#### 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. WestCat TV was present and was granted permission to record the meeting.

Present: other Planning Board members: 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 discussions related to University Station.)

# Update on Close-out memo for University Station

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that the development team has prepared a draft Close-out Memo to serve as a list of project review items that require further attention. At a meeting last week Ms. Loughnane, Mr. Bailey and Merrick Turner met with peer review team members to review this. At this time, Mr. Turner is preparing a redline version of the development team's draft to reflect joint positions on remaining action items. Ms. Loughnane said that the Planning Board will likely be asked to accept a final Close-out Memo at its next meeting on October 8th.

Consideration of Partial Release of Funds Pursuant to Tri-partite Agreement for Philips Estates Ms. Loughnane informed the board that PJMJ has requested another release of funds held under the tri-partite agreement for Philips Estates. Chris Gallagher reviewed and approved this request and prepared Exhibit A to accompany the Partial Release of Funds.

Ms. Eramo Young was present at the meeting to answer questions, if necessary. (A copy of this document is included with these minutes.)

Board Discussion & Comments:

None.

**Public Comments:** 

None.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Olanoff the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the partial release of funds held under the tri-partite agreement for Philips Estates, and Exhibit A as prepared.

# Consideration of Request for Extended Hours of Lighting for Parking Area at Colburn Building – 668 High Street

Presentation Highlights:

Ms. Loughnane explained that she received a request from Coffman Realty to allow one exterior light to remain on throughout the night to provide security lighting for the parking area behind the Colburn Building. She explained that the USROD Special Permit required coordination of the timing of exterior light fixtures with those at the library. The library lighting turns off at 10:00 p.m.

# Board Discussion & Comments:

- A board member asked if Coffman Realty provided the specifications of the security light fixture. (The specifications were not provided for these fixtures.)
- Ms. Loughnane reminded the board that Colburn lighting plan was revised in June and twelve ornamental fixtures (matching those used on High Street) for the rear parking lot were replaced with twelve utilitarian fixtures that were said to be brighter and meet LEED requirements.
- A board member suggested that Coffman Realty consider installing a separate, motiondetecting light directly on the building, as opposed to on a light pole.
- Board members agreed that additional information should be provided by Coffman Realty.
- Ms. Loughnane added that she would request Chris Gallagher to measure the existing Colburn lighting plan by light meter and will report the findings at the board's next meeting.

# **Public Comments:**

- Direct abutter, Rob Malster, 20 Gay Street, commented that he is concerned about the brightness and likely spillover of a light proposed to be left on overnight. He added that in general, the existing lights do spill over past the parking lot.
- Mr. Malster also informed the board that last month during a brief but heavy rain storm, his property flooded, despite the installation of the new drainage system and assurances from the Library's engineers.

Ms. Loughnane said that although the new drainage system was designed and constructed by the library's engineers the system is now owned and maintained by the DPW. She said that the DPW is in contact with the library engineers and looking into this matter further. The Planning Board members will be kept abreast of the plans for a solution to the problem.

# Motion/Action Taken:

Action: Board members agreed to continue this discussion to the next meeting on October 8th.

# Consideration of Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan for Lot C1 Thatcher Street

Presentation Highlights:

Don Myers of Norwood Engineering presented an ANR plan for 76 Thatcher Street. He gave a brief summary stating that the rear, parcel C1-A is being created for transfer to abutting rear lot (76 Thatcher Street). The remaining land Lot C1 is in common ownership with adjoining Lot D (67 Thatcher Street). Both lots are labeled on plan as "Not a Building Lot". He said that this ANR was being done in preparation for the future sale of 67 Thatcher Street.

# Board Discussion & Comments:

- Board members asked why the entire parcel, Map 21 Lot 059, is not shown on the plan. (Mr. Myers responded that the parcel is nearly 8 acres and that surveying the entire lot is cost prohibitive and excessive.)
- Ms. Loughnane suggested that the board may waive the standards to allow for consideration of the ANR plan without a full depiction of Map 21 Lot 059 so long as an

amended plan is submitted showing boundaries are clearly depicted of Lot 059 on the locus map.

