

**Westwood Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
November 24, 2009  
7:30 PM**

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

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

**Continuation of 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**

The applicant submitted a written request for a continuance to a date in late January, 2010 to allow for resolution of issues related to review by the Conservation Commission.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue the public hearing to January 26, 2010 at 7:30 PM.

**Public Hearing to Consider Earth Material Movement Special Permit associated with Limited EIDR Approval of Exempt Use for the Construction of an Additional 99-Car Parking Lot at St. Margaret Mary Parish - 837 High Street**

The applicant submitted a written request for a continuance to a date in late January, 2010 to allow for resolution of issues related to review by the Conservation Commission.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Wiggin, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue the public hearing to January 26, 2010 at 7:30 PM.

**Release of Covenants – Autumn Estates**

Town Engineer John Bertorelli informed the board that all improvements have been completed and the plan for acceptance of Autumn Drive and Autumn Lane has been signed by the Board of Selectmen. He stated that there is no further need to hold funds and that the surety may be released to the developer.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Malster, the board voted unanimously, in favor to release the covenants for Autumn Estates.

**Update on Zoning Amendments for Town Meeting**

**Consideration of Options for Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) – Glenn Garber**

Mr. Garber distributed the document, "Choices for OSRD in replacing MRD threshold in bylaw-*Revised*". The document is included below:

**CHOICES FOR OPEN SPACE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN REPLACING  
MAJOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT THRESHOLD IN BYLAW--*Revised***

CHOICES	DESCRIPTION	ANALYSIS
<b>◆ Land Use Status ◆</b>		
1) Should OSRD projects be permitted as-of-right?	Alternative is to keep them as special permit use. Most applicants would prefer as-of-right status, giving cluster development* at least equal legal weight as a conventional subdivision.	As-of-right status conforms to emerging new state model.  <i>Recommend strong consideration by Planning Board.</i>

◆ As-of-Right Regulatory Options ◆

2) Should OSRD projects be regulated via subdivision control process alone?	In this model, the regulation of the proposed development, the plan review process, occurs within the subdivision control authority of the Planning Board (PB), while the related zoning standards—use, dimensional requirements and density—remain properly in zoning (ZBL). The theory is that in a cluster, the subdivision plan is nearly identical to the site plan.	The as-of-right w/subdivision control approach conforms to the emerging new state model. It requires amending subdivision regulations of Planning Board (PB) in addition to establishing new quantitative standards within zoning bylaw (ZBL). The state sees this method as the strongest regulatory incentive for a developer to use OSRD design. <i>Recommend strong consideration by Planning Board.</i>
2A) Should OSRD projects be regulated with the EIDR site plan review process?	The theory is that retaining the EIDR process is an extra layer of plan review protection for the community. Applicant must still obtain subdivision approval, although the two hearings can be held concurrently to somewhat streamline the process.	This approach does not conform to the emerging new state model. Can be seen as a regulatory disincentive to employ the OSRD design, although the advantage to a site plan review is that it can seldom be employed to turn down a project in the way that a special permit can. <i>Recommend consideration by Planning Board.</i>
2B) What about as-of-right OSRD projects with density bonus incentives?	In either of the two preceding regulatory options, some kind of density bonus mechanism can also be built in, as a further incentive to developers to use OSRD design.	See discussion on density bonuses further on in this table.  <i>Recommend consideration by Planning Board.</i>

◆ Special Permit Regulatory Options ◆

3) Should OSRD projects be regulated by special permit?	Special permit zoning authority represents the highest and most discretionary degree of control for a PB. The site plan review (EIDR in Westwood) typically would be rolled directly into the special permit review and hearing process. Applicant must still obtain subdivision approval, although the two hearings can be held concurrently	This approach does not conform to the emerging new state model. Special permits are sometimes seen by developers as an impediment to reasonable and predictable permitting, and thus a possible disincentive to use OSRD design. A conventional subdivision is subject only to subdivision control in Westwood, due to invalidating of major residential development threshold. <i>There is a trend away from special permit-only regulation of OSRD, but many still feel it produces the best design because of the authority it gives to the SPGA</i>
3A) Should OSRD projects regulated by special permit always offer a density bonus?	The idea in these instances is to employ a density bonus incentive to overcome the developer's reluctance to use OSRD design because it bears the added regulatory burden of a special permit.	Also see discussion on density bonuses further on in this table.  <i>Recommend consideration by Planning Board.</i>

