#### Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Rafsky called the meeting to order at 7:33 p.m. WestCat TV was present and granted permission to videotape the meeting.

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

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

Ch. Rafsky opened the hearing by reading the legal notice and then welcomed the Applicant and several representatives: Matt McGovern and David Rosenberg co-owners of Prime Motor Group, a representative from Audi and a representative of Acura, David Mackwell of Kelly Engineering Group, and Attorney Paul Ayoub.

### Presentation by Matt McGovern, Vice President Prime Motor Group

Mr. McGovern gave a brief introduction of Prime Motor Group and gave highlights of the benefits of the project.

- Property at #375 & #411 Providence Highway are under agreement for purchase.
- Full re-development of #375 and #411 Providence Highway (Approximately 12 acres two buildings housing the following businesses: Pool & Patio Store, Kinder Care and K&G Men's Mart.) The buildings will be demolished and three, full service luxury car dealerships will be constructed on the site. (Porsche, Audi, and Acura.)
- A company mandate requires separate dealerships.
- Professionally run with a luxurious image; no banners, flags or balloons will be used.
- The addition of these businesses will provide approximately \$600,000 a year in real estate tax revenue and excise tax revenue for the Town of Westwood.
- The three new dealerships combined will have 165 jobs.
- Prime is locally owned and managed with its headquarters in Westwood.
- The site will be improved to comply with current stormwater regulations and will improve neighborhood conditions.
- Low traffic generator compared to a big box retail store

## Presentation by Dave Rosenberg, President Prime Motor Group

Architectural Highlights:

- Coming south on Rte. 1 will be Audi Westwood; Prime Acura and the Porsche Westwood. (Porsche will be located at the corner of Glacier/Rte. 1, Audi at the north end of the Rte. 1 and Acura in the middle, relocating from Walpole.)
- Audi's design is similar in design to current design; two stories of glass, raised racetrack in showroom, standard worldwide qualities. Acura's design is uses metallic components, very modern and uses a lot of glass. Porsche design is basically a replica of half of the building across the street.
- Every franchise has its own unique identity. There is heavy pressure from franchisor to use the standard branding images.

### **Board & Town Planner Discussion**

- At this point in the presentation Ch. Rafsky commented that while he understands the desire for and importance of brand and unique identities as a franchisor, he would have preferred something different for this area as it is an extension of the redevelopment of Glacier Drive and an entrance into Westwood and the Islington neighborhood.
- Ch. Rafsky asked the Applicant if he knew what the future use of 420 Providence Highway will be. (Mr. Rosenberg said that Prime owns the building, not the land. Prime's lease expires in 2020 and Mr.

Rosenberg said that Prime does not intend to put another franchise there. He said that he is unsure what the property owner's future plans are for the site.)

- Ch. Rafsky asked if there is a possibility that that these proposed designs could be amended to have a more "New England" feel. (Mr. Rosenberg said that the manufacturers can "strong-arm them" into using the factory standards and designs and expects a lot of pushback from them to amend designs.)
- Ch. Rafsky said that he understands the importance of keeping the character of the franchisor in the designs but also help the town keep its character as well. He added that this site plan review must determine whether these buildings fit in with the surroundings.
- A board member added that during the EIDR process for Prime Mercedes the Planning Board and Prime were able to mutually agree on a good design for the project and asked if that process could be repeated. (Mr. Rosenberg said that he expects that there will be conflict with the factory on this request.)
- Ch. Rafsky added that he would have liked Prime Motor Group to have met with the Planning Board prior to the public hearing in a pre-application conference to discuss design for the buildings. (Mr. Rosenberg responded that he and other representatives met with Ms. Loughnane in the summer and thought at that time it represented its design plans at that meeting.)
- Ms. Loughnane responded to Mr. Rosenberg's comments stating that Prime met with the members of the Land Use Committee in July and at that time she strongly encouraged Prime representatives to schedule a pre-application conference with the Planning Board prior to application and plan submission but they declined.
- Ch. Rafsky said that the board will work to find a way to keep the franchise character and that he would like prime to help the town keep its character too.
- A board member said that over the years there have been concerns with Prime's operation at 420 Providence Highway including repetitive violations of the Decision conditions; parking and display of vehicles on the grass and in unauthorized areas; unloading of vehicles onto the public street, etc. He stated that new facilities must be designed to prevent these problems. (Mr. Rosenberg said that the primary reason for this new project is that they have outgrown the current site.)
- A board member asked Mr. Rosenberg what the construction time frame is. (Begin construction in September 2015)
- Ms. Loughnane said the next steps are for the Planning Board to decide whether it needs a peer review consultant to provide at least an architectural and engineering peer review.
- Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane to estimate how long this process could take. Ms. Loughnane said that it could take 3-4 sessions or 6 sessions and depended on the responses of applicant based on the peer review. She reminded the board that this project also requires a Special Permit from the ZBA and approval of the Conservation Commission and that the Planning Board hearing should remain open while those hearings take place. Ms. Loughnane added that the Board should also take questions and comments from abutters who will likely have questions about the project.
- The Applicant's attorney Paul Ayoub asked Ch. Rafsky if he would allow the architect to continue the presentation to this evening to provide technical details of the project, so as to possibly answer some questions of the neighbors regarding drainage and lighting.