- Board members requested that the property owner of Map 21 Lot 348 submit a letter to the Planning Board demonstrating that she is fully aware that the proposed ANR plan will decrease the area of Lot 348 below the minimum 80,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size required for lots in Single Residence E Zoning District, that the Assessor's office may then combine Lot 348 with the adjacent Map 21, Lot 61 so that Lot 348 no longer exists as an independent parcel, and that such reduction and combination may have financial implications for her as a property owner.
- Ms. Loughnane further suggested that the owner of Lot 348 indicate in that letter that she has the sole authority to act as the owner of the property, and that there are no probate issues affecting her ability to so act.

# Motion/Action Taken:

Action: The Planning Board unanimously agreed that it would continue this matter until its next meeting on October 8<sup>th</sup>.

# Consideration of Request for Waiver or Reduction of Application Fee for Modification of Reynolds Farm SRD Special Permit

Ed Musto, Reynold's Farm developer was absent and the board did not discuss this matter.

# Continuation of Public Hearing for Consideration for Environmental Impact and Design Review Approval and Special Permit for Reduced Number of Parking Spaces – 323-325 Washington Street

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that the applicant has requested a 90-day extension of time for consideration of this application while making arrangements for the sale of the property to an unspecified commercial user.

#### Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing without testimony taken until Tuesday, October 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room.

# Public Hearing in accordance with the Provisions of M.G.L. Chapter 40A, §5, to consider the following proposed amendments to the Town of Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map.

Ch. Montgomery opened the public hearing by reading the legal notice at approximately 8:10 p.m.

Article 1: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Town of Westwood Official Zoning Map, to correct errors or omissions, or take any other action in relation thereto.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane explained that in 1977, St. John's Church lots were rezoned from Single Residence C to Single Residence E. One lot was sold and is now known as 57 Deerfield Ave and the second residential lot was put back into SRE instead of SRC. This amendment would replace the current Official Zoning Map with a revised Official Zoning Map showing the area of "Lot 2"

as SRC and showing "Lot 3" and the balance of the St. John's property as SRE. (A copy of this information is available with these minutes.)

Article 2: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw, Section 8.4 [Senior Residential Development (SRD)], or take any other action in relation thereto.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane explained that proposed changes are mostly clarifications and Section 8.4.1 "Purposes" was added. See amended sections in red for Article 2 below.

#### 8.4 SENIOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (SRD)

- 8.4.1 **Purposes.** The purposes of Senior Residential Development (SRD) are as follows:
  - 8.4.1.1 to encourage the provision of independent living accommodations in the form of senior residential communities which are located and designed in such a manner as to uniquely serve the physical and social needs of senior residents, fifty-five (55) years of age and older, with a range of income levels and physical abilities;
  - 8.4.1.3 to preserve and enhance Westwood's community character by ensuring design compatibility between new senior residential developments and existing neighborhoods; and
  - 8.4.1.4 to preserve open space, protect natural and cultural resources, lessen disturbance to soils, topography and vegetation, and reduce the overall costs of developing high quality senior residential units by allowing for more efficient, compact layout than permitted under a conventional development.
- 8.4.42 **Special Permit Required.** A Senior Residential Development shall require the issuance of a special permit by the Planning Board in compliance with the provisions of this Section.
- 8.4.23 **Conditions.** A SRD shall be subject to the following conditions:
  - 8.4.<del>23.2</del> There shall be not more than two (2) bedrooms in any dwelling unit, nor shall there be any den, office, bonus room, loft, attic, or similar area which could be converted for use as a third bedroom.
- 8.4.45 **Specific Restrictions.** A SRD shall also be subject to the following specific restrictions:
  - The dwelling unit density of an SRD Project shall be determined, at the board's sole discretion, to allow between one (1) and shall not exceed ten (10) dwelling units per acre. When determining To determine the maximum number of dwelling units permitted for the in the SRD Project, the board shall take into account the amount of all-land in the development lot or parcel which is not reasonably suited for residential development shall be excluded, and the amount of (subject to such exclusion), all land therein utilized necessary for access and egress, parking, buffer areas and or dedicated to public ownership as open space shall be included, and shall base its determination of appropriate project density on the remaining developable area. The determination of compliance with this provision appropriate project density shall be made by the Planning Board, which shall take into consideration the density of the surrounding properties, the visibility of the proposed development from abutting properties and public ways, and any graphic or analytic materials provided by the Applicant.
  - 8.4.45.2 Where proposed structures are to be developed on existing streets or direct extensions of existing streets, front yard setbacks may be reduced to not less than twenty thirty (230) feet. Where proposed structures are to be developed on new interior drives, front yard setbacks may be reduced to not less than ten twenty (120) feet. There shall be no minimum side or rear setback between structures within a proposed SRD, however each proposed principal and accessory structure, driveway, and interior drive shall be set back a minimum of thirty (30) feet from the sides and rear of the perimeter of the SRD.
  - 8.4.45.3 There shall be provided at least one and one half two (11/22) off-street parking spaces per dwelling unit, one of which is reserved for the use of such dwelling unit and within one hundred fifty (150) feet thereof.

