Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Wiggin called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

Present: Planning Board members Jack Wiggin, Steve Olanoff, Bruce Montgomery, Steve Rafsky and Chris Pfaff. Staff: Town Planner Nora Loughnane and Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba recorded the minutes. (Mr. Pfaff recused himself from all University Station discussion and agenda items.)

Ch. Wiggin asked if any member of the public wished to record the meeting; there were no requests. (WestCAT videographer was absent until approximately 1.5 hours after the start of the meeting, at which time the meeting was being recorded.)

Ch. Wiggin welcomed the Proponent's development team: John Twohig from Goulston & Storrs, Paul Cincotta from N.E. Development, and Ray Murphy from Eastern Development. Also present Town Peer Review Consultants from Beta Engineering, led by Merrick Turner; Proponent's Consultants Tetra Tech, and members of the Finance & Warrant Commission.

Consideration of University Station Roadway Layout Plans for Recommendation to Board of Selectmen

Special Counsel Gareth Orsmond was present to discuss the University Station Roadway Layout Plans and explained that in accordance with Ch. 41, Section 811, the Board of Selectmen is seeking the Planning Board's recommendation for these plans. Click here to view University Station Roadway Layout Plans.

Highlights of Presentation:

- Mr. Orsmond said that some roadways associated with the prior project are required to be discontinued. Some roadways will require relocation and some widening, slight reconfigurations and temporary construction easements required, associated with Special Town Meeting Warrant Article 2.
- Mr. Orsmond informed the board that these plans have been thoroughly reviewed by Town Engineer John Bertorelli.

Board Questions and Comments:

- A board member asked for an explanation of the colors shown on the plans. (Response: Green on plans indicates areas that require taking of a highway easement interest from a property owner; Blue on plans indicates temporary construction easements.)
- A board member asked for a brief description on the process of taking a temporary construction easement. (Response: Assuming approval of Article 2 of Special Town Meeting, the Board of Selectmen would be granted authorization to carry out this process, with 120 days. All parties would be noticed.)

Public Comments:

None.

Town Planner's Comments:

None.

Motion/Action Taken:

Mr. Rafsky moved that pursuant to Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 41, Section 811, the Planning Board:

- (1) report to the Board of Selectmen in favor of the roadway layouts, alterations, relocations, and discontinuances proposed pursuant to Article 2 of the 2013 Special Town Meeting Warrant, substantially as shown on the plan set entitled "University Station Warrant Article Exhibit Plans," prepared by WSP Sells, dated April 24, 2013, filed with the Town Clerk on April 26, 2013, and the plan entitled "Street Issues Discussion Purposes," prepared by Tetra Tech, revised through November 30, 2012, also filed with the Town Clerk on April 26, 2013;
- (2) recommend to Special Town Meeting passage of Article 2 of the 2013 Special Town Meeting Warrant; and
- (3) direct the Town Planner to send to the Board of Selectmen a memorandum that reflects the Planning Board's report and recommendation on Article 2 of the 2013 Special Town Meeting Warrant.

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

The following member of the Planning Board abstained from voting due to a possible conflict of interest: Christopher A. Pfaff.

University Station Project Manager Chris McKeown – Discussion RE: Access Alternatives at 190 University Avenue

Mr. McKeown was present to update the Planning Board on discussions between him, Proponent and Frank Ryan, business owner of 190 University Avenue, related to proposed access alternatives due to future roadway layout changes affecting #190 University Avenue. The proposed roadway change will prohibit left-hand turns exiting this business establishment.

Mr. Ran, who was present at the meeting, commented that is satisfied with the proposed access alternative, Option #2, (creating a driveway behind #190, with a signalized intersection).

Click here to view this plan.

University Station Proposal – Planning Board Work Session – Plan Refinement and Phase 1 Conformance Review

Architecture Peer Review Presentation by Mike Sonesi, KAO Architects Highlights of Presentation:

- In general, questions, concerns, and issues have been satisfactorily addressed by the Proponent's consultants' memorandum.
- Conceptual Design of Restaurants A, B & C have been received and will be subject to refinement in the future conformance determinations. Click here to view these plans.
- Window glazing recommended for Wegman's.
- Retail Buildings A-C has been reviewed and revisions have been accepted Sidewalk continuity discussed relocation of northwest exterior stairways and to increase plantings along pier/fence along Harvard Street.