# Presentation by Engineer David Mackwell, Kelly Engineering Group Highlights:

• The site design has minimized cuts and fills & will maintain the relatively flat topography. Care has been taken to minimize any work in the existing wooded areas of the site, minimizing any cutting of trees over 6" in caliper and avoiding any impacts to adjacent resource areas. A detailed stormwater management analysis demonstrates that stormwater runoff rates will be decreased. A construction period Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be completed and filed with the DEP, EPA and Conservation Commission prior to any construction. Incorporating the SWPPP into the

construction documents will minimize potential soil erosion and the threat of air and water pollution. Stormwater runoff will be mitigated to ensure no impact to surrounding properties or resource areas.

- Vehicular safety for the site has been enhanced by eliminating and re-arranging the curb cuts on Glacier Drive and Wilson Way. Curb cuts and drive aisles have been arranged to provide all the customer and employee parking near the front of the site where the public entrance points are located.
- The site redevelopment will not impact any scenic views from publicly accessible places. The existing dated buildings will be removed. The proposed buildings and landscaping will enhance views of the site from all offsite locations.
- The proposed landscaping plan demonstrates screening of the parking from public view. A 15' wide landscaping strip designed in accordance with the bylaw will provide the necessary screening from public ways. Additional screening trees have been added to the existing wooded area located on the northerly portion of the site which will enhance the existing vegetated buffer between the residentially zoned properties located on Willard Circle and the site.
- The site landscaping plan will help minimize glare from headlights onto public ways. The proposed LED lighting plan has been designed in accordance with the bylaw and the parking lot lighting will not trespass onto adjacent ways or properties.
- The site is currently serviced by a municipal sewer system. Any hazardous substances associated with the servicing of automobiles will be stored and used within the buildings in accordance with all state and federal requirements. Any floor drains in the building will be equipped with oil/ water separators and connected to the municipal sanitary sewer system as required.
- Waiver Requests: submission of a model; request to waive parking stall dimensions from 8'.8" x 18'6" to 9'x18' stalls; request waiver of 5' setback for public access planting area to allow 3' on side of Audi and request waiver of the submission of a survey of all significant trees on the property.

### **Board & Town Planner Discussion continued:**

- A board member recommended against waiver of significant tree markings and wants to see all large trees slated for removal. He added that it appears that some trees at the front and back are proposed to be removed and suggested of waiver of tree marking on side where trees will be saved is acceptable.
- A board member commented that he does recall flooding of this area adjacent to the neighborhood and said that the flooding problems must be solved and this is a good opportunity to improve conditions for the abutters.
- A board member commented that with the technological advances of LED lighting it can be more
  directional and prevent intrusion on the neighboring properties. Dimming lighting, lower poles and
  possible addition of surveillance cameras can reduce the need for lighting of the past designs.
- Ch. Rafsky reviewed what the next steps of the board will be going forward: select and approve the choice for peer review consultant at the next meeting on January 13<sup>th</sup>. He asked the Applicant how much time it would need to respond to a peer reviewer's report once received. (Mr. Rosenberg said that two weeks would be enough time to respond with comments to the peer reviewer's report.) Ch. Rafsky suggested February 10<sup>th</sup> as the date to continue this public hearing.
- Ms. Loughnane said that a deposit will be due from the Applicant for peer review fees following consultant selection on January 13<sup>th</sup>.

