

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

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

Chairman Rafsky called the meeting to order at approximately 7:31 P.M.

Resignation of Glenn Garber

Ch. Rafsky announced that Mr. Garber has accepted a new position of Planning Director for the Town of Bedford. Board members thanked Mr. Garber for his efforts while with the Town of Westwood. Mr. Wiggin acknowledged Mr. Garber's extensive work on the Comprehensive Plan Update over the past eight months.

Update on Planning Board Annual Committee Appointments

Ch. Rafsky informed the board that he was contacted by Selectman Patrick Ahearn regarding the Planning Board's recent update of the committee assignments to the Housing Partnership, MAPC, MBTA Advisory Board and TRIC. He said Mr. Ahearn expressed his board's desire to see the members of the Planning Board alternate committee appointments from year to year. Ch. Rafsky informed Mr. Ahearn that due to personal schedules of each of the planning board members, these committee appointments have been carefully considered and have been made in the best interest of the Town. In addition, Ch. Rafsky informed board members that a decision was made by the Board of Selectmen to appoint Town Administrator Michael Jaillet as representative to the MAPC and has requested that Mr. Olanoff serve as the alternate.

Ch. Rafsky gave board members an opportunity comment; no comments were made on this matter. Ch. Rafsky requested a motion to amend the Planning Board's recommendations on the MAPC appointments as discussed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted three votes in favor and two opposed (Mr. Olanoff and Mr. Wiggin) to accept the amendments to the MAPC appointments made by the Board of Selectmen.

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 and before resuming testimony asked Town Planner, Ms. Loughnane to provide clarification on the timetable for the planning board's decision on this application.

Ms. Loughnane stated that the Planning Board must make a decision on this application this evening, and record the decision with the town clerk by June 23, 2011. If a decision is not made this evening, with the applicant's agreement, the board could again continue this hearing. Ms. Loughnane said the applicant has informed her that it would agree to a continuance of this hearing to allow additional time for the Planning Board to consider Mr. Maxson's report.

Ch. Rafsky said in his opinion he would like to close the hearing this evening in an hour or less and try to get to a decision this evening.

Ch. Rafsky welcomed Mr. Sousa on behalf of the Applicant, SBA Towers and the board's consultant, David Maxson.

Mr. Sousa made a request to Ch. Rafsky to address that board. Mr. Sousa stated that he would like to introduce a third expert this evening to provide an independent opinion to interpret the RF data for the board, following Mr. Maxson's presentation. He further stated that he would be willing to

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

discuss adjusting the time deadline to file the decision on this application.

Ch. Rafsky thanked Mr. Sousa for his comments asked Mr. Maxson to begin his presentation.

Mr. Maxson began by saying that he believes the applicant has chosen to bring in a third opinion so as to average the findings of all three studies. He complemented the applicant for the submittal of substantial information prepared for tonight's hearing and said he worked very hard to get materials reviewed and this report ready for this evening.

Mr. Maxson said his report covers responses to a number of questions posed to the applicant at the previous hearing. (A copy of this report is included with the record of these minutes.) The report covers the following information: Key Points; Inventory of Query Responses; Coverage Analysis – MetroPCS; Coverage Analysis – T-Mobile with new drive test information and Visual Impact Simulations.

Mr. Maxson began by posing the question, is there a significant gap in service? He stated that this is not a technical decision. He said it is his job as an expert to educate the Planning Board and be sure that accurate and reliable information has been collected into the record upon which to base its decision. He said he will discuss vehicular coverage gaps and in-residence coverage gaps and if there is a gap, are there any realistic or viable alternatives that would be more in keeping with the town's perspective on how wireless communication facilities should be sited in the community? He mentioned the Sheehan School site outside of the overlay district and also a possible facility site at Westwood Lodge parcel as alternative site locations. He showed the board the coverage assessment maps on the overhead projection, showing the average signal models which have a good correlation between computer models and drive test maps. He said the information on in-residence gaps is substantially below MetroPCS' threshold with respect to the Telecommunications Act. He said this threshold is independent of the bylaw and the board may want to use the language of the town's bylaw.

