Attendance & Call to Order:

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

Present: Planning Board members: Steve Rafsky, 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 Alternative Sign Package Approval for Monument Signs and Way Finding Signs - University Station

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Paul Cincotta of NE Development and Special Counsel Dan Bailey.

Summary & Presentation

- Mr. Cincotta presented the Sign Location Plan depicting the Monument Signs and Way Finding Signs. (A copy of this plan is available with these minutes.)
- Monument Signs: Primary Tenant Pylon; Lifetime Athletic/Office Monument; Bridges by Epoch Monument; Gables at US Monument
- Way Finding Signs: 8 Vehicle Directional Signs at signalized intersections to mark destinations
- Pylon signs only logos and lettering are illuminated by steady white light. Backgrounds are not illuminated.
- Monuments only logos and lettering are illuminated by steady white light. Backgrounds are not illuminated.

Board & Town Planner Discussion

- A board member asked the developer if he has found the sign regulations to be too constraining. (No, all signs conform to dimensional requirements with the exception of the way finding signs which exceed the height requirements.)
- Ms. Loughnane reminded board members that proposed monument signs and pylon sign are not specifically addressed in our Bylaw therefore this Alternative Sign Package covers them.
- Mr. Bailey informed the board that the zoning bylaw could be amended in the future to include monument signs.
- A board member commented that he has not seen any signs on the plans that identify the project as being located in Westwood, MA and asked where this might be incorporated. (Mr. Cincotta noted that Ch. Rafsky was referring to the Project Identification Signs which were not part of the Alternate Sign Package but which would be considered by the Planning Board at this meeting under a proposed modification of the Conformance Determination for CDA 1 and CDA 2. He said that the omission was unintentional and he is not opposed to working on this possibly at the entrance of the project on the project identification signs.)
- A board member questioned the need for the large number of poles along the street. (Mr. Cincotta said that the number of poles is related to way-finding and spacing between them.)

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

Motion made by Planning Board Member Mr. Olanoff, as follows:

I move that, pursuant to Section 9.7.10.12 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and with respect to the "University Avenue Mixed Use District, Master Development Plan" approved by the Town of Westwood on May 6, 2013 (the "Master Development Plan"), the Planning Board:

- (1) Vote to approve the Monument, Pylon, and Wayfinding Signs described in the document entitled, "University Station Signage and Wayfinding Package," submitted to the Planning Board by Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC on November 10, 2014 (the "Signage and Wayfinding Package"); and
- (2) Find that the signage described in the Signage and Wayfinding Package addresses the needs of the development and traffic safety while appropriately balancing any impacts on the surrounding environment.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the motion as read.

Consideration of Alternative Sign Package Approval for David's Bridal – University Station Summary & Presentation

Mr. Cincotta presented site plans for David's Bridal depicting front and side elevations with storefront display windows and examples of the use of window screening graphics in some of the windows.

- Front Elevation: display windows 1 & 2 and show windows 2 & 3 have transparent, hanging visual displays. Glazing is shown on transom windows above the front entrance.
- Side Elevation: Sections 1, 4 & 2 will have graphic film at the exterior face of the wall, behind glazing.
- Floor Plan is divided into: Sales Area; Presentation Area; Seamstress/Alterations and Back of the House Areas.
- Depicts the relationship between these areas and visual transparencies that occur into the store from the exterior. There are two levels of visual transparencies ground level sections 3 & 5 (sales) and transom level sections 1, 4 & 2 (back of the house).

Board Questions & Comments:

- There was a brief exchange of questions and comments.
- Board members generally agreed that the display windows with the graphics and glazing are complimentary.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

Motion made by Planning Board Member Mr. Olanoff, as follows:

I move that, pursuant to Section 9.7.10.12 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and with respect to the "University Avenue Mixed Use District, Master Development Plan" approved by the Town of Westwood on May 6, 2013 (the "Master Development Plan"), the Planning Board:

- (1) Vote to approve the signage and Window Screening Displays described in the document entitled, "David's Bridal Sign Plan," submitted to the Planning Board by Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC on November 10, 2014 (the "David's Bridal Sign Plan"); and
- (2) Find that the signage and Window Screening Displays described in the David's Bridal Sign Plan addresses the needs of the development and traffic safety while appropriately balancing any impacts on the surrounding environment.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the motion as read.

