



City of Westfield

PLANNING BOARD
Philip McEwan
Peter Fiordalice, Vice Chair
William Carellas
Jane Magarian
Carl Vincent
Cheryl Crowe, Associate
Raymond St. Hilaire, Associate

February 16, 2015

Chairman McEwan called the regular meeting of the Westfield Planning Board to order at 7:00 pm in the City Council Chambers, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA.

PB MEMBERS PRESENT
 MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF

Philip McEwan, Chair
 Peter Fiordalice, Vice Chair
 William Carellas
 Jane Magarian
 Carl Vincent
 Raymond St. Hilaire (Associate)
 Cheryl Crowe (Associate)

Jay Vinskey, Principal Planner
 Christine Fedora, Secretary

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Chairman McEwan asked if there was anyone in the room who would like to address the Board during the public participation portion of the meeting regarding items not currently before the Board?

There being no one heard the Board proceeded to their next item on the agenda.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by St. Hilaire to approve the minutes of February 2, 2016.

3. Review of "Approval Not Required" Plans

Chair McEwan turned the Chair to Vice Chair Fiordalice to conduct ANR's.

10 Arnold St. -PVTA/City of Westfield. Vinskey noted this was for the consolidating and rearranging lots lines shown on the intermodal center site plan the Board previously approved. The CORE has no frontage requirement. The Board unanimously voted to endorse the plan.

70 Moseley Ave. /Aube. The Board reviewed the plan to divide the lot into 2, each with adequate frontage. Vinskey noted the plan creates a side setback violation, but that is not under

the purview of an ANR plan. The Board unanimously voted to endorse the plan, with the note to be added that the Board makes no determination with zoning compliance.

4. Posted Public Hearings (and possible decision)

Chairman McEwan noted the public hearing notices were combined on one notice and proceeded to read the notices for the hearings into the record.

The Westfield Planning Board will conduct Public Hearings on February 16, 2016, at 7:00 P.M. in City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 59 Court Street, Westfield, MA on the applications of:

Salina Sarat for a Special Permit per Zoning Ord. Sec. 3-50.4(12) to allow for a home-based personal training business at 33 Winding Ridge Lane, zoned Residence A.

Domus Incorporated for a Special Permit/Site Plan per Zoning Ord. Sec. 3-70.4(4), 3-70.6 & 6-10 and a Stormwater Management Permit per Section 16-109 of the Code of Ordinances to allow for the conversion of 25 Dartmouth St. (Moseley School) into 23 dwelling units in a building having a height exceeding 35 feet.

Mercer Island Realty, Inc. for a Special Permit/Site Plan per Zoning Ord. Sec. 3-70.4(4) & 6-10 and a Stormwater Management Permit per Section 16-109 of the Code of Ordinances to allow for the construction of 16 dwelling units at 110 Lockhouse Rd., zoned Residence C.

The applications are available for public inspection during regular business hours at the Planning Office and at www.cityofwestfield.org.

Chairman McEwan asked the applicant for the first public hearing to present the proposal.

The applicant Salina Sarat introduced herself to the board members. She would like to run a personnel training facility from her home. Board members inquired as to the hours of operation? Ms. Sarat replied she would like the hours of operation to be 6:00 a.m to 11:00 a.m., one person at 3:30. Members asked if the hours of 6:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. would be suitable? Ms. Sarat replied yes. Members also asked if there are other employees? Would there be signage? Ms. Sarat replied no. Fiordalice asked about the type of equipment. She replied it would be TR suspension unit, Pilates, stretching, not much weight lifting; most of the women are from the neighborhood. Members also asked if there would be loud music and if there are any expansions being proposed? No this would be it. Would additional insurance be required? Ms. Sarat indicated she is looking into it. Members also asked if there is ample parking? Ms. Sarat replied there is plenty of room in the driveway. Does the garage comply with the requirements of building and fire? Ms. Sarat replied they have already been through the inspection process. She also noted she would like weekend mornings, Saturday and Sundays, 7:00 to noon.

Room questions of fact?

No further questions.

Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by Carellas to close. All in Favor.

Chairman McEwan read the possible findings and conditions into the record.

Findings

After giving due consideration to the application, testimony and evidence at the public hearing, the Board found that (1) the specific site is an appropriate location for such a home-based business; (2) The use as developed will not adversely affect the neighborhood given the restrictions established in the ordinance (Section 5-100.2) and the conditions imposed; (3) Adequate and appropriate facilities, including parking, will be available for the proper operation of the use; (4) the plan, as approved, conforms to all other rules and regulations.