Champagne Meeting Room

- Retail Buildings N, O & Q with rear elevations on University Avenue Window openings should be glazed with glass.
- Overall roof design and color with regard to sustainability More information will be requested during the construction document development process.
- All roof facilities, equipment, and exposed backs of facades should be clean, orderly and neatly finished.
- The summary table shall include building heights and demonstrate overall compliance with the zoning bylaws.
- Hanover Residential Components satisfied with these plans.
- Target satisfied with this component.
- Closeout document will be prepared and submitted to the Planning Board.

Board Questions and Comments:

- Will signs be approved now? (Ms. Loughnane said that signs would be reviewed in CDA 1 & CDA 2, following Town Meeting.)
- When will the restaurants be developed and where is the parking for restaurants A, B & C?
 (Ms. Loughnane said that restaurants will be developed in later core development areas.
 She identified the locations of the proposed restaurants and parking lots on the plans.)
- A board member is concerned about the look of the front of the development, as it is actually the backsides of the buildings.
- A board member would like to see a better view or "statement" (possibly with the use of signs) on the southern entrance. (Mr. Sonesi said that this will be studied later in the project.)

**Ch. Wiggin acknowledged the videographer's presence and granted WestCAT permission to record this meeting from this point, through the end of the meeting. **

Urban Design Peer Review by Don Leighton, Beta Engineering

Highlights of Presentation:

- Very satisfied with the Proponent's responses to comments on the urban design components.
- Project provides for a development with an interconnected system of circulation with a variety of transportation modes and will create an extensive pedestrian network throughout the site.
- The landscaping scope is comprehensive and anchored by notable open space areas at the northern gateway to the project, behind the DWWD wellhead and in the future retail village area.
- Landscaping is a critical link for the entire site running along the west side of University Avenue as a park with a wider sidewalk.
- Median Planting Design <u>(Click here to view these plans.)</u> Planning Board may accept a baseline of 9' planting islands. Mr. Twohig commented that the Proponent is committed to exploring alternative parking lot configurations so as to increase the amount of landscaping and frequency of planting islands to every two bays of parking. This Plan should be approved as drawn.

Board Questions and Comments:

• There was an exchange of questions and answers and minor comments during the

presentation.

- A board member said that making changes to plantings in the project should be considered a minor modification.
- Why don't storefronts line up with parking spaces? (The accessible parking spaces line up with storefronts.)
- A board member wants more trees in the parking lots.

Whitewood Parcel Screening – Shadley Associates, PC

Highlights of Presentation:

- 1. Original Westwood Station sound attenuation wall will remain in place.
- 2. Trees proposed and installed by the Westwood Station project: 133
- 3. Addition trees proposed on the new plans, before meeting with closest Whitewood Road neighbors: 148 trees plus 210 whips
- 4. Additional trees added to plans after meeting with Mr. Maloof: 25 evergreens, 83 pine whips.
- 5. Additional trees added to the plans after meeting with Mr. & Mrs. Peckinpaugh: 15 evergreens.
- 6. Trees currently proposed on the plan: 188 new trees, plus 293 whips.

(For more detail, please click here.)

Board Questions and Comments:

- Does this list include all the trees from the sound attenuation wall to the curb? (Yes.)
- In response to the public comment, and to provide an analogy, a board member mentioned that his property abuts NSTAR and his home is within 500' from the building. This is exactly the same as the distance between Whitewood Road resident, R. Maloof's property and the University Station project. This board member said that he has never had any issues with NSTAR and that constructing a berm on Maloof's property will not resolve anything.
- A board member said that Mr. Shadley's plans have covered the items outstanding.

Public Comments:

- R. Maloof, Whitewood Road said that he is clearly exposed to the apartment buildings and is not happy with the planting plan. He wants a berm for blockage.
- P. Peckinpaugh, Whitewood Road said that the impacts to her home are immediate; her home is 479' away from the apartment building. How will the cul-de-sac look? What am I going to see?
- N. Wynne, Wildwood Road She has nightmares about living so close to a large project under construction. She expressed overall dissatisfaction about the impacts of this project on her brother's, (R. Maloof) home.

Peer Review of Noise Impact Assessment Review by Rob O'Neal, Epsilon Associates, Inc.

Click here to view this document.

