

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

As Approved November 14, 2016

Present: Jeff Squire, Chair; Mark Cavanaugh, Vice-Chair (arrived 6:05 p.m.); Brad Hutchison, Member; Melissa O'Brien, Member; Joan Rosner, Clerk; and Richard Harris, Town Planner

Mr. Squire called the meeting into session at 6:01 p.m.

1. Discussion of the South Hadley Urban Renewal Plan

Frank DeToma, Chair of the South Hadley Redevelopment Authority summarized the status of the plan and the recommendations. He noted that the financial considerations are still being developed. Recommendations are viewed as being implemented over a 15 year time frame but are divided into three 5-year periods for implementation. The Redevelopment Authority is making efforts to ensure the plan is consistent with the Town's Master Plan.

Frank DeToma stated that the top two priorities are:

- Assembling and development of the "Cowan Block" area
- Daylighting Buttery Brook

(Mr. Cavanaugh arrived 6:05 p.m.)

Kathy McCabe, consultant to the Redevelopment Authority noted that the statute provides that the Planning Board needs to make two findings and then the plan is submitted to the Selectboard for a public hearing.

Ms. O'Brien commented about the plan's proposal for converting the existing Town Hall and inquired if there was a recommendation as to where the new Town Hall should be located. Frank DeToma stated that there are several different options for locating a new Town Hall.

Ms. O'Brien noted that the draft plan has identified some parcels on Main Street for acquisition and asked why the South Hadley Fuels site on Main Street was not identified for acquisition. Frank DeToma and Mr. Harris responded as to the background on that business and noted the significant investment the owner, Mr. Chase, has made in the property. They also noted that the property is used as his administrative and business office which brings customers and employees into the Falls.

Ms. O'Brien referenced the BikeWalk Committee's previous comments regarding the draft plan and their recommendations to ensure that the considerations of bicyclists and pedestrians are incorporated into the plan. She commented that the plan does not propose a bike lane on Main Street.

Frank DeToma commented that they would like to meet with the Bike/Walk Committee, he has not seen the bike/pedestrian plan as yet. Kathy McCabe added that the Redevelopment Plan uses the phrase “complete streets” which requires accommodating bikes, pedestrians, and all other modes of transportation. She also noted that the plan calls for a multi-use path along Buttery Brook which would accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians separate from the streets and the plan calls for a comprehensive review of the Maine/Bridge intersection which would also address those issues. There was discussion about the meaning of “complete streets” and other efforts to meet the needs of all modes in this plan.

Mr. Squire stated he would echo Ms. O’Brien’s comments. He noted that he only had an opportunity to scan the draft plan but thought it addressed many of the items that had been raised.

Mr. Squire asked about the next steps.

Mr. Harris stated that the Board would need to make the two findings that Kathy McCabe noted. He commented that it is pretty clear that the Board would be making those finds as the Redevelopment Authority has demonstrated that they conducted a local survey and it would be difficult not to draft a Redevelopment Plan that was not consistent with the Master Plan. However, he stated that making the findings is not the same as recommending the Plan to the Selectboard or Town Meeting for approval – the Board could make a separate recommendation to approve, disapprove, or modify the plan or not make a recommendation – withhold their support.

Mr. Harris added that he will put this matter on the Board’s agenda for the October 17th meeting. Mr. Squire stated that the Board would need the complete plan before taking any action.

Frank DeToma responded that the Redevelopment Authority is working to have the plan completed.

Mr. Squire thanked the members of the Authority and Kathy McCabe for their efforts and for attending tonight’s meeting.

Since the time was 6:18 p.m. and the first public hearing was not scheduled until 6:45 p.m., the Board proceeded with agenda item #4 – minutes.

