

**Westwood Planning Board Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 26, 2020**  
**7:00 pm**  
**Via Zoom Remote Participation**  
**Westwood, MA 02090**

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gorman at approximately 7:00pm. The remote meeting was video recorded by Westwood Media Center, and was live streaming on YouTube. Chair Gorman explained the meeting procedures.

Pursuant to Governor Baker's March 12, 2020 Order suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law MGL C. 30A, §18 and the Governor's March 23, 2020 Emergency Order imposing strict limitations on the number of people that may gather in one place, the May 26, 2020 Planning Board meeting was conducted via remote participation by the Board.

**Present via Remote Participation:**

Planning Board members present: Brian D. Gorman, David L. Atkins, Jr., Deborah J. Conant, Christopher A. Pfaff and William F. Delay. Staff members present: Abigail McCabe, Town Planner, Nora Loughnane, Director of Community & Economic Development and Jessica Cole who recorded the meeting minutes. Thomas J. O'Loughlin & Mr. Ernest H. Horn representing Mr. Gorman.

**Review and Approval of Meeting Minutes:**

May 21, 2020 Minutes

Board Comments:

- Minutes were sent out and done by Mr. Gorman and Ms. Cole.
- Mr. Atkins and Ms. Conant had no comments.
- Mr. Pfaff, curious why there are two sets of minutes for the May 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.
- Mr. Gorman's potentially last meeting so he did them himself so they could be ready in time.
- Mr. Pfaff believed that Ms. Cole's set of minutes was more accurate.

Action Taken:

Mr. Pfaff made a motion to adopt Jessica Cole's minutes from May 21, 2020, and Mr. Atkins seconded it. The Planning Board voted against 2-3 (Conant, Delay, Conant voting against) adopting Jessica Cole's minutes from May 21, 2020.

Discussion:

- Ms. Conant asked if the board could add Mr. Pfaff's comments to Brian's minutes.
- Ms. Conant was curious between what the differences were in both sets of minutes.
- Mr. Delay and Mr. Gorman had not read Ms. Cole's minutes and was not abstaining.
- Mr. Gorman's stated that his minutes were more to the point, but did not have time to look over Ms. Cole's minutes. Use his minutes and add from Ms. Cole's to Mr. Gorman's minutes, he would not support Ms. Cole's minutes.

This motion did not pass and the motion was withdrawn by Mr. Pfaff.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Planning Board voted to incorporate verbatim Ms. Cole's minutes of the first 2 paragraphs of page 2 to the meeting minutes.

Discussion:

Ms. Conant asked Mr. Pfaff to read the 2 paragraphs, because she did not read them.

Mr. Pfaff read the 2 paragraphs as follows:

*Mr. Pfaff, his comment included that Ms. Cole did not take the minutes, she was not there. He also wanted to insert Ms. Goldberg comments, "My job is to counsel the Board and that's what I've been trying to do. In my experience a response such as the one that the Planning Board has drafted would not typically be viewed as responsive. I will state for the record that in my experience, this type of response*

does not suffice.” He said, simply stating in the minutes Attorney Goldberg shared her opinion that discussion should take place about the allegation doesn’t reveal the full tone of her comments and that she was trying to guide the Board in a direction in dealing with these allegations.

*Adopt this paragraph added:*

*Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff both spoke for 2 about minutes each and there was one sentence in the minutes. Mr. Pfaff does not believe that their voices were conveyed in the minutes. He proposed that an attempt be made to convey more strenuously what Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff discussed this at the end of the March 17, 2020 meeting. He felt that the writing in the minutes were a bit dismissive. Mr. Pfaff wants to include Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff strenuously disagreed, and he wants Attorney Goldberg’s comments written verbatim, as stated above. Add ‘Strong’ In front of Opposition.*

Mr. Atkins, why can’t we accept the minutes? He is supporting Mr. Pfaff’s motion.

Ms. Conant stated that she cannot vote, minutes are slow and she cannot decide who said what.

Mr. Pfaff, voted against what Ms. Cole, and he wants the 2 paragraphs added to Mr. Gorman’s minutes.

Mr. Delay, he did not look for minutes today. Not sure why we got Ms. Cole’s minutes so quickly.

Mr. Gorman will not support adding the 2 paragraphs into the minutes. The minutes are redundant, there is the video.

Ms. Conant recommended going back to voting on the minutes; take a recess to read both sets of minutes.

Mr. Gorman did not want to do this.

Mr. Gorman read his minutes

Mr. Pfaff, please add a paragraph from Ms. Cole’s minutes.