Highlights of Presentation:

Mr. O'Neal stated that in general, the sound level impact analysis for University Station conforms to best practices for community noise studies.

• Noise levels are within town standards

Champagne Meeting Room

- Use of noise-controlled HVAC technology should be made part of project approval conditions.
- Installation of 12' high sound barrier should be included as a condition of this project approval.
- Back-up alarm noise should be managed. Limit hours to avoid quietest night-time period.
- Noisy construction activities should be limited to daytime hours only.
- Mr. O'Neal responded to questions asked by residents.

Board Questions and Comments:

- No development shall be allowed which would result in noise standards being exceeded and if impacts are excessive; this will be addressed by the Planning Board. This would result in non-conformity of this aspect of the project.
- The Planning Board will follow the standards of the scientific margin of error standards for noise assessment.
- If there is excessive noise, a more formal monitoring program will be implemented.

Public Comments:

- P. Peckinpaugh, Whitewood Road What is the total impact of sound?
- N. Wynne, Wildwood Road wants to know what the scientific deviations of sound impact are. What is the margin of error of sound levels?

Update on Closeout Memos - Merrick Turner, BETA Group

- Mr. Turner reported that in addition to what the board has heard tonight, other final comment memos have been submitted including: <u>Fiscal Impacts</u>; <u>Traffic</u>; <u>Lighting</u>; <u>Utilities</u> and <u>Roadway</u>.
- Technical issues raised during the traffic review have been satisfactorily addressed and items that will continue to be tracked as the project moves forward include: Adaptive Signal Control; University Avenue Corridor Signal Coordination; University Avenue/Canton Street; University Avenue at Harvard Street; and University Avenue/Blue Hill Drive.
- Mitigation: Route 1A/Everett Street (Westwood) The Proponent has indicated that they are committed to preparing only design plans. Nahatan Street/Clapboardtree Street (Westwood) The Proponent is committed to preparing design documents and funding realignment of connector construction for this location. Route 1/University Avenue/Everett Street (Norwood) The Proponent identified and committed to design and construction of near-term safety improvements and design only for longer-term capacity improvements.

Board Questions and Comments:

• Has MassDOT been shown these plans? (Yes, Blue Hill Drive is at 25% design now. Proponent and Mr. Dahler are working with the consultant for the State.)

Peer Review Comments on Lighting by Power Engineers, LLC (Click here to view this memo.) SL-1

Light uniformity is poor on southbound approach to Rosemont Road. Suggest that Type F
fixture be used on both sides of University Avenue between Blue Hill Drive and Rosemont
Road.

Champagne Meeting Room

• Pole placement and proposed locations for signal equipment should be discussed.

SL-2 & SL-3

- Wall pack units will be necessary for "back of house" areas.
- Align second bay of fixtures in main parking lot. Move Type B fixture along Harvard St.

SL-6, SL-7 & SL-8

 Add fixtures to meadow area behind DWWD, various adjustments to spacing and types of fixtures.

LED Lighting

• The Proponent has identified its commitment to evaluation and implementation of LED technology in the updated list of Sustainability Initiatives.

Sustainability Initiatives by Tech Environmental

Click here to view this memo.

In a memo to the Planning Board, Peter Guldberg reported that University Station has committed to reducing overall energy use by more than 21%, but retains the flexibility to achieve these goals using measures to be refined at the time of the detailed design.

Site Design Initiatives & Building Design Initiatives were identified. (See memo for details.)

University Station Master Development Plan Materials Filed

Attorney John Twohig informed the board of the following:

- Eight, three-ring binders, Volumes 1-10, have been filed with the Planning Board and Town Clerk. The binders include reports, plans, studies, and other supporting materials that are required to be submitted to the Town for the project to be approved under the proposed University Station Mixed Use Overlay Zoning Bylaw.
- Each binder contains a Table of Contents, with reference tabs; a "Project Narrative" and a chart that lists various sections of the UAMUD Bylaw; documents that are required to be submitted under such bylaw sections and documents the proponent has submitted to fulfill each requirement and the tab where each document is located.