Conditions

The Board agreed to the following conditions:

1. Hours of operation shall be limited to 6 am to 5 pm 7 days week.
2. Not more than 4 clients are permitted on the premises at any one time.
3. This Special Permit is non-transferrable and shall expire upon the sale and/or transfer of ownership of the property (unless the listed Applicant, as principal practitioner, continues reside in the home).
4. The Planning Board, and/or their designee, reserves the right to inspect the premises through the first year of the use of this Special Permit.
5. No signage is allowed or proposed.

Carellas MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to approve the Special Permit with the Findings and Conditions. All in Favor. Motion passes.

Chairman McEwan opened the public hearing for Domus Incorporated and called on the petitioner/representative to present the proposal.

Representing the petitioner Domus, Inc. was Attorney Ellen Freyman she explained that Domus Inc. was the successful bidder on the RFP for Moseley School. She proceeded to give some back ground of the project to the room.

DOMUS has hired a preservation consultant and is working with the state and city for the financing, she indicted the financing is conditional upon DOMUS receiving the approval of the Special Permit/Site Plan/Storm Water Management permit. During the process they received a zone change at which time it was noted that Princeton Street was not accepted so the city is working with law department to complete that process.

Rob Levesque addressed the Board regarding the plan for Domus. This will be a 60,000 s.f. building and will be located between Dartmouth Street, Westminster Street, Woodmont and Princeton Street, there will be a fenced in area of the property, and they are planning on taking a portion of Princeton Street and are working with the law department.

There will be 23 residential units which is why this requires a special permit because it is over the 9 units which is allowed. He proceeded to explain the lay out plan and the conceptual landscape plan. They are providing 51 parking space, paving will be moved to the green area, there will be a net reduction in impervious surface, and they will be conducting test pits. There also will be pedestrian improvements in the area. He proceeded to show the landscaping plans and trees, the details of the trees currently are not provided but will be submitted prior to next public hearing. On the northeasterly side there will be a play area of sort but as to the details they are still being worked out, as well as if it will be accessible to the public as well.

Further discussion regarding the possibility of letting the neighborhood children utilize the play area as well, would there be a liability question if the neighborhood children would be allowed to use? Ms. Lentini added she has spoken with Mark Cressotti about the possibility of DOMUS owning the land and then leasing it to the city in good faith so that it would be a community type of play area, similar to Small Park. The Board and applicant further discussed the possibility of letting the neighborhood use the park area as there are no playgrounds and no park in this neighborhood.

Members inquired as to how many children would be at this site? Levesque informed them there would be 4 - 1 bedroom units, 16 - 2 bedrooms, 3 - 3 bedrooms. There also is an addition to the right side of the building which is a 650 s.f. area which will house an elevator. Members inquired as to the parking situation? Levesque replied he would have to look at the signage that is currently located there regarding the parking. Vincent asked if there would be an area for equipment, bikes? Lentini added there would be an area for their equipment adding she also hires outside vendors that do the snow removal so there would not be any large equipment for snow removal it would be for snow shovels.

The Board also discussed the parking situation. Currently it is posted no parking during school hours which is obsolete at the current time. Lentini informed the Board she would be going to the parking commission in the future to discuss this matter adding that part of the problems is the bump outs in that area. Levesque proceeded to show the bump outs to the room and informed them he is planning on making parking spaces in that area but would be going to the Chief and Commission to see if they are comfortable with this and if it can be done.

Carellas inquired as to if this is the final planting plan? Levesque informed him it's not the final plan but he would submit one with further detail with the location as well as the lighting.

Room fact?

Bob Sevila ~22 Dartmouth Street

Inquired about the income levels for the people living in the apartments? Lentini informed him there would be 3 different types of apartments. McEwan stated that is not something the Board gets involved with. Lentini replied they would be between 60 and 80% medium income, all affordable housing, similar to the project on Prospect Hill Apartments it will be well done and there are guidelines that have to be adhered to.

Opposed?

Questions board?

Levesque asked the Board if they would continue the hearing to March 15. AIF.

McEwan opened the hearing for 110 Lockhouse Road. Representing the petitioner was Rob Lévesque of R. Levesque and Associates.

Levesque informed the Board this was originally approved about 2 years ago, the project was never constructed and the permit expired, this is another application for the same site.

