

**Westwood Planning Board Minutes**  
**Tuesday, February 23, 2021**  
**7:00 pm**  
**Via Zoom Remote Participation**  
**Westwood, MA 02090**

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 February 23, 2021 Planning Board meeting was conducted via remote participation by the Board.

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Atkins at approximately 7:00 pm. The remote meeting was video recorded by Westwood Media Center and was available on Comcast channel 12, Verizon channel 42 and on Westwood Media's YouTube channel <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVvSg7JN3V0> Chair Atkins explained the meeting procedures, and how the Planning Board process works.

**Present via Remote Participation:**

Planning Board members present via roll call: David L. Atkins, Jr., Deborah J. Conant, Christopher A. Pfaff, Robert R. Gotti and Michael L. McCusker. Staff members present: Town Planner Abigail McCabe, Director of Community & Economic Development Nora Loughnane, Town Counsel Pat Ahearn, and Jessica Cole, who recorded the meeting minutes.

**730 Gay Street (Assessor's Map 16, Lot 004), Approval Not Required (ANR) Plan – Split existing single-family lot into two lots in SRA zone.**

Project Engineer, John Glossa, was present, representing the owners Terence and Carolyn Connaughton. The owners want to split the lot in half which will leave a vacant lot that will be a buildable lot with an easement for the driveway. Both lots meet the minimum frontage and lot size requirements of the Zoning Bylaw.

*Action Taken:*

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Gotti, the Planning Board voted 4-0 in favor via roll call vote to endorse the ANR Plan submitted for 730 Gay Street.

**420 Providence Highway- EIDR Public Hearing, continued from 2/2.** Applicant proposes to modify existing building to incorporate Mazda brand. Modifications include removing ~700 sq. ft. of building, façade improvements, interior renovations, new signage.

Applicant, David Mackwell from Kelly Engineering Group was present to update the missing information from the last Planning Board meeting. He is waiting for feedback from the building division on the specific zoning relief on the signage from the ZBA. He had a brief presentation explaining that they completed a stormwater management report that demonstrates that the site meets standards and have provided a Long Term O&M Plan. He noted that BETA has reviewed and provided an updated memo.

**Board and Staff Comments:**

Ms. McCabe said that the Building Department is still reviewing the sign package that was just submitted. If relief is needed the applicant will need to file a special permit with the ZBA. A Board member asked if there were any differences for the operations from the dealership across the street? Ms. McCabe responded that this proposal is similar to the dealerships across the street.

Chair Atkins offer an opportunity for public comment by raising your zoom hand, pressing \*9 if on the phone, or typing a question in the Q&A.

Public Comments: There were none.

Ms. McCabe summarized the four waivers needed and her suggested list of conditions of approval.

The waivers for submission requirements are: The exterior lighting plan, traffic study, landscape plan and a presentation model.

Ms. McCabe summarized six conditions of approval:

1. Applicant is responsible for filing with the ZBA for signage relief if required.
2. All loading and unloading of car carriers shall be located on the property and not on Walper or Perwal Street.
3. There shall be no vehicle parking or vehicle storage on the grass areas except in the vehicle display space indicated on the plans on the south side of the Providence Highway drive and the vehicle display spaces adjacent to the building in the concrete area shall not impede safe and adequate pedestrian access and shall maintain 3 ft. of clearance at all times.
4. Applicant/Owner is responsible for complying with the stormwater management system's operation and maintenance plan to prevent pollution and to keep the system operating as designed. As indicated in the project's Stormwater Management System Operation and Maintenance Plan prepared for Mazda of Westwood dated February 11, 2021, all staff shall be trained and records maintained.
5. A copy of this Decision and the Project Plans shall be kept on the Project Site at all times during construction.
6. Any alterations, modifications, deletions or changes to the EIDR Approval shall be requested in writing to the Town Planner prior to implementation. Changes considered de minimis by the Building Commissioner may be accepted as a note to the file, changes considered minor pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Zoning Bylaw may be required to file an Administrative EIDR pursuant to Section 7.3.6 or return to the Planning Board as a request for a minor modification at a publically posted Planning Board meeting. Alterations determined to be major, shall return to the Planning Board as a formal amendment and new public hearing with the Planning Board.

A Board member asked about the site and building's light. Mr. Mackwell responded that there are no proposed changes to the lighting plan and showed some photos of the existing LED lights.