- 8.4.45.4 The maximum permitted lot coverage for a SRD shall be fifty percent (50%), including all structures, roadways, driveways and parking areas.
- 8.4.45.5 Any SRD Project Special Permit shall incorporate by reference the site plan approval. Site Plan Approval
  Required shall be subject to Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) approval pursuant to Section
  7.3 of this Bylaw, which shall be consolidated into a mandatory site plan approval component of the SRD
  Special Permit, and no separate EIDR Approval shall be required.
- 8.4.78 **Decision.** A SRD Special Permit shall be granted by the Planning Board, unless otherwise specified herein, only upon its written determination that the adverse effects of the proposed use will not outweigh its beneficial impacts to the Town or the neighborhood, in view of the particular characteristics of the site, and of the proposal in relation to that site. In addition to any specific factors that may be set forth in this Bylaw, the determination shall include consideration of each of the following:

8.4. <del>7</del> 8.4	Impact on vehicular and pedestrian movement and safety, both within the development and on proximate roads;
8.4. <del>7</del> 8.5	Compatibility of the proposed development with the surrounding neighborhood;
8.4.8.6	Suitability of the proposed design, location, and layout of the overall SRD, and of each individual dwelling unit and all proposed common facilities, to uniquely serve the physical and social needs of senior residents.

# Board Comments & Questions:

- A board member suggested adding a condition stating that SRD must include indoor or outdoor communal space.
- A board member commented that separate parking spaces should be required for guests and would prefer adding wording about a separate guest lot. Ms. Loughnane suggested wording such as: "There shall be appropriate provisions for visitor parking."
- A board member suggested adding a condition that there should be minimum amenities required in SRD. It was suggested to tie amenities to proximity; for example, shuttle bus service.
- A board member asked if apartments are allowed as types of dwellings in SRD. Ms.
  Loughnane said that they are not specifically allowed but that the General Special
  Permit Rules and Regulations will clarify this.
- A board member asked if any surrounding towns have increased the age of seniors beyond the age of 55. (Ms. Loughnane recommended a study of the Rules and Regulations of other towns to study that question.)

# Public Comment:

Donna Garner, 160 Grove Street, thanked the Planning Board and Ms. Loughnane for the text that has been added and the changes and clarification that have been made to the SRD Bylaw. Ms. Garner asked what the required minimum acreage is for SRD; commented that SRD's should be sited in compatible areas and doesn't want this type of housing to impact residential neighborhoods; is concerned about traffic and the other needs of residents in SRD. In addition, Ms. Garner asked how the town monitors the minimum age an inhabitant of an SRD. (Ms. Loughnane responded and said that this is addressed in the Rules and Regulations.)