The previous plan which was submitted a couple years ago and was for 9 multifamily units in one large unit on the north side of site, since they purchased the property and demolished the house the site is vacant. The plan has changed to a 16 units which is more financially sound for the applicant. The site is located off Lockhouse, there will be 2 way traffic with stop sign, dumpsters on the west side, landscaping on the site, screening around the dumpster and internal trees in parking area. He attended the round table meeting last week and have addressed the issues raised. The plans have been updated to reflect that as well as. Vincent inquired about the setback requirement and read section 3-70 -5 (2a) into the record. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the setback requirement. Vinsky informed the Board after reviewing the plan and the GIS he felt it could be argued that the setback is in compliance based on neighboring building's setback, adding the Board could require an engineered survey to confirm the dimensions.

Fiordalice inquired about the dumpster and the problems that could occur with the trucks coming in to empty the dumpster. How would they get there? Further discussion regarding the dumpster and the issues that would arise out of the trucks coming in to pick it up. After discussion Levesque felt the applicant might feel that smaller recycle units and trash receptacles for a curb side pickup might make more sense.

Vincent asked if there would be a homeowners association. Levesque replied it could be an association or a condo community. Vincent also inquired about the parking lights snow and the stop signs. ? Levesque informed him there are 2 lights and a sign location. Vincent asked about snow? Levesque replied it probably would be trucked off site. St. Hilaire asked if when they came in a couple years ago was there a screening so the abutters would be exposed. Rob that would be logical and could be incorporated if necessary.

Magarina asked how many feet from the front of the parking lot to the back? 290 feet. She also asked about the lighting asking if there would be one light in the front and one light in the back? Levesque replied there would be a light in the front and in the back as well as on the units themselves. Magarian voiced her concerns as to whether there would be ample lighting and whether the lights on the individual units would be automatically put on or would the tenants have to put them on? Levesque replied they hadn't discussed that adding the tenants probably would have control of the lights on their buildings. Magarian asked if there could be lights in-between voicing her concerns if people come in late. Levesque replied it could be a possibility, adding he didn't image it would be a show stopper for project. Magarian felt the extra light would be a comfort factor. Vincent agreed with Magarian. Lights in front on automatically. Rob think would be comfortable with 2 additional lights. Carellas asked if they would explain the signage? Levesque replied it would have the 911 address and name "Delaney Manor" on sign and would meet the sign criteria. Carellas asked where it would be located? Levesque proceeded to show the area of the sign. Vinskey noted he wasn't sure that a ground sign is allowed in this district. St. Hilaire noted the complex next door has one; Levesque added they may have received a variance for that.

Vincent asked about the depth of the retention ponds on either side? 4 or 5 feet. Cheryl parking spaces 2 spaces per unit and 2 handicapped and first one in under right looks like 5 spaces, doesn't appear visitor parking area? Rob no visitor parking area. Crowe asked if it would pose problem if have a guest, most people own 2 vehicloes now, a lot of places have marked visitor in a lot of times. Levesque informed her 2.2 required per unit which is required are being met. Not everyone will have 2 parking spaces, Cheryl concern visitors where park? Family functions? McEwan added it meets the requirement, apartment complexes people work different times. Jay equals 2 per unit and 4 extra. Fiordalice asked if they would have designated parking areas per unit. Likely be marked.

Vinskey informed the Board the Engineer might be coming to talk to the Board regarding the bikeway route planning for city; including a future bike way in this area; a brief discussion ensued regarding this issue. Vinskey reiterated the fact this was only in the beginning concept stage. Magarian inquired about the handicapped spot suggesting one should be added in the front as well.

Room act?
Christine Hotts

Bought Norton Street

Spoke in opposition voiced concerns from a 9 unit to 16 units, she would like a 6 foot stockade fence, the lighting will come into her yard, 32 cars per say, more traffic, down property value, not happy about it at all, and people will come onto her property. Privacy issues. Like granted at least a 6 foot stockade fence between her property and other residential property. Stressful to her. Voiced concerns regarding trees might be damaged during the process.

Levesque informed the room if the buffer is disturbed he would replant it. Carellas inquired about the fence? Levesque informed him he didn't feel comfortable responding to that as his client was not at the meeting.

