

City of Warwick Planning Board

Wednesday, January 10, 2007

Members Present: John J. Mulhearn Jr.
Attilio Iacobucci
Philip Slocum
Rick Robinson
Carter Thomas
Michael Constantine

Members Absent: Jeanne Foster
George Arnold
Vincent Gambardella

Also in attendance: Peter Ruggiero, Solicitor
John DeLucia City Engineer
Eric Hindinger, Assistant City Engineer

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 P.M.

On the motion of Mr. Iacobucci, seconded by Mr. Robinson, the Planning Board voted unanimously to accept the December 2006 meeting minutes.

At the request of the Attorney, Chairman Mulhearn agreed to change the order of the agenda to hear the Minor Subdivision application for 39 Jerome Avenue as the first item of business.

Public Meeting

Minor Subdivision

39 Jerome Avenue

Applicant: Gerard and Yvette Guillmette
Location: 39 Jerome Avenue
Assessor's Plat: 377
Lot: 291
Zoning District: Residential A-10
Land Area: 30,072 square feet
Number of lots: 2
Engineer: Flynn Surveys, Inc.
Ward: 5

Attorney Robert Flaherty represented the applicant and was requesting

preliminary approval to subdivide one lot with an existing dwelling to create two lots in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 405.3 (C), one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development in a Residential A-10 Zoning District.

Mr. Flaherty explained the applicant intended to subdivide the lot for a child to construct a home. The attorney explained that the property did have public water and sewer available and that the subdivision was in conformance with the City's zoning regulations.

There was no public comment and no question from the Planning Board.

The Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the final plan shall include all notes and details as required in Development Review Regulations "Appendix B," all existing and proposed utilities within the City right-of-ways servicing both the existing and proposed dwellings, existing buildings on adjacent lots, right-of-way and existing pavement widths, and existing wetlands within 200 feet of the site or a notation stating that no wetlands exist.
- 2) Grading shall be in such a manner that there shall be no additional runoff onto abutting streets and properties.
- 3) That the lowest floor elevations shall be at least three feet (3') above the maximum high ground water elevation.
- 4) That soil erosion and control measures shall be required along the downhill edge

of the limit of disturbance.

- 5) That the final plan shall include a notation that the developer shall contact the City's Landscape Coordinator regarding tree preservation and protection prior to construction in particular the existing cedar trees located within the Jerome Avenue right-of-way and any existing trees located along the proposed new property line.
- 6) Final approval from the Warwick Sewer Authority.

On the motion of Mr. Constantine, seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted five in favor with Mr. Slocum abstaining to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Public Meeting

Minor Subdivision

Greenwood Gardens Section II

Applicant:	Bridgeview Construction
Location:	199 Spooner Avenue and Pamela Circle
Assessor's Plat:	269
Lot:	94
Zoning District:	Residential A-10
Land Area:	28,205 square feet
Number of lots:	2
Engineer:	Ocean State Planners, Inc.
Ward:	8

The applicant, Mr. Terry Harrington of Bridgeview Construction represented himself and was requesting preliminary approval to subdivide one lot with an existing dwelling to create two lots, one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development in a Residential A-10 Zoning District.

Mr. Harrington then introduces his surveyor, Mr. Richard Bzdyra of Ocean State Planners, who explained the details of the project including existing and proposed conditions. The surveyor explained that the property was serviced by public sewer and water and that the proposed subdivision was in conformance with the City's zoning regulations.

There was no public comment and no question from the Planning Board.

The Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes

and General Statements” of the City’s Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City’s Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the final plan shall include all existing and proposed utilities within the City right-of-way along Spooner Avenue and Pamela Circle and servicing both the existing and proposed dwellings.
- 2) Final approval from the Warwick Sewer Authority.

On the motion of Mr. Iacobucci, seconded by Mr. Constantine, the Planning Board voted five in favor with Mr. Mulhearn abstaining to formally adopt the Planning Department’s findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department’s recommended stipulations.

Public Meeting

Request for an Extension

Centerville Commons

Applicant:	Old Forge Properties LLC.
Location:	171, 181 & 203 Centerville Road and Calef Street
Assessor’s Plat:	246
Lot(s):	247, 250, 251 & 257
Zoning District:	Office to Planned District Residential A-7
Land Area:	4.28 acres
Number of lots:	4
Engineer:	Ocean State Planners, Inc.
Ward:	8

Attorney John C. Revens represented the applicant and was requesting extension of the master plan approval for "Centerville Commons" to merge four lots and to allow for the development of a 38-unit residential condominium complex recorded on December 15, 2005.

