SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING:

Application for Special Permit for proposed mixed use redevelopment. Property Location:
36 Bridge Street - north side of Bridge Street (aka State Route 116) (Assessor’s Map Number #5C as Parcel #21)

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2020
As Approved

Present: Mark Cavanaugh, Chair; Melissa O’Brien, Vice-Chair; Diane Mulvaney, Clerk; Brad Hutchison, Member; Joanna Brown, Member; Richard Harris, Town Planner; Attorney Lisa Mead, Town Counsel; Anne Capra, Conservation Administrator/Planner; and Colleen Canning, Senior Clerk Planning and Conservation

Chair Cavanaugh called the Public Hearing to order at 6:02 PM.

Clerk Mulvaney read the Public Hearing notice aloud as follows:

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 February 10, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Auditorium of the South Hadley Town Hall at 116 Main Street, South Hadley, MA to consider and discuss the application of Luis Builders, Inc.; 37 Westbrook Road, South Hadley, MA 01075 for a Special Permit under Sections 255-7, 255-19, Article VII (specifically Section 255-45), Article VIII, and Article IX of the Town’s Zoning Bylaw. The applicant is seeking a Special Permit to allow development of a mixed use building consisting of five (5) residential dwelling units and some commercial/business space in one structure on a single parcel. Additional elements of the development include parking, landscaping, utilities, Stormwater management systems, and similarly related items. As part of their project, the applicant is proposing a sign to be illuminated with goose neck lights pursuant to Section 255- 85 of the Zoning Bylaw.

The subject property is located along the north side of Bridge Street (aka Route 116) and identified on Assessor’s Map Number #5C as Parcel #21. The property is located in the Business B zoning district and is within the South Hadley Falls Overlay District and within the South Hadley Falls Smart Growth Zoning District.

Plans and the application may be viewed at the Office of the Planning Board during normal office hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.). Additionally, the plans and application are posted on the Planning Board’s “Project Plans A through L” page on the Town’s website www.southhadleyma.gov in a section titled “Bridge Street (36) - SP 2020 - Mixed Use Redevelopment”.

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

Diane Supczak-Mulvaney, Clerk
The applicants, Dan and Jamie Luis, were present at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Harris explained that there was an error in posting notice of the hearing on the Town’s website, therefore the hearing was re-advertised to open at the next Planning Board meeting on February 24, 2020. As there was not adequate time to inform the abutters of the change, tonight’s hearing would still be held as an informational session. Tonight’s discussion and findings would be entered into the record for consideration at the re-advertised hearing date.

Dan Luis addressed the Board and described the proposed project. He explained that the lot was purchased with the intention of redeveloping the site. At the time of purchase, the lot was in degraded condition with an existing dilapidated structure. The proposed redevelopment of the site would create a mixed-used building with three 1-bedroom dwellings, two 1-bedroom dwellings, and commercial storefront. He explained that the project was in support of the Town’s Master Plan and ongoing initiatives to redevelop the South Hadley Falls. The project had been reviewed by the Conservation Commission and the stormwater management plan was peer-reviewed for the Commission’s consideration. Following peer-review approval, the Commission issued Order of Conditions to the project. Site development would be outside of the floodplain with only the raingarden designed within.

Dan Luis explained that two waivers were requested in submitting the Special Permit application. As proposed, the site would include 8 off-street parking spaces. The 8 spaces would satisfy the minimum requirement for spaces needed for the residences. However, the 8 spaces did not meet the requirement for off-street parking for both the residential and commercial spaces. A waiver was requested to offer relief from the parking requirements. Additionally, the applicant was requesting a waiver from front and side set-back requirements. Dan Luis explained that the building was designed with the façade along the sidewalk to create a city-scape feeling. The side setback on the left side of the building was proposed to be 3 ½ feet. He noted the proposed building would be the same width as the previous building on the lot. However, the proposed building would be longer than the previous.

Ms. Brown addressed concerns for the limited side setback between the proposed new building on the subject property and an existing structure on the abutting property. She noted that the abutting property had emergency egress at that location. Dan Luis responded that the egress was illegally installed and actually extended over the property line onto his property. The limited side set-back would be used for utilities and was not designed as a pedestrian path. Mr. Harris noted that the Building Commissioner did not express concern for the setbacks as proposed.