Mr. Maxson reviewed the coverage maps extensively for MetroPCS. Figure 1 – Isotrope Coverage Map – MetroPCS Existing; Figure 2 – Isotrope Coverage Map – MetroPCS Existing plus Proposed at 80 Feet; Figure 3 – Isotrope Coverage Map – MetroPCS Existing plus Sheehan School at 900 feet; Figure 4 – Isotrope Coverage Map – MetroPCS Existing plus Sheehan School at 50 feet (Minor WCF); and Figure 5 – Isotrope Coverage Map – MetroPCS Existing plus Lodge at 90 feet. He explained that this analysis resulted in a more "pessimistic" view of the coverage of MetroPCS at its "inbuilding" signal level threshold. In other words, the area served with the MetroPCS – 88 dbm signal (green) on the coverage map shrunk.

Mr. Maxson discussed the similar analysis of T-Mobile. He said this report suggests some degree of agreement on the number of residences that would benefit from improved in-building residence service from T-Mobile. He said in-vehicle coverage is not significantly flawed. The focus is best put on in-building coverage and if there is a significant gap in coverage.

Mr. Maxson reviewed the Visual Impact Simulations section of his report. He said the simulations provided appeared to be substantially narrower than the stated nominal 30" diameter at the top. He presented Figure 8 – TEP Group Photo simulation 1 with Isotrope Annotations in which a 16" maple is marked and a casement window on the building. Figure 9 – Detail View of TEP Group Photo simulation 1 shows a more accurate depiction of the thickness of the flagpole. Figure 10 – Supplemental Photo simulation #1 Modified by Isotrope to Equivalent 50 mm Focal Length with 30-inch Tower Diameter at Top is more representative of the experience of the proposed tower from the vantage point of the camera, which is at the sidewalk on Pond Street. Mr. Maxson said this is helpful to have a reasonably representative example of the proposed tower upon which to assess the visual characteristics of the proposed facility. In addition, Mr. Maxson said the applicant provided a

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

cylindrical view showing the antenna detail for T-Mobile and Metro PCS which depicted the width of the antenna within the flagpole, suggested that the tower could not be more tapered at the top.

This concluded Mr. Maxson's presentation.

Ch. Rafsky opened the meeting to Board member comments.

Mr. Wiggin commented that he found the maps provided by Mr. Maxson showing the existing coverage and proposed coverage are very difficult to see without flipping back and forth between maps. He said he would like to clearly see the area of change and degree of change from either marginally suitable or unsuitable coverage.

Mr. Maxson agreed that it is difficult to present narrow splotches of signal along different areas as well as other "blobs" of color. He said looking at the map in splotches is much less reliable than looking at the map as a whole. He said the larger the "blob", the more likely it is showing consistency. He said on the MetroPCS map, the drive test data is easier to see the above threshold coverage areas, being more concentrated and consistent in color.

Mr. Wiggin said the applicant's map of Martha Jones School showed better coverage at Winter Street and Clapboardtree Street. He asked if Mr. Maxson if he agreed with this.

Mr. Maxson said he did not recall that map although he said he didn't think Martha Jones School was as effective overall as an alternative site, as compared to the Sheehan School site.

Mr. Wiggin said he needs some metric of evaluation to understand this to see if this proposal will fill the coverage gap. He commented about 1,000-4,000 residences will received improved service.

Mr. Maxson said this is a number of 1,000-4,000 is a general assessment.

Mr. Olanoff asked about the report of the third independent consultant hired by the applicant and questioned whether he has provided an independent review.

Mr. Maxson said he respected the third consultant and his work.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Maxson to answer yes or no to the question "Is there a gap in coverage?"

Mr. Maxson said this is a hypothetical question. He stated that the applicants, T-Mobile and MetroPCS have demonstrated areas where residential coverage is substantially below their thresholds in locations that the proposed facility would address.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Maxson if he has drawn a conclusion that there is an alternative site for a proposed tower.

Mr. Maxson said that in terms of coverage, the Sheehan School property within the WCOD would be a substantial substitute, not a perfect substitute for a tower, less so if it was from the rooftop of the school. He said a site at the Westwood Lodge, this would be a direct replacement but he said he is unsure if the owner would be interested in a tower and this location is not currently in the WCOD.

Ch. Rafsky gave board members an opportunity to ask questions but none were asked.