CHOICES	DESCRIPTION	ANALYSIS
<b>◆ Density Bonus Options ◆</b>		
4) Should OSRD projects all be entitled to a density bonus built into the density formula?	Many planners feel that a density bonus can be the foremost incentive to using OSRD design because it adds value to the land in a direct and demonstrable way. The widespread use of density bonuses in MA & their specific statutory authority make them a widely used tool.	Is clear in its intent and application. If existing underlying density = 1.0, then adding a factor of 1.25, for example, is a clear density metric.  <i>Recommend consideration by Planning Board, in comparison to # 4A below.</i>
4A) Alternatively, should OSRD regulation employ a voluntary density bonus system with a public benefit?	Typically granted for provision of extra open space (beyond the minimum), affordable housing units at one or more income levels, or both. Could possibly involve provision of other public benefits as well.	An increasing number of communities use this tool. It can get complicated when the public benefit has gradations, such as an increasing density bonus entitlement the lower the income eligibility levels, or having a sliding scale of open space protection, depending on, say, value of land as habitat.  <i>Recommend consideration by Planning Board, in comparison to # 4 above.</i>
<b>◆ Density Entitlement Options ◆</b>		
5) Should OSRD project density always be the same as the underlying zoning?	The cluster-type project may construct the same number of units for that district as allowed for a conventional subdivision. Westwood’s various zoning districts range from 12,000 square foot minimum lot size, to 15,000, 20,000, 40,000 and 80,000 SF. <b>Often defined by YIELD PLAN, a conventional subdivision sketch.</b>	On relatively small tracts of land, let us say 1 to 10 acres, the yield in dwelling units is minimal and therefore clustering might make little sense; this is particularly so in the 40,000 square foot and 80,000 SF minimum lot size districts. However, a density bonus can offset some of this disadvantage. <i>Minimum base density is not much of a market incentive to use OSRD.</i>
5A) Should OSRD projects always be entitled to a built-in extra density entitlement?	See discussion in item #4 preceding.	
5B) What should the mix of housing be?	Present mix under Senior Residential housing might offer a starting point, with its broad mix of housing types allowed and townhouse-type densities.	<i>Something in the range of 8 to 16 units to the acre and a varying housing mix (combined with stringent open space requirements) could make OSRD choice attractive to developers.</i>

5C) Should wetlands be subtracted up front, as part of any density calculation?	The theory is that wetlands are protected and unbuildable anyway, so why should the applicant be entitled to count them toward the unit entitlement on the site? Various zoning laws subtract anywhere from 25% to 100%. Some laws do not subtract wetlands at all.	There is an argument to be made that this is a disincentive to use OSRD design because it removes some part of the tract from the density calculation, while in a conventional subdivision, typically, no wetlands are subtracted. <i>This issue can only be resolved via discussion among the PB.</i>
5D) Should wetlands subtracted for density calculations still be counted toward required open space on site?	The argument can also be made here that wetlands are already protected and unbuildable, so they should not count—or at least not count 100%—toward required open space. On the other hand, they are valuable resource areas and are difficult to exclude from open space protection.	There is a strong case to be made that wetlands subtracted for density calculations should still be counted toward required open space on site.
<b>◆ Applicability by District ◆</b>		
6) In what residential zoning districts should OSRD be allowed?	Present Westwood flexible development allows only in SR C & E@40,000 SF and 80,000, SF minimum lot sizes. Applicability of OSRD to SR B @20,000 SF and even the SR A, SR D and GR@ 12,000 to 15,000 SF is under consideration in this discussion.	The issue with OSRD applicability in more districts than just SR C&E (40kSF and 80kSF) is that even in the smaller residential zones, there are many oversize lots and a few undeveloped parcels which could benefit from OSRD design. Do we want it to apply in all residential districts? Or add just SR B@20,000 SF to SR C&E? <i>This issue can only be resolved via discussion among the PB.</i>
<b>◆ Minimum Tract or Parcel Size ◆</b>		
7) Should there be a minimum tract (original parcel) size to be eligible for OSRD?	Present flexible development provision has a 10 acre minimum. This is judged to be a very large minimum parcel size is Westwood and a likely reason why the provision has never been used.	Many communities have no minimum parcel size for cluster-type development, and in others it ranges from 1 acre to 20 acres. The preliminary recommendation is that it should be on the small side, as buildable land dwindles. Effective OSRD can be designed on small sites, although the more land there is to work with, the more sweeping the open space opportunities. <i>Recommend a small parcel size, perhaps 40,000 SF minimum?</i>