The attorney explained that the project was awaiting State of Rhode Island approvals including a RIDEM wetlands permit and a RIDOT physical alteration permit.

Being no questions or comments the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the following:

- 1) The project was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and the Comprehensive Plan has not changed substantially since the time of the original application as it would apply to this project.
- 2) The Development Review Regulations, the Zoning Ordinance, and all applicable state and federal regulations were substantially the same as they were at the time of the original application, as they would apply to this project.
- 3) The Zoning Map designation for the subdivision has not changed since the time of the original application.
- 4) No substantial change to the physical conditions of the subdivision or the neighboring property has occurred since the time of the original application.

The Planning Department recommendation was to grant the requested extension to expire on December 15, 2007.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Thomas, the Planning Board voted unanimously to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant the requested extension to expire on December 15, 2007.

Public Informational Meeting
Major Land Development Project

Residences at Ives Bluff

Applicant: Ives Bluff LLC.
Location: Old Forge Road
Assessor's Plat: 209
Lot(s): 1 & 6
Zoning District: Planned District Residential (PDR) A-10/A-40
Land Area: 15.5 Acres
Number of lots: 2
Engineer: S.F.M. Engineering Associates
Ward: 9

Attorney John C. Revens represented the applicant and was requesting master plan approval of a Major Land Development Project to subdivide two lots to create two new lots; one lot for the development of eight new single-family residential structures and one lot to be purchased by the City of Warwick as Open Space in accordance with City Council Zone Change PCO-7-06.

Prior to the presentation, the Planning Board's Solicitor Mr. Peter Ruggiero informed the Board that he had a previous business relationship with a former Corporation with which the applicants were associated.

Attorney Revens informed the Planning Board that the project had been initiated approximately eight years prior in 1998. He informed the board that the project had received approximately 6 or 7 Planning Board extensions, a City Council zone change authorizing the construction of 42 multi-family condominium units, all required State of Rhode Island approvals (which have since expired) as well as a Superior Court ruling allowing the project to precede.

Mr. Revens told the board that the current project had been reduced from the previous 42 units to eight residential units under the condition that the City purchase approximately 4.84 acres of land to be dedicated as open space.

The attorney also informed the board that the development contained a central ISDS sewer system and that this approval was in the process of renewal as with all the expired State of Rhode Island approvals.

Attorney Revens then introduced the project engineer Mr. Scott Moorhead PE. Mr. Moorhead presented a brief overview of the master plan proposal and informed the Planning Board that the new plan included an in-ground pool but that a proposed pool parking area had been removed.

Moorhead told the board that the new plan was to construct eight single family homes on one lot with a common driveway and a turnaround. He stated that the project would have public water

and an advanced ISDS treatment system that is twice as long as the previous system.

Moorhead also explained that the development would also contain several view corridors that would consist of limited trimming of existing trees and brush but would not include clear cutting of vegetation.

Moorhead then described the site grading, drainage and the landscape plan.

Board member Slocum inquired about the possibility moving buildings 6, 7 & 8 out of the flood zone as recommended in the Planning Department comments.

Attorney Revens stated that there was no possibility of moving the structures, that CRMC had granted its approval and that the buildings would not be moved.

Slocum expressed his objections about locating new structures in flood zones and felt that the practice was irresponsible. Mr. Slocum then mentioned the high cost of flood insurance that the property owner would have to pay.

Mr. Moorhead, the project engineer stated that if you fill the flood zone it would no longer be a flood zone.

Mr. Slocum disagreed with Mr. Moorhead correcting him by saying that the buildings may be above the base flood elevation but that they would still be located within the flood zone.

The Board then opened the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Michael Mancuso of 41 Harbor Terrace, a direct abutter to the project offered comment. Mr. Mancuso submitted written comment and spoke about his concerns with the development.

Mr. Mancuso stated that he was aware of the development when he purchased his property but that over time the development has changed from the original approval. He stated that originally the building footprints were at the top of the slope with only two building below but that now three building were proposed to be below the slope.