Joe Deleo Twiss Street

Voiced concerns being so close to his house, privacy and security issues, he has a dog and is concerned the dog, pollution, noise pollution 8 double units in that area extreme. It originally had one house yard now want 16 units in there. McEwan informed him it meets zoning requirements, can't not allow based on number of units. Privacy. Concern 16 units, talking 64 people in there. Vinskey informed the Board this is a special permit, so it is discretionary, above the 10 units for by right use.

Mr. Deleo added he would like to see bushes or a fence going down the line. What line now? Rob evergreen row along edge, white spruce and arborvitae along property line, he too would like a privacy fence as well, security issues.

In favor?

Opposed?

Christine and Deleos' opposed to the petition.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the possible bike trail going in that area. As well as a possible sidewalk, Vinskey reiterated it's very conceptual, but this is one of few turnpike crossings.

Magarian inquired if he was suggesting there should be some type of a connection between the possible bike path and this project? Vinskey suggested a possible condition might be if the city path way is done that a connection be made.

Levesque addressed the Board giving his thoughts about a bike path in this area adding he doesn't see people riding their bikes on Lockhouse Road adding he didn't think it makes any sense. McEwan also felt it would never be a bike route, adding there is no more truck traffic on any road in Westfield, adding he doesn't think it makes sense.

Vincent felt the Board needs to keep an open mind for the future. McEwan asked board members what they would like to see as far as the revisions go for the next meeting.

Board members reviewed the changes they would like make to the plan that being the revised plan showing the lighting and the change in the handicapped parking.

Levesque asked Board members if it would be possible to condition the decision adding it's not changing the lay out or grade and that could be provided to the planner, adding there are no major changes other than the dumpster. Magarian referenced the neighbors and agreed there should be some type of a fence to screen their property. Levesque asked if it could be made a condition as well and told the Board he would ask Jay Beltrandi his thoughts, adding he personally thought 70 some odd arborvitae and spruce and a fence is somewhat of an over kill, adding one or the other he referenced the other apartment building which has 100 or so persons. Magarian inquired if there are any problems with the people in the apartments now? Ms. Howe responded they have problems with the residences that currently live there. McEwan informed the Board the public participation portion of the meeting has been done. And asked Board members what they would like to do?

Vincent said he would like it continued to show the new parking spaces, the handicapped spot moved, dumpster removed, parking lot lighting, a stockade fence along the back of it. This is a new project, the people lived here some time they need consideration as well. McEwan in regards handicapped spaces are both in the middle and one on each side. Magarian felt they should move one up towards the front. McEwan assumed the sidewalk would be raised and the ramp would be up to one level, he felt it would be more beneficial to keep the ramp in the middle that way people could access their apartments easier. Magarian agreed that would be fine. St. Hilaire also felt keeping in the middle was the way to go. St. Hilaire didn't agree with both the fence and the screening he felt there should be one or the other. Magarian was concerned they could get through the bushes. Crowe was in agreement with Magarian as well. Levesque asked if a 6 foot stockade fence that would be impenetrable would that work. Magarian felt that would be fine. Mr. Beltrandi would rather do the fence but not both the fence and the shrubs, the abutters could put shrubs in if they wish. McEwan suggested putting a fence up and if the abutters want shrubs they can do it on themselves.

Vincent asked about the school bus pick up? The Board was informed currently the children are picked up at the end of Twiss Street. Levesque felt a bump out for the kids to pick up the bus would be fine.

Vinskey gave an example of future visioning. He mentioned how when the 99 Restaurant came in the Board thought about a pedestrian connection, on route 20 it was never considered because there were no sidewalks there, now there is a sidewalk there.

Vincent suggested making a condition if this bike trail were to go through it should be conditioned down the road to tie this into it.

Fiordalice MOTIONED, seconded by Vincent to close. AIF.

McEwan read the possible findings and conditions into the record:

Findings

After giving due consideration to the application, testimony and evidence at the public hearing the Board found that (1) the specific site is an appropriate location for the multifamily development proposed (2) The use as developed will not adversely affect the surrounding residential neighborhood. (3) Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the use. (4) The plan, as approved, conforms to all other rules and regulations.