**◆ Minimum Required Open Space ◆**

8) What percentage of the site should be protected open space?	In various environments (urban to rural) and development scenarios, have seen % range from 10% to 90%, but most laws fall in the 30% to 60% range. Use of septic also affects the %, typically requiring more land for that purpose. In WW Flexible development, there are additional OS requirements applying separately in SR C&E, over and above what is required for OS by means of lot size reduction.	We could use different percentages for sewered (the great majority of Westwood has sanitary sewers) and septic-only areas, e.g. 40% OS for septic lots, 50% for sewered. The quality of the open space should also be emphasized, requiring as much massing and connectivity as possible to preserve habitat. More complex formulas are possible, such as the one in the WW Flexible Development provision. <i>The 40% to 50% range seems right as a target.</i>
9) Should existing Flexible Development be retained, eliminated or modified to divide authority between PB and ZBA?	The FD provision has never been used as far as we know. It is administered as a ZBA special permit with density bonuses allowed for housing.	Rather than make extensive changes to the flawed FD, the cleanest action is simply to eliminate it in favor of OSRD, but technically this removes a ZBA power.  <i>Recommend FD elimination, but PB should discuss.</i>

\* Cluster development as employed in the matrix for general discussion purposes is used interchangeably with OSRD development as a term.

The Board agreed that it should, as a group, define the purpose and goals of the OSRD bylaw. Ch. Olanoff commented that infrastructure is cheaper for this type of development but added that the housing is often less desirable. Mr. Malster noted that there are few remaining large undeveloped parcels in town. He asked whether the point of the OSRD bylaw would be to create a new procedure for residential development or to offer greater variety of housing types. Mr. Rafsky asked if the purpose is to preserve resources or change the housing stock. Mr. Garber responded that there are a significant number of oversized lots in town with only one house. He said that the overriding purpose of the OSRD section is to preserve open space. Mr. Wiggin said this bylaw may cause development of existing undeveloped land that the town may not want to encourage. There was a discussion about multi-family housing. Mr. Malster said he would consider multi-family senior (55+) housing. Mr. Rafsky said that he would like to see the Planning Board engage in a thorough review of alternative housing options to be permitted in an OSRD, along with a comprehensive review of the Senior Residential Development section of the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Rafsky noted that such review could not be completed in time for the 2010 Town Meeting. He suggested that the Planning Board undertake such a study over the coming year and propose any necessary action for consideration at the 2011 Town Meeting. Ch. Olanoff asked what the minimum parcel size for an OSRD would be. Mr. Garber replied that the minimum tract size would be 10 acres.

**Public Hearing to Consider Application for EIDR Approval for the Construction of a New Entrance Portal and Sign Canopy and for Alterations to an Existing Parking Lot at Mercedes-Benz Dealership – 425 Providence Highway**

Ch. Olanoff read the legal notice and opened the hearing at approximately 8:10 PM. He welcomed the Applicant and other representatives. Present were Matt McGovern, Applicant; Paul Ayoub, attorney for the Applicant; and Doug Adams, architect. Mr. Ayoub gave an overview of the

application, explaining that Mercedes Benz is implementing a new nationwide branding program called "Autohaus" which requires franchise owners to incorporate certain contemporary architectural elements into each dealership. Mr. Adams explained that the exterior of the building needs to be altered to create a new modern entrance with a contemporary portal finished with stucco, painted blue and silver. He stated that the proposed sign structure is 57' x 18', that the area of the sign will be approximately 1,026 square feet, and that the sign would include eight columns and LED-lit wording. Mr. Adams noted that this new structure will result in the loss of three accessible parking spaces near the new entrance to the building, which spaces will be relocated elsewhere on the property.

Ch. Olanoff commented that he would have rejected this application, as he thought the application was lacking necessary details and clarity. In addition, he said he was confused about the sign's conformity to the town's zoning bylaws. He stated that the plans were missing references to lighting, relocation of accessible spaces, etc. Mr. Adams responded with information on the specifics of the sign shown on the plans, described as having steel columns and beams. He said that the sign would display the name "Mercedes of Westwood", with a white background and blue letters, illuminated with LED lighting. Mr. Adams further stated that the portal was shown on plans as being set off in blue and silver contemporary imagery, apart from the existing green New England-style building. He said the portal will be cut into the showroom, outlined with blue stucco.

