

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
October 13, 2009  
7:30 PM**

**Board Members Present:** Ch. S. Olanoff, S. Rafsky, R. Malster, J. Wiggin and B. Montgomery

**Staff Present:** N. Loughnane, Town Planner; J. Bertorelli, Town Engineer; & G. Garber, Community Development Advisor. Minutes were recorded by J.Barba, Land Use Assistant.

Ch. Olanoff called the meeting to order at approximately 7:40 PM and opened the hearing with by reading the legal notice.

**Public Hearing to Consider Application for Limited Environmental Impact and Design Review (EIDR) Approval of Exempt Use for the Construction of an Additional 99-Car Parking Lot at St. Margaret Mary Parish - 837 High Street**

Robert Murphy, of Danena Engineering Associates, was present on behalf of the applicant to summarize the proposed addition of 99 parking spaces in the rear of the Church's current parking area. Mr. Murphy told the board that the proposed additional spaces will provide parking during the holiday season as well as assist with problems that have been occurring with the stacked spaces which are used by early arrivals and late departures in such a way as to hinder the flow of traffic after services. He said that a pedestrian path from the new parking lot, through the current parking lot, to the church will be constructed, as will a set of stairs down to the new lot. Although this lot will not be handicapped accessible, the applicant meets the town's requirement for handicapped spaces, which are all located near the front of the church.

Mr. Murphy explained that the existing driveways which are controlled by police details will continue to be utilized. Mr. Murphy noted that the driveway to the right of the church is one-way into the parking lot, the driveway to the left of the church is one-way out, and there is another two-way drive at the entrance to the cemetery road. Board members questioned whether the cemetery road was a private road, a public street or an easement. Fr. Christopher Coyne, Pastor of St. Margaret Mary's, responded that a recent title search had shown that land for the cemetery road was sold to the Town by the Church in the 1970's, but that part of the road was actually constructed on Church property. Mr. Rafsky commented that he thought the road may have been accepted by Town Meeting in the 1980's. Mr. Bertorelli suggested that a mutual easement be established by the Church and the Board of Selectmen.

Mr. Rafsky noted the abutting wetlands and asked whether the Conservation Commission had made any determination on the proposed project. Ms. Loughnane replied that the Conservation Commission had scheduled a hearing with this applicant for tomorrow night to consider the Applicant's Request for Determination. She said that any decision of the Planning Board could be conditional upon the outcome of the Conservation Commission's determination. Mr. Murphy explained that the Church and Town have an agreement that allows the town to dump fill at this location and that the Conservation Commission is aware of the ongoing activity.

Ch. Olanoff asked how much fill would be used. Mr. Murphy responded that he did not know for sure, but it would be a significant amount. Ch. Olanoff said that the Applicant must file for a Special Permit for Earth Material Movement, which will require a separate public hearing. Mr. Murphy agreed to do this and Ms. Loughnane said she would reserve a spot for that hearing on the agenda for the first Planning Board meeting in November.

Mr. Murphy explained that porous pavement would be used for the new parking lot surface. He said that porous pavement looks like conventional asphalt pavement, but is permeable, which eliminates the need for a drainage system. Nonetheless, Mr. Murphy noted that the plans called for two observation ports to be installed and monitored to ensure proper infiltration. He explained that porous pavement is more environmentally friendly because there is no runoff. He added that this

type of pavement is ideally suited for a car-only of parking lot, and would not be advisable if heavy trucks were expected to use the lot. Mr. Wiggin and Mr. Bertorelli agreed that this sounds like an ideal application for porous pavement. Mr. Bertorelli had questions about the base of the pavement. Mr. Murphy said soil logs, gravel and perk tests have been conducted, and 8" of crushed stone will be installed or a base. In addition, Mr. Bertorelli said a schedule for vacuuming the lot should be submitted in order to maintain optimum performance of the pavement. He also requested information on the capacity of the soil to permit the dissipation of the runoff. Mr. Murphy said he would provide this information in advance of the next hearing.

Ch. Olanoff noted that the plans show three new lighting fixtures. Mr. Murphy explained that this lighting is proposed to be installed on 30' high poles. He said that the Applicant requests a variance from the maximum permitted 20' pole height in a residential district. Ms. Loughnane mentioned that she had received a phone call from a resident who lives on High Rock Street, to the right rear of the Church lot. She said that the resident had expressed concerns about the lack of dense landscaping around the proposed parking lot, and was worried about possible light spillover from the proposed new fixtures. Mr. Murphy responded that the lights would only be turned on a few times a year for late night Masses. Mr. Bertorelli requested that the applicant provide a lighting footprint and manufacturer's specifications. He said that maximum light levels would need to be identified to ensure that there would be no light spillover to abutting residences.

Mr. Malster asked why only painted lines were shown for islands within the parking lot. He suggested curbing around the light fixtures, at the minimum, and asked why no trees were proposed in the middle of the parking lot. Mr. Murphy responded that there is not sufficient soil in the parking lot to plant trees, and added that the root systems of trees could also interfere with the water recharge through the porous pavement. Ch. Olanoff stated that the plans were not in conformance with the parking lot landscape requirements. Mr. Murphy requested a waiver of the parking lot landscape requirements. Ms. Loughnane reminded the board that the interior landscaping requirements cannot be waived by the Planning Board. She noted that proposed revisions contained a waiver option, but said that these revisions would not take effect unless approved by Town Meeting next May. Ms. Loughnane said that a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals would be necessary if the Applicant wished to proceed with these plans. Mr. Malster suggested that, if the Applicant doesn't plan to begin work prior next May, the Church may want to consider waiting to see if the amendment passes, and if it does, ask the board to grant a waiver.

Mr. Bertorelli mentioned that the parking design standard references on the plans calls for parking stalls that are 8.0' wide. He noted that he would usually recommend a minimum of 9.0' stall width, but in this case he would accept 8.5'.

Ms. Loughnane requested that the Applicant submit a set of revised plans, an application for Special Permit for Earth Material Movement, and the results of tomorrow night's Conservation Commission hearing. She also suggested that Fr. Coyne contact Town Administrator Mike Jaillet to that the Board of Selectmen set a placeholder on the Town Meeting warrant for approval of a mutual easement for the cemetery road.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted five votes in favor, to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, November 24<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 P.M.

The hearing adjourned at 8:50 P.M.

**Next Meeting Date:**

The next meeting of the board is October 27, 2009.