4. Minutes

a. September 12, 2016 Planning Board meeting minutes

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

Motion - Ms. O’Brien moved and Ms. Rosner seconded the motion to approve the September 12, 2016 Planning Board Meeting minutes as submitted. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

b. *September 12, 2016 Public Hearing (Canal Street SP) minutes*

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

Motion - Ms. O'Brien moved and Ms. Rosner seconded the motion to approve the September 12, 2016 Planning Board Public Hearing (Canal Street SP) minutes as submitted. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

5. 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; however, he stated that he anticipated receiving a bill for Turley Publications for an ad that was rerun for a hearing tonight and requested that the Board authorize payment since the next meeting is 3 weeks away.

Motion - Mr. Cavanaugh moved and Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion to authorize payment of the bill for the public hearing readvertisement upon receipt. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

Given the time and the fact that the next public hearing is not scheduled until 6:45 p.m., Mr. Squire stated that the Board would proceed with the Planner's Report and Development Update.

11. Development Update and Planner's Report

Mr. Harris reviewed the following items and activities:

a. Development Report

- Newton Street Duplex (383 Newton Street) – (no change – no application has been submitted).
- Mountainbrook Street Acceptances (no change)
- Rivercrest Condominiums – (no change)
- Willimansett Street Retail Development – the developer of the proposed 6,000 square foot retail building on Willimansett Street called and indicated that the only tenant that they could secure would require a drive-through window for an eating establishment. That is not allowed under the Business C zoning provisions. Therefore, they do not believe they have a bonafide reason to ask for another continuation or extension of the Site Plan Review approval. They understand that if they wish to proceed with the project, they will need to go back through the Site Plan Review process.

Mr. Harris inquired as to how the Board members would respond to a proposal to amend the Zoning Bylaw to allow restaurants with drive-through windows in the Business C zoning district. He reviewed some of the background on this zoning district and suggested Ms. Rosner may be able to provide more since she was on the Board when the Business C provisions were developed and adopted.

There was discussion as to the changes in the retail market which have occurred over the past 20 years and that the market is not developing the commercial spaces as it

was anticipated. Mr. Harris suggested that the redevelopment of Fairfield Mall dramatically changed the retail development market for this site.

Ms. O'Brien stated that, in developing the Master Plan, they heard from the community that they wanted "mom and pop" restaurants and not the chains, specifically not the drive-throughs.

There was further discussion as to whether conditions have changed to warrant an amendment to the Zoning Bylaw. However, Mr. Harris noted that it is clear that the Board would not be unanimous in its support for an amendment to the Business C zoning provisions. Therefore, he stated he would advise the developer that the amendment would have very little chance of being approved.

Martha Terry, 25 Brainerd Street commented that the community did not want to see "golden arches" flood into the community. Mr. Harris stated that the Board had already indicated that they would not support such an amendment and he would convey that to the developer; therefore, there is little to no chance of McDonald's or other fast food restaurants locating in the community.

b. Other Projects

- Urban Renewal Plan and Redevelopment Authority. (Discussed under agenda item #1 above)
- Housing Studies. (To be discussed under agenda item #2)
- Complete Streets Program Participation. Mr. Harris stated that he is working with the PVPC to develop a scope of work so that we can submit the Town's request for Complete Streets funding to develop the Town's Prioritization Plan.
- MassWorks 2016 Application. This application was submitted September 1, 2016.
- Chapter 43D Expedited Permitting Program. This application for Gaylord Street Industrials property was submitted September 2, 2016.
- Participating in the Regional Valley Bike Share planning process with the Town Administrator
- Participating with the Bike/Ped planning process.
- Participating in the "Team Hampshire" economic development coordinating effort – an informal process among several of the cities and towns in Hampshire County
- Permitting Guide.
- General Code. (No change).
- Health Impact Assessment. To be discussed at the next meeting)

c. Workshops/Training Opportunities

Mr. Harris reviewed workshops he has attended and is planning to attend::

- The "2016 Moving Together Conference - MassDOT's Annual Statewide Healthy Transportation Conference" to be held September 29, 2016
- "2016 Southern New England American Planning Association Chapter Conference" scheduled for October 20-21, 2016.
- October 3rd bus tour of two of HAP, Inc. developments in Amherst

- October 5th visit to Montague as part of the Redevelopment Authority's outreach efforts.

