

# Background Materials – March 9, 2026 – Planning Board Meeting

Prepared by Anne Capra, Director of Planning and Conservation, 3/6/26

Meeting will be live streamed on [SHTV Channel 15](#).

## **\*\* Sign Up for Planning Board Notifications \*\***

Receive email or text message when **Planning Board notices** are posted.  
Sign up for *CivicReady* notifications for **emergency notifications and weather alerts**.

<https://southhadley.org/517/Alerts-Notifications>

**Past Background Reports** for Planning Board meetings are posted online:

<https://www.southhadley.org/1274/Agenda-Background-Materials>

## **1) Open Comment Period**

This 10-minute period is set aside for the public to offer comments on items not on the posted agenda, in accordance with the adopted policy, as amended 9/11/23, posted on the Town of South Hadley Planning and Conservation Department webpage:

<https://www.southhadley.org/1286/11881/Planning-Board-Meeting-Policies?activeLiveTab=widget>)

**Action Needed:** Allow public to offer comments to the Board.

## **2) Minutes**

Planning and Conservation Coordinator Colleen Canning will forward draft minutes separately.

**Action Needed:** Vote to approve minutes presented.

## **3) Correspondence**

Correspondence is attached.

**Action Needed:** No action needed.

**6:30 PM - Public Hearing**

#### **4) 577 Granby Road Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Permit**

**Application online:** <https://www.southhadley.org/1526/Granby-Road-577---Professional-Office-Sp>

An application for Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management has been filed by James Falcone c/o TJF Properties LLP to construct two (2) 3,500 square foot one-story office buildings and associated parking lot and stormwater management system on a parcel with an existing commercial building at 577 Granby Road, Map 32 Parcel 42 in the Business the Business A-1 zoning district. [Note- The new Residential Mixed Use zoning district was not effective at the date this application was submitted and therefore is not applicable.]



Email 3/5/26 – Applicant’s Representative:

*Ahead of next week’s meeting, I wanted to share the current set which incorporates the majority of the water department comments. The only sheets that were updated are the Grading & Utility Plan (LC-121) and the detail sheet (LC-500). The big update was the pipe material change and confirming the ability to eliminate the sprinkler services. Remaining comments regarding connection fees and requirements of installation will be addressed when they start construction. That also applies to SHELD’s comment about service requirements. They are currently considering a 200amp service for each tenant (800amp total), but those details are still being worked out and will be part of the conversation once they get an electrician onboard. All the details just haven’t been figured out yet.*

**Use** - The proposed office space come sunder “Personal, business, and professional services” and is allowed by SPR in the BusA-1 zoning district.

**Building Setbacks** – Building setbacks are met: Side 15’, rear 50’

Total building coverage shall not exceed 30% - Existing = proposed buildings = 14,830 or 12.2% of site.

### **Parking Standards –**

Office uses= 3 spaces/1,000SF; Proposed 7,000 SF = 21 spaces required; project proposing 12 spaces.

The buildings appear to have some office space and some garage space for storage. Need clarification from the applicant about square feet per use to determine parking standards.

### **Department Comments**

Water District 1, J. Cyr – Detailed comments regarding water system design submitted to applicant 2/9/26. *[Note – applicant has revised plans based on comments, see above]*

BOH, S. Hart – Test pits and percs will need to be witnessed by BOH for all basins.

Building Department, J. Forgue – No comments from Building.

SHELD, M. Delmonte - The site is currently serviced by a 3-phase underground service from an existing utility pole/road crossing. Please provide service size, voltage and demands so the requirements can be reviewed. We are ok discussing with the customer once they have an electrician on board. The second highway crossing to one parcel would not be acceptable.

DPW, J. Broderick - DPW has no concerns regarding this proposal. FYI they will be charged for (4) sanitary tie-ins (\$1375 each, to accommodate the 4 new service connections. I would like to add that a traffic study might be needed, due to this property being located on Rt. 202.

FD1, Jay Houle - They have already made revisions to the site plan to allow for Fire Department access, and provisions to turn around at the end of the project. Based on the planned use of the buildings a fire sprinkler system should not be required. Jason Forgue would have to confirm this as it is in the Building Code. They proposed a fire hydrant at our request due to the long distance from Granby Road.

**Action Needed:** Open public hearing, discuss project with applicant, accept public comment, deliberate on standards for Site Plan Review, deliberate on standards for a stormwater permit, vote to issue Site Plan approval with conditions if warranted, vote to issue a Stormwater Permit with conditions if warranted, close public hearing.

