

**Town of Westwood Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
50 Carby Street Building
October 24, 2006
7:30 PM**

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

Board Members Absent: None

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

The meeting was convened at 7:30 pm.

Public Hearing: Application for Revision to Site Plan Review Decision for Bubbling Brook Parking Lot

Applicant: Bubbling Brook LLC

Address: 1652 High Street

Project: Revisions to Site Plan Review Decision Regarding Retroactive Approval of Parking Lot Expansion

In Attendance: Don Myers, Norwood Engineering; Sergeant Sicard and Lt. Bob O'Donnell, Westwood Police

Mr. Malster read the legal notice and opened the hearing.

Don Myers of Norwood Engineering stated that last year, this application was before the Board in order for the owner to get retroactive site plan approval for the paving of an additional 14 parking spaces that was done by the previous owner of the restaurant.

Mr. Myers indicated that since they received that approval, the owner has tried different alternatives for controlling traffic circulation and pedestrian safety in the parking lots using barrels. He indicated that he had a consultation with the owner, Town Engineer and the Public Safety Officer at the site, the barrels had to be moved from their original locations in order for the traffic circulation to work. These changes, however, are different from the approved plan.

John Bertorelli, Town Engineer, stated that he agreed that the original plan that was approved by the Planning Board did not work, especially with truck traffic, because the approved entrance on North Street was too narrow.

It was indicated that there should not be a problem with the new location of the swale.

Sergeant Sicard indicated that there were a couple of problems with the implementation of the previous plan. He said cars were having a difficult time turning into the parking lot entrance from North Street and that the queue of

stopped cars on North Street was causing a problem. He indicated that another problem area was at the parking lot exit area onto Route 109; when cars could not pull out on Route 109 because of the steady traffic, they would turn around near the take-out windows in order to exit out onto North Street.

Sergeant Sicard stated that in January, 2000 there were five accidents in the Bubbling Brook parking lot. He stated that this is considered to be a low number considering the amount of activity in this parking lot.

Sergeant Sicard stated that the police have requested a small change in the island near North Street, but otherwise they are satisfied with the on-ground revisions to the plan.

Mr. Montgomery stated that requiring cars leaving the parking lot from North Street has increased overall safety because it has a better sight distance.

Bob O'Donnell from the Police Department indicated that he did not want the North Street curb cut to be reduced any further and did not agree with the Town Engineer that it could be even further reduced. He stated that an ongoing problem is that cars that park near the North Street entrance are SUVs, which reduce the sight distance.

Mr. Olanoff stated that no one had called the Planning Board to ask them for input regarding the use of barrels to "try out" the new configuration. Staff should have give the Planning Board notice that the barrels were going to be used during the summer so that the Board would have had the opportunity to evaluate the alternatives and provide input.

Mr. Myers indicated that, given the configuration of the parking lot, the width of the North Street opening is at the minimum to accommodate delivery trucks.

Lieutenant O'Donnell stated that this parking lot had not been a problem.

Officer Sicard stated that, as a comparison, the Roche Brothers parking lot has already had eight accidents this year alone.

Mr. Olanoff stated that the width of the North Street curb cut should be reduced to about 26 feet.

Lieutenant O'Donnell indicated that the wider entrances provided better sight distance because it prevents cars from parking in the area where sight distance is reduced.

Mr. Murray [a direct abutter] and his attorney indicated that the area next to the parking area had been lowered and that water drains toward his property. He indicated that he wanted on-site drainage in the Bubbling Brook parking lot as the berm that is currently there does not work in the winter. Mr. Murray stated that the previous owner of Bubbling Brook just wanted to blow the stormwater out into the

street because he did not want to have to dig up the existing parking lot to install new drainage. He does not have any problem with the parking lot; he just wants Bubbling Brook to be required to do on-site drainage. There should be a drain to catch the drainage near his property.

John Bertorelli, Town Engineer, stated that the change in the location of the swale still allowed the water to sheet across North Street to the new stormceptor. The Highway Superintendent does not have any problems with icing across North Street and does not want a catch basin on the side of the road closest to the parking lot.

Mr. Murray and his attorney contend that the change in the parking lot does not conform to the stormwater management standards.

John Bertorelli stated that a condition could be included in the decision that if icing occurs, an additional catch basin must be installed. He indicated that due to the pitch of the road, this installation would be quite expensive.

Nan Crossland of 1666 High St. stated she her house is the closest to Bubbling Brook and that there has been numerous near misses (accidents) of cars from Bubbling Brook. Her house is very close to the edge of the road and at one time she had lost all of her landscaping from cars prematurely turning into the parking lot. She stated that there needs to be an education process about the new restrictions about the right turn only from High Street. Many cars ignored it or did not understand the new patterns.

Sgt. Sicard stated that police can only enforce the signs outside of the parking lot that are approved by the Selectmen.

The following changes were as suggested:

1. Make a wider island on North Street
2. Make a more pronounced island on High Street for a right hand turn (will probably lose one parking space)

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Montgomery, the Planning Board unanimously voted to continue the public hearing to November 14, 2006 at 7:30 pm.