*Actions Taken:*

Upon a motion made by Mr. Pfaff and seconded by Mr. McCusker, the Planning Board voted 4-01 in favor (Ms. Conant abstained) via roll call vote to approve the waiver requests at 420 Providence Highway.

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board voted (4-0-1 Ms. Conant abstained) in favor via roll call vote to approve the EIDR at 420 Providence Highway with the conditions listed above.

Upon a motion made by Mr. Gotti and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board voted unanimously in favor via roll call vote to close the public meeting for 420 Providence Highway.

**25 Clapboardtree St. (Map 29, Lot 199) & Abbey Road Public Hearing** – Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) Special Permit Amendment. Westwood Green, LLC proposes to add three senior units to previously approved OSRD on lot 2 at 25 Clapboardtree St. to be combined with condominiums at The Homes at 45.

Ms. McCabe explained that this an Amendment to the existing OSRD Special Permit with a new public hearing.

Attorney Mike Terry presented by giving a brief history for the project approved in 2019 for 40 homes, 7 affordable units and the owner, Mr. Green, is now proposing to add 3 additional units. Mr. Craig Finn the project engineer from VHB discussed that the homes would meet all setbacks. There is a minimum of 50% open space and it is still within compliance.

The Applicant, Mr. Dan Green, explained there is has been a lot of interest in his homes and currently many Westwood residents are moving in and showing interest. The three homes would be smaller than the current homes being built. He discussed roof runoff and open space and the proposed stormwater infiltration. Mr. Green noted that he reached out to neighbors. The group home on Lot 1 does not have much landscaping and Mr. Green heard from neighbors that they would like to see more landscaping so the property looks more like a single-family residence than a group home and he said he will add more landscaping. Mr. Green presented a landscape plan with additional plantings at lot 1 and lot 2 and he proposes expanding the monetary contribution to the affordable housing fund up, initially he proposed \$20K per each of the three houses, and \$40K to the Town's sidewalk fund, but if the Board does not favor the sidewalk fund contribution, he could possibly go up to \$35K per each of the three new homes.

Staff & Board Comments:

Did you get any feedback from the neighbors? Mr. Hyde and Ms. Eramo. If this were a single family home, she thought it would be on Abby Road not Clapboardtree Road.

Concern, is this consistent with the neighborhood and not impact the neighbors?

What are the new contributions to the Town? Mr. Green explained his initial proposal is \$40K which is the estimated cost for sidewalk improvements on Clapboardtree from the Temple to the corner of Winter Street. He will also do extra landscaping at the group home on Lot 1 and initially proposed \$20K per market rate home which will add \$60K to affordable housing total for the three new homes.

A Board member responded that the proposal adds three more homes to the denominator of the Town's housing stock and the contribution is not enough to purchase an affordable home. Mr. Green responded that his proposal is going from 40 to 43 homes, that includes five affordable units at the group home and two homes within the senior OSRD development, when the zoning requires 15% is affordable. Seven affordable units are required with 43 homes and that has been met.

Board members still need to think of it as adding more new homes to our denominator.

A board member asked about reducing the proposal from three to two new units, would that be of any interest to you? Mr. Green responded that that may not be economically feasible. It could just be sold as a single lot. He thinks that it would be a benefit to the Town with more homes and adding landscape.

Why are the homes detached? He explained what plans he would use. They are not wide homes, with 11 feet apart.

What is the cost of the homes? \$1.1M. Labor rates and materials have gone up; it takes approximately 30 weeks to build a home during COVID. Smaller homes will be sell for under \$1M.

Are the other single-family lots already committed? Will you come back with new ideas? Mr. Green responded that the lots are committed, no room to do more.

If you only do 2, it is not economically viable? Mr. Green said two make it hard given the stormwater and other requirements.

2 plus an affordable home would not be a possibility? Not economically okay.

3 homes, would add \$105K? Yes, and can be flexible, \$5-\$10K possible.

A board member asked if he needs two driveways to Abbey Road? Correct.

Distance from driveway to Clapboardtree? Mr. Finn, about 78 feet.

Proposing a denser landscape, worried about driving safety and pulling out of a driveway.

Light of sight and safety? Mr. Finn doesn't see an issue, still plenty of time.

Chair Atkins offer an opportunity for public comment by raising your zoom hand, pressing \*9 if on the phone, or typing a question in the Q&A.