### **Public Comments:**

P. Kelly, 107 Willard Circle – expressed concerned about flooding, maintaining town character; lighting and noise.

C. Poreda, 155 Willard Circle – commented that there are only a few feet of trees and not a forest between the proposed project and the abutting neighborhood. He is less concerned about the use on the property and more concerned about effects on the neighborhood regarding lighting and the need

for shielding it; noise mitigation and timing of car deliveries. He said that the culvert under Wilson Way needs to be rebuilt so as to stop the flooding of South Brook. He said that he doesn't see any point in revising the design of the buildings.

- M. Grille, 80 Wilson Way said that he reviewed the plans and agreed that the buildings do not necessarily need redesign. He is concerned about the view from Wilson Way and wants to see the back of the proposed buildings to be architecturally interesting as opposed to what is there now, blank facades without windows.
- S. Sylvester, 123 Willard Circle Said his biggest concern is flooding and how water leaves the site; concerned about the large amount of impervious surface. He suggested the use of trees, berms and stockade fences. Other concerns: hearing car alarm systems going off all night; the amount of gasoline in stored vehicles and the effects of construction on the Algonquin Gas transmission line. He also said that the entrance onto Everett Street from Glacier Drive is horrendous.
- M. Terry, attorney representing Frugal Fannies expressed concern about the traffic at the intersection of Everett and Glacier Drive; traffic may be worse with the opening of University Station. Concerned about maintenance issues of the "orphan road" between Mercedes and McDonald's; also questioned whether the existing pylon sign advertising Frugal Fannies will be lost.
- M. Verrault, Representative from Carruth Capital, 1690 Glacier Ave., commented that Prime has been a great neighbor, taking care of flooding on Glacier Drive and would love to see mixed use, but understands this is a constrained site. He said that this project will be a great improvement over existing conditions and the Planning Board shouldn't kill the project with delays.
- F. Tannous, 89 Farm Lane made several commented in favor of the project as a producer of tax dollars for the town; current site is an eyesore.
- R. Lavoie, 5 Stonegate Lane commented that the tax revenue expected from this project is very important for the town and added that Prime has been a very supportive community member.
- O. Doxer, owner of Frugal Fannies commented that his greatest concern is with life safety concerns related to the "no-name/orphan" street.
- Ch. Rafsky informed that the street is partially owned by both the Towns of Norwood and Westwood and any questions about the maintenance of it should be directed to the Town's street commissioners, the Board of Selectmen.
- Mr. Rosenberg said to the board that he understood the neighbors' concerns about light, sound and visual pollution and Prime will respond appropriately.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to authorize the Town Planner to request two to three engineering review proposals for this project.

Ms. Loughnane clarified that the proposals will be sent to planning board members via email and a consultant will be chosen and engaged to work on this project proposal before the continuation of this hearing.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, February 10, 2015 at 8:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room,

50 Carby Street.

# Discussion of Landscape and Lighting Compliance Issues – 335 Providence Highway Town Planner's Summary:

- Ms. Loughnane informed the board that she heard from residential abutters to 335 Providence
  Highway who expressed concerns about recent changes to the light levels on their properties which
  they attribute to the use of exterior wall lights on the rear of the AAA building. These abutters have
  also expressed concerns that some of the evergreen plantings required at the time this property
  received EIDR Approval have since died and have not been replaced.
- Ms. Loughnane suggested that the Board allow the abutters to air their concerns.

