



City of Westfield

William Carellas, Chair
Cheryl Crowe, Vice Chair
John Bowen
Robert Goyette, Jr.
Jane Magarian
Philip McEwan
Raymond St. Hilaire
Bernard Puza, Associate
Richard Salois, Associate

October 17, 2023
City Council Chambers

PB MEMBER PARTICIPANTS
 MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF

William Carellas, Chair
 Cheryl Crowe, Vice-Chair
 Robert Goyette, Jr.
 Jane Magarian
 Philip McEwan
 Raymond St. Hilaire
 John Bowen
 Bernard Puza (Associate)
 Richard Salois (Associate)

Jay Vinskey, Principal Planner
 Christine Fedora, Secretary

Chair Carellas opened the meeting at 7:00.

A. Public Participation

Chair Carellas asked if anyone would like to address the Board. None.

B. Review and approval of previous meeting minutes.

Member Crowe MOTIONED, seconded by Member Goyette to approve the 10-3-23 minutes. All in favor.

C. Review of plans not requiring approval under Subdivision Control Law.

Montgomery Road/ Reed

Member Bowen MOTIONED, seconded by Member Magarian to approve. All in favor.

D. Public Hearings

Chair Carellas stated Member Salois will serve as the alternate for tonight's hearings.

- (Continuation) Special Permit/ Site Plan/ Stormwater Permit - multifamily development - Lockhouse Rd.

Robert Levesque represented the petitioner, Joe Kelley, and explained the changes made to the plan following the Board's concerns from the last meeting.

One of the Board's concerns was the height of the 3-story building. Mr. Levesque explained the modifications made to the plan. The height of the new building with the gable would be 33.93 which is under the 35-foot limit.

Mr. Levesque reviewed some of the changes made. Building 1 (west), the rectangles represent private space for each unit. Building 1, west side added a retaining wall, landscaping was also updated. They feel private yards space in the front of the building detracts from the overall esthetic, but they can provide it. On the east side of building one the playscape areas was moved to the east to provide private yards space in that area, a fence would be provided. On the north side is about 10 feet lower on floor one, the back area is a walk out and then is much flatter.

Building 2 (east) adjustments were discussed. Some parking was eliminated. Some of the parking spaces were reconfigured so they would not be coming back with the reserve parking, they are showing 76 units with the required 169 parking spaces.

The recreation area was not programmed last time; he showed elements that that would fit. The amenities included a pavilion, patio style area around it, for use of both buildings, paved area with picnic tables, gas fireplace, swing set, linear style playscape, added bike shelter. Entire area will be fenced in.

The area along the edge by the railroad will have an arborvitae screen as well as a black aluminum ornamental fence to separate the residents on that side. The rest of the plan has not changed except for minor adjustments.

Member Magarian asked how many E.V. parking spots? Mr. Levesque said he wasn't sure of the final number - they will be E.V.-ready spots, for the future.

Further discussion regarding the trees along the railway. Mr. Levesque stated they have no control over the abutting property.

Member Crowe asked if the 2 buildings would not meet the 35 feet. Mr. Levesque noted the measurement is halfway up the gable, which is under the height of 35 feet. Planner Vinskey noted that is how zoning defines building height, but He further noted Building 2 would still require a special permit for more than 2.5 stories.

Chair Carellas asked about snow removal and dumpsters? Mr. Levesque showed the new location of the dumpsters by shifting them down. Dumpsters will be enclosed with a 6-foot fence around them. Snow removal is tight, major storm events will require the snow to be trucked off site.

Member Crowe expressed her feelings regarding the word "Proposed" . Mr. Levesque noted when proposed is used it is "Proposed to be built."

Member Crowe felt this was a huge improvement from last time. Came back with something more suitable. Member Salois also agreed that this was a huge improvement. 30.34

Members discussed the first-floor units' yard areas and delineation by fence, landscaping. Vinskey suggested it may be left to the Applicant's discretion and that these yard areas may be considered to be met through the common recreation yard.

Planner Vinskey suggested the Board may want something lower than Mountain Laurel at the entrance because of the height issue and visibility; suggested replacing it with something low growing. Vinskey noted we don't have floor plans, so we don't know if the balconies are 60 square feet as required. Levesque stated they have an architect working on it and most of them came off a schematic plan that will be updated once they know they have approval. It would be logical that comes back and meets the requirements. All were done by recessing into the building.

