

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

As Approved September 26, 2016

Present: Jeff Squire, Chair; Mark Cavanaugh, Vice-Chair; Brad Hutchison, Member; Melissa O'Brien, Member (arrived 6:09 p.m.); Joan Rosner, Clerk (arrived 6:28 p.m.); and Richard Harris, Town Planner

Mr. Squire called the meeting into session at 6:00 p.m.

Since other members of the Board had not arrived, Mr. Squire stated the Board would begin reviewing the minutes.

8. Minutes

a. August 15, 2016 Planning Board meeting minutes

Mr. Harris referenced the draft minutes which he distributed. The Board members reviewed the draft minutes.

Motion - Mr. Hutchison moved and Mr. Cavanaugh seconded the motion to approve the August 15, 2016 Planning Board Meeting minutes as submitted. The Board voted **Three (3)** out of **Three (3)** members present in favor of the motion.

b. August 15, 2016 Public Hearing (Alvord Street Trees) minutes

Mr. Harris referenced the draft minutes which he distributed. The Board members reviewed the draft minutes.

Motion - Mr. Hutchison moved and Mr. Cavanaugh seconded the motion to approve the August 15, 2016 Public Hearing (Alvord Street Trees) minutes as submitted. The Board voted **Three (3)** out of **Three (3)** members present in favor of the motion.

9. Bills and Correspondence

Mr. Harris referenced a list a list of correspondence provided at the meeting. He also noted that there are no bills ready to be paid.

10. Development Update and Planner's Report

Mr. Harris stated that the update and report are largely provided in the background materials.

He also noted that HAP, Inc. is organizing a tour of two of their developments in Amherst for South Hadley officials. The tour is scheduled for Monday, October 3, 2016. Board members interested in participating are encouraged to RSVP as soon as possible. He distributed a flyer about the tour.

Ms. Rosner noted that she will be unable participate as that is a religious holiday.

(Ms. O'Brien arrived.)

7. Consider Endorsement of Approval Not Required Plan for Matthew and Honora McDonough. Property Location: 148 Woodbridge Street (Assessor's Map #56 – Parcel #66).

Mr. Harris displayed the proposed ANR Plan. He stated that the property is zoned Residence A-1 but the plan merely seeks to create a small parcel which is to be added to the property currently owned by the applicants – it will not create a separate building lot. Therefore, he suggested that the Board could endorse the ANR Plan with the notation that it is not a separate building lot.

Motion - Mr. Cavanaugh moved and Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion to endorse the ANR Plan with the notation that the new parcel is not to be a separate building lot. The Board voted **Four (4)** out of **Four (4)** members present in favor of the motion. Subsequently, Mr. Squire, Mr. Cavanaugh, and Ms. O'Brien signed the plan.

1. Discussion: Can a tree service meet the criteria for a Home Occupation?

Mr. Harris provided some background on the subject reviewing the requirements and restrictions related to a Home Occupation. He stated that this issue, tonight, needs to be viewed from a “conceptual” perspective regardless of the parcel involved. The question is “can a tree service as described meet the criteria for a Home Occupation”?

Mr. Hutchison suggested that the use needs to be viewed in the context. The intent is to minimize noise impacting the neighbors. This location would seem to meet that intent.

Mr. Squire commented that the use does not fit the criteria. He noted the Class 1 Commercial vehicle restriction in particular. Mr. Harris reviewed how the Board determined that Class 1 Commercial was the most intense that the Board deemed appropriate for a residential area.

Mr. Cavanaugh inquired if there is a difference between “agricultural” and “residential” areas. Mr. Harris suggested that if the “agricultural” property is used residentially and not as a farm, then there is no substantive difference in regards to use as it relates to this question.

Carol Bright, realtor, suggested that the project needs to be viewed in its context.

There was further discussion as to the Home Occupation restrictions and the proposed use.

Jennifer Lester, noting Mr. Hutchison's comments, indicated that the use should be viewed in its context. She described the parcel involved and their proposed use of the property.

(Ms. Rosner arrived.)

Mr. Harris noted that he had raised questions as to whether this use would fit a “Home Occupation” category before the current owner acquired the property. He had scheduled an informational meeting for the prospective purchasers before the Planning Board. However,

the buyers (now the owners) indicated that they would retain their business location in Sunderland.