### **Summary of Discussion:**

- P. Kelly, 107 Willard Circle lights on the back and side of the building shine in her backyard. She said that wall lights were kept off for years, but were turned on this summer.
- J. Federico, property owner wall lights on the back of the building were installed when the building was constructed. The lights are shielded and are on a timer to go off at 8:30 p.m. He said that he could eliminate some lights and improve shielding. He said that he wants to be a good neighbor.
- P. Kelly, Willard Circle expressed concern about the multiple dead arborvitaes that were required to be planted by the Planning Board for screening noise and wick water. He said that the plants need to be replaced.
- S. Burke, Willard Circle said that neighbors do not have many issues with the property owner who she says has been responsive over the years although not recently regarding the calls in the summer about the lights on until 8:30 p.m. She agreed with the comments about the loss of vegetation and the need for replacement of the arborvitaes. The noise from the air conditioning units and line of view are much worse than when arborvitaes were alive.
- Ch. Rafsky suggested that the Town Planner contact the DPW Director to conduct a light meter reading and analysis by the Town Engineer and make any recommendations for changes.
- J. Federico, property owner said that two of the four wall lights on the side of the building near the Kelly's must stay on for safety reasons and said that he will have an electrician install better shields on these fixtures. He also said that he will replace arborvitaes that have died and plant an additional 7-8, 20' high arborvitaes in the spring because he wants to be a good neighbor.
- P. Kelly, Willard Circle said that the existing fixtures are not shielded.
- J. Federico, property owner responded and said that the wall lights are shielded but may need adjustment.

### Motion/Action Taken:

No motion needed.

Ch. Rafsky said that the Planning Board will follow-up on this matter`` and continue this discussion at its meeting on January 13th.

# Continuation of Public Hearing to Consider Proposed Far Reach Road Definitive Subdivision Town Planner's Summary

Electronic copies of a revised OSRD plan for the proposed 4-lot Far Reach Road Subdivision were emailed

to the Planning Board members. The applicant is requesting the board's feedback prior to deciding whether or not to submit an OSRD application for the land off Far Reach Road.

Ch. Rafsky reopened the public hearing and welcomed Chris Milton, attorney for (applicant) Old Grove Partners, LLC and engineer John Bensley from Beals & Thomas.

## Presentation by John Bensley, Beals & Thomas

Highlights:

- OSRD Yield calculation would allow for six lots but the Applicant is only proposing four residential lots with an average lot size of 45,455 sf (1.04 acres)
- Includes a small cul-de-sac with turnaround circle to meet Fire Standards.
- Lots 2 & 3 have hammerhead turnaround, 13' width of pavement with 3' wide gravel shoulders (Ms. Loughnane informed Mr. Bensley that the fire department requirement is actually 14' width of pavement and 2' wide gravel shoulders.)
- Open Space area is 194,417 sf which is 50.2% of the total tract
- Non-buildable land within the Open Space includes 14,361 sf of wetlands and 34,555 sf of deed restricted land "To Remain in a Natural State"
- Plan shows 30' perimeter buffer
- Lot 3 & 4 contain some wetland areas with sufficient upland area
- Prefers not to file a Special Permit for a shared driveway
- No waivers are required
- In accordance with the bylaw, they would like a reduction of frontage beyond 75 feet to allow for a shorter cul-de-sac
- Would consider redrafting lots to remove wetlands.

## **Board Questions & Comments:**

There was a brief exchange of questions and comments.

- A board member asked if country drainage will be used. (Shallow rain gardens)
- A board member asked if the applicant if they would consider having shared driveways as opposed to 4 separate ones.
- A board member said he would like to see changes to the driveways. (Mr. Bensley said that they would consider a layout with fewer driveways if the board could approve under OSRD.
- Board members generally agreed that it would prefer that all wetland areas are located in the Open Space area.
- A board member asked if a shared driveway design would require a cul-de-sac style turn around.
- A board member expressed concern about the need for substantial re-grading and asked the applicant to retain as much natural vegetation as possible.

#### **Public Comments:**

G. Silver, 108 Far Reach Road – asked if a peer review consultant is expected to review the project; asked if sewer ejection pumps are still intended; asked where on the lots would the houses be built. (Mr. Bensley said ejection pumps are still intended; Mr. Milton said there will be predetermined building envelopes on each lot.)