Continuation of Public Hearing: Special Permit Application for a Shared Driveway Special Permit at 215 High Street

Applicant: Joseph Flanagan

Project: Shared driveway to service two lots at 215 High Street

****APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED AN IMMEDIATE CONTINUANCE****

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Nedder, the Board unanimously voted to immediately continue this hearing without taking any testimony to December 19, 2006 at 7:30 pm.

Public Hearings: Application for Two Shared Driveways and Approval of Work within the Right-Of-Way of a Scenic Road

Applicant: O.P.D.V. Trust

Address: 303 Grove Street property

Project: One shared driveway to serve two lots; one shared driveway to serve three lots

In Attendance: Jeff Richards, Meridian Associates [Project Landscape Architect], Christopher Noble, Owner Representative

On a motion, the Board unanimously voted to waive the reading of the public hearing legal notices for these hearings.

Jeff Richards, Project Landscape Architect, stated that this property [which as been generally known as the Sarkis property] was divided into a total of ten lots (including the existing estate lot) by the ANR process. The land is registered land. He stated that there is a desire for shared driveways to consolidate the curb cuts on Grove Street and Summer Street to help to retain the historic resources of these two streets.

Mr. Richards indicated that he thought that two locations as shown on the plans were the best locations for the shared driveways in terms of sight distances and minimizing the removal of mature trees. The proposed shared driveway on Grove Street will serve two lots and the proposed shared driveway on Grove Street will serve three lots. Since both of these streets are designated scenic ways, the applicant is also applying for two scenic way permits to remove some trees within the right-of-ways of these two streets to construct the driveways. A third scenic way permit is requested to build a single user driveway on Grove Street for us by the existing estate house. This driveway will require an easement from lots 119 and 120.

He indicated that the corner lot and the estate house were currently off the market. They have been trying to market them as one property.

Mr. Richards stated that this property did not have to go through the Major Residential Development special permit process because the location of the driveways and the proposed locations of the houses meet the requirements for the exemption. The required documentation for these locations is listed as a note on the recorded ANR plan. As a result of meeting these exemption requirements, the building location on the corner lot is relatively tight.

Diane Beecham stated that this has been an issue that has been discussed at length. She indicated that she is not 100 percent certain that this should not have to go through the MRD process, but the issue is not yet "ripe" since no building permits have been pulled that would essentially trigger a zoning review. Since these are ANR lots, the Board had to endorse them. In other words, even if the Board and staff believed that the MRD process is applicable, the Board still had to endorse the ANR plan.

Mr. Richards stated that easements had to be shown on the plan and the owner wants to get an approval first from the Planning Board before the easement areas are calculated.

Regarding the curb cut for the Summer Street, shared driveway, Mr. Olanoff stated that there is plenty of room to be able to retain the two major trees shown on the plan to be removed by reducing the curb radii from the 30 feet that is required in the Rules and Regulations. Mr. Richards indicated that he believed that a 15-foot radius for a fire truck (with all wheels on the road) or a 25-foot radius could be accommodated. They would be receptive to reducing the curb radii.

Betsy Reynolds, 314 Grove Street, questioned why not use the historic, access point on Summer Street where there is already a break in the stone wall? Mr. Richards responded that location would not be safe.

Charlie Reynolds, 314 Grove Street, stated that the stone wall where the proposed shared driveway is to be located is very deep in that area and would be very difficult to break into.

The location of the shared driveway serving the three lots on Grove Street was chosen because of the good sight lines and its avoidance of wetland crossings. The length of the shared portion of driveway before it branched out would be about 90 feet.

Mr. Olanoff stated that he wanted the location of the driveway moved slightly to the left to preserve a 30-inch tree. Mr. Richards indicated that they preferred to be directly opposite from the existing driveway across the street.

Eddie Shaba asked if the developer had addressed the water run-off issue on Grove Street. He indicated that, with the 206 Grove Street project, the water run-off issue on Grove had increased tenfold. He asked if this curb cut would affect this. John Bertorelli responded that this work would not make it worse; the water will run away from the street.

Mr. Richards indicated that they have had discussions with the Water District about extending the water main down Grove Street. They would be willing to extend the line 900 feet along the length of their property and the additional 300 feet beyond their property line would be borne by the Water District. This extension would create a much needed loop in the area. The Water District is very interested in doing this and they will continue their discussions.

There are still two outstanding issues: 1) whether the new driveway to serve the estate lot is definition a shared driveway because it will be located on lots other than the estate lot which it will serve; and 2) whether the existing driveway to the barn has to be 600 feet from the newly created driveways in order to keep the MRD exemption.

Mr. Montgomery stated that if the Planning Board did not grant the shared driveway

special permits, the applicant would then have to put in separate driveways within 600 feet of each other and thus would lose the MRD exemption.

Mr. Olanoff indicated that the shared driveway special permit would essentially accomplish the same objectives as the MRD.

On a motion by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Nedder, the Board unanimously voted to continue the public hearing to December 19, 2006 at 8:00 pm.

A site visit is scheduled for November 10, 2006 at 9:00 am.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.