There was discussion of similar uses having to relocate to an industrial area. Mr. Harris explained the Agricultural exemption and what it would take for this use to “possibly” fit those conditions including having to generate at least 25% of their revenue from items raised on the property. He used a “tree nursery” as a possible example. However, he noted that such a situation is theoretical and steal a “stretch”.

Jennifer Lester inquired if the Board could grant a Special Permit for this location.

Mr. Squire commented that the Board did not have any latitude on the restrictions in the Zoning Bylaw.

The consensus of the Board was that this is not a use, as described, which would fit the Home Occupation criteria.

2. Discussion of the South Hadley Urban Renewal Plan

Mr. Squire said this item will be deferred till the next meeting.

3. PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed Flag Lot Special Permit Application 108 College Street (Applicant requests that it be deferred to September 26, 2016)

Mr. Harris explained that public hearing should not be opened. But the Board should approve the deferral.

Motion - Mr. Cavanaugh moved and Ms. Rosner seconded the motion to defer this public hearing until the September 26, 2016 meeting at 6:45 p.m. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

5. Discussion of the Housing Production Plan and Multifamily Study with PVPC staff.

Mr. Squire said this item will be deferred till the next meeting.

6. Discussion of Design Review Bylaws and Fall STM Bylaw amendment proposals

Mr. Squire said this item will be deferred till the next meeting.

11. Other New Business (topics which the Chair could not reasonably expect to be discussed/considered as of the date of this notice)

Mr. Harris stated that there is a possibility that he may not be able to attend the September 26th meeting. If that were the case, the Board could meet without him present or could set a date for the following week to meet.

Ms. Rosner noted that she could not make October 3rd.

All members indicated that October 5th would work. Therefore, the consensus of the Board was that, if the September 26th meeting needed to be cancelled, the matters would be considered at a meeting on October 5, 2016.

Martha Terry, 25 Brainard Street, commented that she understood, from an email from Mr. Harris that the meeting would not begin until 6:30 p.m. Mr. Harris explained that the Board had a quorum and, after he sent that initial email, he sent a follow up email indicating that if the Board had a quorum there were some items that the Board could and would consider.

Martha Terry, 25 Brainard Street, indicated that she and another person were particularly interested in item #3. Mr. Squire commented that the Board explained that the proposed Tree Service would not fit into a Home Occupation category. Martha Terry, 25 Brainard Street indicated she concurred and was pleased with the Board's conclusion.

There only being the public hearing scheduled for 7:15 p.m., Mr. Squire recessed the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Mr. Squire called the meeting back to order and then recessed the meeting for the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed 12-unit multifamily development 1 Canal Street (Canal, Main, and High Streets)

The Public Hearing was held. (See minutes of Public Hearing.)

The meeting reconvened at 8:10 p.m.

12. Adjournment

Motion – Ms. O'Brien moved and Mr. Cavanaugh seconded the motion to adjourn. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder

Attachment A

List of Documents Reviewed in September 12, 2016 Planning Board Meeting

Document

Planning Board Meeting Agenda and
Background Information
Zoning Bylaw
ANR Plan – 148 Woodbridge Street
Tree Service Proposal
Application and Plans for Canal Street
Multifamily Development

Record Location

Planning Board Agenda Packet Files

Planning Board Files
Planning Board Plan Files
Planning Board Agenda Packet Files

Planning Board Project Files

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
REQUEST SPECIAL PERMIT FOR MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT
ORANGE PARK MANAGEMENT, LLC – CANAL STREET

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2016

As Approved September 26, 2016

Present: Jeff Squire, Chair; Mark Cavanaugh, Vice-Chair; Joan Rosner, Clerk; Brad Hutchison, Member; Melissa O'Brien, Member; and Richard Harris, Town Planner

Mr. Squire called the public hearing to order at 7:15 p.m.

Ms. Rosner read the notice of the Planning Board public hearing:

The South Hadley Planning Board, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40-A, Section 11, Massachusetts General Laws, will hold a public hearing on Monday, September 12, 2016 at 7:15 p.m. in Selectboard Meeting Room of the Town Hall to discuss the application of Orange Park Management LLC; P. O. Box 35; Chicopee, MA for a Special Permit under Section 5(E) of the Town's Zoning By-Law to develop a 12 unit multifamily development on the subject property. The subject property is identified as generally being at the intersection of Canal Street, High Street, and Main Street and identified on Assessor's Map Number #4D as Parcel #15.