**Recommended Motion #1:** *Move to find that the proposed stormwater management plan adequately protect the Town's water resources and is in compliance with the requirements of Chapter 200 Stormwater Management and hereby grant a Stormwater Management Permit [with conditions as set forth].*

**Recommended Motion #2:** *Move to find the proposed site plan complies with the criteria in 255-148 and grant Site Plan approval [with conditions as set forth].*

**7:00 PM - Public Hearing**

## **5) Zoning Bylaw Chapter 255-91 Floodplain Regulations Amendment**

Draft Bylaw online: <https://www.southhadley.org/1318/ProposedDraft-Bylaws>

A public hearing is being held to consider repeal and replacement of the South Hadley Zoning Bylaw Chapter 255-91 Floodplain Regulations. South Hadley is under mandate by FEMA and MassDCR (the State coordinating office for the National Flood Insurance Program) to update the existing floodplain regulations to meet current standards. We have been awaiting the release of updated flood maps for the lower Connecticut River before undertaking this because the currently effective FIRM maps for South Hadley are dated August 15, 1979. Preliminary maps for our area were released in August 2025 and DCR is advising municipalities to proceed with bylaw updates however, we are required to identify only the current effective maps in our bylaw. It may take FEMA/DCR several more years to finalize the updated maps, and when that happens, we will be required to revise our bylaw again to include the new effective map.

View the FEMA Floodplain Maps effective 8/15/1979:

<https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/14872/FEMA-Floodplain-Maps--Effective-August-15-1979>

Preliminary FEMA Map Viewer – Look up your property here and explore the online map viewer:

<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5852ea902db44e55bfce395799315f9c>

**Action Needed:** Hold the public hearing, accept public hearing, discuss any possible edits to the bylaw, vote to send the bylaw to ATM in May for adoption.

**Recommended Motion:** *Move to accept the proposed repeal and replace amendment to Chapter 255-91 Floodplain Regulations and submit to the Selectboard for placement on the warrant for the ATM to be held May 13, 2026.*

## **6) 136 East Street Flexible Development Special Permit and Stormwater Management Permit - Set Performance Guarantees**

The applicant has submitted price quotes for the construction of the stormwater system and the site landscaping:

Marion Excavating - Drainage \$465,832

Silverbrook Environmental - Landscaping and Buffer Zone Planting \$84,470

I am awaiting peer review of the quotes. The applicant has stated that the performance guarantee will be in the form of a Letter of Credit from his bank.

After the performance guarantee is set, the applicant will submit the Form H plan for endorsement.

**Recommendation:** Have the Board authorize the Planning and Conservation Director to set the performance guarantee based on either peer review approval, or the Director of the Department of Public Works.

## **7) 65 Old Lyman Road Site Plan Review and Stormwater Management Permit applications, New SHELD Administration Building - Authorize Peer Review**

Application online: <https://www.southhadley.org/1529/Old-Lyman-Road-65-and-Willimansett-Street>

SHELD has submitted an application for Site Plan Review and a Stormwater Management Plan for a new administrative facility and garage at 65 Old Lyman Road. The application includes a detailed Traffic Impact Study. I recommend that the Board engage peer review for the stormwater management permit as well as review of the Traffic Impact Study. The public hearing has been scheduled for April 13, 2026 at 6:30pm.

**Action Needed:** Vote to engage a third-party peer review consultant.

**Recommended Motion:** *Move to authorize the Director of Planning and Conservation to solicit price quotes for third party peer review of the Stormwater Management Plan and Traffic Impact Study submitted by SHELD for 65 Old Lyman Road from the two firms under contract with the Town for on call professional engineering and consulting services, and issue a Notice To Proceed with the firm submitting the lowest price quote.*

## **8) Discussion on Agricultural Bylaw Amendments**

Draft bylaws and Review and Analysis Report online:  
<https://www.southhadley.org/1318/ProposedDraft-Bylaws>

*\*This agenda item may be postponed due to the amount of time consumed by earlier agenda items. **A public listening session is scheduled for Monday, March 23<sup>rd</sup> at 6:30 PM.***

For many years, conflicts have arisen in regard to agricultural uses and the zoning bylaw, as well as Board of Health Regulations. To address these conflicts, the Planning and Conservation Department hired a consultant to review and prepare recommendations and proposed amendments to the zoning bylaw. These materials were then reviewed collaboratively by the Planning Director, Public Health Director and Building Commissioner and further revised. Last year, the draft amendments were reviewed by the Planning Board and determined to need further revision. A small working group was convened to review the draft bylaws and make further revisions, which are now presented to the Planning Board for consideration.

3/9/26 Planning Board meeting – If time allows a summary introduction to the draft bylaw amendments will be given, followed by Planning Board discussion.