Mr. Mancuso stated although not practicing that he was a Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor so that he was familiar with reviewing plans and topography. He informed the board that he had the development plan and that the plan was proposing a 30% road grade that would require 16' to 18' cut; a cut so steep that it would require a double retaining wall adjacent to his property.

Mr. Mancuso presented pictures of the existing conditions and explained that there would be three homes located in a valley within a flood plane requiring extreme topographic changes. Mr. Mancuso explained that the homes would be located at a six foot elevation and would require nine feet of fill to raise them to the base flood elevation.

Mr. Mancuso stated that the City's Development Review regulations state that a development

should be designed to follow the general topography of a property and that this is not what is being proposed.

Mr. Mancuso also stated that he understands that previous approvals were granted dating back to 1988 but that the approvals have since expired and that that this is considered a new application. He stated that this type of development probably would not be approved today.

Chairman Mulhearn stated that he was aware that the project has been around for several years and that it had received State approvals. The Chairman then asked how much land the City was going to buy.

Attorney Revens responded that the City would purchase approximately 1/3 of the property but that the purchase was contingent upon Planning Board approval.

Revens also stated that the plan meets the regulations.

Mr. Mancuso reiterated that he was aware of the proposed development when he purchased his home. He also understands that the project was reduced in the number of units and that it had received its state approvals and that the developer does not desire to redesign the project at this stage.

Mr. Mancuso asked that the developer modify the landscape plan as it abuts his property. He stated that he understands the developer and the City have agreed to remove the proposed stockade fence and replace it with a vegetative buffer and screen.

The Chairman stated that he was familiar with Mr. Mancuso's property and that it was high above the water with a spectacular view.

Mr. Mancuso asked the Planning Staff for a clarification on the number of units being proposed and the reduction resulting from the City's purchase of open space. He stated that it was his understanding that the project would be reduced from ten units to eight units as a result of the purchase and not from 42 units to eight as had been alluded to in the presentation.

The Planning Staff person confirmed that the reduction was indeed from ten units to eight and not from 42 units to eight.

Attorney Revens requested that the pool be allowed to remain through the master plan stage and informed the Board that the pool may or may not remain in future approvals.

Board member Constantine asked Solicitor Ruggiero for whether stipulation "strongly recommending removal of the buildings from the flood zone" was nonbinding.

The Solicitor responded that it was nonbinding.

Being no further testimony or discussion, the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 “Purposes and General Statements” of the City’s Development Review Regulations,

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City’s Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant master plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the hydrologic report shall be revised and updated to reflect the current development proposal.
- 2) That a water connection plan including a meter pit detail, tapping sleeve and valve details, separate curb stops and dual back flow devices for each building shall be approved by the Warwick Water Division prior to Preliminary approval.
- 3) That the proposed in-ground swimming pool and associated ten car parking area shall be eliminated from the development in that they were not contained in the original development proposal and are not in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
- 4) That engineering details of all proposed retaining walls and cut and fill conditions shall be provided as part of the Preliminary Plan submission.
- 5) That a landscape plan prepared by a Rhode Island Licensed Landscape Architect which shall include provisions for tree preservation, a tree drip line protection detail, street trees and parking lot landscaping shall be approved by the City’s Landscape Project Coordinator prior to preliminary approval.
- 6) That all State of Rhode Island permits including Coastal Resources Management Council (CRMC), Department of Environmental Management ISDS, Water Quality Certification and UIC (if necessary) shall be renewed and updated prior to preliminary approval.
- 7) That the Planning Department strongly recommends that proposed buildings 6, 7 & 8 which are located within the AE-15 Flood Zone be relocated to higher elevations in order to eliminate the need for fill within the coastal zone.

On the motion of Mr. Constantine, as amended by Mr. Robinson and seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted five in favor with Mr. Slocum opposed to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant master plan approval with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations eliminating stipulation 3 requesting removal of the pool.

Public Meeting

Minor Subdivision

26 Highland Avenue

Applicant:	Richard Wixted
Location:	26 Highland Avenue
Assessor's Plat:	235
Lot:	129, 130 & 131
Zoning District:	Residential A-15
Land Area:	1.01 acres
Number of lots:	2
Engineer:	David D. Gardner & Associates Inc.
Ward:	9

Mr. David Gardner, PE. represented the applicant and was requesting preliminary approval to subdivide three lots with an existing dwelling to create two lots in accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 405.3 (C), one lot with an existing dwelling and one new lot for development in a Residential A-15 Zoning District.