G. Silver, 108 Far Reach Road – asked what the required setback from wetlands is. (35') Asked if open space would remain in perpetuity (yes)

D. Odeh, 416 Far Reach Road – Stated that according to the bylaw, the open space should be visible from the road; asked if any of the new lots will need fill to bring grade up. (Mr. Bensley said that lot 4 will need fill.) (Mr. Milton said that if the wetlands on lot 4 & 3 are moved into the open space area, this will bring the open space to the front and be visible from the street.)

B. Waterhouse, Far Reach Road – stated concern about the undeveloped lot across from Lot 4 and the defoliation of buffer of trees and visibility of street. (Mr. Bensley said that removing trees is necessary when grading but they will leave trees that do not need to be disturbed and would add plants and trees.)

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to waive the application fees for the OSRD application.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, February 10<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

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

#### **Town Planner's Summary:**

• Mr. Loughnane reported that she received a request from the Applicant's attorney to continue this hearing without testimony to the February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **Board & Town Planner Discussion:**

 Ch. Rafsky stated that he would prefer to hear about the reason for the delay sooner, at a meeting of the Planning Board in January. He asked Ms. Loughnane to request that the applicant attend the meeting on January 27<sup>th</sup> and provide the board with a full update on the status of the ZBA application.

## **Public Comments:**

None

### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor continue this hearing until Tuesday, January 27<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that tonight's agenda stated that this hearing would be continued to Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> and expressed concern that abutters will rely on this information and not come to the January 27<sup>th</sup> meeting. In addition, Ms. Loughnane said that the Building Commissioner has agreed to begin assessing fees for the zoning violation if the Applicant misses the January ZBA filing deadline.

#### Motion to reconsider:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to amend the previous motion and to continue this hearing to Tuesday, February 24<sup>th</sup> at 8:00 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

## Pre-Application Conference for Proposed New Fire Station 2 – 300 Washington Street

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Don Walter and Rick Almeida from Dore & Whittier Architects, Mark Gabrielle from Parr Corp. and the other representatives. Goal is to get the board's feedback on the plan revisions, file EIDR with the Planning Board by the end of January and to submit this for a bid before May 2015 Town Meeting.

## **Presentation of Revised Plans**

Mark Gabrielle gave a walk-through of the revised site plans of the new Fire Station 2 based on the

December 2<sup>nd</sup> presentation and comments of the board.

- Explained the relocation of the crosswalk on Washington Street
- Showed additional parking near the East Street entrance and additional work remains here.
- Discussed stormwater management system; tie into water system; reuse of existing gas, sewer and electrical systems
- May end up relocating space to side of driveway apron, so as to avoid existing underground utilities.
- A traffic study will be conducted

Don Walter presented the floor plans and elevations.

- Floor plan is essentially the same.
- Brick face on ground level with a cementitious board above.
- Explained desire to obtain commercial look for the first floor, residential look for living quarters
- Noted changes to the roof line dropped apparatus bay roof line with lower ridge and added dormers
- A clock tower is proposed
- Explained fascia board for signage
- Showed remaining elevations and noted there would be an additional windows on the second floor
- Explained hip roof would have flat center with membrane roof allowing for hip roof over large area without excessive height
- Plans call for building to be constructed so as to be solar-ready

#### **Board & Town Planner Discussion:**

- A board member asked if there would be a differentiation in pavement materials for sidewalk and driveway. (Mr. Gabrielle said the apron and sidewalk would be concrete but a different color of concrete.)
- A board member suggested that engineers consider tightening the street radius. (Engineer said this has been tightened up.)
- A board member asked what the material is above the apparatus doors.
- A board member asked a question about the hip roof over the apparatus bay. (Signage)
- A board member asked if the building can accommodate solar panels on the south roof
- Ch. Rafsky stated that the revised plans are clearly responsive to the board's comments and suggested that the proponent should proceed to EIDR filing.

#### **Public Comments:**

None

#### Motion/Action Taken:

None needed.

