

Westwood Planning Board Minutes
Tuesday February 1, 2022
7:00 pm
Via Zoom Remote Participation
Westwood, MA 02090

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, On June 16, 2021, Governor Baker signed into law An Act Extending Certain COVID-19 Measures Adopted during the State of Emergency. This Act includes an extension, until April 1, 2022, of the remote meeting provisions of his March 12, 2020, Executive Order. The February 1, 2022 Planning Board meeting was conducted via remote participation by the Board.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pfaff 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=Q0RUCKDg4RA&t=1037s>. Chair Pfaff explained the meeting procedures, and how the Planning Board process works.

Present via Remote Participation:

Planning Board members present via roll call: Christopher A. Pfaff, David L. Atkins, Jr., Ellen Larkin Rollings, Kathleen Wynne and Thomas P. McCusker. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye. Staff members present: Abigail McCabe Town Planner, Pat Ahearn Town Counsel, Nora Loughane Director of Community & Economic Development, and Jessica Cole, who recorded the meeting minutes.

20 Wildwood Dr. – Earth Material Movement EIDR. This public hearing was continued from the December 14 & January 11 meetings. Applicant proposes a patio in backyard with site work that will result in increased grades.

Ms. McCabe gave the Board an update since the public hearing was opened on December 14, reminding the Board the hearing was continued to January 11 to allow time for the owner to engage an engineer to review the wall and slopes, and on January 11 the hearing was continued to this evening to allow time for the revised plan to be submitted. She also reported that the Conservation commission approved the plan the project at their meeting last week.

The Applicant Dan Merrill of Legacy Engineering was present to discuss the plan.

Board and Staff Comments:

- Ms. McCabe: The Conservation Committee had a site visit and approved the plan at their January 26 meeting.
- There were concerns from neighbors at the December 14 hearing with water runoff. Will these changes help improve the runoff? *Mr. Merrill: Yes, it will not go toward the adjoining property.*
- Elevation levels: Street level 115 feet? *Street is 115, house at 120 and behind the house is a retaining wall 4-5 feet wall. Above that will add another wall at 128 feet. Project engineer said the water would flow to the back of the lot into the wetland.*

Chair Pfaff asked for public comments or questions and asked people to raise their Zoom hand to be unmuted.

Public Comments: There were none.

Ms. McCabe went over the waivers needed: traffic report, exterior lighting plan, drainage report, and presentation model.

Motion:

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Ms. Wynne, the Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to waive the standard EIDR requirements because they are not necessary for this project involving grading work in the backyard at a single-family residence. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye.

Ms. McCabe summarized the recommended standard conditions of approval:

1. The existing pavement on Wildwood Drive shall be protected from damage from loading and unloading of material and/or equipment related to the proposed construction.
2. There shall be no substandard or hazardous fill material used with this project. Applicant shall submit certification from the company providing the loam that the material does not contain any hazardous material to the Town Planner and Building Commissioner prior to bringing any fill on the property.

3. All project related construction such as ledge removal and earth material movement shall comply with the Town's General Bylaws Chapter 292, for Noise and Construction, which are between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, and 12:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Sundays.
4. All trucks carrying earth material to or from 20 Wildwood Drive shall be required to access 20 Wildwood Drive via Hartford Street directly from High Street/Route 109.
5. If project involves blasting to remove the ledge, a blasting permit from the Fire Department is required. A pre-blast survey of the abutting and nearby properties is required prior to any blasting.
6. If the Project, or any Condition imposed in this Decision, requires permit, license, or other approval from any other board, committee, or agency of the Town of Westwood or other regulatory agency of the Commonwealth or the federal government, the Applicant shall make an appropriate application for the same.
7. Any alterations, modifications, deletions or changes to the EIDR Approval shall be requested in writing to the Town Planner and Building Commissioner prior to implementation. Changes considered de minimis by the Building Commissioner may be accepted as a note to the file, changes considered minor by the Building Commissioner pursuant to Section 7.3 of the Zoning Bylaw may be required to file an Administrative EIDR pursuant to Section 7.3.6 of the Zoning Bylaw 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 by the Building Commissioner or the Planning Board, shall return to the Planning Board as a formal Amendment and will require a new public hearing with the Planning Board.
8. Applicant shall promptly repair any damage which Applicant causes to sidewalks, street pavement, signs or other fixtures or features within the public right of way, after obtaining permission from the Town Department of Public Works. Such repairs shall be performed to Town of Westwood standards.
9. A copy of this Decision and the Project Plans shall be kept on the Project Site at all times during construction.
10. This EMM-EIDR Approval shall lapse if a substantial use thereof or construction thereunder has not begun, except for good cause, within two (2) years following the grant thereof. The Planning Board may extend such approval, for good cause, upon the written request of the Applicant. In the case of the EMM-EIDR Approval, the term "substantial use thereof or construction thereunder" shall mean the commencement and substantial progress of the approved activity.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Mr. Atkins, the Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to approve the Earth Material Movement EIDR for 20 Wildwood Drive with the conditions of approval reviewed by Ms. McCabe. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye.