Public Comment:

Ms. Fusco, Pine Lane, submitted comments in the Q&A that were summarized by the Chair. Ms. Fusco commented that during the initial approval it was expected that the condos would sell for \$750,000 and have now been selling for a million.

Mr. Green responded that he does not believe he gave a specific number nor at \$750,000 since he expected they would sell for more than that.

Ms. Hyde, 15 Martingale Lane, believes there needs to be more landscaping in front of the Lifeworks group home lot 1 and that should be handled separately from this Amendment proposal. She believes there are

too many curb cuts now on Abbey Road, believes the three units is too dense, asked that two be considered, and encouraged the visual and aesthetic appearance of Clapboardtree Street to remain.

Ms. Eramo, 48 Clapboardtree St., has concerns about this proposal and would like to see it remain a single-family lot. She initially expressed support for this project during the original approval with the single-family homes along Clapboardtree Street but believes she will be impacted by this proposal as the abutter directly across the street. She would also like to see more landscaping at lot 1.

Mr. Bailey, 29 Martingale Lane, speaking as a neighbor in opposition of what is being proposed because it is not compatible with the single-family homes that are in close proximity. Three single family homes are not consistent with the neighborhood and feels this is too dense.

Ms. Brennan commented in the Q&A summarized the purpose of Open Space Residential Development (OSRD) section 8.3. of the Zoning Bylaw, believes this is too dense and too different from the original proposal.

Ms. Fusco, Pine Lane, commented in the Q&A, read by the Chair that when density concerns in Islington were raised they were dismissed yet density concerns on Clapboardtree over 3 units seem to have traction.

Ms. Castaldini in the Q&A, summarized by the Chair, asked about putting in an affordable unit on site rather than a satellite site and to make an affordable house rather than give funds. Chair responded this has been discussed and is under consideration by the applicant and board.

#### Board Comments:

It is a great project, 55+ senior housing.

Impact on the additional units.

Single family units on the perimeter, \$1.2M, and inside \$1.1. How does the math work? Homes on the perimeter are selling for \$1.5-\$1.7M. Mr. Green answered, the difference is that they don't have to put their drainage underground like the Homes at 45, same with utilities. The cost structure is different.

Mr. Green said this feedback has been eye opening. He would like to ask for a continuance to the next meeting on March 16 so he can revisit his proposal, look into the request for two units, more screening and reducing the curb cuts on Abbey Road.

Ms. Loughnane added that if adding 2 homes, they still need to be age restricted, with no more than two bedrooms and age restricted to be merged into the OSRD. Ms. Loughnane further added that the Special permit decision condition 1B requires contributions be made upon the sale of the market rate units to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Mr. Green has currently provided \$40k already on the sale of the first four since \$10K per market rate was required. The Planning Board's 2019 condition was for the funds to be placed in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund. However, we have since learned that the Town does not have an affordable trust fund. In order to set one up, we need to go to the Town with an article, and the Select Board has a placeholder for this on the warrant currently. They are reconsidering, and think that it would be better for the Applicant to donate the funds directly to WAHA, Inc. (Westwood Affordable Housing Associates, Inc.) instead. Essentially, the request is to remove the middle man and to amend the condition to be the funds related to the affordable housing contribution be submitted to WAHA, Inc. rather than now create a trust fund.

The board discussed the funds going directly to WAHA and the intent that either way the funds eventually get to WAHA to create affordable housing. If the Board modifies the language of the OSRD special permit to change where the money is submitted.

Ms. Loughnane suggests changing the specific language in the special permit. The Board does not need to vote on it tonight, but should give direction to the Select Board about keeping or removing the Article from Town meeting since they are considering warrant articles before going to Fin Com.

Board members had questions on whether WAHA would use the money for upkeep or other administrative tasks and asked if the funds could be dedicated to be used only for affordable housing. Mr. Ahearn responded that Ms. McCabe has prepared draft language that the funds be used to cover the cost of creating one or more units of affordable housing to add to the Town's Subsidized Housing Inventory. A Board member noted in the past on other projects the Board called it a linkage fee to WAHA.

Mr. Louis Rizolli, Chair of WAHA and the Westwood Housing Authority, explained that often times they get money to go and repair homes to bring them up to date and to be able to comply with the State's requirements to qualify as affordable units, but these funds could go directly to towards purchasing and renovations to create affordable housing.

A Board member asked to get some information from Sarah Bouchard the Housing & Zoning Agent, as to which would be the better option. Trust or sending it to WAHA? It would be helpful to get this info before the next meeting.