Jerry Rappaport, representative from Chestnut Hill Realty, commented that he supports these bylaw amendments to SRD.

Ken Goldman, 121 Summer Street, commented that it is important to keep the vision of the Master Plan for Westwood in mind when amending the SRD bylaw.

Article 3: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw, Section 8.3 [Open Space Residential Development (OSRD)], or take any other action in relation thereto.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane explained that proposed changes include: Require Conforming Lot Frontage on Existing Road; Adjust Minimum Tract Size Requirements; SRB remains 120,000 sq. ft. - Equivalent to 6 Lots; SRC increased from 160,000 to 200,000 sq ft = 5; SRE increased from 200,000 to 400,000 sq. ft. = 5 and with the OSRD is Consolidated EIDR Approval. See amended sections in red for Article 3 below.

#### 8.3 OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- 8.3.4 **Minimum Tract Requirements.** The minimum tract of land for an OSRD shall consist of one parcel or two or more contiguous parcels, with a minimum area of 120,000 square feet in SRB, 160,000 200,000 square feet in SRC, and 200,000 400,000 square feet in SRE, prior to further division. The Planning Board may make a finding that two or more parcels separated by a road or other infrastructural element are effectively contiguous if such is consistent with the purposes of this Section.
  - 8.3.8.2 **Site Plan Approval Required.** An OSRD Project shall be subject to Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) approval pursuant to Section 7.3 of this bylaw, and no building permit shall be issued for any structure within the OSRD prior to the recording of the OSRD-EIDR Approval in the office of the town clerk.
  - 8.3.8.3 **Uses Requiring Special Permit.** An OSRD containing one or more structures of single-family attached housing, and/or one of more density bonus dwelling units, shall require an OSRD Special Permit issued by the Planning Board in addition to the required EIDR Approval, and no building permit shall be issued for any structure within the OSRD prior to the recording of the OSRD Special Permit and EIDR Approval in the office of the town clerk. The OSRD Project shall be subject to EIDR approval pursuant to Section 7.3 of this Bylaw, which shall be consolidated into a mandatory site plan approval component of the OSRD Special Permit, and no separate EIDR Approval shall be required. No building permit shall be issued for any structure within the OSRD prior to the recording of the OSRD Special Permit in the office of the town clerk.

#### 8.3.9 **Density and Dimensional Requirements.**

- 8.3.9.2 **Yield Calculation.** The maximum base number of dwelling units to which an OSRD is entitled shall be determined by the Planning Board following the submission of a Yield Calculation, as set forth below. The Yield Calculation shall be submitted as part of the OSRD-EIDR or OSRD Special Permit application, but may be submitted on a preliminary basis to the Planning Board, as part of an informal pre-application meeting, as provided for in Section 8.3.5.1 herein.
- 8.3.9.3 **OSRD Dimensional Requirements.** The following dimensional requirements shall apply within an OSRD, in place of the requirements set forth in Section 5.2, Table of Dimensional Requirements:

Minimum Dim	ensional Requirements in OSRD	
	Detached single-family	Single-family attached

	dwelling units	dwelling units
8.3.9.3.1 Lot Size	10,000 sq. ft.	7500 sq. ft.
8.3.9.3.2 Lot Frontage on existing street	75 <sup>2</sup> 100% of lot frontage requirement in underlying district	75 <sup>2</sup> 100% of lot frontage requirement in underlying district
8.3.9.3.3 Lot Frontage on an interior drive	75'	75'
8.3.9.3.34 Front Setback on existing street	50100% of front setback requirement in underlying district	50100% of front setback requirement in underlying district
8.3.9.3.45 Front Setback on an interior drive	20°	10'
8.3.9.3.6 Side setback for principal structure	10°	10'
8.3.9.3.7 Rear setback for principal structure	10°	10'
8.3.9.3.8 Side and rear setbacks for accessory structures	5'	5'

