building (proposed at the back of the project site) is too big. When you look at all the planning principals, the town code and the SRD bylaw, the site, location and the neighborhood, the beliefs of the Planning Board members, the first step was looking at that (flat) building.
- He added that CRP strongly believes in the merit of having this "flat" building design and offering a diversity of housing types for seniors in town. He said that at some point you have to start building these buildings with parking underground and a certain size.
- Mr. Zuker presented two sketches of possible alternative designs for illustrative purposes: "*All Townhouses Option*" –37 townhomes, one and two-bedroom units, each approximately 1,700 square feet and "*Reduced Size "flat" Building & Townhouses Option*" - flat building footprint is shown as being reduced by one third, including the underground parking garage, as well as the existing townhouses. Mr. Zuker said that by reducing the flat building footprint, this will not only reduce the density but will preserve a buffer and allow for more screening in between the project and neighboring properties. He added that the architectural features could also be changed to make the flat building resemble other two-story, with third floor walk-up residences in the abutting neighborhood by adjusting rooflines and dormers. Mr. Zuker said that CRP believes that this plan is a good starting point and is seeking the Board's guidance on each plan and the public's feedback on these options.
- Mr. Zuker concluded that he is aware of the traffic and utility concerns identified by the Planning Board and the public but said that these concerns cannot be addressed until the site plan is decided upon.
- Mr. Zuker thanked the Planning Board for its time.

Town Planner Nora Loughnane's Comments:

- Peer Review Consultants Phil Paradis and Greg Lucas of BETA Group have been asked to focus their efforts on analyzing existing conditions including density analysis and roadway issues. In addition,

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

BETA will be asked to review these newly submitted, revised sketches.

- Ms. Loughnane added that she met with the Proponents last week and discussed these revised sketches as an attempt to reduce the density of the project to a level that the Planning Board is supportive of. She indicated to the Proponents that she believed these revisions were a step in the right direction.
- Ms. Loughnane then asked Mr. Paradis to present a summary of the preliminary analysis to the Planning Board.

Presentation by Phil Paradis, BETA Group

- Mr. Paradis introduced himself and his associate Professional Traffic Engineer Greg Lucas. Informed that he and Mr. Lucas were present at the last hearing and that they heard the conversation about focusing their analysis of the project on density and traffic safety that were raised by both the Planning Board and the residents. Mr. Paradis said that as the project evolves the review will go into all other areas of engineering as required. Mr. Paradis noted that he and Mr. Lucas have visited the site at 215 High Street.
- Mr. Paradis said that his analysis began with looking at the density of the neighborhood and a similar development (Fox Hill Village) located across the street. Presented "Density Analysis Figure" to the Planning Board which depicted three blocks of surrounding parcels - Country Lane, Grove Street and Fox Hill Village, based on the town's assessor's map. Grove Street – ¼ unit per acre; Country Lane – 1.8 units per acre and Fox Hill Village – 4.2 units per acre. Mr. Paradis said that in accordance with the SRD Bylaws, the undevelopable areas were deducted from the density calculation leaving 6.98 acres of developable area, leaving a density of 10.3 units per acre for this project. He also looked at recently permitted Reynolds Farm - 3.05 units per acre.
- Mr. Paradis was asked by Ch. Rafsky for his opinion on what he believes is a reasonable density for the site. Mr. Paradis said that in his opinion, the density of this project should not exceed 4-5 units per acre.

Presentation by Greg Lucas, BETA Group

- Mr. Lucas said he reviewed the traffic study submitted by the Proponents. He said that although the number of units is still influx for this project, generally speaking the traffic study was prepared according to industry standards. Traffic volumes were measured on the critical peak periods: weekday morning, weekday afternoon and Saturday mid-day.
- Mr. Lucas' Responses:
 - (a) The Traffic Study must evaluate the site's proximity to public transportation, and should evaluate both vehicular and pedestrian connectivity to neighborhood shopping and service facilities.
 - (b) A consistent afternoon peak hour should be used for all three intersections. The afternoon peak hour and peak hour data shown in Table 1 should match the peak hour used for Figure 3.
 - (c) A summary of intersection crash data and a safety analysis were performed. Mr. Lucas' comment: The safety analysis effectively summarizes the crash data, but does not describe additional components of both vehicle and pedestrian safety. Updated information is necessary.
- Trip generation: was calculated and distributed to the local roadways according to industry standards and is appropriate for the development and is intended for residents who live independently, are typically active and may or may not be retired. Mr. Lucas said that ITE trip generation rates should be supported by peak hour entering/exiting volumes from similarly-sized, over-55 residential developments in communities bordering I-95/Route 128.
- Stopping sight distance and intersection sight distance were measured and compared with minimum required values based on the 85th percentile speed. Measured distances exceed minimum required values.
- Gap data was collected and tabulated to determine whether acceptable gaps exist to allow vehicles to exit. The site is accessed via a single driveway which creates an un-signalized intersection

