### Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Montgomery called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and asked if anyone present wished to record the meeting. No requests were received. (WestCaTV was absent.)

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

# Consideration of Minor Amendments to EIDR for 920 High Street, Bibi's Café

Bibi's Café owners Ms. Fatenah Dowlatshahi and Mr. Kaveh Zafar were present before the board to discuss requested amendments to the approved landscaping plan.

### Requested Amendments:

- Ms. Dowlatshahi informed the board that Church Street abutter Patty Stewart has requested
  the planting of shrubs or trees instead of installing a wooden fence between the two
  properties, which was a condition of the EIDR approval. Ms. Dowlatshahi stated that Ms.
  Stewart was concerned that the wooden fence would be repeatedly damaged by her
  plow operator.
- As a condition of the EIDR Decision, three trees on the property were required to be
  preserved and the applicant was instructed to try to save a fourth tree. Ms. Dowlatshahi
  said that three of these trees and roots were damaged and subsequently removed because
  they were located near an existing retaining wall that ended up being demolished and then
  re-built, as recommended by the building department. One tree, the largest one was
  saved.
- Ms. Dowlatshahi informed the board that she is now seeking permission to add a retail component to the business which will now only have 12 seats instead of the approved 20 seats.

### **Board Questions & Comments:**

- Board members asked why has the number of seats changed? Has the building size changed? Ms. Loughnane replied that the building size is the same as shown on the approved plans.
- A board member commented that condition #8 of the approved EIDR Decision states ..."The Property Owner shall ensure..., ...that no retail takeout sales are conducted in association with the restaurant and/or bakery". Ms. Loughnane reminded the board that the original EIDR Approval allowed up to 20 seats, but specifically prohibited take-out sales due to the limited parking available on-site. She noted that, due to the size and shape of the lot, the applicant was only able to construct 7 on-site parking spaces. She noted that Ms. Dowlatshahi's latest proposal for 12 seats (3 spaces), 3 employees (2 spaces), and a take-out station (3 spaces) would require a minimum of 8 parking spaces where only 7 are provided.
- Board members asked why the owner wants to add a retail component. Ms. Dowlatshahi said that if she can't have the retail sales component, her business won't make it.
- Ms. Loughnane explained that the Planning Board was now being asked to amend the EIDR

Approval to remove the prohibition on take-out sales. She stated that the Board could only approve such amendment if the proposed business would be in compliance with the zoning requirements.

- Board members explained that the property has sufficient parking to be used either a restaurant or a retail bakery, but not both at the same time.
- A board member asked if the Planning Board could waive the minimum number of parking spaces required or if an abutting property owner would share a parking space. Ms. Loughnane said that the board could in certain cases issue a special permit to allow fewer parking spaces than required, based on the specific characteristics of a proposed use associated with a property, but she noted that there would have to be sufficient room on the property to allow for the construction of the minimum number of required spaces if they are eventually needed to serve a future use or an expansion of the proposed use. She stated that this section of the Zoning Bylaw is intended to allow for the paving of a limited number of parking spaces on a large lot in order to preserve the natural character of the land, but does not apply in this case with new construction on a very small lot.
- Board members discussed parking on Church Street and whether any other space is available for use by Bibi's café. They noted the existence of on-street parking spaces next to the Veteran's Park, which are often used by customers of other existing area businesses.
- Other board members stated that there has already been an issue with a lack of parking on the west end of Church Street to serve existing businesses, and that the town has received complaints from residents of the east end of Church Street about cars parking in front of their homes.
- Board members discussed the lack of planting area between 920 High Street and the Divina Day Spa/Church Street abutter. Ms. Dowlatshahi was asked to propose a species of shrub that could grow in the limited 2-foot wide planting space, provide the necessary screening, and withstand damage by Ms. Stewart's plow operator. She was unable to do so. Board members suggested the installation of a block or stone wall. Ms. Dowlatshahi said she would install the wooden fence as originally proposed.
- Board members discussed the removal of trees that had previously provided screening between Bibi's and the dry cleaner next door. Board members agreed that the removed trees should be replaced with new trees or shrubs.
- Ch. Montgomery told the owners that a new landscaping plan is required showing the proposed shrubs, including species, size and location, for approval by the Town Planner in accordance with condition #6 of the EIDR Approval.
- The chairman also advised the owner to submit a business plan for the proposed operation
  to the Building Commissioner so that he can make a determination about the appropriate
  use category and the sufficiency of parking to serve that use. He said that this written
  determination by the Building Commissioner must be submitted to the Planning Board
  before the board could consider amending the EIDR Approval condition prohibiting takeout sales.

Board members agreed that it would continue this discussion following receipt of a written determination by the building commissioner and the owner's submittal of amended landscaping plans.

This discussion was continued until Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.

\*\*\*

Ch. Montgomery welcomed the Proponent's development team: John Twohig from Goulston & Storrs and Paul Cincotta from N.E. Development. Also present were Dan Bailey and Gareth Orsmond, Special Counsels for the Town; Peer Review Consultants from Beta Engineering led by Merrick Turner; and the Proponent's Consultant, John Healy from SurfaceMatter Design.