In reviewing the site plan, the Board found that (1) The proposed project and site plan is in conformance with the intent of the underlying district and does not take precedence over other specific provisions of the Ordinance; (2) All buildings, structures, uses, equipment and materials are readily accessible for police and fire protection, as the plans have been submitted to, and not been objected to, by public safety Departments; (3) Adequate off-street parking and loading spaces will be provided to prevent on-street and off-street traffic congestion; all parking spaces and maneuvering areas are suitably identified and designed to address standards specified within this ordinance; and pedestrian and vehicular circulation is sufficiently segregated to ensure safe pedestrian movement within and adjacent to the property by the installation of sidewalks. (4) Pedestrian access ways do not create traffic hazards and are: adequate in width, grade, alignment and visibility; are an adequate distance from street corners, places of public assembly and other access ways; and are adequately designed for safety considerations. (5) General landscaping of the site complies with the purpose and intent of this ordinance; there is no notable vegetation to be retained; parking, storage, refuse containers and service areas are suitably screened during all seasons from the view of adjacent areas and the street by way of location and fencing. (6) The lighting of the site will be adequate, but not excessive, at ground level for the protection and safety of persons in regard to pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and the glare from the installation of outdoor site and sign lights will be properly directed or shielded from the view of adjacent property and public rights-of-way.

(7) Utility system locations, design and installation are in compliance with, and will meet the approval of the appropriate boards, departments and agencies, and will protect the environment from adverse pollution. More specifically, and following review by the City Engineer the Board found: (a) the stormwater management plan and the erosion and sediment control plan are consistent with the purposes and objectives of the Stormwater Management Ordinance (Chapter 16, Article II, Division 4 of the Westfield Code of Ordinances); (b) the stormwater management plan (including 2/16/16

revisions/comments) meets the performance standards described therein; (c) the erosion and sediment control plan meets the design requirements (d) and will adequately protect the water resources of the community and is in compliance with the requirements of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Additionally, (8) No sensitive environmental land features such as steep slopes, and large rock outcroppings, public scenic views or historically significant features on the property will be impacted by this project. (9) The location, design and size of proposed buildings as well as the nature and intensity of the residential use in connection therewith, are in general harmony with the adjacent neighborhood.

DRAFT Conditions

1. Work shall be in accordance with the approved site plan, entitled "Proposed Residential Development" sheets T-1, C-3 through C-6 and D-4 revised 2/16/16 and C-1, C-2, D-1 through D-3 dated 1/28/16 as prepared by R Levesque Associates, signed and sealed by Robert M Levesque, R.L.A. or Filipe J. Cravo, P.E., and as may be amended herein.
2. No work shall commence until a pre-construction conference has been held between the applicant, the contractor, City Stormwater Coordinator (DPW) and other appropriate city officials and project personnel.
3. All work shall be completed within 18 months of building permit issuance.
4. This Stormwater Management Permit approval grants no relief from any other requirements of the City of Westfield stormwater ordinance, including performance standards, operation, maintenance, inspections and enforcement. The City Stormwater Coordinator is hereby authorized to serve as an agent of the Board in the administration of this component of this permit.
5. Maintenance of the stormwater management system shall be in compliance with the submitted "Long Term Operation & Maintenance Narrative" prepared by R Levesque Associates, dated January 28, 2016/revised February 16, 2016. Inspection reports, completed not less than once annually, shall be made available to the City Stormwater Coordinator.
6. The site shall be stabilized with permanent plantings and perennial grass cover within thirty days after the completion or cessation of construction, except that during winter months other erosion control methods may be utilized until spring.
7. Prior to any certificate of occupancy being issued or applied for:

The applicant shall provide the Board with a written statement from the project engineer, with his seal/stamp affixed, certifying that all work has been done in accordance with the approved plans and applicable conditions of this approval and that all systems are functioning as designed. A paper copy of "As-Built" record site plans and digital/PDF copy of same shall accompany the statement.

The entire stormwater management system must be completed, stabilized and functioning in compliance with the approved plans, subject to confirmation and inspection by the City.

However, the Planning Board may, by an affirmative vote of at least 5 members taken at a public meeting, permit said use or occupancy, in whole or in part, to commence prior to compliance with or completion of all conditions. This approval is subject to the sole discretion of the Planning Board, who may require a performance bond or other measures to ensure compliance and completion of all of the conditions.

8. Plant material which dies or fails to thrive shall be promptly replaced in general conformance with the approved plans.
9. Signage shall comply with the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Rob duration of permit? Jay special permit 2 years as opposed to previous one year, adding it could be extended by the Board.

Vinsky briefly reviewed the additional changes the Board would like. (10) There would not be a dumpster; there would be trash pickup at the units; (11) 6 foot fencing west and north side to 1st unit; (12) 2 added parking lot lights, may be motion sensors; (13) connection of the sidewalk going to the street for bus stop, leave layout to designer's discretion.