Consideration of Alternative Sign Package Approval for Chipotle – University Station Summary & Presentation

- Chipotle has requested approval to permit the direct application of perforated frit applied to the inside face of glass behind a translucent red acrylic panel. This will allow for screening yet allow for transmission of light and movement from the kitchen to the exterior.
- This treatment will allow a red glow providing an active looking storefront.
- This application of screening graphics within one inch of the interior glass surface is prohibited unless specifically approved by the board.

Board & Town Planner Discussion

- There was an exchange of questions and comments and some dissatisfaction with the spirit and appearance of this proposed treatment.
- A board member said that this treatment appears to be "all logo", "having too much branding".
- A board member asked if a similar screening exists at other stores and requested photographs or better graphic representation was requested.
- Ch. Rafsky requested additional peer review of this alternative sign package for this site.
- Ms. Loughnane said the proposed graphics do not exceed the maximum allowed 20% signage and
 are thus permitted under the previously approved Alternate Sign Package for window signs and
 window screening. She noted that it is only the application of the perforated frit to the back of the
 window glass, and not the graphic visible through the perforated frit, that is before the Planning Board
 for consideration at this meeting.
- Board members agreed that the use of perforated frit is not necessarily a concern, but the combination of the frit and background graphics required further review.
- Mr. Cincotta was asked to speak with Chipotle regarding the other concerns with multiple brands/logos on the back wall and the desire for a more consistent look.
- A board member asked if there could be greater consistency in the wall and window signage among different retail users.
- Ms. Loughnane said the intent was to provide a diverse and active urban retail look among the
 different establishments, avoiding a unified suburban mall appearance. She said that the proposed
 changes to the bylaw to allow for window screening graphics was intended to avoid large expanses
 of blank wall behind the street front windows.
- Mr. Cincotta said they expect the tenant to have a certain quality treatment, not necessarily a uniform look.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

This discussion will be continued following feedback from Mr. Cincotta, at the board's next meeting.

Consideration of Conformance Determination for All Signs in CDA 1 & 2 – University Station Board & Town Planner Discussion

- Ms. Loughnane explained that a Conformance Determination was issued for all signs in Core Development Areas 1 & 2 but excluded development signage, including way finding signs, monument signs and project identification signs.
- The proponents have now requested issuance of a Conformance Determination for the proposed project identification signs for the north and south approaches to the development and the monument sign for the Hanover Apartments shown in the University Station Signage and Wayfinding Package.

- This modification of the Conformance Determination is intended to cover all signs which are compliant with the UAMUD Bylaw, or approved by the Planning Board pursuant to a PDR Approval, or approved by in the Planning Board pursuant to Alternate Sign Package Approval
- An additional concept- level Hanover Apartment monument sign was shown on site plans and elevations in April 2013. At that time, the sign details and copy had not yet been determined. No sign details or copy have since been submitted for review for this additional monument sign. This additional monument sign is not covered by this modification to the Conformance Determination, and it is expected that the Board will consider a further modification to the Conformance Determination, as well as another Alternate Sign Package Approval, if necessary, for this additional monument sign at a future meeting.
- The proposed signs covered by this modification to the Conformance Determination comply with the UAMUD Bylaw signage requirements and the Master Development Plan. (Ms. Loughnane noted that the proposed "Chipotle" window signs and window screening were not included in this Conformance Determination.)