# Pre-Application Conference for Proposed OSRD Development – 615 High Street Town Planner's Summary:

The prospective purchaser of 615 High Street, Patrick Geraghty and his engineer Edmond Spruhan of Peter Nolan & Associates, LLC were present to discuss a proposed OSRD, instead of an SRD at 615 High Street.

#### **Highlights of the Presentation:**

• Mr. Spruhan presented the proposed OSRD concept plan to the board depicting four house lots. Two new single family house lots allowed as of right, and a density bonus of one extra lot with the preservation of the existing historic structure on lot 1 requiring a Special Permit. These lots would be

serviced by a site drive on the left hand side of the existing house to a cul-de-sac less than 500' in length.

#### **Public Comments:**

- P. Young, High Street Said that this plan is devastating because all three house lots would be right along the property line.
- L. Cohen, Hillcrest Place said that the rear of this parcel has remained undeveloped for hundreds of years and asked why this land is considered buildable now.
- D. Dutton, High Street said that this is too much development crammed into a small space; proposed design is outrageous.
- M. Waters, Birch Tree Drive asked where the fourth structure is proposed to be located. (Mr. Spruhan responded that a fourth lot has been identified on the plans based on setbacks.) The resident asked how the yield calculation will be determined. (Ms. Loughnane explained the four steps of the yield calculation and said that the result is that the fourth lot is considered the density bonus because of the preservation of the existing historic structure and the remainder of Lot 4 is larger than the other three lots and has greater than 50% open space.)
- L. Cohen, Hillcrest Place said that this project is only donating and saving wetlands. She said that there is no open space gain, as wetlands couldn't be developed anyway. (Ch. Rafsky said that this this parcel could have been developed as a conventional subdivision with more houses with a longer road, destroying more land. Preservation of land is not the same thing as what makes land buildable or not buildable.)
- P. Young, High Street asked if board members have been to this site. He said that the first proposed new house is shown where land falls 27' sharply downhill. (Ch. Rafsky said that these plans are still in concept form.)
- M. Waters, Birch Tree Drive asked who has the authority to determine the suitability of these plans. (Ch. Rafsky and Ms. Loughnane both said that this OSRD plan with the density bonus (fourth lot) is allowed only by Special Permit, but this OSRD with three lots is a use allowed as of right that would be reviewed through the site plan review process and it may not be denied.)
- B. Moore, Beverly Lane asked what the required road setback or buffer is from abutters. (Ms. Loughnane said that a 30' perimeter setback is required for an OSRD and there is no roadway setback required for a subdivision.) Who would own the open space?

#### **Board Questions/Comments:**

- A board member asked if there are any slopes greater than 15% in these plans. (Ms. Loughnane said that the slopes look steep but will need to be reviewed by an engineer.)
- A board member said this is a tough parcel; moving away from developing this parcel under SRD is a
  aood thing and he like the use of OSRD to preserve the historic house.
- A board member said if a conventional subdivision was proposed it could be done as of right and the historic house could be demolished as we do not have a demolition delay bylaw in place.
- A board member said that he understands the wishes of the abutters to see this lot remain as is but stated that property owners have rights to develop their land. He applauded applicant's attempt to minimize impacts of development and encouraged the applicant to find a way to reduce impact on abutters. He said that he doesn't think this subdivision is appropriate.

Patrick Geraghty commented that he has been before the board at least five times and has changed his plans according to the Planning Board's feedback and public comments and said that he appreciates its time. He said that it has been a challenge to create these plans while keeping the existing historic structure. He said that it would be a much easier three lot subdivision if they chose to tear down the existing structure and put the road down the right side of the property.

## Motion/Action Taken:

None needed.

## Consideration of Alternative Sign Package Approval for Chipotle – University Station

Paul Cincotta was present to discuss the altered proposed window screening design for the new restaurant in Building Q – Chipotle.