Upon a motion made by Ms. Wynne and seconded by Ms. Rollings, the Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to close the public hearing for 20 Wildwood Drive. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye.

Zoning Amendments Public Hearing on all zoning amendment warrant articles submitted for Annual Town Meeting.

Article 1 - Zoning Bylaw & Map Amendments Relative to a new Mixed-Use & Multi-Family Residential Overlay District pursuant to Chapter 358 of the Acts of 2020 amendments to Section 3 of M.G.L. Chapter 40A for MBTA Communities. Ms. McCabe summarized Article 1 and the proposed properties.

Ms. McCabe presented the zoning articles for the six articles the Planning Board is sponsoring for Annual Town Meeting. Ms. McCabe explained that amendments were made to the state zoning act last year that requires all MBTA communities to have: at least one zoning district of reasonable size for multi-family housing; allows minimum gross density of 15 units per acre; within a half mile of a train station or bus stop; suitable for families with children; and the permit process for multi-family cannot be discretionary.

Ms. McCabe reported that the state has issued draft guidelines and expected to finalize them over the summer and is taking public comments on the draft guidelines until end of March 2022. The guidelines call for compliance by December 2023. The guidelines also define reasonable size of a zoning district to be a minimum of 50 acres and have a unit

capacity percentage based on a town's total housing count. For Westwood, Westwood is required to have a total of 77 acres of land zoned based on 20% of the Town's total housing stock (5,801 housing units).

She summarized the Planning Board's proposal with this zoning articles is a new zoning overlay district to encompass 4 parcels total: the two parcels at 22 Everett St.; 85-95 University Ave.; and 120-130 University Ave. The proposed new zoning bylaw includes an EIDR (Environmental Impact & Design Review) with a public hearing and public notification process. Application involves drainage, setbacks, height restrictions, 15% of units required to be affordable, 10% of units must be more than two bedrooms.

Board & Staff Comments & Questions:

- The 20% because we are a designated Bus Community? *Mr. Ahearn: Yes, the way the definition reads he believes we are a Commuter Rail Community, not a bus service community but the state has currently designated Westwood as a Bus Service Community and subject to the 20% of total housing to determine the housing unit capacity.*
- Add "unit per acre" to the slide with the required district size
- Did we get any guidance about the train station in Dedham? *Ms. McCabe: We have not received an official response yet on our draft zoning proposal.*
- Proposal now is 16 acres total for the new zoning overlay district.
- 50 contiguous acres? *McCabe responded the guidelines call for 25 contiguous acres then the remaining acreage can be spread out but no areas less than 5 contiguous acres.*
- How many areas are less than 5 acres in our recommendation? *Ms. McCabe: Everett is 6.78, Gables is 6.5, Pulte's is 2.7 acres.*
- It was the consensus of all the board members not to increase the size of the overlay zoning district at this time because the guidelines are still in draft form. Board members want to wait until after the final guidelines are issued before proposing a larger zone.
- No desire to increase the size, 77 acres is an aggressive ask, even 58 acres. Board members have acted in good faith and still want to proceed with what we have for the new zoning.
- Do we bother including Pulte because it is 2.7 acres? *Mr. Ahearn reminded the board that these are guidelines and could change so recommends not removing one proposed zoning area because of the draft guidelines.*

Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing up to anyone wanting to ask questions or have comments on this article to please raise their zoom hand.

Public Comments:

Joseph Previtera, Dean Street said he was not in favor of including the 22 Everett St./Foster Block property if the train station in Islington was proposed to be relocated.

Mr. Ahearn responded that there is no proposal to relocate the train station.