Motion/Action Taken:

Mr. Montgomery moved, as follows:

Pursuant to Section 9.8.12.2.1 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw, the Planning Board:

- (1) Vote to approve a Conformance Determination for the following areas shown on the plan entitled "University Avenue Mixed Use District, Master Development Plan," prepared by TetraTech, last revised March 22, 2013 (the "Master Development Plan"):
 - (i) Core Development Area 1 and Core Development Area 2;
 - (ii) the two Open Space Areas; and

Champagne Meeting Room

- (iii) the associated roadway improvements, including those on University Avenue, Rosemont Road, and Harvard Street, all as further described in documents on file with the Planning Board and the Westwood Town Clerk and in oral reports, written reports and other documentation delivered at this meeting by the Town's consultants and by the Proponent and its consultants. Such documents are indexed in a document entitled "University Station, UAMUD Bylaw Submission Documents, Table of Contents," dated April 26, 2013 (the "Final Plans and Materials"), which is also on file with the Planning Board and the Town Clerk. Beta's oral reports tonight shall be incorporated into written memoranda that shall become part of the Final Plans and Materials.
- (2) And, further, that the Planning Board makes the following findings:
 - (i) the Final Plans and Materials materially conform to the Master Development Plan and supporting materials on file with the Planning Board and the Town Clerk; and
 - (ii) the Final Plans and Materials are otherwise compliant with the standards and requirements set forth in Section 9.8 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw.
- (3) And, further, that this Conformance Determination shall not apply to project signage, which will be addressed pursuant to the Project Specific Signage Alternative provision at Section 9.8.10.12.
- (4) And, further, that this Conformance Determination shall take effect upon the passage of Article 1 of the May 6, 2013 Special Town Meeting, pursuant to which the above-referenced Section 9.8.12.2.1 will be formally adopted by the Town of Westwood.

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

The following member of the Planning Board abstained from voting due to a possible conflict of interest: Christopher A. Pfaff.

Consideration of Partial Release of Funds Pursuant to Tripartite Agreement for Philips EstatesTown Planner's Comments:

 Ms. Loughnane was informed by Deputy Director DPW Chris Gallagher about a request for release of subdivision funds for Philips Estates by PJMJ. Mr. Gallagher prepared Exhibit A – Estimate of Construction Costs, which provides important details to the board. <u>Click here to</u> review this document.

Board Questions and Comments: None.

Public Comments: None.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the requested partial release of funds from Three Hundred Ninety-eight Thousand Seven Hundred Forty-eight Dollars (\$398,748.00) to Three Hundred Forty-four Thousand One Hundred Seventy-one Dollars and Seventy-four Cents (\$344,171.74), in accordance with the Revised Construction Estimate attached as Exhibit A.

Consideration of proposed Minor Modification of Reynolds Farm SRD Special Permit to Permit Finished Basement with half bathroom in one unit

Highlights of Discussion & Board Comments:

Ed Musto and Attorney David Hern were present to request the board's consideration for a minor modification to allow a finished basement with a half-bathroom in the same unit. Attorney Hern said that this decision is not in the Planning Board's jurisdiction or any agency representing zoning because it concerns interior design/layout.

- Some board members disagreed with Mr. Hern's opinion and asked then what the purpose is of this discussion.
- A board member commented that the board's decision required that certain areas of these units were to remain unfinished.
- Some board members commented that this request for modification is inconsistent with the intent of the SRD bylaw. (The finished basement could possibly be used for a third bedroom. The bylaw conditions that there shall not be more than two bedrooms in any dwelling unit.)
- A board member said that the project should be built as approved.
- Mr. Musto said that original plans did not include basement floor plans and one room on the second floor showed space as "unfinished".

Town Planner's Comments:

 Ms. Loughnane said that this request for minor modification is not consistent with the plans as submitted and approved as a part of the Decision of the Special Permit. The plans showed interior areas with two unfinished areas.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted three votes in favor and two opposed, determining that this modification is considered minor and approved this modification of the Special Permit.

Continuation of Public Hearing for Revisions to Planning Board Rules and Regulations

Work continues on the revisions to the Planning Board Rules and Regulations. Ms. Loughnane informed the board that no new revisions have been distributed to the board since the last hearing and she requested that the board continue this hearing until a date specific, after Town Meeting.

Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Rafsky the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, May 28, 2013 at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne

Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, May 6th at 6:30 p.m., Westwood High School Cafeteria.

Adjournment

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 11:20 p.m.

List of Documents:

List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits

Links are listed throughout document.