#### Discussion:

- A sample of the perforated frit was installed in one of the street front windows that board members viewed over the weekend. The white lettering and pepper would be printed on grey panel. White perforated frit would be applied directly to inside of glass. Lighting will be installed between the panel and window to allow shadow movement at night.
- A board member asked if the window will look like a bright sign at night. (Mr. Cincotta said the light will be filtered by the panel and the frit.)
- A board member asked if this is the proposed solution for Chipotle only and will others propose
  different sign plans. (Mr. Cincotta said that this approval is only requested for Chipotle.)
- Ch. Rafsky noted the location of dumpster enclosure blocks view of side window from University
  Avenue. He acknowledged successful design of buildings to break up spaces. He said that he is no
  longer concerned by the massive wall/window signs and that the final effect does not look like too
  much logo.

## Motion/Action Taken:

## UNIVERSITY AVENUE MIXED USE DISTRICT CHIPOTLE SIGNAGE

At a hearing of the Westwood Planning Board held on December 16, 2014

#### Motion made by Planning Board Member Bruce H. Montgomery, 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) Votes to approve the signage and Window Screening Displays described in the document entitled, "Chipotle Sign Plan" submitted to the Planning Board by Westwood Marketplace Holdings LLC on December 16, 2014 (the "Chipotle Sign Plan");
- (2) Finds that the signage and Window Screening Displays described in the Chipotle Sign Plan addresses the needs of the development and traffic safety while appropriately balancing any impacts on the surrounding environment;
- (3) Finds that the Chipotle Sign Plan materially conforms to the Master Development Plan and supporting documents on file with the Town Clerk; and
- (4) Incorporates the Chipotle Sign Plan by amending and supplementing that certain 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" and that certain "Construction Sign Package", each approved by the Planning Board on October 14, 2014, and as further amended by that certain "University Station Signage and Wayfinding Package" and that certain "David's Bridal Sign Plan", each approved by the Planning Board on November 10, 2014.

Motion seconded by Planning Board Member Steven H. Olanoff.

#### **Record of Vote:**

The following members of the Planning Board voted to issue this Alternate Sign Package Approval and Conformance

Determination: Bruce H. Montgomery, Steven H. Olanoff, Christopher A. Pfaff, Steven M. Rafsky, and John J. Wiggin.

The following members Planning Board voted to oppose this Alternate Sign Package Approval and Conformance Determination Conformance Determination: None.

# UNIVERSITY AVENUE MIXED USE DISTRICT DAVID'S BRIDAL SIGNAGE

At a hearing of the Westwood Planning Board held on November 10, 2014

### Motion made by Planning Board Member Steven H. 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) Votes 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) Finds 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.

#### Motion seconded by Planning Board Member John J. Wiggin.

#### **Record of Vote:**

The following members of the Planning Board voted to issue this Alternate Sign Package Approval: Bruce H. Montgomery, Steven H. Olanoff, Christopher A. Pfaff, Steven M. Rafsky, and John J. Wiggin.

The following members Planning Board voted to oppose this Alternate Sign Package Approval: None.

# UNIVERSITY AVENUE MIXED USE DISTRICT PROJECT APPROVALS CONFORMANCE AND PDR AMENDMENTS

At a hearing of the Westwood Planning Board held on November 10, 2014

#### Motion made by Planning Board Member Bruce H. 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:

- (5) Votes 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.

#### (6) Makes 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.

### Motion seconded by Planning Board Member Christopher A. Pfaff.

#### Record of Vote:

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

The following members Planning Board voted to oppose this Conformance Determination: None.

# UNIVERSITY AVENUE MIXED USE DISTRICT SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING PACKAGE

At a hearing of the Westwood Planning Board held on November 10, 2014

## Motion made by Planning Board Member Steven H. 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) Votes 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) Finds 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.

## Motion seconded by Planning Board Member Christopher A. Pfaff.

#### **Record of Vote:**

The following members of the Planning Board voted to issue this Alternate Sign Package Approval: Bruce H. Montgomery, Steven H. Olanoff, Christopher A. Pfaff, Steven M. Rafsky, and John J. Wiggin.

The following members Planning Board voted to oppose this Alternate Sign Package Approval: None.