Louis Rizoli, member of the Westwood Housing Authority (WAHA). Was very thankful to the Planning Board for taking up this article and for the Planning Board's outreach to the Housing Authority in developing this proposal. He noted that he believes Westwood could be considered a commuter rail community since there are 2 train stations in Town.

Gary Kaplan, 101 Magnolia Drive. New member of WAHA and is in strong support for the new zoning district. It will enable young families with children to participate in the benefits of living in Westwood for all age ranges. It will go a long way.

Trevor Laubensstein: Thank you to the Planning Board for this work he sees this as an opportunity for more affordable housing for seniors. Why would we not set aside more property by Everett Street and University Station to make it bigger?

Mr. Pfaff responded that other zoning area on Washington Street were discussed by the board for consideration and other areas within the half mile radius of the train stations. All or part of University Station, but board does not want to develop all of the commercial areas for housing because we don't want to diminish the commercial tax base. The board felt the 16 acres are the best suitable acres. Ms. Rollings added that the new housing cannot be strictly for senior housing, which has been discussed a lot. The law requires it to be family friendly housing with no age restrictions. The two areas in University Station where the new overlay zoning is proposed is developed, it is not likely that it will be bulldozed and turned into multi-family housing because multi-family at a higher density is already there. Mr. Atkins: It is important that we have a process. The EIDR process is a thoughtful proposal. Ms. Wynne: We are starting small with the best locations and will continue to review after final guidelines are released by the state.

Jackie K., 22 Redwood Road, typed in the Q&A which was read by Chair Pfaff: For the record, if we do not do this what happens? Is there a fine or do we just lose grant money?

Mr. Pfaff responded that grant money is part of it, and we need to comply with the state law. If we are not zoned for it, we have no control after 2023 and will be in violation of the law. Mr. Ahearn responded that a variety of things could occur; we want to be in a reasonable defensive position. Mr. McCusker believes it is a vague and poorly written piece of legislation but believes we should continue with this article onto Town meeting at this time.

Barbara Shea: Suggest Roche Bros, to be considered as a location for expand the overlay district if we need to add parcels to have more area.

Mr. Pfaff responded that the board will reevaluate more parcels if we have to for more area to meet the requirements.

Ms. Fusco, 20 Pine Lane, typed in Q&A which was read by Chair Pfaff: Has anyone involved the school committee in these talks? The potential development could cripple our school system, put stress on our Water Resources, police and fire.

Ms. McCabe responded that not specifically because right now we are talking about zoning and not specific projects as no specific projects are proposed. State law requires we adopted a zoning district to allow multi-family housing with a non-discretionary permit process so we don't have as much discretionary review for the housing use.

Jackie K., typed in Q&A read by Chair Pfaff: Thank you for the answer. I have a follow-up. If it's just the grants, how much is the grant money and how often are we getting those grants? Would those grants outweigh the costs incurred by the yearly cost of police, fire, schools, Etc.? And could we build our own affordable housing?

Chair Pfaff responded that we will become ineligible for certain grants if we don't comply, we don't know the numbers because nothing is being proposed. We will not build our own affordable housing. Mr. Ahearn: It will not comply with this law.

Ms. Fusco typed in Q&A: We need to know what dollars in grant money we are talking about. Do you realize it costs \$20,000 a year to educate one child in Westwood and more to educate a child with special needs? This could outweigh any grants the Town may get.

Ms. Wynne responded that she has confidence in the school system in Westwood and our Town to adapt to changes over time.

Staff Comments:

Ms. McCabe: The Law specifically mentions 3 grants that we are not eligible for (Housing Choice, Mass Works Infrastructure Program, and Local Capital Projects funds; and says that other discretionary grants may be considered. Ms. Loughnane: We did receive a Mass Works Grant for \$5 Million, the DPW is always looking for them.

Jayne Allan typed in Q&A read by Chair Pfaff: I know a Westwood resident who filed a FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) request and we actually lost the equivalent of a smaller Elementary School in terms of student population. Again that is Elementary School.

Ms. McCabe had a final comment, she sent the draft for all zoning articles to the Building Commissioner and Fire Chief for review. Suggesting adding a definition for "Institutional Uses" which has been added to this draft.

Article 2 - Zoning changes related to solar arrays and the permitting process.