Public Comments:

None

Motion/Action Taken:

Motion made by Planning Board Member Mr. Montgomery, as follows:

I move that, pursuant to Section 9.7.12.2.1, Section 9.7.12.2.2, and Section 9.7.10.12 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and with respect to the "University Avenue Mixed Use District, Master Development Plan," approved by the Town of Westwood on May 6, 2013 (the "Master Development Plan"), the Planning Board:

- (3) Vote to:
 - a. incorporate the alternative signage described in the documents entitled, "University Station Signage and Wayfinding Package", the "David's Bridal Sign Plan", and the "Project Identification Sign Plans", which were submitted to the Planning Board by Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC on November 10, 2014, by amending and supplementing the following approvals:
 - i. the Conformance Determination granted by the Planning Board with respect to Core Development Areas 1 and 2 on April 29, 2013 (effective May 6, 2013) as amended by that certain "Master Sign Plan Package" granted by the Planning Board on October 14, 2014, and as further amended by that certain "Construction Sign Package" granted by the Planning Board on October 14, 2014;
 - ii. the Project Development Review (PDR) approval for Development Area C (Lifetime) granted by the Planning Board on December 13, 2013;
 - iii. the Project Development Review (PDR) approval for Development Area B (Bridges) granted by the Planning Board on January 28, 2014;
 - iv. the Conformance Determination for Core Development Area 4 (Bonefish) granted by the Planning Board on May 13, 2014, as modified by that certain Minor

Modification to Conformance Determination granted by the Planning Board on September 2, 2014; and

v. any Conformance Determinations or Project Development Review Approvals for all other areas and phases of development within the UAMUD as may be granted by the Planning Board.

(4) Make the following finding:

that the Signage and Wayfinding Package, the David's Bridal Sign Plan, and the Project Identification Sign Plans materially conform to the Master Development Plan and supporting documents on file with the Town Clerk.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the motion as read.

Public Hearing to Consider EIDR Approval of Proposed DPW Equipment Shed at Municipal Facility – 50 Carby Street

Ch. Rafsky opened the hearing by reading the legal notice and welcomed DPW Director Todd Korchin, Facilities Manager Jim O'Connell and BETA's Phil Paradis.

Project Summary:

- The proposal is for the use of a temporary sprung structure at the Carby Street Municipal Complex on an open-air area of the grounds, located parallel with the parking lot.
- This structure would be used for park maintenance equipment currently being housed at a shed at Morrison Park. That shed would be made available for Fire Department use.
- The proposed facility is a 50 ft. by 50 ft. by 32 ft. high, arched, tent-like building with two garage doors and additional access doors. It will have electricity, primarily for lighting. It will not have heating, water or sewer services.

Board & Town Planner Questions & Comments:

- Will this structure be permanent? (Mr. Korchin responded that it is likely to become permanent.)
- There was a brief discussion about the options for the fabric color. (Mr. Korchin stated that he would prefer white in keeping with other existing structures onsite.) Board members discussed the green and tan options.
- Will this structure be visible from Dover Road and from other neighbors? (no)
- Is there a buffer between the closest neighbors? (The closest neighbor is on the corner of Carby Street and Dover Road. There is a buffer of several trees and brush.)
- How long will it take for the structure to be ordered and installed? (Mr. Korchin said that it could be as soon as 90 days.)

Public Comments:

- J. Martin, 221 Conant Rd. expressed dislike for white-colored salt shack and suggested choosing brown or green for the temporary structure.
- P. O'Grady, 213 Conant Rd. questioned the need for this structure. (A brief explanation was given related to the fire department's need to use the structure at Morrison Park.)
- K. Blue, 233 Conant Rd. asked whether any lighting would be installed. (It was explained that lights will be mounted above each of the garage doors and the primary pedestrian access door.)

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor to approve the EIDR for Proposed DPW Equipment Shed with the condition that color samples will be provided to and reviewed by the town planner and that the tent material shall be either green or tan.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor to close the public hearing.