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. O'Brien seconded the motion to defer this public hearing until the October 17, 2016 meeting at 6:45 p.m. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

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

Mr. Harris noted that he may not be able to attend the scheduled meetings during the next 3 months due to some family issues. He inquired if there were Mondays which would not work for any of the members in the event he has to miss a scheduled meeting and the meeting is to be cancelled.

All members indicated that they could attend meetings on any of the available Mondays except November 21st.

Mr. Harris noted the bus tour being offered by HAP, Inc. and inquired which members could attend. Several members stated that they would plan to meet the tour in Amherst. Mr. Harris stated he will find out the locations and times of the tours.

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

Mr. Harris noted that the PVPC planner was not present and suggested that this matter be deferred until the next meeting. He noted that the draft plan has been posted on the website and highlighted some of the background facts and recommendations contained in the plan.

Mr. Squire stated that this will be placed on the next meeting agenda.

Mr. Squire then recessed the meeting for the public hearing at 7:15 p.m.

6. PUBLIC HEARING: Special Permit Application for proposed increase in guest rooms in a Bed & Breakfast (from 3 guest rooms to 5) and change in ownership - Property Location: 25 Woodbridge (Assessor's Map #52 – Parcel #219)

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

The meeting reconvened at 7:29 p.m.

Motion - Ms. Rosner moved and Ms. O'Brien seconded the motion that the Planning Board make the Special Permit findings previously discussed during the public hearing and vote to grant a Special Permit for the operation of a 5 guest room Bed & Breakfast at 25 Woodbridge

Street subject to a written decision with conditions consistent with the Planning Board's discussion during this evening's public hearing including the following:

- The Bed & Breakfast be modified and operated as described in the application and the public hearing.
- The use is limited to 5 guest rooms being for rent.
- The site modifications are limited to the addition of a parking space and other modifications as required by applicable codes
- The minutes of the public hearing and of this meeting be incorporated into the decision
- The application materials and comments from departments be incorporated into the decision.

The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

Mr. Harris stated he would draft the decision and forward to the Board Chair for his signature.

Mr. Squire then recessed the meeting for the public hearing at 7:34 p.m. Mr. Harris noted that the Board has another public hearing scheduled after this matter.

8. PUBLIC HEARING: Special Permit for Proposed 12-unit multifamily development – Property Location: Canal, Main, and High Streets - (Assessor's Map #4D – Parcel #15)

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

The meeting reconvened at 8:04 p.m.

7. PUBLIC HEARING: Special Permit for Proposed Professional Business - Property Location: 2078 Memorial Drive (Assessor's Map #7 – Parcel #123)

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

The meeting reconvened at 8:15 p.m.

Motion - Ms. O'Brien moved and Ms. Rosner seconded the motion that the Planning Board make the Special Permit findings previously discussed during the public hearing and vote to grant a Special Permit for the operation of a Professional Business (Design, Marketing, Administration, Sales staff at 2078 Memorial Drive subject to a written decision with conditions consistent with the Planning Board's discussion during this evening's public hearing including the following:

- The site is not to be modified.
- The use is limited to the Professional Business as described in the application and the public hearing.
- Site modifications are limited to those required by applicable codes

- The minutes of the public hearing and of this meeting be incorporated into the decision
- The application materials and comments from departments be incorporated into the decision.

The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

Mr. Harris stated he would draft the decision and forward to the Board Chair for his signature.