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

with High Street. Expected trip volumes are too low to justify traffic signal installation at the intersection (11 AM, 10 PM).

- Mr. Lucas said that although Table 6 shows that a sufficient number of gaps will be available for exiting traffic, Table 10 shows that 95th percentile queues for High Street westbound at Summer Street currently extend beyond the proposed site drive. Queued westbound vehicles extending to or beyond the site drive will significantly impact visibility for left-turning vehicles exiting the site. The proponent should consider mitigation measures to reduce queues at the intersection of High Street and Summer St.

Additional Comment by Phil Paradis, BETA Group

- Mr. Paradis stated that this plan depicts a dead end road approximately 1,000 feet in length and in Westwood the subdivision regulations restrict the length of a dead end road to 500 feet. He presented a site layout depicting a reduced road length to 500 feet, essentially cutting the road in half.

Board Questions/Discussion:

- A board member asked for clarification on which zoning districts Fox Hill Village and Reynolds Farm are located in. (Ms. Loughnane answered that they are ARO and SRC respectively.)
- A board member asked Mr. Lucas if there are adequate gaps for a car to make a left-hand turn out of the site and if not, would prohibiting left-hand turns solve cueing problems. (Mr. Lucas responded that there are adequate gaps for a left-hand turn but deeper analysis is required to answer the second question.)
- A board member asked the Proponent if they have looked at the possibility of having two driveways. (Mr. Rappaport responded that he has but having creating another driveway would take up a significant amount of green space. He said that creating plan with a loop may be investigated as well as a plan with two driveways, one running on the outside, closer to the neighbors. Mr. Zuker followed up with comments that he and his team will meet with the planning department and with the Fire Chief to discuss public safety access and the possibility of making one of the proposed walking trails an emergency access point. He said these discussions are still very preliminary.
- A board member emphasized that there is a much greater risk to the public safety if the Planning Board waived a >500' length of a driveway in this type of residential development as opposed to waiving a >500' length of a driveway for a one or two house lot subdivision.
- A board member expressed his satisfaction with Mr. Paradis' table of data gathered to determine the relative density of the site in relation to the adjacent areas. This analysis has shown that although the total lot area of the proposed SRD is 8.64 acres, the effective buildable area is 6.98 acres after undevelopable areas and non-buildable areas are deducted, in accordance with the SRD bylaw. This information validates that the 10.3 units per acre is in excess of what the SRD bylaw allows and that this proposal should not have been considered at the start.

In addition, this board member mentioned that under the SRD Bylaw, specifically Section 8.4.8 - Decision – density of development that conforms to the decision criteria in the bylaw having to do with compatibility of the project with neighborhood in which it is embedded. We're not yet coming close to design compatibility with the neighborhood. Using Fox Hill Village as an analog to determine density is not appropriate

- Ch. Rafsky commented that ensuring public safety of residents is the first criteria used in determining whether the Planning Board would consider a waiver of the excess length of the roadway serving residential development.

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

- Ch. Rafsky read portions of a letter to Mr. Montgomery from abutters and neighbors of 215 High Street, expressing heart-felt appreciation to the Planning Board for its efforts to impartially evaluate the proposed SRD and ascertain numerous issues that are inherent to the proposed site. The letter also reiterates abutters' strong opposition to the proposed SRD related to: Traffic, Building Density Conformance, Drainage and Blasting. (A copy of this letter is available with the minutes.)