### **Brief Update on University Station**

Paul Cincotta reported on the following:

- The relocation of Rosemont Road is underway, including utility discontinuation and relocation work with the coordination of Westwood DPW and the engineering staff. Weekly construction meetings have commenced.
- University Station site contractor D.W. White and the Westwood Fire Department jointly held an informational meeting for residents on August 14th, on proposed blasting during the University Station construction. The purpose of the meeting was to inform residents about the availability of pre-blast surveys for individual properties and to provide information on the potential impacts of blasting. Test blasts will be conducted in early September in the vicinity of the Wegman's pad.
- Pad preparation and delivery for Wegman's and Target is forthcoming.
- MEPA Certificate was issued on Friday.
- DOT coordination is still ongoing.
- Norwood and Canton off-site intersection improvements have been fine tuned.
- A cooperative agreement is in place with the Town of Canton.
- Meetings are ongoing with DWWD related to formalizing several agreements such as easements, pipelines, inspections etc.
- PDR application is being finalized for submission before the end of September for Lifetime Fitness (Harvard St. parcel).
- Design is underway for the assisted living facility (65 units) which will be developed by National Development. Preliminary meetings have been held with Fire Chief Scoble for public safety input on design plans. It is expected that a PDR application will be filed in October.
- University Station Village concept is in early stages of development.
- Residential developer Hanover Company's design development is advancing. Hanover has met with the building department regarding design.
- An introductory meeting with the building department staff and developer's building representatives (Target, Wegman's, Lifetime Fitness, Hanover Properties, National Development, New England Development and Eastern Development) regarding submission process, etc., is scheduled for September 19<sup>th</sup>.

Board Questions & Comments: None.

Consideration of Proposed University Station Signage Package

John Healy of Surface Matter Design was present to discuss the Signage & Way-finding Master Plan. (Click here to view this document.)

# First, Mr. Cincotta made a few comments:

- Plan is preliminary, fairly basic. No detailed information for office and village areas yet.
- Two gateway signs will incorporate a stone theme with stone taken from the site.
- Two types of retail pylons at each end of the site.
- Hanover Residential Monument sign at University and Rosemont intersection.
- Assisted Living Monument sign at corner of wellhead-park.
- Lifetime Fitness & office building Monument sign at corner of Harvard & University intersection.
- Wayfinding/directional signs are mostly on University Avenue, which will be placed in the grass strip. Signs will be a mix of real names and categories, including arrows. (Approximately 12' high, within the 8' grass strip, set back 2' from the curb.)
- Only monument signs will be lit.

# Comments by John Healy, Surface Matter Design:

- Style, cohesiveness and consistency in design are most important.
- University Station horizontal, amber-colored sign may change slightly, halo illumination with LED's.
- Wayfinding signs will be based on legibility and the speed of travel in areas of placement.
   Will not be illuminated. One side of sign will have 4-5 lines of text and the other side of the sign may have a brand statement and a texture.
- Hierarchy of signs two anchors at top, double sided with cutout logo.
- Multiple colors will be used, based on brands and the diversity of logos.

#### **Board Questions & Comments:**

- Is the design and color shown on the plans definite for the University Station signs? (Not sure, a logo may be added, color may change. The design is still in flux.)
- What is the proposed finish on signs? (Satin finish.)
- Why aren't directional signs lit? (Signs will have reflective coatings and reflective letters, which will be activated by vehicle headlights. Street lights and ambient light will assist with reading them as well.)
- How high is the A5 (University Station ID, building mounted) sign? (Approximately 20-26', thought it will be further analyzed.)
- A board member suggested using "Westwood" in the gateway signs.
- Are corner sign locations being coordinated with DOT? (Yes.)
- Will there be a sign at Canton and University intersection? (No.)
- What will the sign look at the embankment / grade change area? (The base of sign will be 4-5' higher than the sidewalk; 25' tall at that location.)

### Peer Review Comments from Beta Group, Inc.:

• Complimented the consistency of design, suggested that the amber color wraps around the signs; suggested a wider base for the stone.

- Suggested incorporating address numbers into the University Station gateway signs and other areas. (Will review public safety and postmaster requirements.)
- How will these signs integrate with proposed regulatory signage? (Mr. Cincotta said that he would look at the design plans and get back to Beta.)
- The two pylons at south and north drives for the pad buildings should be studied with respect to these tight corners. (Mr. Cincotta agreed and said that this will be studied.)

### **Public Comments:**

• P. Peckinpaugh - How tall are the signs along University Ave.? (8' above grade, 12.5' tall)

# University Station Land Taking Update: Dan Bailey & John Twohig

Mr. Bailey reported:

- I Cubed process is progressing.
- Next week the Board of Selectmen will be attending to all takings authorized by town
  meeting, with the exception of Canton Street and University Avenue, as the design here has
  not yet been finalized. A warrant article will be prepared for fall town meeting for an
  additional land-taking.
- A board member asked why this land-taking is being delayed.
- Mr. Twohig responded to this question by saying that there have been some design changes to allow for proper lane movement and additional widening and additional takings by the Town of Westwood may be necessary.