Mr. Gardner explained that the applicant was proposing to unmerge existing lots under zoning section 405.3 (c). He further explained that the property owner had received approval to expand the sewer line from Post Road through an easement on an abutting property to access his property.

The Chairman asked if the Sewer Authority had approved the extension.

Gardner responded to the affirmative and explained that because of the sewer the applicant would need only to meet 80 percent of the requirements for the A-15 Zoning District.

John DeLucia, City Engineer, was recognized by the Planning Board and explained that property included a fairly steep slope and that the applicant would be required to contain all storm-water runoff on site.

The Chairman asked if the current plan contained a provision for containing the storm-water.

Board member Slocum asked if it was possible to contain the storm-water.

Mr. Gardner explained that the plan had been revised to address Mr. DeLucia request and that

the storm-water would be contained.

Being no further questions or comment, the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the disturbance of the existing stone wall along the southerly property line shall be approved by the Warwick Historic District Commission prior to final approval.
- 2) That the proposed sewer easement on abutting Assessor's Lot 49 providing sewer service to the subject property shall be approved by the Warwick Sewer Authority and recorded in the land evidence records prior to final approval.

On the motion of Mr. Robinson, seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted unanimously to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Public Informational Meeting
Major Land Development Project

472 Warwick Avenue

Applicant:	Mike DiDomenico & Denis DiMassion
Location:	472 Warwick Avenue & Vickery Avenue
Assessor's Plat:	290
Lot(s):	159
Zoning District:	General Business and Residential A-7
Land Area:	31,248 square feet
Number of lots:	3
Engineer:	Joe Casali Engineering, Inc.
Ward:	1

Attorney Bruce Thibideau represented the applicants and was requesting master plan approval of a major subdivision to subdivide one lot to create three new lots, two conforming lots with a single-family dwelling on each lot and one nonconforming lot with less than the required frontage and lot width having two existing structures with less than the required setbacks.

Mr. Thibideau explained that the applicants had appeared before the Planning Board previously requesting approval to construct two two-family dwellings on the same site. At that time, the Planning Board denied the application finding that the density was high because the area was comprised of single family dwellings.

The attorney reminded the Planning Board that an attorney had represented the neighbors at the previous hearing. Mr. Thibideau then informed the Board that he had contacted the attorney to explain the new application and that he assumed the she was satisfied because there were no objectors present.

Mr. Thibideau then introduced Mr. Joseph Lombardi, Real Estate Expert and Mr. Joseph Casalli PE. and asked that they be accepted as experts in their fields.

Mr. Casalli described the project and informed the Planning board that the water table in the area was approximately 2.5 to 5 feet, that the property had access to sewers that there was no flood zone present and that runoff was to be contained using underground injection control (UIC) measures.

Mr. Lombardo presented a resume to the Board and informed the members that he was a Certified Professional Planner (APA and AICP). Mr. Lombardo testified that the development was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan Zoning Ordinance and Development Review Regulations. Mr. Lombardo also submitted a report to that effect for the record.

Being no questions or comment from the public or the Planning board the Board then heard the

Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations; and:

- 1) Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
- 2) Not in compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance; therefore, requiring Zoning Board of Review approval to create one nonconforming lot with less than the required frontage and lot width having two existing structures with less than the required setbacks.
- 3) That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.
- 4) That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
- 5) That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant master plan approval with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the applicant shall receive Zoning Board of Review approval to establish one nonconforming lot with less than the required frontage and lot width having two existing structures with less than the required setbacks.
- 2) That any use other than a single-family dwelling for proposed "Lot A" shall require Zoning Board of Review approval.
- 3) That the applicant shall plant one new street tree 2 ½ inches in caliper to be approved by the City's Landscape Project Coordinator along the front of new lot "B" and lot "C" within the City right-of-way.
- 4) That all existing and proposed buildings shall be connected to the Warwick Sewer System.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Thomas, the Planning Board voted unanimously to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant Master Plan approval with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations and the additional stipulation that the applicant clearly define the property line between the General Business zone and the Residential Zone with permanent markers (granite bounds) and/or a hedge.