Review and Recommendation of Phillips Way Roadway Acceptance Article for Special Town Meeting AND Consideration of Reduction of Tri-Partite Agreement Amount for Phillips Way Definitive Subdivision

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Marjorie Eramo Young of PJMJ.

Planner's Summary:

- PJMJ, developer of Philips Estates Definitive Subdivision off Margery Lane, has requested Town Meeting acceptance of the subdivision road - Philips Way. The Board has been asked to provide a recommendation to the BoS as Roadway Commissioners and to Town Meeting.
- All public improvements at the Philips Way subdivision are complete except for the top coat of roadway paving, which is expected to be done tomorrow, weather permitting, and except for the installation of a light pole and the planting of two or three street trees.
- In addition, PJMJ has requested the reduction of the tri-partite agreement to zero dollars to reflect the completion of the work that this agreement intended to secure, and the replacement of that tri-partite agreement with a new form of surety to secure the few remaining work items. Ms. Eramo Young stated that she intended to provide the new surety in the form of a passbook account.
- Because PJMJ has chosen to install the final coat of paving prior to the development of the individual
 house lots, there is some concern that construction equipment might damage the finished roadway.
 It is recommended that some form of surety should remain in place to secure repairs to the public
 roadway, if necessary.

Board & Town Planner Discussion:

- The Board may vote to recommend the roadway acceptance, subject to Jeff Bina's final review of as-built conditions: confirmation that a light pole, two trees (in the spring time) and a grey manhole are installed.
- Ms. Loughnane noted that this is not a typical request, usually the final course of roadway is held off until all houses in a subdivision have been built.
- Ms. Eramo Young requested to add a clarification to the discussion about the installation of the two trees. She stated that the trees are proposed to be planted in front of a lot that has not yet been developed and that the trees will be planted after that. The Tripartite Agreement/passbook would reserve funds for that purpose.
- The Board discussed the option to recommend that the Board of Selectmen ask town meeting to accept the roadway, subject Mr. Bina's final review of the as-built conditions and to make sure that a bond or other provision is made with town counsel requiring funding to finish the above mentioned items.
- A board member asked if there some contingency plan in place to protect the subdivision streets
 from damage during construction of future houses. (Ms. Loughnane said the funds for this purpose
 should be held outside the tripartite agreement and may be in the form of a bond posted by an
 individual lot owner in the future. The need and form of such surety should be determined by the
 Board of Selectmen upon advice of Town Counsel.)

 Board members discussed that the surety could be in the form of a passbook savings established by PJMJ in favor of the Town or the Town might require individual construction bonds from each contractor before the issuance of any building permits for individual lots.

Public Comments:

None

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor to recommend in favor of Town Meeting's acceptance of Philips Way, and to encourage the Board of Selectmen to condition any recommendation to the Finance and Warrant Commission for acceptance of this roadway upon the establishment of satisfactory provisions to secure funding for any necessary repairs to Philips Way which might be necessary if the roadway is damaged as a result of the development of house lots along that roadway, with said recommendation conditioned upon approval of the final course of paving and as-built plans by the Town Engineer prior to Town Meeting.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor to reduce the June 2, 2011 Tri-Partite Agreement for Philips Estates from \$78,935.45 to Zero Dollars, conditional upon the acceptance by Town Counsel of a Passbook Account with a deposit in an amount sufficient to secure all items listed on a Revised Construction Estimate, as confirmed by Mr. Bina, and conditional upon Town Counsel's determination that satisfactory provisions are in place for the protection, maintenance, and repair of public improvements during the period of development for each of the lots within the Definitive Subdivision.

Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider EIDR for Hogan Tire – 14 Washington Street

Ch. Rafsky reopened the hearing and welcomed engineer Tim Paris and Applicant Ed Hogan. Ms. Loughnane distributed paper copies of the latest site plans delivered by Mr. Paris today and also sent by email yesterday.