3/23/26 Planning Board meeting @ 6:30 PM – Public Listening Session – Presentation by Planning Director on the draft bylaw amendments, comments from the public, Planning Board discussion

Next steps: Revise draft bylaw amendments, schedule public hearing, submit final amendment proposals to Town Meeting for adoption (May or November)

## 9) Planning & Conservation Department Report on Planning Projects and Development Updates

### Upcoming Planning Board Meetings

The following meetings are to be held in person at the South Hadley Senior Center/COA with Zoom virtual attendance permitted.

<b>3/23/26</b> <i>Nate's last meeting</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agricultural Bylaws Public Listening Session</li> </ul>
<b>4/13/26</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SHELD/65 Old Lyman Road SPR and Stormwater Permit Public Hearing</li> <li>• Sign Bylaw Amendment Public Hearing</li> </ul>
<b>4/27/26</b> <i>1<sup>st</sup> Meeting After Election</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Reorganization</li> <li>• Set Summer Meeting Schedule</li> </ul>
<b>5/4/26</b>	
<i>5/13/26</i>	<i>Annual Town Meeting</i>
<b>5/18/26</b>	

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

No additional business has been submitted to me as of the date of this background report.

**SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD  
LIST OF CORRESPONDENCES  
MARCH 9, 2026 REGULAR MEETING**

---

**Letters and Memos**

- Flyer (attached) for April 23 public hearing to consider MassDOT proposed improvements associated with the Main Street Reconstruction project.
- February 4 email (attached) from Jacqueline Dupre and Rudy Ternbach, Ferry St, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- February 5 email (attached) from Linda Sachs, 193 Woodbridge Street, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- January 26 letter (attached) from Linda Sachs, 193 Woodbridge Street, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- March 5 letter (attached) from Linda Sachs, 193 Woodbridge Street, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- Letter (attached) from Marc Desrosier, South Hadley resident, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- January 8 email (attached) from Alison Ingellis, Associate Director of External Operations at Mount Holyoke College, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- January 11 email (attached) from Joe Marois, Orion Farm, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- February 5 email (attached) from Marie Rohan, Precinct D, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- March 3 email (attached) from Nichole Zarba & Michael Bringnolo, 143 Woodbridge Street, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.
- February 3 email (attached) from Bobbie and Robert Salthouse, 20 The Knolls, regarding proposed bylaw changes to agricultural uses.

**Legal Notices**

*Amherst*

- 

*Chicopee*

- 

*Granby*

- Notice from the Granby Planning Board for a public hearing on March 9 to consider an application for Special Permit for used auto sales at Dressels Service Station located at 161 W State St.
- Notice from the Granby Planning Board for filing the following decisions: 1) Site Plan Review for a private garage/stable exceeding 1200 sq ft at 157 Amherst Street; 2) Site Plan Review for a private garage/stable exceeding 1200 sq ft at 127 Morgan Street; and 3) Site Plan Review for a private garage/stable exceeding 1200 sq ft at 35 Baggs Hill Road.

*Hadley*

- Notice from the Hadley Planning Board for filing special permit decision for senior housing apartments at 41 Russell Street.

*Holyoke*

- Notice from the Holyoke Ordinance Committee and Planning Board for a public hearing on March 24 to consider native plating requirements for new construction and aligning city with prohibited plant list.



# Design Public Hearing South Hadley – Main Street Reconstruction

## What is happening?

The purpose of this hearing is to provide the public with the opportunity to become fully acquainted with the proposed improvements associated with the Main Street Reconstruction project. All views and comments made at the hearing will be reviewed and considered to the maximum extent possible.

## How will this affect you?

The purpose of this project is to provide operational and safety improvements to Main Street in Downtown South Hadley and enhance pedestrian and bicycle access along the roadway. The project involves the addition of on-street bicycle lanes from Canal Street to Carew Street and a shared use path from Carew Street to the Chicopee City line. Work will also include sidewalk and curb ramp reconstruction and traffic signal improvements at the intersection of Main Street and Bridge Street (Route 116).

## When

Thursday, April 23, 2026  
6:00 PM

## Where

South Hadley Public Library, Community Room  
2 Canal Street  
South Hadley, MA 01075



Visit <https://www.mass.gov/orgs/highway-division/events> for more information or to view a recording of the presentation if you are unable to attend the meeting.



To ensure its meetings are accessible, MassDOT reasonably provides: translation, interpretation, modifications, accommodations, alternative formats, and auxiliary aids and services. To request such services, please contact MassDOT’s Chief Diversity and Civil Rights Officer at 857-368-8580 or [MassDOT.CivilRights@dot.state.ma.us](mailto:MassDOT.CivilRights@dot.state.ma.us). For adequate time to process such request, please make them as early as possible, ideally 10 days prior to the event.