- 8.3.13 **OSRD- EIDR Decision.** Approval shall be granted by means of a written OSRD-EIDR decision, based upon a determination by the Planning Board that the OSRD application meets the criteria below.
  - 8.3.13.1 Consistency with the purposes of this Section.
  - 8.3.13.2 Demonstration of proper and complete application of the OSRD 4-step design process.
  - 8.3.13.3 General consistency with all applicable elements of the EIDR standards in Section 7.3.7.
  - 8.3.13.4 Responsiveness to all applicable elements of the Design Standards in Section 8.3.12.
  - 8.3.13.5 Establishment of measures sufficient to provide for effective protection and maintenance of the common open space.
- 8.3.14 OSRD Special Permit Decision for Single-family Attached Housing. Approval shall be granted by means of a written OSRD Special Permit decision, based upon a finding by the Planning Board that the OSRD application demonstrates consistency with the standards below:
- 8.3.15 **OSRD Special Permit Decision for Density Bonus Units.** Approval shall be granted by means of a written **OSRD** Special Permit decision, based upon a finding by the Planning Board that the proposed density bonus meets one or more of the allowed bonuses in Section 8.3.9.4.
  - 8.3.15.1 **Limit on Density Yield.** The Planning Board shall further find that the density bonus for the OSRD project will not exceed, in the aggregate, fifty (50) percent of the Yield Calculation of dwelling units.
- 8.3.16 **Special Conditions and Performance Guarantee.** The Planning Board may impose reasonable conditions as part of any OSRD-EIDR or OSRD Special Permit approval and may require suitable performance guarantees to assure compliance with those conditions.

# Board Comments & Questions:

- A board member suggested applying this density used in the OSRD bylaw to the SRD bylaw as well.
- Article 4: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw, Section 8.1 [Conversion of One-Family Dwelling], or take any other action in relation thereto.

# Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane explained the purpose of this amendment is to add a Statement of Purpose; Emphasize Maintenance of Existing Character; Require ZBA Approval for Alteration, Addition or Relocation; May Consider Change to 75-year Threshold. See amended sections in red for Article 4 below.

#### 8.1 CONVERSION OF ONE-FAMILY DWELLING

- 8.1.1 **Purposes.** The purposes of this section are as follows:
  - 8.3.1.1 to preserve culturally, historically, or architecturally significant residential structures of value to the community;
  - 8.3.1.2 to encourage the preservation of community character through the maintenance of existing residential properties and their surrounding landscapes;
  - 8.3.1.3 to offer greater housing choice by allowing varied mixes of housing type, compatible with community character.
- 8.1.2 **Special Permit Required.** Upon the grant of a special permit by the Board of Appeals, the conversion and/or use of a one-family dwelling to a dwelling for not more than two (2) families may be authorized, provided that such one-family dwelling has been in existence for not less than seventy-five (75) years, and provided that the exterior character of the property remains consistent with that of a single-family dwelling.
- 8.1.3 **Alterations, Relocations, or Additions.** The Board of Appeals may allow for the alteration or relocation of a structure proposed for conversion under this section, and may allow for the construction of one or more additions to said structure, if in the Board's determination, the proposed alteration, relocation, or addition does not significantly change the exterior character of the property.

# **Board Comments:**

- A board member asked how if Ms. Loughnane knew how many homes in Westwood are eligible to be converted and if it the date of existence is 75 years from 1938?
- Article 5: To see if the Town will vote to approve certain amendments to the Westwood Zoning Bylaw to distinguish between pet care facilities and commercial kennels, including amendments to Section 2.0 [Definition], Section 4.1 [Principal Uses], and Section 6.1 [Off-Street Parking], or take any other action in relation thereto.

#### Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane explained the purpose of this amendment is to add a new definition. See amended sections in red for Article 5 below.