Ms. McCabe summarized Article 2-Permitting for Solar Arrays. She explained the purpose of the zoning amendments to the permit process is to be more consistent with state law that does not unreasonably regulate solar arrays. The current zoning allows for solar on buildings to be straight to building & electrical permits and that is proposed to stay the same. The proposal changes the solar on the ground to be an administrative review by the Town Planner and Building Commissioner for small scale solar. The zoning adds in a definition for "large scale solar" projects, which requires the public hearing and EIDR application with the Planning Board as proposed. The zoning also proposes adding in a maximum height for ground mounted solar and front yard setback, in addition to the setbacks in the zoning currently for accessory structures.

Board and Staff comments:

- 7.7.13-Maintenance Plan: Will that be required for smaller or larger. Can it be more specific? *Ms. McCabe: she will look at it and address it.*
- Logic behind 250kW? Do we need to specify that? Technology is changing quickly. Do we care about the wattage or the size? *Mr. Pfaff: Our concern is the size. Ms. McCabe: A lot of applications reference the wattage rather than the size. Board concluded to stick with the 10,000 sq. ft. since the physical size was what has the impact and thus trigger for the public hearing with the Board rather than the wattage.*
- Size or Power? Board members believe it is the size, take out the wattage.

Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing up to anyone wanting to ask questions or have comments on this article to please raise their zoom hand.

Public Comment:

Ms. Shea, 14 Cardinal Drive. Agrees in taking out the wattage. Any level of return to the Town for putting up solar panels?

Mr. Ahearn responded that this is specially the purview of the energy manager, not a zoning or planning board issue. Looks like the changes to zoning is removing ground mounted, and changing it to other, and saying it is no longer a Board of Appeals issue but is by-right in all zones. Removing restrictions. Mr. Pfaff: We are doing what the State asked us to do. 7.7.8-the lot coverage? McCabe: Maximum lot coverage, the ground mounted ones are up above the ground, but you must follow the setbacks. It could cover your lot, as long as you follow the setbacks. 25 feet from the street, the same setbacks for accessory buildings.

Chris Poreda, 155 Willard Circle, typed in chat: On Article 2 why not let the admin process (ie Town Planner) use discretion to decide which solar projects need to be a planning board hearing instead of stating area or wattage.

Mr. Ahearn: The State has really limited what the Town can do with restricting solar. It is a matter of right. Public health, safety and public welfare.

Claire Galkowski was present and said that these proposed zoning changes will bring us more into compliance with state law.

Donna Morrison: 303 Oak street: Caution you as you write the bylaw. People who may be interested in placing several solar panels on their property, may clear cut as long as it doesn't exceed the setbacks. Write it so we don't end up losing more wooded areas.

Ms. Galkowski: Yes, true, woods are important, habitats and ecosystems can coexist together. Critically important that we reduce the use of fossil fuels.

Ms. Morrison: How to dispose of solar panels, they are bad for the environment. *Ms. McCabe: Nothing specific on how to dispose of them.* Ms. Morrison: It needs to be considered.

Ms. LaCroix typed in Q&A: Agrees wholeheartedly with Claire.

Ms. Galkowski typed in Q&A: Solar companies require the return of panels. This is also putting solar arrays to a higher standard than other structures like swimming pools.

Article 3 - Amend Zoning Map and Zoning Bylaw to add FMUOD-7 at 909 High St. for the adaptive reuse of the Obed Baker House for two residences, and a portion over the adjacent town land to LBA & FMUOD-7 to construct a one-story commercial building, and expand the FMUOD-7 to the adjacent business property known as Westwood Plaza at 911-929 High St.

Ms. McCabe gave a summary on Article 3. She explained the Planning Board's article is to expand the Local Business A (LBA) and the Flexible Multiple Use Overlay District 7/High Street business district (FMUOD7) to two town-owned parcels with the Obed Baker House and the adjacent parcels included in the recent Request for Proposals (RFP) issued by the Town. The zoning article also includes expanding the overlay to the adjacent commercial plaza at 911-929 High Street because the property asked to be included during a recent application before the Board to allow additional redevelopment opportunities in the future.

Board Comments:

- Nice to see the initial plan. How close to the Wetlands buffer will the new building be? *Ms. Loughnane: Outside the 35 feet of the wetlands.*
- Is there any plan to address the wetlands? *Ms. Loughnane: Part of the proposal does involve removing trash and invasive plants.*

Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing up to anyone wanting to ask questions or have comments on this article to please raise their zoom hand.