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

Mr. Sousa asked if he could allow the third consultant, Daniel Goulet of C Squared Systems, LLC to

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

present his report with respect to Isotrope's analysis. He commented that under the Telecommunications Act, carriers have the right to provide reliable service to its users no matter where they are. He said there would be no proposal for this site if the carrier didn't see a need for it. He passed out copies of C Squared Systems report.

Following this, Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Sousa if he brought a section of proposed monopole for the board to view.

Mr. Sousa responded to Ch. Rafsky and said he did bring a small sample section of the cladding material to be used on the monopole. He held it up to show the board and the audience.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Sousa if this sample is a fair representation of the appearance of the monopole. Mr. Sousa said due to the large size and heavy weight of an actual section of the monopole, he brought this sample of the cladding material. Mr. Sousa also passed out a letter from Tower Engineering Professionals regarding Photosim clarification. He said the letter speaks for itself.

Mr. Sousa said the proposed monopole will be no more than 30" in diameter all the way up the pole and that a taper which the planning board requested will not possible as a 36" width base would be necessary to support it.

Mr. Sousa submitted copy of the resume of Daniel Goulet of C Squared Systems and he said Mr. Goulet will summarize his report in response to Isotrope's coverage plots.

Mr. Goulet began his presentation to the planning board. He gave a brief background on his twenty year career history with multiple wireless carriers as a RF manager. He said he represents wireless carriers only. He began reviewing the report which covered the following topics:

1. Background
2. Proposed Facility
3. Technical Need for the Proposed Facility
4. Predictive Analysis
5. Coverage Plots – Results & Findings
6. Analysis Comparisons
7. Summary
8. Statement of Certification
9. Tables 1-4
10. Exhibits 1-8

In the report summary it states, "C Squared concludes that coverage gaps exist for both T-Mobile and MetroPCS in the area around the proposed site. The degree to which the coverage gaps effect each individual network will vary somewhat based upon each carrier's surrounding network of sites, and the targeted signal level threshold used in their respective designs."

The coverage gaps include roadways such as Route 109, Clapboardtree Street, Oak Street, Winter Street, and the adjoining neighborhoods.

The proposed site will serve to fill in much of these coverage gaps for both wireless providers and will increase "in-building" coverage areas to include 14% more of Westwood's population than are presently served.

This concluded Mr. Goulet's presentation. (A copy of this report has been submitted with the record for this meeting.)

Ch. Rafsky asked Board members if they wished to ask questions or comment.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

Mr. Montgomery asked Mr. Goulet to confirm that he was hired by the applicant. Mr. Goulet confirmed that he was hired by the applicant. Mr. Montgomery said for this reason he did not think this review could be considered "independent" but actually an additional review.

Mr. Sousa said the purpose of C Squared's report is to further clarify and further broaden the data about the disagreement on level of the gap in coverage, for the Planning Board.

Mr. Montgomery asked Mr. Goulet if he was asked to look at the Sheehan School as an alternate site for the monopole and Mr. Goulet responded that he was not asked to look at the Sheehan School site.

Mr. Wiggin commented that he thinks C Squared's report essentially used Isotrope's data and applied it to another model.

Mr. Sousa said the C Squared report provides a more sophisticated model and analysis of the data.

Mr. Goulet said the gaps shown by Isotrope may be slightly larger than what they show in the real world and his reports show the real gaps in the real world. He agreed with Mr. Wiggin's comments that Isotrope's data was plugged into a different predictive tool that aligns with their data.

Mr. Wiggin commented that engineers who work for cell companies do not agree with engineers who do not.

Mr. Goulet said he disagreed with this comment. He said does not agree with the information provided by Isotrope.

Mr. Olanoff asked Mr. Goulet to explain the differences between the two predictive models.

Mr. Goulet said he would only talk about C Squared's model and software. He said the drive data have some spots that do not line up due to overpasses etc. He said the two models have some slight errors due to standard deviation, 7.5 db. He said Isotrope's drive test reports are off by 2.5-3.0 db. He said adjustments can be made for tree height, de-fraction, absorption etc.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Goulet to explain the effectiveness of radius from the monopole.

Mr. Goulet said the coverage plots do not measure a true radius because of hills, tree heights or notches. He said the higher the frequency, the smaller the radius.

Ch. Rafsky asked for an average distance that a wireless carrier would expect in order for there to be optimum usage in a town.