Mr. Pfaff withdrew his earlier motion.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Planning Board voted in favor 3-2 (Delay, Gorman) to adopt Ms. Cole’s paragraph:

*Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff both spoke for 2 about minutes each and there was one sentence in the minutes. Mr. Pfaff does not believe that their voices were conveyed in the minutes. He proposed that an attempt be made to convey more strenuously what Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff discussed this at the end of the March 17, 2020 meeting. He felt that the writing in the minutes were a bit dismissive. Mr. Pfaff wants to include Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pfaff strenuously disagreed. Add ‘Strong’ In front of Opposition.*

Into the May 21, 2020 minutes.

Discussion:

Mr. Atkins, I support this motion and withdraw the previous motion.

Ms. Conant, no comments.

Mr. Pfaff had no comments.

Mr. Delay, we always get minutes a week or 2 after a meeting, it is very unusual.

Mr. Gorman, I don’t see the relevance and do not see the need of the paragraph at all.

Vote: 3-2, it passes.

Mr. Delay and Mr. Gorman had no comments on minutes

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Atkins, The Planning Board voted in favor 5-0 to adopt Mr. Gorman’s minutes with the addition voted on.

May 12, 2020 Minutes

Comments from the Board:

Mr. Gorman, March 2nd, was that a Fin Com meeting? Ms. McCabe stated that it was.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, The Planning Board voted 5-0 to approve the minutes from May 12, 2020.

**247 Station Drive- Verizon Wireless-** Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon (WCOD-EIDR)\* Public Hearing. Applicant proposes to install 9 panel antennas, 6 radio heads, 2 junction boxes and associated equipment to the roof of the existing three story building. The panel antennas will extend 8 ft. above the roof.

Applicant: Sean Mahoney, real estate consultant SAI Communications, LLC, for Verizon Wireless. The reason for the requests is real estate driven. Had 690 Canton Street is untenanted, and cannot give coverage anymore. Antennas will be removed from 690 Canton Street. Only the antennas will be visible and will reuse Metro PCS equipment. Main reason for the move is that it is a much better site.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe had no concerns at this time. The Westwood Fire Department did ask about interference with emergency communications. The Town will need a peer review about this in the future. The applicant responded that this is acceptable Verizon has its own band width.

Board Comments:

- 690 will still have Sprint, just Verizon antenna as will be removed? *It will still have other carriers there.*
- Why is this the best alternative? *It gives the best coverage. The antennas are 6-8 feet tall. Appearances from a distance, the light goes through it.*
- PCS? *He was not sure, they may have one antenna.*
- How long have you been at 690 Canton Street? *Sometime after 1996.*
- One of the major components is a visual, aesthetically, University is being seen as a possible town center. Worried about a building filled with antennas. Why can't we shield the antennas more? *Just brought one presentation, it was a preferred design and better for a building like this. Have to put the antenna where the building owner will allow us.*
- 690 is not out in the open like Station Drive.
- Visually this Board member does not want to see antennas, It is a prime location. *We can look into screening. But he is not sure there are ways to make it any less offensive. It can still degrade the signal, a slight degrading, we can add it as a condition. There is an additional cost and weight.*

Screening/loss of signal and pushing back? *If you push it back, you need to push it up in height.*

Would like to see more data.

Would like to see the screening before we approve it.

The scaffolding behind it is bothersome. How about just the 4 antennas? *We would have to make more designs.*

690 Canton Street, untenanted, curious is it a physical issue? *Probably, multiple factors, leasing issues.*

No one else is on Station Drive, they would be the first.

It concerns the Board that other companies will be interested in going on the building too. *No one else is on Station Drive, they would be the first. Would like to work together to make it work for all.*

Ms. McCabe said that the next scheduled meeting is June 16 and then June 30<sup>th</sup>.

The Applicant, Mr. Mahoney, agreed they will need more time to prepare screening options and submit to the Board and requested the June 30<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow more time for preparation.

Public Comments: Chair Gorman asked for public comments by using the 'raise your hand' button or press \*9 and there were none.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Ms. Conant and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, The Planning Board voted 5-0 to continue the Public Hearing to June 30, 2020, 7 pm, via remote meeting through zoom.

**Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP)** - Continued Public Hearing. The OSRP was approved by the Planning Board February 2019 and received conditional approval from MA DCR in July 2019. The MA approval requested further edits. This hearing was continued to allow more time to review the requested additions and changes to the OSRP.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe gave an update to the Planning Board, it was adopted and went to the state and they asked for additional information. Not anything was substantial, but wanted specific dates and the chart was updated. Added some narrative and environmental challenges.

Board Comments:

- Good to go and send to MAPC.
- Not in support of the plan, no comments.
- In favor of moving it along
- Stone walls, preserving them, protecting them, they've been in Westwood for over 400 years. it is not in there. They are historical and they should be protected. *Ms. McCabe stated that Scenic roads do include reviewing any changes or removals of stone walls or trees.*  
What about the stone walls on property, they should be preserved somehow.
- Mr. Gorman asked for specific Language: The Board member would like to see the walls protected, it is a boundary wall, probably shared.
- Do walls fall under the Historic Demolition? *Ms. Loughnane stated that they do not, the Historic Demolition bylaw only covers structures, the stone walls are less than 4 feet tall and they are not considered structures.*
- Historical Zoning? *Ms. Loughnane, It goes beyond zoning, Can make the Town a Historic District*
- Consider protection of the historic stone walls in Westwood; make people aware that these walls have historical relevance. Preservative of walls. We don't want to take people's property away.
- Investigate a future bylaw to protect and preserve the historical walls.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe, suggested Goal 1, is where it would most likely fit in.

Board Comments:

- Investigate walls 1630-1650, before 1700, they are worth preserving.
- Preserve walls, bylaw challenges, include a non-binding statement within the plan
- Page 80, goals, management of Conservation goals - that could be a place to recognize and ensure the character of the historic stone walls.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe, suggested, Investigate ways to preserve and protect stone walls, not call it a bylaw.

Ms. Loughnane suggested on Page 79, the goal 1 Protect and Preserve Westwood's Community Character, then there are objectives, add to the end: of the first objective "including historic stone walls".

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Delay and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Planning Board voted in favor 5-0 to include, *Including Historic Stone Walls, before 1700 in the Town of Westwood* on Page 79, under Goal One, General Goals and Objectives at the end.

Public Comments: Chair Gorman asked for any public comments by using the 'raise your hand' button or press \*9 and there were none.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board voted in favor 3-2 (Conant and Delay voted against) to submit the OSRP revised May 26, 2020 to MAPC.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Planning Board voted in favor 5-0 to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, July 21st at 7:00 pm remote meeting via Zoom.

Other Business:

Upcoming Meetings:

June 16th no applications at this time and may cancel this when it gets closer if no applications are submitted.  
 June 30th with at least the continued hearing from earlier this evening.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board members voted in favor (5-0) to adjourn the meeting at approximately 8:25 pm.

**List of Documents:**

<p><b>247 Station Drive-WCOD-EIDR</b>          Public Hearing Notice, From: Westwood Planning Board, 4/29/2020, 1 page.          Narrative and Description, To: Westwood Planning Board, From: Sean Mahoney, SAI Communications, LLC, 4 pages.          Photo Simulations, From: Verizon, 3/23/2020, 22 pages.          Radiation Frequency Exposure Report, From: C Squared Systems, LLC, 4/7/2020, 13 pages.          Radio Frequency Report, From: C Squared Systems, LLC, 3/13/2020, 19 pages.          Structural Report, From: Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC, 3/11/2020, 37 pages.          Plan Set, From: Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC, 11/4/2019, 7 pages.          Waiver Request, To: Westwood Planning Board, From: Sean Mahoney, SAI Communications, LLC, 2 pages.          Presentation, From: Chappell Engineering Associates, LLC, 12 pages.          Staff Comments, 5/21/2020, 2 pages.</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p><b>Open Space &amp; Recreation Plan (OSRP) Continued Public Hearing</b>          Open Space &amp; Recreation Plan (OSRP) Adopted by Planning Board 02-26-2019, From: OSRP Committee, 2019, 162 pages.          MA DCR Conditional Approval Letter 071019, To: Nora Loughnane, From: Melissa Cryan, The Commonwealth of MA, 7/10/2019, 2 pages.          OSRP Revised 05-26-2020 Redline Responsive to DCR, From: OSRP Committee, 2019, 166 pages.          Summary of OSRP Changes May 2020, 5/26/2020, 2 pages.          OSRP Conservation Restrictions Updated Chart, 2 pages.</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p>Draft meeting minutes from May 12 and May 21, 2020</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p>Memorandum from Town Planner to Planning Board Members, RE: Meeting Summary for Tuesday, May 26 Meeting, dated May 22, 2020</p>	<p>PDF</p>