Plans and related materials may be viewed at the office of the Planning Board during normal office hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.).

Any person interested or wishing to be heard regarding this application should appear at the time and place designated.

Joan Rosner, Clerk
South Hadley Planning Board

Published: Friday, August 26, 2016
 Friday, September 2, 2016

Mr. Squire invited the applicant to present their proposal.

Pat G _____, principal of Orange Park Management, LLC and Ray Hervieux, architect were present to represent the application.

Ray Hervieux, architect, using a copy of the plans submitted with the application, reviewed the various plans for the project:

- Floor Plans - He noted that the application refers to a 3-bedroom unit but it is really a flexible space plan as they recognize some persons will want a study, storage space, or a third bedroom or a guest bedroom as a multipurpose room. They are trying to introduce elements desired by most buyers.
- Elevation Plans
- Site Plan – they are proposing an “ornamental fence” to surround the property as it provides a little bit of control of the space. The plan is designed to avoid any visual obstruction. They are proposing a crosswalk to the new library – the location is flexible. Some changes are necessary in the electrical arrangement to address needs of SHELD.
- Landscape Plan. The plants are chosen for hard conditions with low maintenance requirements. Some plants are proposed for the tree belt.

Mr. Squire stated that the Board will offer questions/comments first and then the public will be invited an opportunity to pose questions and comments.

Mr. Squire commented that there were omissions in the submission package that the Board typically looks to review including:

- Photometric plan – even if the only outside lighting is on the buildings, given the close proximity to the other buildings in the area, the lighting impact is important.
- Stamped plans – none of the plans were stamped and there it is unclear as to the plans prepared by the surveyor and the subsequent plans.
- Erosion Control plan
- Site Plan Materials details
- Privacy fence details – important to know what it is going to look like
- Management plan – snow and trash in particular
- Drainage plan – recognizing that the site is not large enough to require a Stormwater Management Permit, it is still important to know how the drainage will be handled and if the site will handle it.

Ray Hervieux responded with some clarification as to the driveway and curb plans.

Mr. Harris noted that the new project will have less impervious surface than the prior development of this site.

There was discussion as to whether the DPW would be commenting on the drainage aspects of this project and the location of the crosswalk – what is on the opposite side. Mr. Squire noted that the crosswalk needs to line up with access on the opposite side.

Mr. Hutchison questioned about the architectural context of the proposal – how does it fit in with the surrounding building types, etc. He inquired as to the impetus to “screen out” the housing form the surrounding neighborhood as the plan does not seem to engage with the neighborhood. He noted that all living spaces are upstairs and not at street level. He opined that it may help to remove the lattice from around the decks.

Ray Hervieux stated that they don't have to put in the lattice work. They wanted to screen the trash cans, etc. He described the entryways.

Ms. O'Brien suggested another type of planting instead of the lattice work. She asked if the parking is all asphalt.

Ray Hervieux indicated they plan to pave the parking areas.

Mr. Squire asked if there were restrictions on parking in the setback areas. Mr. Harris stated that for the size of the parking areas there are no restrictions.

Mr. Cavanaugh questioned the adequacy of the depth of the parking spaces off the road. He noted that it appears to be only 16 feet from the property line to the garage – it seems tight. Ray Hervieux responded that the Zoning Bylaw does not have a minimum dimension requirement for the parking spaces. The space Mr. Cavanaugh was referring to would accommodate a "Mercedes".

Mr. Cavanaugh commented that the 16 feet would only accommodate a 14 foot vehicle – that appears tight.

There was further discussion as to the maneuvering of vehicles in and out of the parking spaces. It was noted that a car would have to back into the street to allow another car to exit the garage – in several instances.

Mr. Squire offered comments regarding the landscaping plan.

Mr. Squire asked if the Town Planner was aware of the wording of the "sight easement" abutting Main Street. Mr. Harris stated he had not seen the language and he would ask the Town Administrator regarding this matter. Mr. Squire suggested that it would help the Board to understand what they could require for fencing, landscaping, etc. in that area if they had the wording of the easement.