#### 2.0 DEFINITIONS

Kennel, Commercial A commercial establishment in which more than three (3) dogs or domesticated animals are housed, groomed, bred, boarded, trained and/or sold, including a facility providing day care to more than three (3) animals at any one time. The term "Kennel, Commercial" shall not include "Pet Care Facility" as herein separately defined.

Pet Care Facility A commercial establishment which caters to the needs, comfort, and/or benefit of pets, or which offers pet-oriented services including the grooming and/or training of dogs or domesticated animals, but which does not engage in the housing, breeding, boarding, or sales of such animals, and does not provide daycare to more than three (3) animals at any one time. The term "Pet Care Facility" shall not include "Kennel, Commercial" as herein separately defined.

#### 4.1.5 COMMERCIAL USES

PRINCIPAL USE	DISTRICTS												
TRIVEH ALI USE	SRA	SRB	SRC	SRD	SRE	GR	SR	LBA	LBB	HB	I	Ю	ARO
4.1.5 COMMERCIAL USES													
4.1.5.17 Pet Care Facility	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	BA	BA	N
4.1.5.178 Kennel, Commercial	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	BA	BA	N
6.1.5 PARKING REQUIREMENT	'S FOR	COMM	ERCIA	L USES	S								
6.1.5 COMMERCIAL USES												_	
6.1.5.9 Pet Care Facility 6.1.5.910 Kennel, Commercial					sq to re ba in	uare feet selling, lated to seement	t of floostorage such us areas u	or area o e, service e, exclus sed only	o hundrer fraction and all sive of conformation for stora	n thereon other accellar and age or se	f devoted tivities rvices	<u> </u>	

# **Board Questions & Comments:**

- A board member suggested taking out the word "commercial" after "kennel".
- A board member asked what kind of use is a Pet Care Facility. (Ms. Loughnane said that this is considered retail service use.
- A board member asked if grooming could be a home occupation.
- A board member asked if there should there be a limit on the number of pet care facilities.

Article 6: To see if the Town will vote to approve housekeeping amendments to various sections of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map as may be necessary to correct errors or inconsistencies and to clarify such sections, or take any other action in relation thereto.

See Article 6 below.

Article 6: To see if the Town will vote to approve housekeeping amendments to various sections of the Westwood Zoning Bylaw and Official Zoning Map as may be necessary to correct errors or inconsistencies and to clarify such sections, as set forth below, or take any other action in relation thereto:

#### **Correction of transcription error in Use Chart:**

1) Replace the letter "Y" with the letter "N" under the "SRD" column in the Use Chart for Section 4.1.5.26 "General Services Establishment", and replace the letter "N" with the letter "Y" under the "SRD" column in the Use Chart for Section 4.1.5.27 "Campground, wildlife preserve, fishing grounds operated not for profit", so that the amended sections read as follows:

	DISTRICTS												
PRINCIPAL USE	SRA	SRB	SRC	SRD	SRE	GR	SR	LBA	LBB	НВ	I	Ю	ARO
4.1.5 COMMERCIAL USES, CONTINUED													
4.1.5.26 General Services Establishment	N	N	N	¥N	N	N	N	N	N	BA	N	N	N
4.1.5.27 Campground, wildlife preserve, fishing grounds operated not for profit	Y	Y	Y	NY	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

#### **Correction of misspelling in Definitions:**

2) Replace the word "overhand" with the word "overhead" in the Section 2.0 definition of "Essential Services", so that the amended section reads as follows:

Essential Services Services provided by a public service corporation or by governmental agencies through erection, construction, alteration or maintenance of gas, electrical, steam or water transmission or distribution systems and collection, communication, supply or disposal systems whether underground or overhead, but not including wireless communications facilities. Facilities necessary for the provision of essential services include poles, wires, drains, sewers, pipes, conduits, cables, fire alarm boxes, police call boxes, traffic signals, hydrants and other similar equipment in connection therewith.