Public Comments:

Todd Sullivan select as the project developer in response to the RFP was present. Mr. Sullivan said it will be a four phase project. Renovate and add to the existing Obed Baker House, build a new commercial building, rebuild the existing cemetery shed, and then clean up the vegetative wetlands which are in pretty rough shape.

Ms. Shea: The driveway, is there a contemplated easement by adding the overlay district? The Town owned building? *Ms. Loughnane: The Cemetery barn will be replaced on the cemetery property, and the barn will be torn down. The driveway is the driveway out of the cemetery and also the driveway into the Obed Baker House and used as an egress from the cemetery. Is there a way to make safer ingress and egress for the Dunkin Donuts and accommodate parking for The Obed Baker Property?*

Ms. Loughnane responded that the Planning Board will have to review the application for a special permit in order to complete the development. Exit and entrance will remain in the same place to be used in the same manner. Any redevelopment of the Dunkin plaza will have to be brought to the Planning Board and there are no projects proposed at this time.

Article 4 - Zoning amendments to permit process for expansion of nonconforming uses & structures Section 4.5.3 for new non-conformities.

Ms. McCabe summarized Article 4-Expansion of Non-Conforming Properties. She explained that court cases have found that there should be more flexibility given to alterations to nonconforming structures if they are minor and not substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood. Ms. McCabe explained that currently any new non-conformities proposed or increases to the non-conforming nature currently require a variance with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The zoning proposes allowing a special permit application process with the ZBA when the alteration is determined by the Building Commissioner to be minor and not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood.

Board Comments:

- Definition for Detrimental? *Mr. Ahearn it will be determined by the Building Commissioner. He will review applications when they come in and recommend special permit or variance, both with the ZBA. He has recommended the Building Commissioner develop standards.*

Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing up to anyone wanting to ask questions or have comments on this article to please raise their zoom hand.

Public Comments:

Brian Clinton: 44 Baker Street: Last fall he applied for a variance, mom has moved in with the family. Applied to put an exclusive porch so she could exit from her side of the porch. She wants independence. Granted a special permit but denied a variance for 2 feet. There needs to be exceptions. People will benefit from this.

Ms. Shea was present: Will there still be a notice to neighbors? *Ms. Loughnane: It would still go before the ZBA as a Special Permit as opposed to a Variance and the Special Permit Notice requirements are exactly the same as the Variance Notice Requirements. Is a Special Permit a lower bar to have to reach? Ms. Loughnane: Correct. So this Amendment might have made it easier for Mr. Clinton? Mr. Pfaff: It alters the process, subject to the Building Commissioner's discretion. Why is this being proposed? Mr. Ahern: To comply with current case law.*

Mr. Clinton: Neighbors were supporting his project. Discretion of the Building Commissioner should come into play. *Mr. McCusker: If the Building Commissioner is giving the discretion to decide whether a variance or a special permit is needed, that doesn't give the property owner the right to do what they want. They still have to get the special permit or the variance and the appellate rights of the abutters. Mr. Pfaff: the only thing that is changing is how you get into the project, by variance or special permit.*

Ms. Morrison was present, 303 Oak Street, without this amendment it would be easier to tear down and do a rebuild. Keep it into consideration. Facilitate it. Children cannot buy homes in this town anymore and are moving home. Add-ons will be the future.

Article 5 - 394 & 396 Providence Highway – Rezone parcel with shell gas station and portion of former right-of-way from Industrial Office (IO) and unzoned portion of road layout to Highway Business (HB) for purposes of redeveloping the existing motor vehicle service station.

Ms. McCabe summarized Article 5. She explained the owner of the property wants to redevelop the existing gas station and retail building. They have recently purchased the adjacent lot that is currently un-zoned because it used to be part of the state's right-of-way. The proposal is to re-zone both parcels to Highway Business, which will then facilitate the redevelop for the new gas station and new retail building. That will still need an application to the planning board for the project, as well as Zoning Board and Conservation Commission.

No further board comments.

Chair Pfaff opened the public hearing up to anyone wanting to ask questions or have comments on this article to please raise their zoom hand.

Public Comments:

Michael Brown, attorney for the owner was present, he knows that any redeveloping would require coming before the Planning Board and requested this change so they can continue with project plans.

Ms. Shea: Surprised that the corner had no zoning, it sounds like spot zoning. And there are wetlands nearby too?

