

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Board members present: Ch. S. Rafsky, S. Olanoff, B. Montgomery, C. Chafetz and J. Wiggin
Staff present: N. Loughnane, Town Planner, G. Garber. Minutes were recorded by J. Barba.

Chairman Rafsky called the meeting to order at approximately 7:20 P.M.

Planning Board Discussion and Consideration of Endorsement of the Comprehensive Land Use and Planning Act (CLURPA)

At the board's last meeting May 2nd, Glenn Garber discussed proposed legislation for the Comprehensive Land Use and Planning Act. Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Garber to send board members additional information and an analysis of this information. Mr. Garber sent several documents including the 100 page bill; a table covering Zoning Act, c.40A, Master Plans, C.41, Subdivision Control Law, c.41, Land Use Partnership Act, c. 40U; Approval Not Required; 40A:4 Powers of Cities & Towns; and Non-Conformities & Vested Rights.

Ch. Rafsky invited board members to comment on the proposed legislation or any of the documents that were sent by Mr. Garber. There was agreement amongst board members to support this legislation.

Mr. Garber requested a letter of support from the Planning Board that he would submit at the CLURPA hearing on May 18, 2011.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to endorse/support the Comprehensive Land Use and Planning Act (CLURPA).

Continuation of Public Hearing for Consideration of Special Permit and Environmental Impact Design Review (EIDR) for Wireless Communication Facility at Temple Beth David – 7 Clapboardtree Street

Ch. Rafsky reopened the hearing at approximately 7:34 P.M.

Ch. Rafsky welcomed David Maxson from Isotrope Wireless, the consultant to the Planning Board for this application. He asked Mr. Maxson to review and summarize his report. (This document is included with the record of these minutes.)

Mr. Maxson stated this report is responsive to numerous questions raised at the first public hearing and includes two exhibits. Exhibit 1 is a discussion of failed monopole towers and Exhibit 2 is an analysis of the existing and proposed coverage maps in the subject area around the proposed facility.

Exhibit 1 – Monopole Failure Modes

- The number of monopole failures is miniscule.
- The Planning Board's decision on the risks of permitting the proposed tower will depend on how it weighs the benefits and risks of the location near Clapboardtree Street.

Exhibit 2 – Coverage Analysis

- In general, the existing T-Mobile coverage in the target area is uneven.
- There is an area of a lack of in-building coverage in the area.
- There is some uneven in-vehicle coverage.

Alternative Locations

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

- Norwood Standpipe at Bellevue Avenue – unsure of additional co-location capability
- Martha Jones School, Sheehan School & Sheehan Fields – good alternatives, although outside WCOD (Mentioned past discussions amongst town officials, staff and tower company representatives about alternative locations.)
- High School – not a good alternative

Drive Test Map & Data

- Validated drive test data

FAA Notification Threshold

- File with FAA to determine a “no-hazard” and is within notification slope of Norwood Airport

Tower Size

- The applicant should prepare dimensional drawings and visual simulations of a narrow-two carrier tower and the wider proposed four-carrier tower.

Personal Coverage Check

- Compared contours between “excellent”, “very good” and good coverage and found that “excellent and very good” correlates to “in-building” coverage and “good” correlates to “in-vehicle” coverage.

At this point Mr. Maxson concluded the main points of his report and said would answer any questions of the planning board.

Ch. Rafsky invited board members to ask any questions and offer comments.

Ms. Chafetz asked Mr. Maxson to elaborate on Figure 11 – T-Mobile Existing Coverage Map as Originally Submitted, located on page 32 of his report, in which it is stated, “...our computer model suggests there is substantially more area presently covered from existing facilities than the first T-Mobil map indicated.”

Mr. Maxson responded that map generation settings are statistical estimations of performance and drive test data are more accurate.