13. Adjournment

Motion – Ms. O’Brien moved and Ms. Rosner 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 8:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder

Attachment A

List of Documents Reviewed in September 26, 2016 Planning Board Meeting

<u>Document</u>	<u>Record Location</u>
Planning Board Meeting Agenda and Background Information	Planning Board Agenda Packet Files
Zoning Bylaw	Planning Board Files
Application and Plans for Canal Street Multifamily Development	Planning Board Project Files

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

**REQUEST SPECIAL PERMIT FOR BED & BREAKFAST
RUTH TODRIN ETAL – WOODBRIDGE STREET (25)**

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

As Approved November 14, 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 26, 2016 at 7:15 p.m. in Selectboard Meeting Room of the Town Hall to discuss the application of Richard, Ruth, Michael, and Joshua Todrin; 67 January Hills Road; Amherst, MA 01002 for a Special Permit under Section 5(E) and Section 7(R) of the Town's Zoning By-Law to operate a Bed & Breakfast Inn/Home with up to 5 guest rooms on the subject property. The subject property is identified as generally being at the intersection of Woodbridge Street and Silver Street and identified as 25 Woodbridge Street and identified on Assessor's Map Number #52 as Parcel #219.

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

Publication: Friday, September 9, 2016
Friday, September 16, 2016

Mr. Squire invited the applicant to present their proposal.

Ruth and Richard Todrin, representing the applicants, stated that they are in the process of purchasing 25 Woodbridge Street. They talked about how wonderful the house is and that they will reside in the house and would like to operate it as a Bed & Breakfast with 5 guest rooms. Their plan is to live on the first floor and they will not alter the building but

will add one parking space to meet the requirements for having 5 guest rooms. They noted that the current owner has been renting out 4 guest rooms.

Richard Todrin noted that they have talked to as many of the abutters as they could. Several have provided written statements of support for their application which he submitted to Mr. Harris for the record.

Mr. Squire asked, since there is currently a B &B at this location, why is this application before the Board. Mr. Harris stated that the transfer to new owners and the request to change from the approved 3 guest rooms to 5 guest rooms. Even if there was not to be a transfer, the current owner would have to seek an amendment to increase the number of rooms. Similarly, even if the new owners were not seeking to increase the number of guest rooms, since Special Permits are not transferrable, they would need to seek their own Special Permit.

Mr. Cavanaugh inquired as to whether they will make any exterior changes. Ruth Todrin stated that there will be no exterior renovations – just an additional parking space and landscaping improvements.

Charlene Baiardi, Building Commissioner, explained her comments made regarding the application.

Mr. Harris suggested some conditions appropriate for this application:

1. Limit on Usage. The Bed & Breakfast is to utilize the existing structure located on the subject property. Special Permit is only for use of the property as a Bed & Breakfast with up to 5 guest rooms being available for rent.
2. Limit on Guest Rooms. Number of guest rooms available for rent shall not exceed 5.
3. Structures. No changes are to be made to the exterior of the structure and no additional structures are to be erected thereon. This condition does not apply to changes of a cosmetic or maintenance or public safety nature (such as painting, roof replacement, fire alarm etc.)
4. Parking. One additional parking space is to be added to the site.
5. Signs. No additional signage is to be provided or permitted on the property.

Mr. Squire asked if there were any further comments. There being no further comments or questions, with the concurrence of the other members of the Board, he closed the hearing at 7:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

**REQUEST SPECIAL PERMIT FOR MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT
ORANGE PARK MANAGEMENT, LLC – CANAL STREET**

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

As Approved November 14, 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 7:34 p.m. He noted that this is a continuation of the public hearing began on September 12, 2016.

Mr. Squire invited the applicant to review the plan changes and comments.

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

Ray Hervieux, architect, distributed copies of revised plans and noted the changes in the site plan.

There was discussion regarding the "sight easement". Mr. Harris noted that the materials provided to the Chair from the Town Administrator appeared to provide some guidance as to what is acceptable. In a discussion with the Town Administrator, he said it is clear that nothing other than low lying grass type vegetation can be placed in the "sight easement".

Mr. Harris also noted that, according to the Town Administrator, the "sight easement" is measured from the street edge (pavement) and not the property line. In this instance, that seems to reduce the area by 5 feet on Canal Street and about the same on High Street.

Ray Hervieux also reviewed the narrative which he submitted to the Board. He stated that he toured the area and noted that there are a number of buildings which approach the height of the proposed buildings – the others ranged up to around 35 feet and the proposed buildings have a maximum height of 38 feet. Additionally, he commented that the new library is much higher than the buildings being proposed for the subject property. In conducting his survey he also noted a wide variety of architectural styles in the surrounding neighborhood. Many of the existing buildings have very steep pitched roofs with windows in the upper floor.

