Attendance & Call to Order:

Ch. Jack Wiggin called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

Present: Planning Board members Jack Wiggin, Steve Olanoff, Steve Rafsky, Bruce Montgomery and Chris Pfaff and Town Planner Nora Loughnane. Planning & Land Use Specialist Janice Barba recorded the minutes.

University Station Proposal – Design Refinement Work Session and Status Report on Proposed Zoning Bylaw – Focus on Fiscal Impacts of Proposed Development

Ch. Wiggin welcomed proponent's team; John Twohig from Goulston & Storrs, Paul Cincotta from N.E. Development, Ray Murphy of Eastern Development and John Connery of Connery Associates.

Main Points of Connery Associates Fiscal Impact Report:

- Summary of Methodology: School Aged Children Estimate & Education Costs; General Services Costs Estimates; Revenue Projections; Fiscal Profile
- Summary of Findings
- General Service Costs: Residential General Service Costs; Commercial General Service Costs;
- Education Costs: Student Projections; Comparables and Proposal Equivalency; Enrollment Equivalency with Selected Communities; Education Cost and Student Enrollment at Stabilization; Total Estimated Annual Service Cost
- Municipal Revenue: Residential Assessed Value; Multi-family Comparables; Retail Assessed Value; Hotel Assessed Value; Office Assessed Value; Assessed Value of the Assisted Living/Memory Care Facility; Total Estimated Assessed Value for University Station;
- Fiscal Profile: The Estimated Fiscal Profile Year by Year 2013 to 2020; Estimated Revenue Stream During the Construction Period; Cost to Revenue Ratio and Estimated Fiscal Benefit 2013 to 2020
- One Time Fees & New Growth Benefits
- Sensitivity Test

A copy of this report is available on the town's website at http://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/index.cfm/pid/29282/stCode/live/preview/yes/cdid/29284

Peer Review Comments:

Merrick Turner, Project Manager for Beta Engineering and fiscal impact peer review consultant, Judy Barrett from Community Opportunities Group, were present to comment on the methodology of the Connery Associates Report.

Highlights of Judy Barrett's comments:

- It is imperative that comparable developments are examined in preparing the fiscal impact report. Municipal, Police, Fire, Public Works & Schools case study information should be reviewed for comparable towns.
- Demographics details are missing, a benchmark should be established.
- All assumptions and data should be documented on cost and revenue sides. Are budgeted revenues or actual expenditures being used?
- Impacts on municipal spending should be studied and year-end financials should be used.
- Estimates for municipal employment growth must specify whether total costs include both salary and benefits.
- Report should address upfront costs incurred ahead of expected revenues.

Board Questions & Comments:

When will the final fiscal report be ready? (Mr. Twohig said that the final report will be ready

in approximately two weeks.)

- Have the proponent's and town's consultants been working together, and if so, do they agree on methodology and process? (Mr. Twohig said that the consultants have not been working together and that methodology and processes can vary.)
- A board member said that a more substantive report was expected at this meeting and he is concerned about the process.
- Who is the audience for this fiscal report? Planning Board, Board of Selectmen, Finance Commission or School Committee? (Mr. Twohig said that all of these other committees will contribute comments and benefit from this report.)
- Will this project break even? When will the town see a net benefit? (Mr. Twohig said that Mr. Connery will provide a chart identifying costs and revenue. The upfront costs and revenue lags will also be addressed in the report.)
- Public Safety costs should be clearly identified. (Mr. Connery said that he will only identify general salary costs, on average.)
- Town Meeting will need to be convinced that comparable communities have been analyzed in association with data reported and results found.
- Connery Associates should consider input from the Superintendent of Schools on the identification of comparable school districts with regard to fiscal impacts.
- Standards for the residential units should be addressed. (Mr. Twohig said that this will be discussed further at a later date and will be addressed in the development agreement.)
- Will the fiscal impact report reflect the findings of the past comprehensive public safety study
 that was done during the review of the Westwood Station project? (Mr. Twohig said that that
 study would not be considered in this review.)
- The planning board is interested in the housing number and mix, regardless of the market and fiscal impact report. The board is focused on the desires of the community.
- The development agreement should address fiscal mitigation and contingent liabilities associated with school impacts.
- Will the impacts of the new senior residential units be studied? (Ms. Barrett said that the impact of these units is only relevant for the short term. In addition, she said that she is not sure that there is a market for this type of housing here.) (Mr. Connery said that downsizing by individuals 55 and over is not related to what kind of housing is available.)

Public Comments:

 Barb Delisle, Finance Commission – Are the residential comparables for condos or apartments? (Mr. Cincotta said the exact mix between rental and ownership has not been established yet, although the report assumes a conservative approach on the cost side.) Is a new on-site public safety facility being considered? (Mr. Twohig said that this matter would be addressed in the development agreement.)

Motion/Action Taken:

None needed.

Additional discussion on University Station will continue at the Board's next meeting on November 5^{th} , 2012 at 6:30 p.m., at the Islington Community Center. The focus of the discussion will be traffic and transportation.

Public Hearing for Consideration of Special Permit and Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) for Wireless Communication Facility at Westwood Business Center – 690 Canton Street

Ch. Wiggin opened the hearing by reading the public hearing notice. He welcomed Martin Cohen, consultant for T-Mobile.

Highlights of Presentation:

T-Mobile's proposed modification to the existing facility at Westwood Business Centre is a part of a modernization project and will consist of the following elements:

- Six (6) antennas, two (2) per sector mounted on the rooftop of the existing building;
- Two (2) equipment cabinets situated in a central location on the rooftop of the existing building;
- Co-axial cables running in a cable tray from the radio cabinets to the antennas.
- Equipment will removed and replaced with virtually the same sized equipment and cables.

Mr. Cohen said that three waivers are requested to require existing topography on the plans; a stormwater plan and a traffic study.

Ms. Loughnane added that a waiver of the model requirement should also be requested.

Board Questions & Comments:

- Will the new cables be installed in the same cable tray? (yes)
- Will the new antenna increase the coverage? (It will not increase coverage but improve service with upgrades to the equipment.)
- Questions arose about the list of abutters of the property.
- Any unused antennas and equipment should be removed, if possible. (Mr. Cohen said he
 doesn't think that anything will be removed because of possible re-use in the future.)

Public Comments:

None.

Motion:

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to waive any unnecessary submittal items associated with this application.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to close the hearing and approve the special permit and environmental impact and design review for the wireless communications facility at 690 Canton Street.

Public Hearing for Consideration of Special Permit and Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) for Wireless Communication Facility at Meditech, Inc. – 100 Lowder Brook

Ch. Wiggin opened the hearing by reading the public hearing notice. He welcomed Martin Cohen, consultant for T-Mobile.

Highlights of Presentation:

T-Mobile's proposed modification to the existing facility at Meditech building is a part of a modernization project and will consist of the following elements:

- Three (3) antennas, one (1) per sector mounted at 125 +/- on the existing monopole tower;
- Two (2) equipment cabinets situated on the ground within T-Mobile's leased space at the base of the monopole; and
- Co-axial cables running inside the monopole from the antennas and over a cable bridge to the equipment cabinets.
- Three antennas will be removed and replaced with modernization project antennas.
- The equipment cabinet will be replaced with an updated cabinet of the same size and same location.

Board Questions & Comments:

- Will the new cables be installed on the outside of the same pole? (Mr. Cohen said that fiber optic lines will be added to the existing co-axial cable on the pole.)
- All new cabling and equipment should be painted the same color as the existing pole and associated equipment. (Mr. Cohen said that these would be painted the same color.)

Public Comments:

None.

Motion:

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously in favor to waive any unnecessary submittal items associated with this application.

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously in favor to close the hearing and to approve the special permit and environmental impact and design review for the wireless communications facility at 100 Lowder Brook Road.

Consideration of Proposed Minor Modification of FMUOD Special Permit for 40 Allied Drive *Highlights of Discussion:*

Ms. Loughnane stated that at the last meeting on October 30th the Planning Board was asked to consider amended architectural plans affecting the south-facing elevation of the new medical office building. Board members had several questions about the proposed changes so it was requested that Shields MRI come to the meeting tonight to give a detailed presentation.

Ch. Wiggin welcomed Steve McCarthy of Shields MRI and Bob Buen of SBA Architects.

Mr. McCarthy explained that the new medical building space will house the New England Baptist Hospital as its anchor tenant. As a result, interior changes were necessary to accommodate program needs as well as several exterior design changes associated with services offered there.

Mr. Buen presented the board with the amended plans showing exterior elevation changes and canopy changes on the Westwood or south side of the building.

Highlights of Presentation:

- There are two new canopies on the south side of the building: one for the service entrance and one for the mobile diagnostic services. Metal panels (previously masonry) will be added above both of these canopy doors.
- On the east elevation the second floor will have fewer windows based on interior program needs (i.e.: surgery rooms, etc.)
- New metal panel siding has been added in place of the glass windows.
- Mechanical penthouse located on the roof of the building has been relocated slightly on the side of the building, in Dedham.

Board Questions & Comments:

- Has the Dedham Planning Board seen these proposed changes? (Mr. McCarthy said that he has already appeared before the Dedham Design Review Committee and these changes have been approved.)
- Any changes to the parking and circulation patterns? (Mr. Buen said that there aren't any proposed changes to the parking lot.)
- A board member said that he considers this a minor modification and considers these changes an improvement.

• A board member asked about the colors of the metal panels. (Mr. Buen said the printer variations changed the color and said the colors are more neutral than shown on paper.)

Public Comments:

None.

Motion:

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously in favor to consider the proposed alterations to plans for 40 Allied Drive as minor.

Upon a motion by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously in favor to approve the proposed modifications to the plans for 40 Allied Drive, without requiring a modification of the Special Permit.

Continuation of Public Hearing for Revisions to Planning Board Rules and Regulations – Review of Proposed EIDR Rules and Regulations and Subdivision Rules and Regulations Ch. Wiggin reopened the public hearing.

Highlights of Discussion:

- Phil Paradis of Beta Engineering informed the board that he has submitted a proposal to the DPW to fund his services for the review of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.
- Ms. Loughnane said that Mr. Paradis will draft new stormwater regulations and bylaw in accordance with the DEP guidelines for the town. These stormwater regulations will be a separate document, similar to the town's existing Parking Design Standards.
- It is anticipated that the amended Rules and Regulations will be ready for acceptance at May town meeting.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion:

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue this hearing until Tuesday, November 20th at 7:30 p.m., in the Champagne Meeting Room.

Next Meetings:

Tuesday, November 5th at 6:30 p.m., at the Islington Community Center.

Adjournment

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Pfaff the board voted unanimously in favor to adjourn the meeting at approximately 8:45 p.m.

(This meeting was videotaped and is available at www.westcat.tv)

List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits

Fiscal Impact Analysis Report by Connery Associates, 11-08-12

Great Boston Musculoskeletal Center Plans – 3 sheets: exterior elevations, finishes, layout and materials plan.