Public Hearing for Consideration of Adoption of New Rules and Regulations Pursuant to Section 9.8 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw - <u>University Avenue Mixed Use District (UAMUD)</u>. Click on link to view this document.

Ch. Montgomery opened the hearing by reading the legal notice of public hearing at 9:20 p.m. Special Counsel Gareth Orsmond gave a brief summary of revisions made to the draft UAMUD Rules and Regulations. Click here to view a realine copy of this document, showing the revisions.

- Document was divided into two parts, separating "Conformance Determination" from "UAMUD Special Permit Review".
- Section 3.2 "Coordination of Applications for Project Development Review & Special Permits" was deleted, as well as Section 4.0 "UAMUD Special Permit Review" and all references to "Special Permit" in other sections of Part I were deleted.
- Section 15.3 "Special Permit Application Review" was deleted.
- Section 16.1.6 "Lapse of PDR Approval" was deleted.
- Section 16.2 "Disposition of Special Permit Application" was deleted. New Section 16.1 -Building and Occupancy Permits – added "Building Commissioner"
- New Part II "UAMUD Special Permit Review"

# Board Questions & Comments:

• Can the Planning Board determine when a Special Permit is required? (No)

- A board member asked why the Rules & Regulations are broken into two parts. (Mr. Bailey informed the board that he believes it is imperative two keep the Site Plan Review process and Special Permit process distinctly separate from one another in these regulations.
- Section 1.6 consistency is necessary as this wording is considered boilerplate language.
- Section 17 Section 6.0 (should be section 5)

### **Public Comments:**

None.

### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, four votes in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>, at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

# Public Hearing for Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) of Proposed Alterations to Wireless Communications Facility – 100-200 Lowder Brook Drive

Mr. Montgomery read the legal notice to open the public hearing at 9:55 p.m. and welcomed Sam Adelson, agent for T-Mobile Northeast, LLC.

# Presentation Highlights:

- Proposed alterations are part of a nationwide initiative to update T-Mobile's facilities to provide enhanced services.
- Proposal is to add three (3) AIR 21 antennas on new t-arm mounts extending twelve (12) inches from sides of monopole, one (1) per sector with three (3) UMTS tower mounted amplifiers (TMA), one (1) per sector, and to relocate three (3) existing AIR 21 antennas onto new t-arm mounts, and to install co-axial and fiber cables and other modernization components on the existing monopole tower, mounted at an elevation of +/-125'. All six antennas will be on one mount.
- Three AIR 21 antennas are 56" in length, the same as the existing antennas at the site. Mounts will be as close as possible but do require space for ventilation as they heat up.

### Board Questions & Comments:

- There were several questions about the lack of clarity in the submitted plans about how far the antennas would extend from the monopole.
- Why are the vertical mounting poles higher?
- Will cables be located on the interior?
- The chairman asked the applicant to submit revised plans, showing clear dimensions.

#### Public Comments:

None.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Wiggin the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne

Meeting Room.

Public Hearing regarding the revision of various sets of existing Planning Board rules, regulations, standards and guidelines, and the adoption of new sets of rules, regulations, standards and guidelines, including the following:

- 1) Revision of Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land in Westwood, Massachusetts, pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 41, § 81Q;
- 2) Revision of Rules and Regulations for Planning Board Special Permits Pursuant to Various Sections of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw;
- 3) Revision of Rules and Regulations Pursuant to Section 9.5 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District (FMUOD);
- 4) Revision of Rules and Regulations for Scenic Roads pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 40, §15C (the "Scenic Road Act"), and M.G.L. Chapter 87, §3 (the "Public Shade Tree Act");
- 5) Adoption of Rules and Regulations Pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR);
- 6) Adoption of Rules and Regulations Pursuant to Section 8.3 of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw Open Space Residential Development (OSRD);
- 7) Revision of existing Traffic Study Guidelines;
- 8) Revision of existing Parking Design Standards; and
- 9) Adoption of Bicycle Facility Design Standards.

# Presentation Highlights:

Rules & Regulations for Bicycle Facility Design Standards:

Revisions were suggested by a board member and the draft document has been edited. <u>Click</u> <u>here to view a redlined copy of this document.</u>

#### Public Comments:

None.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Olanoff the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

### **New Business:**

Brief Discussion of Possible Warrant Articles for November Special Town Meeting:

- SRD amendments
- OSRD amendments
- St. John's property- map amendment
- Medical Marijuana Special Permit standards?
- Pet care/grooming & Commercial kennels amendments
- Housekeeping Amendments

# Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:55 p.m.

# **Next Meeting:**

Tuesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:30 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room, 50 Carby Street.