Ray Hervieux described the introduction of a gazebo on the High Street side area as an attempt to relate the development to the neighborhood. He noted that it would be fenced off by a short wrought iron or similar fence. However, much like traditional porches, it would provide a "face" to the neighborhood where the residents and their invited guests

could interact with each other and the neighborhood – similar to the porches on buildings of the past.

Mr. Squire commented that it appears the applicant has addressed some of the concerns voiced at the initial hear. However, he noted a number of items have not been addressed including:

- Lack of an engineer stamped plan
- Photometric plan
- Drainage and DPW-related issues

There was discussion regarding these matters. It was noted that the applicant’s lighting vendor is providing a photometric plan and their engineer is working on soils testing and providing a drainage response.

Ray Hervieux, in a discussion about the screening of the entries, suggested that he would like to reserve the right to provide some lattice work up to the height of the handrails.

Mr. Hutchison stated he appreciated the architect’s intent and the recessing of the driveways on Canal Street. However, he said he would prefer that there be trees in lieu of the gazebo.

Ray Hervieux reiterated how the gazebo was designed to facilitate interaction with the neighborhood – an issue raised at the last meeting. There was discussion about the social interaction and how the gazebo is to be owned by the condo development and is not intended to be a “public” space. Ray Hervieux stated that there will be trees around the gazebo as well. Mr. Harris suggested that the fence could have a locking gate so that the condo residents could invite neighbors into the area.

Mr. Hutchison inquired as to how some of the parking spaces work. Ray Hervieux explained the maneuvering spaces being provided.

Mr. Cavanaugh inquired about the impervious surface on the site. Ray Hervieux provided the quantity of the impervious surface. Mr. Harris noted that it would have to be less than what was previously present since the Fibermark building previously occupied nearly the entire site.

Mr. Hutchison asked about the Smart Growth District Design Standards. Mr. Harris stated that, since they are not using the SMGD, the standards do not apply.

Mr. Cavanaugh queried if all the units will be sprinklered. Ray Hervieux responded that they will be sprinklered and explained the design.

Mary Millard, 12 Alvord Street, noting the proximity of the sidewalks, library, and the shallowness of the driveways proposed off Canal Street, inquired as to the “safeguards” to be provided for bicyclists and pedestrians on Canal Street. She suggested installation of warning signs or other devices for the benefit of the persons using the sidewalks and

bicyclists on Canal Street. One option she also mentioned was some way to distinguish the sidewalks from the driveway. Ray Hervieux responded and suggested that they would be pleased to install such signs or other reasonable devices. He also stated that they would like to have a different texture for the driveway – if the Town was agreeable.

Charlene Baiardi, Building Commissioner, inquired as to the distance between the buildings. She stated that the buildings have to be 10 feet apart. Ray Hervieux responded that the buildings are proposed to be 6 feet apart – per code – as they do not have windows in those areas. Charlene Baiardi reiterated that they need to be 10 feet apart and suggested that the Board cannot approve the plan when it is in conflict with the code.

Mr. Harris explained the relationship to the Planning Board’s actions and code compliance. He noted that if the Board approves a plan which is later determined, during the permitting process, to require changes to the plan, then the applicant has to come back to the Board – possibly start all over again – for approval. As examples, he suggested that a plan which shows buildings 6 feet apart that is later determined must 10 feet apart, or a plan which shows 3 driveways and MassDOT or the Town’s DPW only allow one driveway, or a plan which shows water or sewer services in one alignment but the DPW or the Water Department requires changes which may alter the outside of the building – in any of these cases, the applicant would have to come back to the Board. Mr. Squire stated, at a minimum, they would need to get Board approval for a modification of the plan. Therefore, Mr. Harris suggested that it is incumbent on the applicant to be certain of their code compliance as it relates to the plan.