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. He said that he looks forward to commenting on the project further.
- J. Tierney, 232 Grove St. – agreed with comments made that Fox Hill Village is not an equal analogy. He expressed multiple comments in opposition to the project. Also commented about possible watershed problems that may result from 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 who were unaware of this proposed project. He asked why other residents were not notified about this.
- B. Delisle, 96 Skyline Dr. – Will the ongoing bridge construction connecting Rte. 109 to Rte. 95 impact any traffic associated with the proposed SRD? (Mr. Lucas responded that a possible concern may be traffic backing up onto the ramp and that precise 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 – asked how a gap in traffic is determined on High Street.
- 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. The project is great but it is in the wrong place. It's not compatible and safety is a major concern.
- W. Sabrosky, Fox Hill St. – what are the traffic signals proposed here?

Chairman's Comments:

- Ch. Rafsky said that he would like to try to encourage a discussion that doesn't get too deep into the details, as the Planning Board and Beta Group have not done that level of study yet. He said that the Planning Board is trying to give a direction to the Proponent about where it is going with this process.
- Ch. Rafsky reminded the public to please address the board with its questions and comments, as some of the information that the public is seeking cannot be answered until more study has been done. He asked that the discussion should be directed around the subject of density and that discussing the obvious is not productive.
- Ch. Rafsky asked the public that if no one in this room could see anything in this development, what would be your concerns with regard to density.

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

Public Comments:

- A. Cannon, Fox Hill Village – stated that she is concerned about traffic safety and figuring out the traffic gaps.
- D. Evans, Fox Hill Village – asked if this completed project cause even more traffic volume.
- B. Soule, High Street – said that the concept of visibility is not is what is in the statute, it is what is appropriate in that neighborhood. He said that this plan is not appropriate and not in the right place. He wants the board to consider appropriateness.
- R. Keller, Fox Hill Village – asked how many residents are proposed to be located there.
- K. Manor-Metzhold, 5 Longmeadow Dr. – commented that as an Opens Space Committee Member, people often ask here about what is going on in town. She said that people are busy and don't always read newspapers and online communication isn't great. She said that the Town does its best to keep residents informed. She added that residents throughout the town are concerned traffic related to the proposed project and the further congestion of Rte. 109 and safety matters.
- L. Soule, High Street – She said that at 10:20 a.m., 57 cars and trucks later she was able make a left turn out of her driveway. She commented about impacts on water pressure. She added that it is not fair to the residents that the Planning Board not drag this on over the "cover of summer".
- Attorney Luke Legere, McGregor & Associates – He said that with regard to density, the loss of open space is a very large concern of the clients that he represents. He said that protection of natural resources is one of the criteria to be considered by the Planning Board when making a decision.
- K. Sharifzdeh, 246 Grove St. – requested that the town's peer review consultant to be more impartial and more objective. He wants them to present the facts and keep the interests of the residents of Westwood in mind.

Chairman's Comments:

- Ch. Rafsky said that one of the highest hurdles that the Planning Board has to get over is the length of the street. He said that it will be difficult from a public safety standpoint to waive a >500' roadway. He said he wondered what this board would use as a justification to do so.
- Ch. Rafsky that there is a need to see if there are comparable developments in the area that can be analyzed to assist the Planning Board in better understanding the real impacts of this type of project. (For example: Who is the representative population intended for this project? What kind of public safety data is available regarding traffic and crash rates this type of project? What are the burdens of underground parking, a community center and some of the other planned features of the project?) Ch. Rafsky said that the town only has one approved senior residential development and that the board's experience with impacts of this project is limited.
- Ch. Rafsky asked the board if it had any additional comments. (None.)
- Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Rappaport if he wanted to present any additional comments. *(Mr. Rappaport said he met many residents at the senior center and that he has 70+ letters of support for this type of housing. He said that he understands the concerns of the neighbors but notes that Westwood residents want product diversity in housing types.)*
- Ch. Rafsky said that he has been very clear from the beginning that this is not a debate about senior residential housing. He said that the Planning Board supports senior residential development. He said that this is hearing is about whether this is the right spot for this development.
- Ch. Rafsky said that he personally likes the diversity of the housing options but believes having the flat

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

building in the back could cause this project to not happen. He said that he is trying to understand the burdens of having such diversity, for example: the underground parking. Ch. Rafsky asked if the flat building in the back is adding burdens to this project and what does it do the cost per square foot?