#### Removal of extra word in Special Permit for Signs:

- 3) Remove the word "permitted" after the word "maximum" and prior to the word "number" in Section 6.2.1.4, so that the amended section reads as follows:
- 6.2.14 **Special Permit.** The Board of Appeals may grant a special permit for a sign that does not comply with sign area, height, or setback requirements set forth herein, or which exceeds the maximum permitted number of signs permitted, provided that said sign is otherwise in compliance with all other provisions of this section, and provided further that the Board of Appeals makes the following findings:

6.2.14.1	Applicant has adequately demonstrated that compliance with the provisions of this Section will be an undue hardship.
6.2.14.2	Sign scale is determined to be in reasonable relation to the scale of the building or structure and the sizes of signs on nearby structures.
6.2.14.3	Sign size, shape and placement serves to define or enhance architectural elements of the building or structure such as columns, sill lines, cornices and roof edges.
6.2.14.4	Sign design is harmonious with other signage on the same or adjacent structures and provides reasonable continuity in mounting location and height, proportions and materials.
6.2.14.5	Sign materials, colors, lettering style, illumination and form are reasonably compatible with building design, and surrounding neighborhood.
6.2.14.6	Sign size, location, design and illumination do not present a safety hazard to vehicular or pedestrian traffic.

Suggestion from Peter Hechenbleikner Correction of number in Sign Height Requirements:

- 4) Replace the number "5.2" with the number "5.4" in Section 6.2.8.2, so that the amended section reads as follows:
  - 6.2.8.2 **Sign Height Requirements.** No part of any sign, or light fixture illuminating said sign, shall be at a height greater than the maximum height permitted pursuant to Section 5.24 of this bylaw for the building or structure to which the sign pertains. No part of any sign, or light fixture illuminating said sign, shall be higher than the highest point of any building or structure on the same premises. In the case of a sign located on a lot where there is no other structure, no part of said sign, or light fixture illuminating said sign, shall exceed a height of ten (10) feet above ground.

# Suggestions from Dottie Powers that exceed Housekeeping standards – may be considered under Proposed Article ${\bf 5}$

1) Delete the definition of "Kennel".

<u>Kennel</u> Any pack or collection of more than three (3) dogs three (3) months old or over, owned or kept on a lot irrespective of the purposes for which they are maintained.

2) Amend the definition of "Kennel, Commercial" under Section 2.0 to read as follows:

Kennel, Commercial A commercial establishment in which more than three (3) dogs or domesticated animals, three (3) months old or over, are housed, groomed, bred, boarded, trained, and/or sold, including a facility providing day care to more than three (3) animals at any one time. The term "Kennel, Commercial" shall not include "Pet Care Facility" as herein separately defined, nor shall it include the keeping of up to six (6) domestic animals within a residence for non-commercial purposes.

# 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, October 8<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

Continuation of 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.

# Discussion:

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that no additional edits have been made to these

documents since the board's last hearing and that Phil Paradis will be present at the board's next meeting on October  $15^{th}$  to discuss the proposed amendments to the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

# Motion/Action Taken:

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to immediately continue this hearing without testimony taken until Tuesday, October 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street.

# **New Business:**

Mr. Olanoff informed the other board members that the MPO is conducting an intersection study and the streets/intersections that are included in Westwood are: Nahatan Street and High Street; High Street and Pond Street; Washington Street and Everett Street; Nahatan Street and Clapboardtree Street.

# Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Mr. Wiggin and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m.

# **Next Meeting:**

The next meeting of the board is Tuesday, October 8<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street. Immediately following this meeting, the Planning Board will attend the Finance Commission's meeting at the High School, at approximately 8:30 p.m.

# **List of Documents:**

Letter to B. Montgomery from C. Gallagher re: Partial Release of Subdivision Bond –	PDF
Philips Estates Definitive Subdivision, Exhibit A	
Electrical Site Plan, ES1.01 – Colburn School	PDF
Lot C-1 Thatcher Street – ANR Application & Plan	PDF
Proposed Zoning Amendments: Articles 1-6 Amendments Redlined	PDF