

**Town of Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
Carby Street Building
June 29, 2006
7:30 PM**

Board Members Present: Steven Olanoff, Bob Moore, Rob Malster, Bruce Montgomery

Board Members Absent: George Nedder

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

The meeting was convened at 7:30 pm.

Working Session on MUOD Rules and Regulations: Transportation Demand Management and Shared Parking

In Attendance: Dan Bailey, Rackemann, Sawyer & Brewster; Susan Sloan-Rossiter, VHB; Chris Cocklin, VHB

Shared Parking Rules and Regulations June 29, 2006 Draft

Ms. Sloan Rossiter and Chris Cocklin stated the following regarding the June 29th draft of shared parking rules and regulations:

There are different ways to calculate the numbers with respect to shared parking. This analysis will require that all be presented.

This analysis ensures that the parking assumptions that will be made by the developers will be consistent with the traffic assumptions.

It is important to make sure that the parking that is on the ground is actually sharable.

The regulations require that a parking analysis be done using the national standards for parking (such as 4 spaces per 1,000) and also an analysis using the parking standards required by the local bylaw. The regulations require that a shared parking analysis be done regardless of whether the developer will be requesting a shared parking special permit.

Back-up data has to be provided.

The particular ULI document cited in the regulations is perfect for this size project.

Office and retail uses are compatible for shared parking; developers do not want to share residential spaces with other uses. There may be some opportunity to share residential guest spots.

The compatibility of office/retail sharing depends on how these two land uses are integrated. The success of the sharing depends on their proximity.

The largest benefit for shared parking for hotels is for functions, such as weddings. Thus, it is important to know whether the hotel has a business or a leisure focus.

Hotels could use valet parking to utilize the outer parking lots. However, another issue is that valet parking is used to over park. The Town's parking regulations require that vehicles be parked in a designated parking space.

Transportation Demand Management Rules and Regulations June 29, 2006 Draft

Ms. Sloan Rossiter and Chris Cocklin stated the following regarding the June 29th draft of shared parking rules and regulations:

In terms of the required provision of a 75% subsidy of the cost of a MBTA pass, there could be a requirement that it go up 100% if the targets are not met.

The Town may find that shuttle circulators within the development are not utilized by riders. This is not necessarily part of TDM. It is connected to the TDM plan because if there is an employee who uses the MBTA to get to work, then they may use the shuttle bus to get around the development.

[VHB stated that shuttle busses do not have a lot of riders and it could be very expensive and so may not be a good use of TDM. It would be more of a site amenity. Mr. Olanoff stated that it should be an important part of the project and should be part a requirement in the Rules and Regulations. If not part of the TDM, it could be part of the urban design section.]

Mr. Olanoff stated that he wants standards for bicycle parking.

The developer's MEPA traffic analysis indicates very low auto usage and very high transit usage for the residential portion of the project. This would limit the overall parking ratio for residential uses to 1.5 per unit which is consistent with the traffic assumptions.

It is important to make sure that the Zip Cars are conveniently located.

VHB is comfortable with limiting the overall parking ratio for the entire development (excluding residential) to 3.0 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet. This would be very consistent with the traffic assumptions made by the developer. The 3.0 parking ratio will require a "pretty effective" shared parking program.

VHB does not think that it would be a constraint to limit the surface parking within the development to the number that exists there now (approximately 2,500 spaces). For all phases of a project, the developer would be limited to the number of surface parking spaces that exists there now.

The 2,500 existing spaces represent 20 percent of the anticipated full build out of 10,800 spaces.

VHB recommends that the survey of the site employees should be done every other year and not by annual survey. Annual survey responses get progressively worse.

How will the Town know that the landlord has fulfilled his obligations to put the required TDM language in the leases? One alternative is to require an affidavit from the landlord.

Discussion of Plan and Drawing Requirements

There will need to be a checklist in terms of all that will be required in the application upfront

Include a list of requested subdivision waivers.

Should the developer be required to develop design guidelines for the later phases? Dan Bailey stated that he will look at the Pine Hills project in Plymouth. This project originally was designed to have a concept special permit and then the details filled in as part of subsequently staged special permits. The project ended up having appeals of the staged special permits and so the Town went back and revised the zoning to require that it have only one special permit.

ANR Plan

Applicant: John & Carolynne Cronin

Address: 125 Margery Lane & Lot 5 Phillip's Way

Project: Removal of lot line to combine two lots

On a motion by Steve Olanoff and seconded by Rob Malster, three members of the Planning Board in attendance voted in favor to endorse, as not requiring approval under the Subdivision Control Law, a plan entitled "Margery Lane Plan of Land Westwood, MA", dated June 27, 2006, prepared by Merrikin Engineering, LLP, Consulting Engineers, 2 Milliston Road, Suite 1C, Millis, MA 02054.

Record Owner: John & Carolynne Cronin

128 Margery Lane

Westwood, MA 02090

Land Affected: 128 Margery Lane & Lot 5 Phillip's Way

Assessors' Map 40, Parcels 16 & 187

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 pm.