Ch. Olanoff asked about the drainage from the canopy. Mr. Adams said it will be internally drained with the underside being a metal deck. Questions were raised about lighting. Mr. Adams said lights might be installed on the ceiling of the canopy. Mr. Montgomery asked for a clarification about the LED lighting on the sign. Mr. Adams said the lights glow but do not cast or project light. Ch. Olanoff asked for specifications on this lighting. Mr. Adams agreed to provide this information, and said the lighting is compliant with the zoning bylaw.

Mr. Rafsky asked why the structure was called a "sign". Mr. Ayoub said this was because the sign lettering is incidental to the structure. Ms. Loughnane said the purpose of this canopy is not for shelter but solely for brand identification. She noted that the Applicant was before the Planning Board because its corporate headquarters had asked it to pursue a new design which would more clearly identify the facility as a Mercedes dealer. Mr. Adams said the canopy could be considered an architectural element.

Mr. Wiggin questioned the statement in the application that said the proposal is offered as an incentive to local dealerships. Mr. McGovern replied that this work is required by the corporate office and must be completed within two years to bring the franchise into compliance with terms of its contract. He noted that, in addition to the proposed exterior work, other interior work is required. Mr. Wiggin commented that this seems like an odd addition to the building.

Ch. Olanoff said the Planning Board needs to decide if this design is in harmony with the design previously approved for Mercedes of Westwood. Mr. Rafsky agreed and said the major impact is to the Applicant's own property. He said that the proposed canopy is a distracting element taking away from the appearance of the building. Ch. Olanoff said the design should harmonize with what is in the community, not with other buildings on the "Auto-mile". Mr. Malster said this proposal would be a prominent addition to the current building and is incongruous. He noted that he had not seen any other buildings in Massachusetts that are comparable to this dealership.

Mr. Rafsky said as a franchisor, he is aware that a franchisor like Mercedes Benz does have the right to impose a certain design image on a franchisee, but cannot force the Town of Westwood to approve this proposed design if the Planning Board finds it objectionable. Ms. Loughnane said the board should look at this proposal as an alteration to an existing structure that was already approved under site plan review. She noted that the original approval was well thought out and carefully designed due to its highly visible location at a key entrance to Westwood. She added that the proposed canopy structure is a defining feature on this important site. Ms. Loughnane said that the Board must decide if the proposed design adds to the architectural character that the Planning

Board has encouraged for this site, or if it substantially distracts from that character.

Ms. Loughnane pointed out that the site plan is also affected by the proposed canopy construction, since portions of the canopy structure would be built within the circular area at the entrance to the building. She stated that the positioning of the canopy structure partially within this area would affect the readability of the pedestrian circulation pattern. Ms. Loughnane added that the Planning Board received a memo from Public Safety Officer Paul Sicard raising concerns with pedestrian circulation and with handicapped access to the sidewalk. Ch. Olanoff asked, whether the circle will need to be redone if the canopy is installed, since the canopy would be partially over the sidewalk and partially over the path of vehicle travel. Mr. Adams said the only displacement would be of the three nearest handicapped accessible parking spaces. There was some discussion about the relocation of these handicapped spaces to an area adjacent to the service department. Ch. Olanoff asked for reassurance that the handicapped accessible spaces comply with Section 5a-4 of the town's traffic rules and orders, per Sgt. Sicard's memo.

Mr. Rafsky said the branding requirements should be designed to enhance rather than change so much of the existing structure. He suggested that the franchisor work with the franchisee to come together on a more appropriate design. Mr. Montgomery commented about the scale of the structure. He said that he thought the canopy could be redesigned to fit with the existing architecture, without overpowering it. There was a discussion about the existing signs and cupola as a secondary sign.

Mr. Ayoub asked if the board would vote tonight. Ch. Olanoff said he could not vote to approve the application as submitted. However, he suggested that the board not vote to deny the EIDR application at this time, but rather that the board recommend that the Applicant return at a later date with revised plans that the board might find more acceptable. There was a general consensus that the submitted design is not desirable. Mr. Ayoub asked if the board would continue the hearing. Ch. Olanoff said that the board could either continue the hearing or the Applicant could withdraw the application and resubmit after developing a new set of plans. Ms. Loughnane recommended that the Applicant consider a much reduced-scale canopy or a new design element which could be applied to the building without impeding circulation. She suggested much greater congruity between the existing architecture and the proposed brand identification elements. Mr. Adams said that he would advise Mercedes of the board's comments and try to further refine the proposal.

Upon a motion by Mr. Rafsky and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the board voted unanimously in favor to continue the hearing to January 12, 2010 at 8:00 PM.