Planning Board members indicated initial support for amending that condition on the funds going to WAHA, Inc. but did not take an official vote as they requested a memo from the Housing Agent.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board vote 5-0 via roll call vote to continue the OSRD Public hearing to Tuesday, March 16, 2020 at 7 pm via Zoom.

**10 Longwood Drive, EIDR Minor Modification Request.** Fox Hill Village received EIDR approval in 2019 for a three-story addition for 24 assisted living residences and amenities in a new wing. Request is for partial and/or temporary occupancy prior to completing all requirements.

Ms. McCabe explained that the Applicant is essentially two minor modification requests related to authorizing the Planning Board to consider temporary partial occupancy prior to completing all the required work. She explained the Board approved an EIDR in 2019 and advised the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) relative to the affordability requirement because the ZBA is special permit authority for the residential retirement community special permit but the Planning Board is advising authority on the original request for off-site affordable housing requirement of the Zoning Bylaw.

Request 1 – Request for occupancy of the first floor which contains the amenity space for the community, by April 16th. Staff is supportive of this request and believes this is a minor modification.

Request 2 - Is to permit occupancy prior to the group home units are occupied and alter the Planning Board's recommendation to the Zoning Board which requires eligibility of listing on the Town's Subsidized Housing Inventory (SHI) for the affordable units prior to occupancy of any of the 24 new assisted living units. The Board should vote on this to determine if this a minor modification and if so, would also require a modification from the ZBA. The affordability requirement was achieved through a 5-unit group home expected to be completed June 30, 2021.

Ms. Schneider, attorney for Fox Hill Village, was present and gave a brief summary of the project, and is requesting two Temporary Certificates of Occupancy be permitted.

Board Comments & Discussion:

Concerned about the affordability. Ms. Loughnane explained that the census counting has been done, but the Town will not get numbers until September-December at least. The Town's concern is that we don't want to fall behind in the percentage pertaining to the Town's subsidized housing inventory.

Dafna Krouk-Gordon, President of TILL, the group home, approved as the location for the off-site affordable units was present and gave an update on the project. She explained that construction is well under way, working diligently, and have formally accepted two residents.

A board member asked about the conditions from the ZBA, from Nov 2019, has the applicant submitted a deed restriction to maintain the five affordable housing units in perpetuity, at 230 High Street? Ms. Schneider, said it has been submitted. Staff added that it has been submitted to it has not yet been accepted by the Town because more work is still needed on the agreement to secure the units as perpetual.

The Applicant is looking for a Temporary Certificate of Occupancy for the amenity space area that includes the pool, café, and common area and hoping to for some leniency on occupying the assisted living units before end of June because their construction is almost complete.

**Public Comments:**

Ms. Fusco commented in the Q&A opposition to early occupancy.

**Action Taken on Request #1:**

Upon a motion made by Mr. Gotti and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board voted 4-1-0 (Mr. McCusker voting against) via roll call vote to grant the temporary partial occupancy for access to the amenity space containing the pool, café, and shared space, but no occupancy of residences at 10 Longwood Drive.

**Further Comments:** No residency. It is a cafe, pool and common area.  
Motion carries.

**Staff & Board Comments:**

Ms. Loughnane explained the submission was a requirement by January 2020. The issuance of the certificate of occupancy comes from the Building Commissioner and the way the ZBA and Planning Board approvals are now, unless modified by the two Boards, the Building Commissioner does not issue a certificate of occupancy until the group homes are determined to be eligible for listing on the SHI in accordance with the two approvals. It requires the Town to determine that the group home units are eligible and that they are perpetual. That is why the Town's consensus in that agreement is necessary for the Town to be satisfied that the units are perpetual, and the Town is not satisfied.

If there was an agreement with the Town that satisfied the Town. they still need relief from the ZBA.

Willing to try, but need to work on the perpetuity. Don't want to expose the Town. Ms. Loughnane explained that group home units are not added to the SHI until the actual residents of the group home move in, which is different than if the affordable units were in the development.

Ms. Schneider asked to continue this discussion on the second occupancy request to another meeting after further discussion and review with her team and staff.

No need for a continuance vote, the Applicant can come back when ready and if ready by March 16, 2021.