Brief Update by Tim Paris:

- Pavement was pulled back and reconfigured into one row.
- A berm was built up approximately 3-5 feet high. Two rows of plantings and vegetation are planned: Arborvitae hedge; Canadian pines; Holly plants and azaleas.
- Plans were amended in response to Mr. Paradis' peer review comments.

Phil Paradis' Comments:

- 1. Provide spot grades to show handicap parking area does not exceed 2 % grades in all directions.
- 2. Make one of the handicap spaces van accessible (8 foot wide access area).
- 3. Recommend that a condition be included that requires Town to observe soil at bottom of excavation for infiltration system.
- 4. Clarify and provide elevations of infiltration system and outlet pipe on plans.
- 5. Provide storm drain on south side of berm to prevent ponding on abutting properties.
- 6. Provide new catch basin (STC 450i) adjacent to converted DMH C to capture and treat runoff in this area.
- 7. Clarify catch basin A to be model STC900
- 8. Provide 12 inch HDPE pipe from catch basin A to drain manhole A
- 9. Provide erosion controls to prevent sedimentation from entering street and Town stormwater collection system during construction.
- 10. Provide referenced landscape plan for review.
- 11. Install a solid fence on the top of the buffer berm to provide screening and sound mitigation.

Mr. Paradis added that there is no real noise abatement with foliage and that a solid fence is the best way to mitigate the noise.

Mr. Hogan – provided a handout with a depiction of the decibel scale and informed the board that he conducted a noise meter reading.

Board & Town Planner Discussion:

- There was a lengthy exchange of questions and comments between the Board members and the Applicant.
- Comments were related to noise abatement and how best to mitigate it. A solution was suggested to require garage doors with sound attenuation qualities and should open and close behind vehicles. Installing a solid fence, creating a wider berm between abutters and addition of more substantial plantings than proposed were also discussed.
- Ms. Loughnane noted that this lawfully existing non-conforming use and structure may continue.

Public Comments:

The following abutters commented on the project:

B. Fleming, 10 Lull Street

S. Zinno, 6 Lull Street

M. Reardon, 14 Lull Street

K. Holthaus, 14 Lull Street

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve EIDR for 14 Washington Street with the conditions that the garage doors remain closed, and that a revised landscape plan showing a sufficient berm with substantial plantings, appropriately spaced to provide a year-round impervious screen, be submitted to and approved by the Town Planner.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to close this hearing.

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 announced that this hearing will be immediately continued without testimony taken.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, December 2nd at 8:00 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider EIDR Approval of Proposed Alterations at Needham Bank – 341 Washington Street

Ch. Rafsky announced that this hearing will be immediately continued without testimony taken.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, Tuesday, December 16th at 8:00 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

New Business – Reserved for topics not reasonably anticipated to be discussed Draft Planning Board Minutes for Consideration

The following Planning Board Meeting Minutes drafts were presented to the Board for approval with edits made as requested.

$\cap A$	-28-	1.	4
()4	- /X-	- 4	4

05-05-14

05-13-14

06-10-14

07-08-14

07-15-14

08-05-14

09-02-14

09-30-14

07-30-14

10-14-14

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the above mentioned minutes with edits as received from board members.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Wiggin the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:50 p.m.

Next Meeting:

Monday, November 17th at 7:30 p.m. – Planning Board will attend Town Meeting, 200 Nahatan Street.

List of Documents:

LIST OF DOCUMENTS.			
University Station Signage & Way-finding Drawings prepared by Surface Matter Design 11-10-			
14			
BETA Review Memo, dated 1-10-14 to N. Loughnane from P. Paradis RE: Review of 14			
Washington Street			
Revised Site Plan - 14 Washington Street dated 11-05-14			
Photographs & Specifications of Landscape Materials – 14 Washington Street			
Close up of Plans – buffer area – 14 Washington Street			
Close up of Plans – landscape area at front of reconstructed addition – 14 Washington Street			
Copy of Decibel Scale – 14 Washington Street			
60W Full Cut-Off LED Wall Pack – illustration & lighting specifications			