Ms. Mulvaney inquired if the street would be able to accommodate the additional parking. Mr. Harris explained that the on-street parking spaces were not assigned to any particular business and the availability changes day-to-day. He noted that limited available on-street parking showed a thriving local business economy.
Clerk Mulavney inquired how handicap off-street parking would be accommodated. Dan Luis responded that the first space would be designated as handicapped and the dimensions would be larger than the other parking spaces. Chair Cavanaugh advised that the plan should reflect the dimensions and location of the handicap parking space.

Chair Cavanaugh inquired if the proposed project included stairs at the rear of the building as it appeared on the submitted plans. Dan Luis responded that there was a balcony and concrete pad at that location.

Chair Cavanaugh inquired about trash collection for residents of the building. Dan Luis responded that he was working with different vendors to understand his options. Mr. Harris noted that the Board of Health has permitting requirements for on-site dumpsters. No Board of Health permitting would be required for curb-side trash collection. Mr. Harris noted that satisfactory trash collections could be conditioned into the approval.

Clerk Mulvaney observed that the exit driveway was narrow and expressed safety concern for pedestrians passing the building on the sidewalk. Dan Luis responded that lighting was proposed along the exit drive. Concern for pedestrian safety was still expressed.

Vice-Chair O’Brien inquired what the project’s relation to Buttery Brook would be as it was located on the rear of the property. Anne Capra, Conservation Administrator/Planner, responded that the brook was not culverted at the subject property. She added that the Conservation Commission issued Order of Condition to the project which was recorded against the property deed.

Mr. Hutchison noted that the egress path was shared with both vehicles and pedestrians. Dan Luis replied that only one egress was required through architectural code as sprinkler systems were installed and the width of the building was only 28 feet.

Chair Cavanaugh returned to the concern for the conflict between exiting vehicles and pedestrians. Dan Luis noted that commercial space would have large windows which allowed increased visibility of exiting cars and pedestrians.

Chair Cavanaugh inquired if the renderings showed a ramp. Dan Luis responded that no ramps would be required as the building would be set at grade.

Clerk Mulvaney inquired about snow removal practices on site. Dan Luis replied that snow would be pushed onto the raingarden. During large storm events, the snow would be hauled off site.

Clerk Mulvaney inquired about the small window on the top of the building’s façade shown on the renderings. Dan Luis explained that it was not a window but a placard which would include the name of the building.
Chair Cavanaugh advised the applicant to review the application submission as there were some inconsistencies relating to the number of bedrooms within the proposed dwellings.

Clerk Mulvaney inquired if the applicant had tenants for the commercial space secured. Dan Luis responded that he did not.

Chair Cavanaugh opened the hearing to public comment at 6:27 PM

Frank DeToma, Chair of the Redevelopment Authority, addressed the Board. He inquired what materials would be used to construct the building. Dan Luis responded that the bottom of the building would be brick and cement board siding would extend upward. Planters would be installed along the right side of the building. Frank DeToma asked why the building was mixed-use with retail on the street level. Mr. Harris responded that the Master Plan supports mixed-use buildings with business developments along the street front within South Hadley Falls.

Marilyn Gass, Precinct D, addressed the Board. She asked everyone to speak into their microphones.

Clerk Mulvaney inquired about addressing potential overcrowding of the municipal parking lot near the subject property. Mr. Harris responded that if parking issues are observed within the Falls then the Redevelopment Authority could investigate possible parking mitigation.

The Board reviewed the items that would need to be addressed prior to closing the hearing which included: trash removal practices, potential accident prevention at the driveway exit and clearly identifying the handicap parking spot.

As there was no further public comment, Chair Cavanaugh inquired if there was a motion to continue/reopen the Public Hearing.

**Motion:** Clerk Mulvaney moved to continue/re-open the Public Hearing on February 24, 2020 at 6:30 PM. Vice-Chair O’Brien seconded the motion. Five (5) out of five (5) members voted in favor of the motion.

The regular meeting reconvened at 6:34 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

As Approved
Colleen Canning, Senior Clerk Planning and Conservation
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