**Zoning Amendment Discussion. Preparation for public hearing on 3/1/21.** Discuss zoning amendments submitted for Annual Town Meeting in advance of the public hearing scheduled for Monday, March 1 at 7:00 pm. (Due to newspaper publication error the public hearing will be Monday, March 1st). Full article text and details under Planning Board Applications here: [www.westwoodpermit.org](http://www.westwoodpermit.org)

In response to a question asked by the Chair earlier about the difference about this not being the official public hearing, Mr. Ahearn informed the Board that the Board can still discuss the zoning items if it was posted on the meeting posted and will have two nights to discuss.

Article 1: Zoning Map Amendments Related to Town-owned Property on High Street in the vicinity of the Obed Baker House

Ms. Loughnane, reported that the Town put out a Request for Proposal (RFP) a year ago and Todd Sullivan has replied with four options for the property. They will meet this week to review a proposal. It will allow for the Obed Baker house to be commercial use on the first floor and residential on the second floor. He may be interested in the barn too but will learn more later this week.

**Board Comments:**

How many Town owned properties in the area? *High Street Fire Station, Thurston Middle School & Obed Baker House.*

The RFP, this is the 3rd time the Town has tried to get it redeveloped.

Who is in the Working Group? *Chris Coleman, Abby McCabe, Sara Bouchard, Karen Catrone, Todd Korchin and Brendan Ryan.*

Between Barlow and Church? *Thurston Middle School.*

Is Deerfield included? *No, it is not fronting on High street.*

Public Comments:

Ms. Fusco asked how many units of residential is Todd Sullivan proposing? Ms. Loughnane, not sure yet, at least 2, will know after the meeting.

Does it include The Fisher School? It is part of the Middle School, but it is being leased to the Westwood Historical Society for a 99-year lease at \$1/year. The building is on Town owned land.

Article 2: Zoning Amendment Relative to Temporary Structures and Uses

Ms. McCabe explained the purpose to allow for requests less than 6 months rather than going through the special permit process which can take a few months.

Article 3: Zoning Amendment Relative to Fire Arms/Explosives Sales and Services. Ms. McCabe explained the purpose of this article is to prohibit the uses no compatible with what we're looking for the in the downtown village business districts as they are better suited for the Highway Business and Industrial Zoning districts where they are currently allowed.

Article 4: Zoning Amendments Related to Medical Uses

Ms. McCabe gave a quick review explaining she created a working group of eight residents and two Planning Board members last fall. Mr. Gotti was part of that group and will explain more completely the proposed zoning amendments and went through a presentation.

Patrick Gallagher, working group member, there was a lot of discussion about traffic, tax base, and noise impacts. A lot of thought went into it and is comfortable with the proposed amendment and it is the best option for the town.

Mr. Elcock, working group member, added that Westwood is always one of the Towns to look at for future development given its location near the highway. The group was looking for the best to protect the town.

Mr. Amico, Director of Fox Hill Village, explained that he did review the zoning proposal with the Fox Hill Board of Directors, which includes 9 residents. They have been pleased with the neighborhood, the Fox Hill Village and their residents are opposed to a hospital, substance rehabilitation treatment facility in their neighborhood. It would change the Fox Hill neighborhood and they are very concerned and opposed to this zoning proposal.

Ms. Loughnane explained that the definition is broad and that is the intent of the zoning proposal is to protect the Town by setting regulation and limited locations of where any of these facilities could go. The Town is currently not protected and there is no proposal for a hospital or substance treatment center. The proposed bylaw change adds a definition for substance rehabilitation treatment facility and it makes it a special permit use and it proposes in this version making that special permit use allowed within the under the medical facilities overlay district. It would cover the Fox Hill Village property and the Meditech property on Lowder Brook Drive only with this proposal.

Definition: Substance Rehabilitation or Treatment Facility It is a building designed and used for the diagnosis and treatment of human patients for substance Rehabilitation and or treatment.

Ms. Sawitsky attorney for Fox Hill Village said the definitions were very broad. They feel vulnerable and concerned.

Ms. Loughnane, explained that the Town and these two properties on Lowder Brook in the ARO zone are currently unprotected and exposed. The option of doing nothing is not an option. It is a concern that needs to be addressed.

Where was the objection of the other site? *Both ARO districts.*

How can we find a solution? *Ms. Sawitsky cannot speak for the Board.*

Mr. Amico, 100% opposed to a hospital.

Mr. Ahearn, without protections we are exposed.