Mr. Hutchison queried about the access routes to the street from the dwellings. He suggested that there should be more "direct connection" to the street. While he stated he wants to maintain the green space, the location of some of the walks should be shifted. There was discussion regarding the placement of the walks relative to the driveways and parking areas.

Mr. Hutchison suggested that the area is mostly single-family and the Board is okay with increased density.

Mr. Squire asked if the HVAC mechanical equipment will be screened. Ray Hervieux responded that they would be screened.

Mr. Squire asked if the Board members had any further questions or comments at this time. Members indicated they did not. Therefore, Mr. Squire invited comments/questions from the public.

Frank DeToma, 31 Ashfield Lane asked if about the type of siding. He noted that this site is in the “Smart Growth District” and the Planning Board has adopted Design Guidelines for the district. Ray Hervieux responded that it will be “hardy board” siding. Mr. Harris noted that the Design Guidelines that Mr. DeToma referred to only applies if a project is using the Smart Growth District provisions and, in this instance, he stated they are not doing so. Mr. Harris noted that the Smart Growth District would allow approximately 22-23 dwellings on this site – by right without a Special Permit.

Gillian Woldorf, _____ stated that this project is out of scale with the area and do not “fit in”. She noted that the 37 foot high elevation and 3 stories is not found in the surrounding residential properties. The buildings all face inward and do not have a “street front”. She expressed concerns about how the parking spaces could work – cars having to back out onto the street to let a car out of the garage, for example. She suggested fewer units would mean few cars.

Mitch Resnick, 41 Ashton Lane, asked to have the easement issue clarified. He expressed concern about the trash, and the parking arrangements. He said he would rather not see the lattice work.

_____ Robinson, 12 Canal Street expressed concern about the lack of on-street parking. They noted that the Town installed a curb which resulted in parking on only one side of the street. There is not adequate parking at the present time. This development will cause more on-street parking.

Joseph Rodio, Library Director, suggested that instead of using a “Mercedes” for the parking assessment, an Odyssey would be more appropriate. He stated that parking is an issue in the area. He asked about the SHELD engineer comments and whether the electrical work will require the Library to go without service.

Ray Hervieux and Pat G _____ reviewed the discussions that they have had with the SHELD engineer. The pole with 3-phase service does need to be relocated. That will be done at the developer’s expense, but they will need Verizon approval. Mr. Harris and others noted that replacement of electrical services as a result of construction is common and there is no reason to expect an interruption of service for the library or anyone else as a result of replacing the pole.

Gill Woods, realtor reviewed the background on the developer’s proposal and his experience at selling condos in South Hadley.

John _____ stated that snow removal will be interesting given the tight site. Mr. Squire stated that will need to be addressed in the Management Plan.

_____ Sullivan, 12 Canal Street stated that the project is too dense for the area. She didn’t understand the landscaping plan and did not realize that a fence was being proposed.

Bobby Merchant, _____ Canal Street, stated that the proposed 42” fence will be a visual obstruction.

Pat G _____ stated that they will move the fence back out of the “sight easement” area. There was further discussion regarding the issue of visual obstruction and the “sight easement”.

Frank DeToma, 31 Ashfield Lane, stated that the Selectboard is very aware of the “sight easement” issue and concerns regarding the visual obstructions related to traffic.

Gillian Wolford asked about the proposed prices for the units. Mr. Harris suggested that the topic of the proposed prices is not a matter that relates to the Planning Board’s criteria for consideration; therefore, the matter should not be discussed. He suggested that discussion of prices could be viewed as an “exclusionary” interest.

Gill Woods, stated that this will be the most expensive residential investment in the Falls in many years.

Mitch Resnick asked if the DPW comments would address safety, etc. Mr. Harris stated that the DPW is not expected to address safety as the Police, Fire, and DPW had previously indicated (in the preliminary meetings) that the plan did not pose a public safety issue.

Mr. Squire asked if there were further comments. There being none, he inquired as to a continuation date and time for the hearing. Mr. Harris suggested September 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Motion – Ms. Rosner moved and Mr. Cavanaugh seconded the motion to continue the public hearing until September 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

Mr. Squire announced that the public hearing is continued until September 26, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder