

**Town of Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Carby Street Building
May 16, 2006
7:30 PM**

Board Members Present: Steven Olanoff, Bob Moore, Rob Malster, George Nedder

Board Members Absent: None

Staff Members Present: Diane Beecham, Town Planner; John Bertorelli, Town Engineer

The meeting was convened at 7:30 pm.

Planning Board Reorganization

On a motion by Bob Moore and seconded by George Nedder, the Planning Board unanimously voted to reorganize as follows: Rob Malster, Chairman; Steven H. Olanoff, Vice Chairman and Bob Moore, Secretary.

Continuation of Public Hearing: Amendment/Modification/Rescission of Westview Estates Subdivision

Applicant: Westwood Planning Board

Project: Review of thirteen unconstructed lots within the Westview Estates subdivision

Jack O'Toole, Briarwood Drive asked which set of subdivision rules and regulations that would apply to this plan. Would it be the current rules and regulations or those that were in effect at the time the plan was approved? At the last hearing, there seem to be a difference of opinion between Town Counsel and Mr. Phillip's attorney.

Mr. Malster stated that the Board was not at this time in a position to address this issue. It will be reviewed at length at the appropriate time.

Mr. Olanoff stated that constructing this subdivision using 40 year old construction standards is unacceptable.

Mr. Moore stated that safety is paramount and he wants something better than a 40-year standard. However, if the utilities have already been installed and are working properly, then he would not expect them to be changes. However, he can not make that determination yet; it is too premature.

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Nedder, the Planning Board unanimously voted to continue this public hearing to July 11, 2006.

Endorsement of Captain's Crossing Subdivision Plan and Covenant

Applicant: William Duffey
Address: Fox Hill Street and Gay Street
Project: 22-lot subdivision

In Attendance: Paul Brodmerkle, Toomey & Munson, Engineers; William Duffey,
Applicant: Owen Todd, Esq.

Mr. Brodmerkle indicated that Mr. Duffy has received both the Major Residential Development special permit and conditional subdivision approval. The subdivision approval was subsequently appealed but now all appeals have been settled. Mr. Duffey is now before the Planning Board to get final endorsement of the subdivision plan and covenant.

- Mr. Brodmerkle indicated that the following changes were made to the plan to address the conditions in the approval:
- Wetlands/ponds are shown within 800-feet of the subject property.
- Emergency easement layout changed to save some trees.
- Note on the plan to refer to the special permit.
- Note on the plan to limit the project to 22 lots.
- Pedestrian easement (10 feet wide) is located along the perimeter of property from the subdivision roadway to Thatcher Street.
- Looped water main is shown on the plan.
- Spot grades are shown.
- Additional detail on the plan and profile sheets; water main has more detail.
- Street lights are shown.
- Sanitary sewer connections are shown.
- Larger sewer manholes in certain cases are shown.
- Pavement detail is shown where the roadway cut into Fox Hill Street.
- Sanitary sewer detail is shown.
- Chimney detail is shown.

Mr. Malster asked if the swimming pool is to remain on lot 4? It looks like it is only 5 to 10 feet from the lot line and is that a zoning violation? Mr. Brodmerkle stated that the swimming pool was built in 1935 and would likely be filled in.

On a motion by Bob Moore and seconded by Rob Malster, the Planning Board formally endorsed the covenant and the final subdivision plan.

Working Session on Development of MUOD Rules and Regulations: Traffic
In Attendance: Dan Bailey, Rackemann, Sawyer & Brewster; Jason Schrieber, RF Walsh; Susan Sloan-Rossiter, VHB; Ralph Willmer, VHB; Chris Cocklin, VHB

Ms. Sloan-Rossiter stated that VHB has provided three different sections for the transportation portion of the MUOD rules and regulations: the Transit Demand Management guidelines; shared the parking; and traffic impact guidelines. VHB's has a good understanding and expertise with mixed-use developments and these documents provide a good level of expectation for the level of analysis that should be required for a large mixed-sue development. The analysis required will be

comprehensive and reflect the suburban character of the area, the intended intermodal use and the integration of issues, such as parking, with the traffic analysis.

Mr. Malster asked how the lessons learned through the EENF process work with these rules and regulations? Ms. Sloan-Rossiter stated that the developer has done their traffic analysis according to what they think MEPA wants. There have been several meetings with Mass Highway and the developer to work on the assumptions that will be used for the state and local analysis. These were productive meetings because the Town and State did not agree with some of the developer's assumptions.

Mr. Bailey stated that the state/MEPA analysis will be at a higher elevation than the local analysis. The MEPA analysis will be more focused on regional impacts than the local analysis. The local analysis will be much more detailed.

Mr. Nedder stated that he thinks that the traffic impacts of this project should be evaluated for the entire Town.

Mr. Malster stated that a focus of the beginning of the draft traffic impact guidelines is on project scoping and he feels that the Town is already well into that process now with the EENF/MEPA process.

Steve Carroll, NSTAR Real Estate, stated that the developer states in the EENF that the project has a 5-7 year build-out but that the regional infrastructure will not be there to support the increased traffic.

[The Planning Board reviewed the draft traffic impact analysis guidelines that were developed by VHB to ultimately be included in the MUOD Rules and Regulations.]

Determination of the necessity for submission of traffic impact study [The Board discussed the issue of whether to include this paragraph as part of the MUOD regulations which attempts to identify which projects will require a traffic analysis. VHB indicated that they wrote this draft as more generalized traffic impact guidelines that could be applicable to all projects in Town. It was decided that this guidelines should be as specific to the MUOD as possible and then at some later point in time, could be made more generalized to fit other projects.]

Mr. Nedder stated that he wants to have traffic analysis that specifically shows the traffic impacts of both the commercial and residential portions of the project. For example, he will want to know what the impact to traffic would be by reducing the number of residential units.

Ms. Sloan-Rossiter stated that Mr. Nedder is referring to an alternative analysis, which is not unusual to have this required. As part of this analysis, there will have to be a justification as to why the proponent's alternative is better than the alternatives.

Analysis Scenarios [There was a question of whether to use "opening year + 5 years". Ms. Sloan-Rossiter stated that this is standard language and that this development would likely end up taking 10 years for a full buildout. She stated that there was a need to define "opening year".

Mr. Malster stated that the analysis should be done to reflect the fact that this project will be phased.

There needs to be a scenario that includes "development without mitigation".

Traffic Data Collection This will have to include the type of vehicle.

Trip Generation and Distribution If there is no ITE trip generation land use code, then there should be language in this section that the Planning Board could accept other empirical data at its discretion.

Mr. Nedder asked if there was any way to compensate individuals for the added aggravation of the additional traffic cause by the project, such as some sort of penalty clause. Mr. Bailey stated no.

Mr. Nedder stated that he has concerns regarding the air quality and how should it be evaluated? He stated that this is a very important issue. Putting a small city on the outskirts of Westwood may have significant impact on the rest of the community.

The rules and regulations need to address the issue of regulating demolition and construction traffic. What will be the condition of the demolished properties between phases?

Approval of Meeting Minutes: October 25; Executive Session October 25; November 1; November 15; November 29; December 13; December 20

On a motion by Bob Moore and seconded by George Nedder, the Planning Board unanimously voted to approve the meeting minutes for the following meetings: October 25, 2005; Executive Session October 25, 2005; November 1, 2005; November 15, 2005; November 29, 2005; December 13, 2005; December 20, 2005.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.