Ms. Loughnane explained that the bylaw is not just about substance rehabilitation and hospitals, they are the two new uses of being added for definitions because these uses are undefined in the current zoning bylaw. It also clarifies medical centers and clinics and offices of healthcare professionals to distinguish one from the other. We're replacing the term *office of a doctor or dentist* with the term of *office of a healthcare professional* which is the term that has only been used for University Station. It is questionable where else it goes. We're making that an allowed use everywhere the office of a doctor or dentist is now allowed which is in every commercial District or buy Special Permit in the general residence district. For medical centers and clinics, defined in the bylaw it is only allowable at University Station. The difference between a *medical center* and *Clinic* can be an office of a healthcare professional is a question of scale. Office of a *healthcare professional* can be an office either a single practitioner or a practice of multiple doctors. A medical center is something more along the lines of the Brigham and Women's office building at University Station which is multiple practices of different offices. Trying to distinguish the two so that a Medical Clinic doesn't end up on Washington Street or High Street or in the general residence district. A healthcare professional could continue in those uses. Medical centers or clinics are more likely to be nonprofit and so there are tax implications and the Town would like to keep those within University Station where we already have a means of addressing pilot agreements. It still has to pass at Town meeting  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.

Article 5: Housekeeping Article

Ms. McCabe, said it involves renumbering and rewording a few items.

**Other Business:**

Dover Public Hearing Notification for 61-63 County St. Comprehensive Permit.

Notification about a public hearing tomorrow night in Dover. Comprehensive Permit. Proposing of 39 apartment style units on 109 in Dover, if you have comments on traffic mitigation. Ms. McCabe will submit a comment letter from the Board.

**Adjournment:**

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Pfaff, the Planning Board voted in favor (5-0) via roll call to adjourn at 10:52 pm.

**List of Documents:**

Link to Documents:

[http://westwoodtownma.iqm2.com/Citizens/Detail\\_Meeting.aspx?ID=1603](http://westwoodtownma.iqm2.com/Citizens/Detail_Meeting.aspx?ID=1603)

Link to the Planning Board web page

<https://www.townhall.westwood.ma.us/departments/community-economic-development/planning-division>

<b>730 Gay Street</b> ANR Plan Gay Street #730, Glossa Engineering, 2/5/2021, 1 page. PB-02-23-2021-RECORDED, Westwood Planning Board, 2/17/2021, 2 pages.	PD F
<b>420 Providence Highway - EIDR</b> Application, Public Hearing Notice, Westwood Planning Board, 1/5/2021, 1 page. Project Narrative & Waiver Requests, From: Kelly Engineering Group, To: Westwood Planning Board, 12/29/2020. Architectural & Demo Plans, The Curtis Architectural Group, 5/11/2020, 6 pages. Site Plans, Kelly Engineering Group, 12/17/2020, 2 pages.	PD F