### **Public Hearing to Consider Application for EIDR Approval for the Construction of a New Facility to House the Westwood Public Library – 660 High Street**

Mr. Malster recused himself from participating in this public hearing as a Planning Board member because he is a direct abutter to the library. He stated that he would remain in the room and participate in the hearing as an abutter and citizen.

Ch. Olanoff read the legal notice and opened the hearing at approximately 9:05 PM. He welcomed Library Director Tom Viti, and architects Jim Alexander and Ellen Anselone from Finegold Alexander & Associates Architects. Also present were Library Trustees Karen Coffee and Jane Wiggin, and residents Claire Connors and Caitlin Connors.

Ms. Anselone presented revised drawings and an updated EIDR statement with information on proposed light poles, light fixtures and signage, and compliance with Board of Health requirements regarding demolition, trash removal and sanitary facilities. Mr. Alexander began the presentation informing the board that the set back and height issues have been resolved, so that the building can be moved closer to the street to align with the predominate character of High Street. He said that he had very successful meetings with the library building committee to incorporate the Planning Board's wishes to use traditional elements in the architecture to tie in with the rest of the street, and

to not appear so monumental. Mr. Alexander and board members discussed the porch on the front of the proposed library. Mr. Montgomery asked about the pitch of the roof. Mr. Alexander said the roof is essentially flat. Board members indicated that they would prefer to see a more traditional sloped roof porch like those on nearby house and commercial properties.

Ms. Loughnane told the board that she had spoken with Fire Chief Bill Scoble, who is mainly concerned about being able to turn around emergency vehicles in the library entrance circle. She noted that the predominant traffic that the fire department would serve at this site would be emergency vehicles responding in direct service to people in the library, so it is essential that an emergency vehicle can enter, turn and exit the circle. She added that Chief Scoble also has concerns about getting a fire truck around the rear of the building and back out of the parking lot in case of a fire, but noted that quickly exiting the site would not be the primary concern in that case. Ms. Loughnane told the board that Chief Scoble did not believe his ladders would be able to reach up over the building, and thus he would like to see an access path on the north side of the building. She said that this would have to be a winter maintained path, and would have to reach at least half way to High Street. A board member suggested that the screening landscaping could be planted on the neighbor's property to leave enough of an access way on the north side of the building. Mr. Alexander said that he would schedule a meeting with Chief Scoble to resolve these issues. Mr. Bertorelli said he would provide the architect with a template of the fire truck turning radius.

Ms. Anselone told the board that the requested stormwater drainage and runoff calculations to support the proposed drainage treatment and recharge plans were submitted to Mr. Bertorelli late this afternoon. Mr. Bertorelli said he would provide comments to the board as soon as his review is complete.

Ch. Olanoff stated that the town is in the process of purchasing bicycle racks with grant money received from the MAPC. He said that the library should include bicycle racks as well. He also asked if access would be provided to the library along the path to Gay Street which runs between the Malster property and Appleseeds. Ms. Anselone said that this path is shown on the plans. Ms. Loughnane asked if the path could be continued around the edge of the parking lot to the Deerfield School. Mr. Alexander said that they could continue the path, under the trees, using crushed gravel. Ch. Olanoff asked if the town would need a formal easement here. Mr. Malster said that the town does not maintain the sidewalk here. He said he often maintains the path so that children have a safe way of walking to school.

Board members discussed the windows on the High Street side of the building. They were in agreement that the current design does not fit in with the rest of High Street. Ms. Anselone responded that the extensive glass serves two purposes: to provide a significant amount of light during the day, and to display activity in the evening. Board members asked if window shading would be used to minimize the light spillover from inside the library onto neighboring residential properties.

Ms. Loughnane noted that the Historical Commission has concerns about the volume of glass on the gable end. She said the Commission was also dissatisfied with the design of the porch, and would be looking for something that fit in with the colonial look of High Street. Mr. Viti said that the porch was added to reduce the scale of the building. Mr. Rafsky said he feels that the porch is too contemporary for a colonial style building. Mr. Alexander said they want to keep the porch, but that they would consider the board's comments. Mr. Rafsky said that these items should be addressed before the board can have a substantive discussion.

Mr. Wiggin asked the applicant to provide additional information on the green building features. Mr. Viti said the glass on the side of the building serves this feature. He noted that a member of the building committee is tasked with calculating LEED certification status, and added that 27% of the building is glass and 32% is the standard for this LEED status.