Ms. Chafetz asked Ms. Loughnane when the second set of “existing coverage” maps from T-Mobile were submitted. Ms. Loughnane responded that the first set of maps was received in January and the second set was received in mid-March. Ms. Chafetz asked if when Mr. Cannata and Chris McKeown were discussing possible sites, were they were relying on data that showed a much more pessimistic view of existing coverage? Ms. Loughnane said these maps were not available at that meeting which was in 2009.

Mr. Maxson stated that the highest priority search rings/locations are given to cell tower location companies to find locations. He said this search ring may have been ill-conceived.

Ch. Rafsky asked if Mr. Maxson if he thought his report was complete or if additional information is needed from the applicant in order for the Planning Board to conclude its review and render a decision.

Mr. Maxson responded that in his report he created boxes that outlined “information requirements” needed from the Applicant. He identified these boxes:

- Drive Test Data

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

- Status of the utilization of the standpipe in Norwood
- Status of "Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation"
- Visual simulations of a narrow-two carrier tower and a wider proposed four-carrier tower (Mr. Maxson said a modest reduction of height of 10-20 feet would be possible and not fatal to the applicants using the tower.)

Mr. Maxson concluded that he did believe that board had enough material in the record, plus additional items that would be sufficient for it to render a decision.

Ch. Rafsky allowed the Applicant, Mr. Sousa, to comment.

Mr. Sousa stated that he received Mr. Maxson's report, dated April 29th, reviewed it this morning and suggested that the report is not complete based on the following reasons:

- On May 3rd SBA Towers submitted additional information and drive test data to the Planning Board and he said this information is not incorporated into Maxson's report. He said that data is crucial in discussing alternative sites and this information has factual data proving a gap in coverage. Furthermore, SBA Towers would not invest a significant amount of time and money into a site that would not close a coverage gap. He said Mr. Maxson's analysis is over-predictive.
- In response to Maxson's comment that the water tank in Norwood is a viable alternative to the Temple, Mr. Sousa disagreed and said the Town of Norwood will not issue an RFP for that site. In addition, the coverage associated with the water tank does not reach the coverage objective of the Temple.
- Mike Johnson, site acquisition consultant from MetroPCS, spoke regarding siting antennas at the water tank in Norwood in 2009. He said after multiple meetings and discussions with the town administration in 2010 the Norwood Board of Selectmen voted against allowing additional RFP's for this site.
- Mr. Sousa asked Mr. Johnson if other carriers were seeking to co-locate on that water tank. Mr. Johnson responded affirmatively and said there were at least three other carriers who were seeking to locate there.

Mr. Olanoff asked what the reason was that the Norwood Board of Selectmen gave as the reason for no longer allowing RFP's at this site.

Mr. Johnson responded that a reason was not provided.

Mr. Wiggin asked if this water tank is within the town of Norwood's wireless overlay district.

Mr. Johnson responded that he was not sure if it was.

Mr. Sousa said he was aware that the Town of Norwood grants use variances for some locations outside the wireless overlay district.

Mr. Wiggin said his previous question was related to Mr. Johnson's report that referred to two sites in Westwood that seem to be rejected because they were not in the wireless overlay district. He said that Mr. Johnson is applying a standard that exists in Westwood and not in applying it in the town of Norwood.

Mr. Sousa said the overarching fact is that that site in Norwood does not provide the coverage being sought in this application.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Mr. Sousa introduced Brian Isins, RF engineer for T-Mobile who explained the coverage plots produced for the area surrounding the Norwood water tank. Mr. Isins read from coverage maps that he presented to the board, which he said essentially prove that the coverage is insufficient or spotty.

Mr. Maxson asked about the height of the other antennas on the water tank. He also asked if three sector models were used. Mr. Johnson said three sectors models were not used. Mr. Maxson said his computer models differ from the applicant's models, which will produce different variables with the overlay of drive test data. He asked Mr. Johnson if he performed a statistical analysis against of drive test data against the coverage maps. Mr. Johnson responded that he did not. Mr. Maxson said both he and Mr. Isin are making reasonable assumptions based on the data and the models used. They both agree that coverage is spotty or uneven.