Mr. Goulet said the radius would be under a mile from the footprint of the T-Mobile and MetroPCS tower.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Maxson if he concurred with C Squared's report or wished to comment on it.

Mr. Maxson responded that he agreed with the fundamentals of the reports which summarize that both MetroPCS and T-Mobile show areas that are substantially below their targets for in-building coverage. Although he said he disagrees with C Squared Systems mischaracterization of his maps and said the 2.5-3.0 db referred to a mean error and not a standard deviation. He said that the measurements were compared with other maps, data points and drive tests. He said C Squared System's conclusions are misleading as the comparisons are not "apples to apples". He said he has

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

a more optimistic view of coverage and views of coverage substantially below target.

Ch. Rafsky opened the hearing to the public comments.

The following residents made comments:

J. Atkinson, 182 Pond Street – commented about the cross section of the tower cladding material brought this evening.

J. Hickey, 82 Sexton Avenue – commented that this tower is not needed.

J. Concordia, 182 Pond Street – commented about the length of the planning board hearing process and expressed frustration about the number of times the applicant has been given to keep continuing the application and hearing process.

Ch. Rafsky responded to Mr. Concordia's comments. He said the Planning Board continued its last hearing for the purpose of discussing the process going forward, subsequently set the next hearing, which is this evening's hearing. The hearing was posted with all pertinent information with the town clerk and on the town website. Ch. Rafsky said that he believes at this time the Planning Board has all the information it needs in which to deliberate, in order to make a decision. Furthermore, he said he is not sure if there is enough time tonight to make a decision, nevertheless, the Planning Board has followed the process it had stated that it would.

J. Concordia, asked for an update on the status of the Conservation Commission's review of the application.

Ms. Loughnane responded that the Conservation Commission has reviewed the Notice of Intent submitted by the Applicant, issued an Order of Conditions related to the wetlands on site. The application has been approved by the Commission and can be built as proposed if a Special Permit is received by the Planning Board.

D. Kutzer, Windmill Lane asked when C Squared was hired by the applicant and if the company has ever worked with Temple Beth David in the past.

Mr. Goulet said he would not sure and would have to check with company representatives. He said the company had not worked with the Temple regarding a tower but had with an in-building type of technology.

Ch. Rafsky asked Mr. Goulet to explain what "dropped call" activity is.

Mr. Goulet responded that "dropped call" refers to the retention of a call and accessibility of making a call.

Ch. Rafsky said he does not understand the information regarding the problem area for the customer who is within the distance of the tower.

Mr. Sousa suggested that Ch. Rafsky review Tab 8, which refers to the number of complaints about no signal, dropped calls, etc.

Ch. Rafsky asked if a radius was mentioned.

Mr. Sousa said a three mile radius was mentioned.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

Ch. Rafsky said he believes there is incomplete information about references to distances. He pointed out that the applicant offered "customer complaint" information for an approximately three (3) mile radius while the proposed pole will cover an area approximating one (1) mile in radius. Ch. Rafsky stated that our several requests to understand the "customer complaint" information for that area will be serviced by this pole was never answered as the applicant has not shown any data that shows the "customer complaint" information within one mile of the pole. Mr. Sousa acknowledged that the information was not available.

K. Barnicle, Sherman's Way – commented about the negative aesthetics of this tower.

M. Young, 54 Buckmaster Road – asked if the site will have aviation lights.

Ch. Rafsky stated that the site will not be lighted.

Mr. Sousa said he has not received any final determination from the FAA on whether this facility shall be lit. However, it does not anticipate any lighting for the tower.

D. Stebbins, 43 Circuit Road – noted section 9.4.7.6 of the bylaw and said this monopole cannot be described as a flag pole.

This concluded the public comments.

Ch. Rafsky commented that he has reviewed this file extensively. He said when the Planning Board wrote this bylaw it believed it was done correctly. He explained that sometimes certain zoning can create unintended consequences and the board will do its best to make amendments. He suggested to Board members to keep the hearing open, without taking any additional testimony. He asked Ms. Loughnane to comment. She suggested a continuation date of July 26th but said the agenda is quite full already.

Mr. Wiggin commented that he did not think there is not enough time tonight.

Ch. Rafsky agreed.

Mr. Olanoff suggested that the board "forge ahead".

Ms. Chafetz stated that she thought the board could begin deliberation tonight after taking a five minute break.

Mr. Montgomery agreed with Ms. Chafetz and Mr. Olanoff and said that he would like to try to conclude the hearing this evening.

Ms. Loughnane asked Ch. Rafsky if she could ask three questions prior to the five minute break. Her questions were as follows:

1. Regarding the discrepancy in the diameter of the monopole, Ms. Loughnane asked Mr. Sousa for the dimensions of the flag shown in the photo simulations. (*Answer - Mr. Sousa said he would need to look through the materials to find those dimensions.*) Ms. Loughnane commented that a flag of a certain size must have been in mind during the production of the photo simulations.
2. Clarification on equipment areas shown on the plans – Ms. Loughnane asked if there would be any reduction in the four the fenced-in equipment areas. (*Answer – Mr. Sousa said on plan C-2, all four locations are shown; top left location, is for T-Mobile, top right is for MetroPCS and the other two locations are labeled as future use.*) Ms. Loughnane asked Mr. Sousa if this will remain the same on the plans and he responded that there will be no change.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

3. Ms. Loughnane asked if either T-Mobile or MetroPCS has applied for a special permit for a wireless communication facility within the Town of Westwood and been denied? (*Answer – Mr. Sousa said he would have to research this. He asked Ms. Loughnane if she had any particular site in mind.*) Ms. Loughnane responded that according to planning department records, she did not find any denials; every previously submitted application by these carriers has been approved to date.

At this point the Planning Board took a five minute break.

Ch. Rafsky resumed the hearing and said the Planning Board will discuss the following information prior to making its decision:

- Is this is the application complete?
- Has the applicant determined that there is gap in coverage?
- Has the applicant demonstrated that this is the best and only site in which to install the facility?
- Is this site aesthetically appropriate for the neighborhood?

Ch. Rafsky asked board members to comment on each of the bulleted points.

Mr. Olanoff asked Town Planner Ms. Loughnane to comment on the completeness of the application.

Ms. Loughnane stated that the application is complete in that it includes the minimum requirements under the zoning bylaw, with the exception of a providing a clear demonstration of the physical appearance of the structure.

Ch. Rafsky said of all the information that has been provided, he thinks there is a consensus that improved wireless service is the goal.

Mr. Olanoff said he was not sure if the zoning bylaw addresses the level of service.

Ch. Rafsky said it must be considered in the Federal Telecommunications Act.

Ms. Chafetz said it is not difficult to believe that coverage is less than desirable some of the time on the some of the roads and in some of the residences. She said as a lay person she finds it is difficult to make a determination that there is a significant gap in coverage, as defined by the Telecommunications Act. She also said this is only one component of the deliberation.

Ch. Rafsky said the data does not address any questions that a non-RF engineer would ask and be able to interpret regarding coverage maps.

Mr. Wiggin said when the town originally created the wireless communications overlay districts it was unaware of how many companies there would be in the future and the advancements in technology. He said the bylaw requires that the overlay districts to be sited in areas that allow for the best coverage for the companies in a way that has the least impacts on the town, regardless of the neighborhood it is proposed in.

Ch. Rafsky said there have been a lot of comments on the aesthetics of this facility. He said from the very beginning with the balloon test, he has struggled to see how this structure fits in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Montgomery said he is not struggling with this.

Mr. Wiggin said from early on he said there is no question that this is the first proposed facility that

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

has the most visual impact, being in the front of a building and so close to the street. He said attempts have not been made by the applicant to minimize the visual impacts.

Mr. Olanoff said he believes the entirety of the application should be considered. He said it is the Planning Board's duty to see that the benefits of this application do not outweigh the negative impacts, particularly the aesthetics, of the proposed facility. He thinks another location should be considered, as attempts to minimize the visual impacts have not been possible. Mr. Olanoff said he thinks it would be beneficial to encourage the applicant to find another location.

Ch. Rafsky said the board has the authority to approve a tower of a lesser height. He asked if board members would consider a tower of a lower height.

Mr. Olanoff said he thinks a tower of a lower height is going to reduce the coverage even more and will not make any difference in the aesthetic impact.

Ms. Chafetz agreed with Mr. Olanoff regarding lowering the height of the tower and said the diameter of the tower is more of an issue for her. She said she visited the adjoining neighborhood today and is concerned with visual impact that the width of this monopole proposes. She also mentioned the possibility of additional sound impact associated with the equipment cabinet, etc.

Ch. Rafsky concurred with those statements.

Mr. Montgomery said he is concerned with more than the aesthetics of the tower and he said this location would be deeply disturbing and intimidating to people walking or driving by the Temple. He said calling this tower a flagpole is a stretch.

Ch. Rafsky said he is unaware of any other wireless communications site in town that is so intrusive. He discussed other locations in town as being unobtrusive and somewhat unnoticed by residents. He said this structure's negative aesthetics have played such a strong role in this process.

Mr. Wiggin commented on the development standards section of the bylaw in which it states that the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board that the visual and aesthetic impacts of the facility will be minimal.

Mr. Montgomery said the studies that were presented comparing property values do not look at sites that are 40' off of an intersection and he said he thinks a monopole at this site would affect property values.

Mr. Olanoff said the board should avoid discussing property values in relation to this site and focus on visual impacts.

Mr. Montgomery agreed.

Mr. Olanoff said the message from the Planning Board to the applicant is to try to find another location and work with the town in accomplishing that task.

Ch. Rafsky said from early discussions about siting a wireless facility, there were ample opportunities for the applicant to work with the town to present zoning amendments. He said the planning board's success rate at passing zoning amendments at town meeting is 100%.

Board members agreed with Ch. Rafsky.

Mr. Wiggin said that during this hearing process, there was compelling testimony from town officials

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

in which its willingness to work with the applicant was demonstrated.

Ch. Rafsky asked Ms. Loughnane to comment on the deliberations thus far.

Ms. Loughnane stated that at this point in the deliberation the board is focused on (1) is there is gap in coverage? (2) is this is the best and only site to install the facility? and (3) are the impacts minimal to the neighborhood? Furthermore, Ms. Loughnane said the applicant has failed to provide the visual impact information to demonstrate of the diameter of the pole and the size of the flag for the pole. She said any pole at this location would be highly intrusive to the area.

Ch. Rafsky asked board member if they wished to deliberate more.

Ms. Chafetz said she can make a decision tonight based on her review of all the documents pertaining to the application.

Mr. Montgomery agreed he could make a decision tonight, after initially being unsure about this application; his further review helped him become more convinced that this facility would be unacceptable.

Mr. Olanoff commented that in reviewing the zoning bylaw he said this application is in violation of section 9.4.7.1 and 9.4.7.2. In addition, he said section 9.4.7.4 regarding the maximum number of uses would contribute to the detriment of the facility.

Mr. Wiggin said in the second half of section 9.4.7.1 it states "the facility must be located at the proposed site due to technical, topographical or other unique circumstances." Mr. Wiggin said that he thinks this site was chosen because it is in the WCOD and maybe out of convenience in the sense that one of the reasons is a statement about process or regulatory efficiency.

Ch. Rafsky agreed and he requested a motion to close the hearing.

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

Upon a motion by Mr. Olanoff and seconded by Ms. Chafetz, the board voted unanimously, five votes in favor to deny the application and encourage the applicant to work with the town to find a more suitable location.

Other Planning Board Business that may come before the Board

Phillips Way Extension – Board members signed the paperwork for the previously approved Phillips Way Extension.

The meeting adjourned at 10:35 P.M.

The next meeting of the Planning Board is Tuesday, July 12th at 7:30 PM at 50 Carby Street, in the Champagne Meeting Room.

**Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2011
WHS Auditorium
7:30 P.M.**

List of Documents, Materials and Exhibits

Isotrope Wireless – “Second Technical Report on the Application for a Wireless Communications Facility at 7 Clapboardtree Street, Westwood, MA”, dated 06/11/11

Prince Lobel/Ricardo Sousa – “Proposed Wireless Communication Facility Application – 7 Clapboardtree Street - Supplemental Filing”, dated 06/07/11

Photosim Clarification Letter re: 7 Clapboardtree Street, associated with Special Permit & EIDR application, dated 06/16/11, from Tower Engineering Professionals

Report of C Squared Systems, LLC re: Independent RF Analysis for SBA Towers, dated 06/13/11