Vincent MOTIONED, seconded by Magarian to approve the plan with the Waivers and Conditions as presented and amended.

St. Hilaire	-	yes
Crowe	-	yes
Vincent	-	yes
Magarian	-	yes
Carellas	-	yes
Fiordalice	-	yes
McEwan	-	yes

Angelica Estates revised request Angelica Estates

Vinsky reminded Board members on 1-5-16 the Board voted to release the convent in exchange for a \$329,000 in the form of a bond or cash, the applicant has since requested

instead to allow part of covenant to be released and still hold covenant on some lots in exchange reduced bond amount.

Fiordalice asked if the engineer was off on the numbers. Vinskey replied that might be one issue, he explained to the Board members how the city's numbers would be higher than the applicants noting the city has numbers built in for contingencies costs, prevailing wages etc.

Levesque informed the Board he's not questioning the city engineer he has to protect Westfield. Levesque addressed the Board informing them his client has a contract to finish the road and it is a lot less than the estimate received from the city. Levesque explained what they would like to do; he was hoping to not put more responsibility on the developer than they need to. They would like to put a bond in place as well as the security of the lots that are in the covenant. The developer has 4 pending sales right now, they would like to do this right away, this type of procedure makes more sense for these developers indicating they are real estate agencies, developers, doctors, they don't typically do bonds, makes more sense for them. He said he understands the position of the city but the city would 5 lots which would be remaining under the covenant as well as a bond in the amount of \$100,000.00.

Vinskey informed the Board this would also require a waiver of regulations and a covenant doesn't have any transferable value like a bond, the city would be having risk, and a restrictive covenant keeps them from getting sold. Carellas asked if the road costs more than 100,000. the city has to sell the lots, would it be a half-finished subdivision and a half-finished road? He was not in favor of this he would prefer a bond.

Magarian inquired as to what work needs to be completed? Levesque informed her top coat and the sidewalks. Magarian then asked why it can't be done. Lévesque replied you don't put in the sidewalks and top coat until the houses are done. A lot of the work is based on the timing of when project finished, it's a timing issue and a conservative approach from the engineer.

Levesque explained the lengthy process to the Board members. There are a couple options on how to approach either a covenant or bond is the present as option.

Vincent read a portion of the January 5, 2016 minutes, page 4, into the record. After reading into the record he noted at that time the applicant was Ok with the bond. Levesque added those were calculations from the city engineer, the developers can't dispute it. It's a reality you agree with it rather than fighting it. Vincent asked if you would be trading lots as opposed to having a set amount of money.

Levesque added when the subdivision was approved it was put on a covenant to start road, not deviating from approach. This is what was started, they are continuing on that approach and they are also providing a bond.

Vincent asked if this was done before? Vinskey informed him not since he's been here, but years bace this was apparently used on a subdivision. The City Engineer thought it was not effective at that time. Vincent felt it leaves exposure to the city as well as the abutters that voiced their concerns, city maintained that amount in bond to make sure protects city and abutters and overall, big problem when talked about in January, haven't heard of anything like this before.

Jane reason not secure amount?

Joe Kelly addressed the Board stating they are trying to find happy medium here, it's difficult to bond. Everything should be done shortly, Beltrandi Construction is working on it.

Carellas said he would like to hear from the engineer adding he feels the Board can do what they feel, he felt the Board needs a bond in place, looking at numbers there is 65,000 contingency he's comfortable with the 200,000, 250,00 level for 4 lots.

Vincent motioned to continue to the March meeting. McEwan been before a number of times, Engineer will come back he covers himself conservatively, not come back saying 150,00.00. The City would be holding 5 lots those lots are over 100,000 a piece. Levesque proposal by Carellas acceptable to his client. Levesque if could release 5 would be helpful. Carellas can always come back. Carellas MOTION to release 4 lots for 200,000. Magarian seconded.

Vinskey asked what lots they would like released. Lots 2,3,4,6

Discussion?

Approved 6-1. Vincent Opposed.

Vincent asked if Mr. Cressotti will be coming to address the bike path. Vincent asked if the Board would be meeting on March 1 or recessed until March 15th. No meeting March 1, due to election.

McEwan noted backwards buildings - CVS , Home Depot. Found Suffield requires backwards done properly.

MOTION to adjourn at 9:23.