Public Hearing

Major Land Development Project

Crowne Plaza Hotel Addition

Applicant:	Warwick Hotel Associates
Location:	801 Greenwich Avenue
Assessor's Plat:	265
Lot(s):	18 & 21
Zoning District:	GB (General Business)
Land Area:	17.8 acres
Number of lots:	2
Engineer:	Garofalo & Associates, Inc.
Ward:	8

Attorney K. Joseph Shekarchi represented the applicant and was requesting preliminary approval of a Major Land Development Project to subdivide a lot in order expand an existing hotel resulting in a building with less than the required side setback in a General Business Zoning District.

Mr. Shekarchi introduced Mr. Nick Pompiano, PE, Garafalo & Associates and presented an "affidavit of notice" to the Planning Board.

Mr. Shekarchi explained that the applicant was subdividing the property for financing purposes. He further explained that the proposal was to construct 116 additional hotel rooms but that the total number of rooms was still below that which the City Council approved several years ago as part of its zone change on the property.

Being no questions or comments from the public or the Planning Board the Planning Board then heard the Planning Department's findings and recommendation.

The Planning Department found the proposal to be generally consistent with Article 1 "Purposes and General Statements" of the City's Development Review Regulations, and:

1. Generally consistent with the Comprehensive Community Plan.
2. In compliance with the standards and provisions of the City's Zoning Ordinance having received Zoning Board of Review approval (Petition #9261) for less than required side setback.
3. That there will be no significant negative environmental impacts from the proposed development.

4. That the development will not result in the creation of individual lots with such physical constraints to development that building on those lots according to pertinent regulations and building standards would be impracticable.
5. That the proposed development possesses adequate access to a public street.

Planning Department recommendation was to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer, upon compliance with the following stipulations:

1. That the final landscape plan shall be approved by the Warwick Landscape Project Coordinator.
2. That any sub-metering shall be the responsibility of the property owner and that the Water Division will continue to read the master meter for the entire complex only.
3. That an RPZ backflow device shall be installed on the line before the first tap for domestic service use and that a double check detector backflow device must be installed on any fire service proposed for the building.
4. That the project engineer shall submit an as-built plan and certificate of conformance for the construction of the drainage system.

On the motion of Mr. Slocum, seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted unanimously to formally adopt the Planning Department's findings and to grant preliminary approval with final approval to be through the Administrative Officer upon compliance with the Planning Department's recommended stipulations.

Street Abandonment

Portion of Laura Street

Petitioner: Herff-Jones Inc.
Location: Assessors Plat: 290 See attached map.
Ward: 2

Attorney John Garahey represented the applicant and was requesting an abandonment of an undeveloped portion of Laura Street. Attorney Garahey introduced Mr. Bob Ilg of Herf Jones explained that Herf Jones owns both sides of the right-of-way and desires to consolidate its property. Mr. Garahey introduced a letter addressed to the Planning Director into the record proposing stipulations requested by the Water Division in order to protect its access and interest for a water line which is located within the right-of-way.

Those stipulations include:

1. Provide the City with an easement for unlimited access to water lines currently located within the Laura Street Right-of-Way.

2. That there shall be no building over the water lines which would prevent the City from accessing the same.
3. That the applicant agrees to install a gate along the abandoned portion of Laura Street to allow the City direct access to the water lines.
4. That the applicant shall hold the City harmless for any damage occurring to the property of Herf-Jones or others located within the abandoned portion of the street as a result of the bursting of the water line in its present location, provided however that the City shall be responsible to maintain said water line and shall be responsible for any and all costs associate with such maintainence, including without limitation, the refilling of any trenches necessary to repair said water line.

Mr. John DeLucia, City Engineer was recognized by the board and asked that Herf Jones work with the City to resolve an existing drainage problem on Laura Street.

Mr. Ilg stated that he had conversation with the Public Works Director and would participate within reason to resolve the existing drainage problem.

On the motion of Mr. Constantine, seconded by Mr. Iacobucci, the Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend in favor of the proposed abandonment with the stipulations agreed to by the Petitioner in its January 10, 2007 letter addressed to the Planning Director.

Prior to adjourning, Mr. Peter Ruggiero, City Solicitor, informed the Planning Board that the Woodfield Farm application had been remanded back to the Planning Board by the Superior Court for reconsideration and asked that an item for discussion be added to the Planning Board February 2007 agenda.

Being no further the Planning Board adjourned at 9 pm.