Mr. Pfaff: We tried to make the change back in 2015 to rezone, and it did not pass with the Lamberts Plaza. It used to be part of the State Right of Way.

Article 6 - Housekeeping to correct any errors or any inconsistencies and clarify such sections.

Ms. McCabe summarized Article 6. Ms. McCabe found a few typos and errors here to clarify certain sections.

Chair Pfaff stated that these articles have our support. We are looking for Town-wide support and will present articles to Finance & Warrant Commission next month.

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Mr. Atkins and seconded by Ms. Wynne, the Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to continue the meeting to Tuesday Feb 15, 7:00 pm on zoom. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye.

Review DHCD's Draft Compliance Guidelines for Multi-Family Districts Under Section 3A of the Zoning Act applicable to MBTA Communities and review public comment submission process.

Ms. McCabe stated that the State is accepting Public Comment until March 31st. Ms. McCabe wants to start compiling comments and they can be sent directly to her.

Other Business

Action Taken:

Upon a motion made by Ms. Wynne and seconded by Ms. Rollings, the Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to approve the meeting minutes from January 11, 2022 as presented. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne – aye.

Conflict of Interest Law - This is a friendly reminder that Done annually and return the certificate to the Town Clerk, in person or via email. Online ethics training must be done by April. Send certification to Ms. McCabe or the Town Clerk.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion made by Mr. McCusker and seconded by Ms. Wynne, The Planning Board voted 5-0 in favor via roll call vote to adjourn at 9:31pm. Record of the vote: Atkins – aye, McCusker – aye, Pfaff – aye, Rollings – aye, Wynne

List of Documents:

Link to Documents: https://westwoodtownma.igm2.com/Citizens/detail_meeting.aspx?ID=1677

Link to the Planning Board web page

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

<p>20 Wildwood Drive Application, Public Hearing Notice, Westwood Planning Board, 11/18/2021, 1 page. Site Plan, Continental Land Survey, LLC, 11/10/2021, 1 page. Project Description, 1 page. Existing Conditions Photo, 1 page. Existing Conditions Photo 2, 1 page. Staff Review Comments from View Permit Applicant's response to BETA Comments Waiver Request & Fill Origins, 1 page. NEW: Revised Site Plan, Legacy Engineering, 1/17/2002, 1 page. NEW: Response to BETA Comments, Legacy Engineering, 1/17/2022, 3 pages. NEW: BETA Comments on Revised Plans, BETA, 1/24/2022, 5 pages.</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p>Zoning Amendment Public Hearing Planning Board Warrant Article Request, Westwood Planning Board, 1/4/2022, 2 pages. Public Hearing Notice, Westwood Planning Board, 1/12/2022, 3 pages. Public Hearing Notice with full text and visuals (Detail), Westwood Planning Board, 1/12/2022, 26 pages. Article 1 Draft Zoning Map Multi Family Overlay, Draft Guidelines for MBTA Communities 12-15-2021, Dept. of Housing & Community Development, 11 pages. Fire Chief Solar Zoning Amendment Comments Building Department comments on zoning amendments Westwood Advisory Opinion Response from DHCD Colbea Zoning Change Petition, Colbea Enterprises, 10 pages. Current Official Zoning Map May 2021, 1 page. Current Zoning Bylaw May 3, 2021, Town of Westwood, 225 pages. Initial Article Presentation to Fin Com 01-18-2022, Westwood Planning Board, 1/18/2022, 7 pages. Zoning Article Language Detailed Revised</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p>Compliance Guidelines for Multi-Family Districts Zoning Act Sec 3A Draft Guidelines Public Comment Process, 1 page. Draft Guidelines for MBTA Communities 12-15-2021, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Housing & Community Development, 11 pages. Letter to MBTA Communities 12/15/2021, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Housing & Community Development, 12/15/2021, 3 pages. How to Comply in 2022 for MBTA Communities, Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Housing & Community Development, 12/15/2021, 1 page. MBTA Communities FAQ, 1/11/2022, 7 pages. MBTA Communities Webinar Deck 01.12.22, 1/12/2022, 19 pages.</p>	<p>PDF</p>
<p>Memorandum from Town Planner Abby McCabe to Planning Board Members, Re: Meeting Summary for February 1, January 29, 2022. Summary of Conflict of Interest Law for Municipal Employees Draft meeting minutes from January 11, 2022</p>	<p>PDF</p>