Board members discussed the Colburn School and its future location. Mr. Montgomery said the



Historical Commission wants to keep it. Ms. Loughnane said that the Westwood Historical Commission wants to see the Colburn School preserved and reused. She noted that the memorandum of agreement between the Town and the Massachusetts Historical Commission calls for the Colburn School to be moved to the back of the parcel during construction of the new library, and returned to High Street at a later date once a party can be found to restore and reuse the building. Board members asked what would happen if no funding source was found for the restoration. Ms. Loughnane replied that the Town was obligated to do all they can to market the Colburn School, with the hope that it will eventually be relocated as shown on the plan. Mr. Viti feels that the library building committee has fulfilled its obligation to put the Colburn School in the back left corner of the lot, according to the Memorandum of the Understanding. This is a temporary location for the school, as it would not be considered an approved location according to the Westwood Historical Commission or the Massachusetts Historical Society.

Board members discussed the difficulty of planning for the site without knowing when or whether the Colburn School would actually be moved here. Ms. Loughnane noted that the Planning Board could review this plan as having three possible options for the portion of the lot where the existing library sits. She said that the first and preferred option would be for the relocation of the Colburn School to this site, the second option would be to leave the area open for a town green, and the third option would be to develop the site with a new commercial building. The board agreed that the design of the site and proposed parking location would be appropriate for any of those three possible uses. Ch. Olanoff noted that the Planning Board would have further opportunity to review the plans for the Colburn School after a new use and user are identified.

Ch. Olanoff commented about sparse turnout, and opened the meeting to the public. Ms. Wiggin commented that the current characteristics of the town center are not necessarily cohesive. She stated that the proposed library building will fit the town's needs and provide a place in the town center for public gathering.

Mr. Alexander asked the board to grant conditional approval of the EIDR. Ch. Olanoff said that a report from the town engineer regarding the most recently submitted information is outstanding and therefore the hearing must be continued. Mr. Malster stated that he is very interested in the drainage report because drainage is a currently a problem with water from the library parking lot collecting in his back yard. He said that there is a catch basin in his back yard which flows to Gay Street, but this is not maintained by the town. He also asked about the proposed fence and whether it would be wooden or chain link. Ms. Anselone said a fence is proposed to enclose the dumpster. She noted that a fence is also shown on the north site of the proposed library. Ms. Loughnane said a fence might not be necessary on the other wooded north property line. She said that it might be better to simply add more dense plantings in this area. Mr. Malster also commented that he wants to see the modifications that will be required to satisfy the fire chief's conditions.

Ms. Loughnane said that the proposed landscaping, as shown on submitted plans, seems to meet the screening requirements. However, she expressed concern that a reduction of the landscape budget could cause the project to fall short of the minimum screening requirements. Ms. Anselone responded that some of the ornamental landscaping would be reduced, but the screening features would be maintained. Mr. Malster asked if a photometric design had been submitted. Ch. Olanoff said it had not. Ms. Anselone said the plans show the location of each of the proposed lights, and noted that a one page luminaire specification sheet was submitted with the application. Ms. Loughnane said the light fixtures would be set on twelve foot poles, similar to the lighting currently on High Street. Ch. Olanoff asked the architects to make sure the light next to Mr. Malster's property would not spill over into his yard.

Mr. Malster asked the applicant where the air condition unit would be located on the site, noting that the current a/c unit on the library is right next to his lot line and it is very noisy. Ms. Anselone said the new unit would be located on the roof and would have sound dampening installed around it. Mr. Montgomery asked what the areas on the roof shown in blue would be. Ms. Anselone said these are possible locations for solar panels. Ch. Olanoff asked for specifications for the a/c units, including

the sound dampening. Ms. Loughnane suggested a condition addressing this and other items discussed in the meeting, regarding architectural issues.

Mr. Montgomery said that the porch design is very fragile looking for such a large heavy building. He suggested it have a more substantial appearance, Mr. Alexander said he would consider this comment.

Ch. Olanoff asked if the applicant understood the Board of Health's comments regarding the demolition of the existing library. Ms. Anselone said that a page was submitted in the application that shows the dumpster fence enclosure. She noted that the other Board of Health comments about demolition are standard requirements and will be incorporated into specifications for the contractors.

Upon a motion by Mr. Montgomery and seconded by Mr. Rafsky, the board voted unanimously, in favor to continue the hearing to December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at 7:30 PM.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:00 P.M.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 P.M., at 50 Carby Street.