There was discussion of the electrical vault.

Mr. Squire suggested that this hearing needs to be continued. He outlined the following additional materials which the applicant needs to provide:

- Stamped plan
- Photometric plan
- Drainage plan or details
- Planting plan

Mr. Cavanaugh inquired as to how the mail will be handled – door to door or a central location. He also asked about the trash. Mr. Harris stated based on past experiences, that the Post Office determines how the mail will be handled – most likely, they will require a central location readily accessible by their carrier. Ray Hervieux stated each unit will have a “trash closet” and the individual owners will be responsible for placing it at the curb.

Mr. Squire suggested that these items should be addressed as part of a management plan which was not submitted. He also noted that snow removal should be addressed as well.

Mr. Hutchison inquired about a “landing” to the sidewalk from the gazebo. Mr. Harris suggested including a gate at the end of the landing. Ray Hervieux stated that they could do both items.

Mr. Squire reiterated the items which need to be provided to the Town:

- Stamped plan
- Photometric plan
- Drainage plan or details
- Planting plan
- Management plan

Mr. Harris suggested that these items need to be provided by October 7th for the public hearing to be continued on October 17th.

Motion – Mr. Hutchison moved and Ms. Rosner seconded the motion to continue the public hearing until October 17, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. The Board voted **Five (5)** out of **Five (5)** members present in favor of the motion.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Squire announced that the public hearing is continued until October 17, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. With concurrence from the other members, Mr. Squire recessed the hearing at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING

**REQUEST SPECIAL PERMIT FOR PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS
SPECTRUM CRAFTS – MEMORIAL DRIVE (2078)**

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

As Approved November 14, 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 8:04 p.m. He apologized for the delay in starting this hearing but the last one ran longer than allotted.

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 26, 2016 at 7:45 p.m. in Selectboard Meeting Room of the Town Hall to discuss the application of Spectrum Crafts, Susan Knopp, President; 70 Orville Drive; Bohemia, NY 11716 for a Special Permit under Section 5(E) and Section 7(M) of the Town's Zoning By-Law to operate a Professional Business (Sales, Marketing, & Design staff for Spectrum Crafts) on the subject property. The subject property is identified as generally being at 25 2078 Memorial Drive and identified on Assessor's Map Number #7 as Parcel #123.

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

Publication: Friday, September 9, 2016
Friday, September 16, 2016
Friday, September 23, 2016 - CORRECTED

Mr. Squire invited the applicant to present their proposal.

Judy Sileski, Product Development Manager, Spectrum Crafts, Chicopee reviewed the background of the company. She stated that they are proposing to house their Sales, Marketing, & Design staff at this location. The number of employees is estimated to total 5 and their hours are generally 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. although on occasion, they may

work till 8:00 p.m. if they are working on a specific project/presentation. There will be no signs promoting the business. No manufacturing will take place on this site. They will be renting the building from the current owner.

Judy Sileski stated that there will be no expansion of the building and they will use the existing parking area. Sales do not generally occur at this location – they visit clients in the client’s business location usually.

Todd Demers stated that they want to retain the sign structure for a potential future use – it was a fairly expensive sign.

Mr. Cavanaugh inquired what they plan to do with the sign. Todd Demers stated that they will spray paint over the sign and will not illuminate the sign.

Mr. Harris suggested some conditions that would be appropriate for this application.

1. Limit on Usage. Utilize the existing structures located on the subject property Special Permit only authorizes the use of the property for the Spectrum Crafts Design, Marketing, and related personnel. No manufacturing or on-site sales are to be undertaken at this site.
2. Structures. No changes are to be made to the exterior of the structure and no additional structures are to be erected thereon.
3. Parking. No additional parking is to be added to the site.
4. Signs. The existing sign structure may be retained but is to be “covered over” as described by the property owner at the public hearing.

Mr. Squire asked if there were any further comments. There being no further comments or questions, with the concurrence of the other members of the Board, he closed the hearing at 8:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

AS APPROVED

Richard Harris, Recorder