Mr. Sousa said Mr. Maxson's report did not include an analysis of the overlay of the plots.

Samir Parakevty, RF consultant discussed coverage maps and overlaps and dropped coverage with the drive test data.

Mr. Sousa said he would provide the plots to Mr. Maxson so that they can be included in his report.

Mr. Maxson asked about the orientation of the water tank model and what is possible in terms of reaching the target area. He asked if the colors of the drive test overlay and the colors of the corresponding coverage maps. He also asked Mr. Parakevty if he performed a statistical analysis against of drive test data against the coverage maps.

Mr. Parakevty responded that he did not.

Mr. Sousa asked Mr. Parakevty if the water tank would provide both coverage objectives and Mr. Parakevty said it would not provide coverage to the proposed area. He asked Mr. Parakevty if Mr. Maxson's reports are over-predictive and Mr. Parakevty agreed with him.

Mr. Olanoff asked the applicant how the elevation of the water tank compares to the proposed site.

Mr. Parakevty said he wasn't sure how high the water tank is but that the proposed tower is higher.

Mr. Sousa said Mr. Maxson's report said the ground elevation of the water tank is higher than the proposed site and is located over one mile away. He said there is a clear difference between what each carrier is doing but essentially increasing network coverage.

Mr. Sousa requested that Mr. Maxson submit an updated report based on the new information submitted by the Applicant.

Mr. Maxson said he has commented tonight and can comment further, in writing, if the Planning Board wishes.

Mr. Sousa said that Mr. Maxson should analyze drive test data and plots as opposed to marketing data. He also said a Sheehan School tower would be duplicative for T-Mobile and would fill some coverage for MetroPCS and a tower at Martha Jones School would be duplicative for both T-Mobile and would not improve in-building coverage.

Mr. Montgomery asked about the coverage available from the Sheehan School site. Mr. Johnson said it would depend on the height of a tower at the Sheehan School.

Mr. Sousa again reminded the board that the Sheehan School is only partially located in the wireless

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

communication overlay district. He said the town has not changed the wireless district and there is no RFP from the Town for a tower.

Mr. Montgomery said the town was willing to issue an RFP, but was not asked to do so.

Ch. Rafsky read an email from Chris McKeown, Economic Development Officer for the Town of Westwood regarding his recollection of meetings with Mr. Cannata and Ms. Loughnane regarding the site visits in town. A copy of this email is included with these minutes.

Ch. Rafsky read a memo from Michael Jaillet, Town Administrator regarding cell tower exploration for locations, dated May 10, 2011. A copy of this memo is included with these minutes.

Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane if she wanted to comment.

Ms. Loughnane responded and repeated a similar account of the meetings with Skip Cannata and other town officials. She said Mr. Cannata's initial interest in locations for a tower included 50 Carby Street and Hale Reservation. A few months later, Mr. Cannata expressed an interest in Hale Reservation, Sheehan fields or both. At a meeting with Mr. Jaillet, Ms. Loughnane stated that Mr. Cannata was informed that the town was willing to issue an RFP for a specific site and would not issue a blanket RFP. Following this, Mr. Cannata informed Ms. Loughnane that he was interested in another location within Hale Reservation that was outside the wireless overlay district. Ms. Loughnane and Mr. Jaillet suggested an article at the fall town meeting to amend the wireless communication overlay district. Following this, in October 2009, Mr. McKeown and Ms. Loughnane met with Mr. Cannata and they visited the Sheehan School site and he expressed an interest in locating at this site. Ms. Loughnane said she told Mr. Cannata that an RFP would be required and she said she would pursue a zoning change if this was a desired location and brought this information before the town's Land Use Committee for feedback. Soon after that, Mr. Cannata said his company was pursuing the property at Temple Beth David. In December Mr. Cannata told her that he was interested in one of the parcels on the Temple property which was not located in the wireless communications overlay district. Ms. Loughnane stated that rezoning would be necessary and Mr. Cannata then decided he would move ahead on the other parcel on Temple property, which is located in the wireless overlay district.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Sousa if he wished to comment.

Mr. Sousa said this information is consistent with Mr. Cannata's testimony from the first hearing. He said clearly the site at the Temple would fill the gap in coverage, as well as the Sheehan School site; although the Martha Jones School site would not fill a gap in coverage. He said he believed there was some uncertainty from a leasing standpoint of the Sheehan School regarding zoning. He said choosing the Temple property, which is in the wireless communications overlay district, is the most viable site.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Sousa if the flagpole at Buckmaster Pond is an adequate site for locating a tower.

Ms. Loughnane said the two sites at Sheehan School were discussed with Mr. Cannata. She said the school property is zoned appropriately on the left side of the building, but the right side along Buckmaster Pond is not. She said the height of the existing school building would help balance the height of the tower and there is clearly space at this site for the tower.

Ch. Rafsky said clearly the town's consultant and the applicant's consultants do not exactly agree. He asked Mr. Sousa if Mr. Maxson's report is deficient, different, should the board not depend on it or is this just a different way of looking at technology.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Mr. Sousa said he has worked on numerous applications on which Mr. Maxson has worked on the other side for other towns. He said he as an attorney cannot challenge the technical aspects of his report but he said both RF engineers disagree with Mr. Maxson's plots. He thinks this information is inconsistent and thinks Mr. Maxson's report is incomplete because he has not reported in written form on the drive test data. He said there are enough differences of opinion on a technical standpoint and believes the data his RF engineers, who actually design networks, should be weighted appropriately.

Mr. Sousa said he has proved the supposed alternative, the Norwood water tank, which was the focus of Mr. Maxson's initial report, is not a viable alternative.

Mr. Montgomery said an alternative site is the Sheehan School and is not being discussed.

Mr. Sousa said the Sheehan School would fill a gap in coverage but that location was not within the wireless overlay district. He said there is no assurance that the town would issue a use variance and this is used in site acquisition.

Ms. Loughnane said Sheehan School site is within the wireless overlay district and is a viable site and was pursued from the beginning by Mr. Cannata. The Sheehan fields would have required town meeting action as it is outside the wireless overlay district.

Mr. Sousa said he is not disputing this but said the engineers looked at the Sheehan fields they were informed that this location was outside the wireless overlay district.

Ms. Loughnane said the engineers were looking at siting on the Sheehan School.

Mr. Sousa disagreed and said they were looking at the fields. In addition he said an antenna installation of the roof of the Sheehan School would not be high enough to site a tower.

Ms. Loughnane said the roof on the Sheehan School would be an appropriate location as there is no limit on the height of the tower. She said the Sheehan School lot and Martha Jones lot were discussed at the last meeting as they are within the wireless overlay district. She said the Sheehan field lot was also discussed, but that the Sheehan School lot is the most comparable property to the Temple lot.

Mr. Sousa asked if there is a proposal for a 50' tower on the Sheehan.

Ms. Loughnane said a preferred alternative would be a tall tower on the roof of the school or freestanding flagpole style monopole on the property next to the Sheehan School.

Mr. Maxson asked to speak to make a clarification. He said he did not model a 100' tower at either the Sheehan School or Martha Jones School because he said at the last meeting he heard the applicant say it was fully accepted that those sites would be satisfactory with a 100' tower.

Mr. Sousa agreed and said Mr. Isin confirmed that a 100' structure either on the roof or on the Sheehan School property would still give the same coverage objective. Mr. Sousa said that he did not think a 50' tower on the roof of the school would be acceptable from a design or structural perspective.

Mr. Maxson said he modeled a minor wireless communications facility by estimating the height of the buildings and the models were just other alternative sites. He said it does not matter to the Town of Westwood if the tower was on the building or not.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Mr. Sousa asked Mr. Maxson if a minor facility would be located at tree level.

Mr. Maxson agreed.

Ch. Rafsky stated that based on the testimony of town officials, it is his opinion that the town was working on going forward with the RFP process and then learned that the applicant was not receptive of going forward. He asked Mr. Sousa why the town would issue an RFP be issued based on this.

Mr. Sousa said the town would have the right to issue and RFP at any time to take control of the process and to encourage wireless carriers to particular sites. He said the decision was made by SBA to look at other viable sites. He said the town still could have issued an RFP.

Mr. Maxson said he recalled an alternate location on the Temple parcel that was going to be considered. He also mentioned second party testimony of the non-availability of a water tank in Westwood. He suggested that the board require the applicant to provide a copy of a decision by the Norwood Board of Selectmen regarding this and enter that into this record.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Sousa to respond to the comment about the alternate location that was being considered on the Temple parcel.

Mr. Sousa responded that in the past the other lot owned by the Temple was researched as a possible location but it was found that this lot is outside the wireless overlay district. In addition there are restrictive covenants on that parcel. He submitted a letter to Ch. Rafsky on this matter.

Ch. Rafsky opened the meeting to public comment.

M. Young, 54 Buckmaster Road, on behalf of Phillip Eramo, Sr. who submitted a letter to the Planning Board regarding his lack of support for this application. (A copy of this letter is included with this record.)

J. Hickey, 82 Sexton Ave., commented about his dissatisfaction with this application based on lack of proof of coverage and alternative sites.

J. Concordia, 182 Pond St., commented about the wetlands on the Temple property and thinks the Conservation Commission should be consulted.

Ms. Loughnane asked to comment at this point to inform the board that the applicant has filed a notice of intent with the Conservation Commission and she has been informed that the Commission has approved the application and is in the process of drafting an on order of conditions.

K. Kutzer, Sherman's Way commented about the AT & T merger with T-Mobile and if this changes the burden to prove the need for coverage in this area.

Ch. Rafsky said this merger has not been finalized and both companies are continuing to pursue technology improvements until this is finalized.

Mr. Sousa said this site also is providing coverage for MetroPCS which is not involved in that merger.

D. Stebbins, 43 Circuit Rd., commented about seeing the base of this tower becoming a landmark for the area.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Ch. Rafsky said Town Counsel is present tonight and will be advising the board through this process.

C. Hobson, 36 Sherman's Way commented about alternative sites and the aesthetics of these sites and that the viable alternative has been identified.

M. Calawa, 30 Circuit Rd., commented about the aesthetics of the monopole and the equipment associated with this. He submitted pictures to the board showing another tower and its appearance and concealed equipment within a fake rock. He also commented about the decrease in property values and the equivalent towns compared.

B. Haak, 27 Sexton Ave., commented on the size of the pole and the number of carriers that may be located at this site. Also said he thinks in building coverage is satisfactory.

M. Young, 54 Buckmaster Rd., asked if there will be a light required on this tower by the FAA and expressed concern if a light were to be required.

Mr. Sousa responded that he does not expect this tower to be lit.

B. Haak, 27 Sexton Ave., suggested that the applicant be required to submit his documents electronically to Mr. Maxson. He said the scanned copies are not satisfactory.

Mr. Sousa said electronic documents were submitted to Mr. Maxson and said they would send revised plots to him as well.

Mr. Maxson said the applicant needs to prove availability and potential coverage of the water tank in Norwood before further study occurs.

J. Concordia, 182 Pond St., asked if the applicant was McDonalds, would this be an appropriate location for it. He suggested that the Temple should be limited to religious activities.

Ch. Rafsky said our zoning does not allow for McDonalds to conduct business in Westwood.

Ms. Loughnane stated that the property the Temple is located on is properly zoned for a cell tower and that is why this application is before the Planning Board.

Mr. Sousa asked his site acquisition representatives to comment, regarding their work with the town of Norwood and the water tank site.

Mr. Johnson stated that he met with John Carroll of the Town of Norwood multiple times and said the town has restricted the water tank location for municipal equipment only.

Ms. Chafetz asked if Mr. Johnson has worked with other cell tower development companies in Massachusetts other than SBA Towers.

Mr. Johnson responded that there are several other companies in Massachusetts that he has worked with. He named two companies. He said he has been working exclusively for T-Mobile now.

D. Barry, 20 Circuit Ave., asked Mr. Maxson to confirm his statement that a reduction in the height and width of the tower will not significantly affect the coverage.

Mr. Maxson confirmed that it was his opinion, although the decreasing the width may not be possible.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

D. Barry, 20 Circuit Ave., asked why four carriers have to be allowed to be site there.

Mr. Maxson responded that many Towns require maximizing co-location of carriers on towers.

D. Stebbins, 43 Circuit Rd., commented about another cell tower application currently being heard in the town of Topsfield for T-Mobile and the differences between that site and the Temple's site.

Mr. Maxson said he worked on that application and he said the town of Topsfield denied that application and required the applicant to find an alternative site.

B. Haak, 27 Sexton Ave., of the two schools, which is the best location in town to provide the best coverage.

Mr. Sousa said the Temple property is the best site for the best coverage and deferred to Mr. Isins.

Mr. Isins said the Sheehan School would be adequate but the Temple is the best location.

Mr. Olanoff asked Mr. Maxson if the water tower was used as a location, he asked if the antenna orientation and rotation be set at 120 degrees.

Mr. Maxson said the antenna should be pointed directly at the target in a three leaf clover pattern to optimize coverage.

Mr. Olanoff asked if it is possible if this is possible and would provide adequate coverage.

Mr. Maxson said each antenna would need to be adjusted and then said he is not sure that the water tank is even a viable site.

Mr. Sousa said his applicant's model and the lack of a drive test would not be feasible.

B. Haak, 27 Sexton Ave., asked about conducting another drive test from the Sheehan School.

Ch. Rafsky thanked the public for the comments and said at this time the Planning Board will discuss the future process of this hearing. He said based on the information presented tonight, he believes that the board will not adjourn this meeting tonight. He asked that at the next meeting on May 17th, he would like to allow ten minutes to review a list of the last outstanding items needed to continue the meeting and close the hearing on June 16th. He asked Mr. Maxson and Ms. Loughnane to develop this list. He asked Mr. Sousa if the applicant would be willing to extend the time for the planning board's review due to the regulatory deadline.

Mr. Sousa said he would like to wait and see until after all information is received from the town planner and the consultant and then make that determination at the June 16th hearing about whether or not to extend the timeline.

Ch. Rafsky said he thinks the Planning Board would like to close the hearing on June 16th but is still uncertain if that is possible. He asked Ms. Loughnane and Mr. Maxson if they are satisfied with this timeline.

Both Ms. Loughnane and Mr. Maxson agreed with this timeline.

Ms. Loughnane asked if Mr. Sousa if he brought a section of the pole to demonstrate size and breadth of the cladding material of the tower tonight.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Mr. Sousa said he is still working on getting a section from the tower manufacturing company and will bring it to the next hearing.

Ms. Loughnane asked for clarification on the diameter of the tower and she said within the materials submitted with the application there are three different depictions showing different levels of tapering. She asked him to inform the board as to what the exact proposal is for the base of the tower and all the way to the 99'.6" height.

Mr. Sousa said he would check with his client but referenced TAB A, which provides additional information.

Ms. Loughnane said in the materials under TAB A, the tower is depicted as 36" diameter pole from base to height, without any taper at all.

Mr. Sousa confirmed that the tower will not be tapered.

Ms. Loughnane stated that this is significant difference from the original proposal.

Ch. Rafsky said at the meeting on May 17th, no testimony will be taken. Mr. Maxson and Mr. Sousa will be allowed to make any comments at that time during that brief submission of information.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to adjourn and continue the meeting until Tuesday, May 17th, at 7:30 p.m. in the Champagne Meeting Room at 50 Carby Street, in which no testimony will be taken rather only a discussion of matters for further review. At that time the date and time of the continuation of the public hearing will be announced at that meeting and will be posted on the Planning Board's web page.

**Other Planning Board Business that may come before the Board
*Request to Extend Tri-Partite Agreement – PJMJ LLC/Phillips Estates***

Ms. Loughnane informed the board that a request has been received from Margery Eramo Young, representing PJMJ, LLC the developer of the Phillips Estates subdivision, to extend its current Tri-Partite Agreement, expiring in May 2012 through November 2014. In order to complete the work remaining on this subdivision, construction should have already been in process. Because the economy has not recovered to the extent that the developer had hoped, additional time is needed.

Ms. Eramo Young said the bank has agreed to the extension of three years and has requested that the Planning Board provide an approval.

Ms. Chafetz asked what has been completed since the last extension. Ms. Eramo Young said that blasting, clearing grub, earth excavation and unclassified excavation has been completed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to extend the Tri-Partite Agreement for Phillips Estates through November 14, 2014.

Planning Board Reorganization and Committee Assignments

Ms. Loughnane said she has spoken to all board members regarding the chairmanship and suggested that Mr. Rafsky remain as Chair and the town would benefit from continuity in the leadership of the board.

Ms. Chafetz agreed with Ms. Loughnane.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

Mr. Rafsky commented that he thinks rotation is important but said he would support Ms. Loughnane's suggestion to keep the board membership as is.

Mr. Olanoff agreed with leaving the membership as is.

The following was suggested:

Steven M. Rafsky, Chairman
Steven H. Olanoff, Vice Chairman
John J. Wiggin, Secretary
Bruce H. Montgomery
Carol E. Chafetz

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to approve the organization of the Planning Board as stated.

Ms. Loughnane said the following committee assignments need to be reorganized and Board members agreed to the following assignments:

Housing Partnership Representative – Steve Rafsky and alternate, Carol Chafetz
Metropolitan Area Planning Council – Steve Olanoff and alternate, Carol Chafetz
MBTA Advisory Board Designee – Steve Olanoff and alternate Steve Rafsky
Regional Transportation Advisory Committee – Steve Olanoff (appointed by the Board of Selectmen)
Three Rivers Inter-Local Council – Carol Chafetz and alternate Steve Olanoff

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to approve the above mentioned committee assignments.

Re-Appointment of Town Planner

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Olanoff, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to approve the reappointment of Nora Loughnane as Town Planner for the term ending May 2012.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 P.M.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, May 17th at 7:30 PM at 50 Carby Street, in the Champagne Meeting Room.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
Westwood High School Auditorium
7:15 PM**

List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits

Document – Isotrope Wireless – Technical Report on the Application for a Wireless Communications Facility at 7 Clapboardtree Street, Westwood, MA, dated 4/29/11

Document – Prince Lobel – SBA Towers II, LLC, T-Mobile Northeast LLC & MetroPCS Massachusetts, LLC, dated 05/03/11

Memo from M. Jaillet, Town Administrator to Planning Board, dated 05/10/11, RE: SBA Wireless Cell Tower Exploration for Locations

Email from C. McKeown, Economic Development Officer to S. Rafsky, Ch. Planning Board, dated 05/10/11, RE: Wireless Antenna at Temple

Letter from C. Gallagher, Deputy Director of Public Works to S. Rafsky, Ch. Planning Board, dated 05/10/11, RE: Proposed Monopole at Temple Beth David

Letter to Planning Board, from Phillip Eramo, Sr., 48 Clapboardtree Street, RE: proposed telecommunications tower, dated 05/10/11

Sign in Sheet from Public Hearing – includes names of all residents who spoke at the hearing.