- Ch. Rafsky said that the message tonight is that this has been a step forward in the process although the excessive density remains a big concern.
- Ch. Rafsky said that some administrative items need to be addressed prior to adjourning this hearing.

Town Planner's Comments:

- Ms. Loughnane said that her comments are explanatory so that everyone knows what the Planning Board is reviewing and what its role is. She asked members of the public, if it hasn't done so already, to review Section 8.4.8 of the Zoning Bylaw, which describes exactly what the Planning Board needs to do when making a decision on the proposed Senior Residential Development. Ms. Loughnane said there has been a lot of discussion about density and added that it is only one factor in the board's decision. *Ms. Loughnane summarized the specific bullet points from that section of the bylaw.*
- Ms. Loughnane added that she wants to make sure that the public does not get hung up on the number of units because density is about a lot more than the number of units. The number of units and the number of bedrooms will determine how many people will live at the project and the number of cars. The physical layout of the project and the impact on vehicular and pedestrian movement and safety within the development and on the proximate roads will be considered very carefully. Therefore, the Planning Board needs to take its time with this review and hearing process, noting that the applicant has a right to due process.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing to Tuesday, July 15th at 8:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street. (A larger venue will be chosen in the next day or so and the location will be posted with the town clerk and on the town's website.)

Pre-application Meeting with Potential Applicant for Senior Residential Development at 615 High Street Summary & Presentation:

- Patrick Geraghty has entered an agreement to purchase the property at 615 High Street and is seeking a SRD SP for the development of the site. With Mr. Geraghty was Ed Sprown discussed a proposal for Senior Residential Development at 615 High Street.
- Town Planner Ms. Loughnane informed the board that she has met with Mr. Geraghty on two occasions to review early concept plans.
- The property is described as 160' wide and 1200' long with a significant grade change from the street front to rear lot line.
- Proposed are either, seven, two-family units or six, three-family units, located 20' from the front yard setback; with a new driveway proposed on the right hand side of the lot.
- Existing dwelling on property could be reused.

Board Comments/Discussion:

- This downtown location is desirable for development of a SRD.
- The applicant will face a significant challenge maintaining the 30 foot perimeter buffer called for under the SRD Section due to the fairly extensive wetland area.
- Although there are traffic signals located on High Street within 200 yards in each direction from the site, a traffic study will be required.
- Some concerns were expressed about increasing the grade on the site and the possible impacts to the abutting properties.

Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM

- Proposed site road/driveway exceeds 500' in length and may not meet the dimensional requirements for fire trucks/public safety vehicles.
- Mr. Geraghty expressed an interest in reusing the existing dwelling and Board members agreed with this idea.
- A one-car garage is planned for each unit.

Mr. Geraghty thanked the Board for its time and consideration and said that he and his engineer would revise plans in accordance with the issues discussed tonight and contact Ms. Loughnane when ready to go forward with next steps in the process.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

None needed.

Recommendations to the Board of Selectmen for Committee Appointments

The following recommendations were made for the various committee assignments and were agreed upon unanimously, by the Board, with the exception of the MAPC Committee Appointment, which there was one vote opposed to the recommendation:

- Housing Partnership Representative – John Wiggin
Alternate – Chris Pfaff
- Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) – Mike Jaillet
Alternate – Steve Olanoff
- MBTA Advisory Board Designee – Steve Olanoff
Alternate – John Wiggin
- Regional Transportation Advisory Council – Steve Rafsky
Alternate – Steve Olanoff
- Three Rivers Inter-Local Council – Chris Pfaff
Alternate – Steve Olanoff

Adjournment:

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

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, July 8th, 7:30 p.m., Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 10, 2014
Middle School Cafeteria – 850 High Street
7:30 PM**

List of Documents:

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Memo to PB from Beta Group dated 06-09-14 re: 215 High St. – SRD Density & Traffic Impact Review	PDF
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Copy of Plan depicting Density Analysis Figure for Four Seasons Village (215 High St.)	PDF
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Letter to Ch. Montgomery, from abutters of 215 High St., dated 06-06-14 re: opposition to proposed SRD	PDF