The Board reviewed the draft decision/conditions. 76 units. The condition as to reserve parking was not relevant to the plan (including references in findings). Additional condition added following the Board's discussion specifying Building #1 being 2 stories max at its southern elevation.

Member Puza MOTIONED, seconded by Member Magarian to close the public hearing. All in favor.

Member Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by Member Crowe to approve the Special Permit, Site Plan, Stormwater Management Permit for 0 Lockhouse Road.

By Roll Call Vote:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|-----|
| Member Salois | - | Yes |
| Member McEwan | - | Yes |
| Member Magarian | - | Yes |
| Member Goyette | - | Yes |
| Member Bowen | - | Yes |
| Member Crowe | - | Yes |
| Chair Carellas | - | Yes |

- (Continuation without prior discussion) Site Plan/Stormwater Permit - 3 & 33 Fowler Street Extension

Planner Vinskey stated the property has not been rezoned yet, possibly the Council will vote on Thursday. Mr. Levesque asked if the Board is amenable, he would like to continue without discussing tonight. Member Magarian MOTIONED, seconded by Member Crowe to continue to November 21. All in favor.

- Special Permit/Site Plan - hangar construction -110 Airport Road

Representing the petitioner was Robert Levesque of R. Levesque Associates. Mr. Labrie already owns a hangar at Barnes Airport. Mr. Levesque noted the project is straight forward, not part of the runway but is being done at the same time as Bravo 5 which is being extended into this area. There is one existing water line which will have to be avoided. Taxi way currently going out to bid and the drainage will have to be changed.

Part of the drainage system is proposed to accommodate all areas, some of the grading on the plan, is not there's but work done by the airport services group. Mr. Labrie leases the ground from the airport, owns the buildings and makes improvements.. The hangar will be a 60 x 60 hangar with a sliding retractable door. The aquifer zone clips the building, by definition this is in the aquifer.

Airport is pursuing the improvements and drainage which includes a treatment train, treating water quality. This is being updated, piggy backed on to that, impervious fairly minimal ,under this would be exempt under storm water permit because clip aquifer that is why comes into play. Stormwater improvement to the site, would need to be done, now running water to their drainage system.

Member Bowen asked if they plan on running water from new hangar into the airport's new Bravo 5 runway? Yes, stormwater. Anticipate they will be done before hangar? Yes, think its being pursued aggressively.

Vinskey clarified they are not requesting waiver from aquifer regs, it's from the stormwater ordinance. Impervious increase? Bowen within guidelines? Rob didn't believe triggered because of impervious. Threshold?

Public comment was invited (none). Planner Vinskey noted there is a 35-day aquifer waiting period for others' comments.

Mr. Levesque asked for a continuance, and Member Bowen MOTIONED, seconded by Member Salois to continue until November 21. All in favor.

E. Other Business

- Southampton Zoning Bylaw amendment – car washes and gasoline sales in their Water Supply Protection District (“aquifer”)

Planner Vinskey informed the Board we received a notification from Southampton stating they are proposing loosening some of their aquifer use regulations. The public hearing is scheduled for next week, and thought the Board may wish to weigh in.

Member Salois mentioned the City is being cautious about what is going on in the aquifer and voiced his concerns about any change, he felt the Board should take a hard stance. He further stated he could attend but felt there should be something from the Planning Board that he could read into the record. Member Bowen felt this is not a good idea and felt the Board should tell him. Chair Carellas agreed as well. Member Goyette felt the Board should write them a letter. The board members agreed; Planner Vinskey to draft it - mention it is a regional issue, incremental changes are risky, etc.

F. Announcements/Future agenda items

Chair Carellas stated he would arrange for meeting Prof. James Lowenthal to review lighting at Smith College. Planner Vinskey noted there should be no deliberation among members if more than 3 attend. He further noted the lighting ordinance change did not pass Council.

Planner Vinsky felt at the December 5 workshop meeting the Board should dig into the Master Plan.

Member Salois updated members on the CPC's actions: Funding was approved for the Baptist Church on Elm Street for an elevator to continue school extension classes & funding for the new school playground on Franklin Street. He also mentioned that Domus will be coming to the Committee for funding for the old Town Hall across for housing for veterans.

At 8:21, Member Crowe MOTIONED, seconded by Member Bowen to adjourn. All in favor.

APPROVED