### Discussion RE: Proposed Revisions to Gateway Park – University Station

Highlights – Paul Cincotta, NE Development

- The original retaining wall adjacent to a stormwater management area was allowing seepage of stormwater onto the roadway during storm events with the potential for flooding of the intersection during the times when the water level exceeds the roadway elevation.
- A revised design has been developed and will eliminate seepage from the wall. A gravity wall will
  also be installed and will require that a multi-use path be relocated closer to University Avenue than
  originally intended.
- The tightest point of the multi-use path between the curb and sidewalk goes from 6.5' wide to 5' wide. The rest of it has a comfortable green space and is substantially intact with the original design.
- The river rock and salvage stone rock is about 2' thick and this will be the stone veneer to waterproof this.
- The pond is working fine with some areas having variable depths with certain plantings so as to prevent stagnation of water.
- This revision will be approved as a field change by the town engineer.

# Project Identification Signs Board & Town Planner Discussion:

- Ms. Loughnane reminded the board that at the last meeting it requested the addition of "Westwood,
  Massachusetts" on project identification signs. Mr. Cincotta had previously disagreed with the
  placement of "Westwood Massachusetts" on the pylon signs and tonight has suggested an
  alternative placement of signs mounted on stone walls at the following locations: Harvard
  Street/University Avenue and Blue Hill Drive/University Avenue.
- Board members generally agreed with the placement and appearance of the signs mounted to the stone walls.
- One board member suggested that the space between Wegmans and Target is an amenity or "people space" that should have placards put up about the history of the community and some other kind of treatment about "arriving at Westwood".
- Another board member suggested adding "Westwood Massachusetts" below the wayfinding sign.
- Mr. Cincotta suggested that a mock-up sign could be created and placed on the wall for the board's approval.

# New Business – Reserved for topics not reasonably anticipated to be discussed University Station Street Signal Operations Update

- Mr. Cincotta reported that NSTAR is scheduled to install permanent power for street lights and traffic
  control boxes during the week of Christmas or by the first of the year. Mr. Cincotta said that the order
  of power installation will be: Station Drive (Rosemont Road), Harvard Street and Canton/University.
  Canton/University may be first to get permanent power. Power installation to the two site entrances
  will be last priority as they don't need to operational until the project opens.
- Mr. Cincotta said that this Saturday, 12/21, permanent roadway striping of University Ave. in its permanent striping configuration. On Monday the traffic will be moved to its normal operation on both sides of the median. Periodic lane closure close to construction areas will occur.

#### Question about Timing of the Release of Names of Tenants and Openings for the Project

- Mr. Cincotta distributed a draft opening schedule with updates in the core retail area. March-April –
  most of core retail will be open; Blue Hills Bank in late August and Wegmans around Labor Day.
  Lifetime Fitness is hoping for Memorial Day opening; Epoch Assisted Living by July; Gables by Hanover by May; Bonefish Grill Early May; Not Your Average Joes August opening.
- Aerial Photos of late November were distributed and are also available on the Town's website.

• When will MA DOT make the cul-de-sac on Blue Hill Drive? (Right now utility relocations are taking place and then the cul-de-sac will be in place in mid-February.) DOT will put up advance warning signs about the new dead end.

## Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:30 p.m.

## **Next Meeting:**

Tuesday, January 13th at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street

# List of Documents:

| Memo to PB from Peter Nolan & Associates, LLC 12-04-14 RE: proposed OSRD @615 High St.     | PDF |
|--|-----|
| Proposed OSRD Sketch Plan  |     |
| Memo to N. Loughnane & J. Bina from BETA 12-16-14 RE: Canton & Blue Hill Dr. Wall Revision | PDF |
| Letter to N. Loughnane from P. Zahka 12-15-14 RE: 341 Washington St. Needham Bank          | PDF |
| Memo to N. Loughnane from Beals & Thomas, Inc. 12-12-14 RE: 4-lot OSRD Concept Plans       | PDF |
| 4-Lot OSRD Concept Design Worksheet  |     |
| 2010 Aerial Photo for 335 Providence Highway discussion                                    | PDF |
| Copy of 2002 Planning Board Decision EIDR – 335 Providence Hwy.                            |     |