<p>Existing conditions photo, 1 page.  Existing Drainage Plan 2015, A-Plus Construction, 8/31/2015, 1 page.  Existing Conditions- Drainage, Kelly Engineering Group, 1/14/2021, 1 page.  BETA Engineering Review Comments, From: BETA, To: T. Korchin, A. McCabe &amp; K. Flynn, 1/29/2021, 4 pages.  Staff Comments, 1/28/2021, 3 pages.  Presentation Slides from February 2 meeting, 17 pages.  NEW: Revised Existing Layout 02-15-21, Kelly Engineering Group, 12/17/20, 2 pages.  NEW: Utility &amp; Drainage from 2005, F. Douglas Adams and Associates, Inc., 5/5/2005, 2 pages.  NEW: Existing Stormwater Calculations updated 2021, Kelly Engineering Group, 2/11/2021, 23 pages.  NEW: Drainage Response letter, From: Kelly Engineering Group, To: Westwood Planning Board, 2/11/2021, 3 pages.  NEW: Stormwater and Operation &amp; Maintenance (O&amp;M) Plan, 2021, Kelly Engineering Group, 2/11/2021, 13 pages.  NEW: Signage Mazda Brandbook, AGI, 1/13/2021, 10 pages.  NEW: BETA Review Revised Material 2-17-21, From: BETA, To: T. Korchin, A. McCabe &amp; K. Flynn, 2/17/2021, 3 pages.</p>	
<p><b>25 Clapboardtree Street &amp; 25 Abbey Road</b>  Application, Public Hearing Notice, Westwood Planning Board, 1/27/2021, 1 page.  Environmental Impact Memo Narrative, From: vhb, To: A. McCabe, 2/5/2019, 6 pages.  Site Plan, Revised 2.18.21, vhb, 2/10/2021, 1 page.  Open Space Evaluation &amp; Overall Layout Revised 2.18.21, 1 page.  Yield Calculation - 15.3 acre OSRD 2021-01-21, 1/21/2021, 1 page.  Stormwater Management Update 2021, From: vhb, To: A. McCabe, 1/29/2021, 34 pages.  Traffic Impact, From: vhb, To: D. Green, 12/23/2020, 2 pages.  Planning Board Approval 2019-04023, Westwood Planning Board, 4/23/2019, 17 pages.  Fiscal Report Update Homes at 45 OSRD 2021-02-04, 1/24/2021, 17 pages.  Stormwater Management Report 2019, From: vhb, To: The Green Company, 2/14/2019, 165 pages.  Architectural Elevation &amp; floor Plan, KTG Y Group Inc., 3/25/2015, 2 pages.  Architectural Elevation &amp; floor Plan 2, Stephen Kelleher Architects, 10/27/2020, 2 pages.  Landscape Plans, Grady Consulting, L.L.C., 12/31/2020, 2 pages.  Earth Work Letter, From: D. Green, To: A. McCabe, 2/8/2021, 1 page.  2019 Planning Board OSRD Decision, Westwood Planning Board, 4/23/2019, 17 pages.  2019 OSRD Special Permit Site Plans, vhb, 2/4/2019, 19 pages.  Lot 2 Landscape Perspectives Early Years 2021-02-19, 3 pages.  Lot 2 Landscape Perspectives 4-5 Years Out 2021-02-19, 3 pages.  Engineering BETA Review Comments, From: BETA, To: T. Korchin, A. McCabe, K. Flynn, 2/18/2021, 3 pages.  Staff Comments updated 2-22-21, 2/22/2021, 2 pages.  Site Dimensions 2-19-21, vhb, 2/10/2021, 1 page.  2018 Preliminary Planning Board Approval December  Planning Staff memo from Abby McCabe Town Planner to Planning Board dated February 19, 2021  Planning staff comments draft Findings of Fact, dated February 22, 2021</p>	<p>PD F</p>

<p>Public Comment letter from Doug Hyde, to Planning Board, re: 25 Clapboardtree Street &amp; Abbey Road, dated February 15, 2021.</p> <p>Public comment letter and photographs from Margery J. Eramo, to Westwood Planning Board Members, RE: Application – 25 (Lot 2) Clapboardtree Street/Abbey Way, dated February 21, 2021</p>	
<p><b>10 Longwood Drive</b></p> <p>Fox Hill Request, From: Hemenway &amp; Barnes LLP, To: A. McCabe, 2/17/2021, 2 pages.</p> <p>2019 Fox Hill Dr. Planning Board Approval, Westwood Planning Board, 9/3/2019, 7 pages.</p> <p>2019 Approved Plans Fox Hill Village, Perkins Eastman, 8/22/2019, 25 pages.</p> <p>ZBA Fox Hill 2019 Approval, 6 pages.</p> <p>Planning Board member to ZBA November 2019</p> <p>Decision-High-St-230-2020-04-07, Westwood Planning Board, 4/7/2020, 5 pages.</p>	<p>PD F</p>
<p><b>Zoning Amendment Discussion</b></p> <p>Warrant Article Request, Westwood Planning Board, 12/16/2020, 2 pages.</p> <p>Medical Use Presentation from January 26 Fin Com Meeting, 32 pages.</p> <p>Zoning Amendment Summaries for March 1st Public Hearing, Westwood Planning Board, 2/10/2021, 3 pages.</p> <p>Proposed Zoning Articles for March 1st Public Hearing, Westwood Planning Board, 2/10/2021, 11 pages.</p> <p>Memo from Interim Town Counsel Daniel J. Bailey to David Atkins Chairman Planning Board March 12, 2019</p> <p>Medical Zoning FAQs, 8 pages.</p> <p>Current Zoning Bylaw, 222 pages.</p> <p>Zoning Map, 1 page.</p>	<p>PD F</p>
<p>Memorandum from Town Planner Abby McCabe to Planning Board Members, Re: Staff Meeting summary for February 23, 2021 meeting, dated February 19 revised February 23, 2021</p>	<p>PD F</p>