Project inquiries may also be emailed to [MassDOTProjectManagement@dot.state.ma.us](mailto:MassDOTProjectManagement@dot.state.ma.us). Please submit any written statements regarding the proposed undertaking to: **Carrie A. Lavalley, P.E., Chief Engineer, MassDOT, 10 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02116, Attention: PROJECT MANAGEMENT, PROJECT FILE NO. 608785**

---

## Please Share

1 message

---

**Jacqueline Dupre** <jdupre118@verizon.net>

Wed, Feb 4, 2026 at 1:13 PM

Reply-To: Jacqueline Dupre <jdupre118@verizon.net>

To: Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>, "shart@southhadleyma.gov" <shart@southhadleyma.gov>

### Sent via electronic mail:

February 4, 2026

South Hadley Board of Health

South Hadley Agricultural Uses Bylaw Amendments Advisory Committee

We are respectfully requesting that Section 255-25 (H) (1-3) permitting the raising of livestock in residential zones all over town, no matter how small the property, be deleted in its entirety. We also ask that you review proposed changes to Section 255-26. I'm referring to the "Farm Related Activities/Uses" that are not farm related. I am specifically concerned about the permitting of amplified, outdoor music events. Initially this started as a few nights over the course of the summer. In the summer of 2025 that has increased to 2 nights every weekend, sometimes on Sundays, June-September. I live on Ferry Street, directly north west, through the woods. We tolerated the occasional event BUT every weekend is asking a lot. At one time we were able to enjoy the peacefulness of our back yard during the summer months. That is no longer possible. We shudder to think about the other activities, that have nothing to do with farming, i.e. batting cages, that could take place within the guidelines of this by-law with the potential to further disturb our enjoyment of the outdoors.

The proposed bylaw has the potential to negatively impact many residents. It's ridiculously long and complicated. I see no rush to get it to TM this May. There needs to be robust public input before a decision is made to put it on the books.

Thanks in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Dupre

Rudy Ternbach

---

## draft Agricultural Uses By law Section 255-25

1 message

---

**linda sachs** <lsachsnyc@earthlink.net>  
To: Planning Board <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Thu, Feb 5, 2026 at 8:07 AM

Dear Anne,

I am writing about Section 255-25 (H) (1-3) in the draft Agricultural Uses By law amendments, which you and the Advisory Committee will be considering tomorrow, February 6. I hope you pass on my concerns to the Committee and the Planning Board.

Section 255-25 (H)(1-3) contains a totally new permissible use: allowing livestock to be raised in Residence A-1, Residence A-2, Residence B, Residence C or wherever a home is located in "other zoning districts where permitted or nonconforming." In other words — nearly everywhere in Town, as long as the livestock is for the occupants "personal use."

(State law appears to permit the slaughter of livestock on residential property if for personal use.)

I hope you will delete Section 255-25 (H) (1-3) in its entirety from the draft! (I don't understand how the consultant could even put this in the draft!)

South Hadley does not have the money in its budget to regulate the raising and butchering of livestock in Residential Zones.

Responding to complaints, and keeping neighbors and their pets safe from nuisance and disease, and preventing the neglect and mistreatment of animals would require vastly increasing the number of municipal employees.

As you said at the January 14 Advisory Committee meeting "We're kinda suburban." Raising and butchering livestock is an incompatible use in Residential Zones of a "suburban" area, especially given the desire to increase housing density.

Allowing this use in South Hadley has the potential to ruin a neighborhood and home property values. I understand maybe a few egg-laying hens or a horse or pony. But anything else is a bad idea.

As defined in Section 255-10, "livestock" is incredibly broad: Pigs, cattle, goats, sheep, chickens, geese, ducks, mink and other fur bearing animals, to name just a few. These would not be pets. (The raising of fur-bearing animals was a huge problem overseas during the COVID epidemic. Because the practice is so cruel, many industrialized nations are banning it.)

The list of diseases that livestock carry is long and many are transmissible to humans.

Who is going to respond when a pig in a residential zone gets sick and dies or a goose that may have bird flu? Who is going to respond when the manure pile gets too big or too smelly or covered with flies? Who will respond when a resident's livestock is running through their yard or garden? Who will respond when livestock for personal use is being mistreated or neglected? What about waste from livestock slaughter?

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Linda Sachs  
Town Meeting member, Precinct D  
193 Woodbridge St.

January 26, 2026

Anne Capra, Director Planning and Conservation  
Members of the Agricultural Uses Bylaw Amendments Advisory Committee:  
Mark Cavanaugh  
Rebekah Cornell  
Sharon Hart  
Steve McCray  
Tom Reidy  
Chuck Scott  
Tina Smith  
Rob Watchilla  
South Hadley Town Hall  
South Hadley, MA 01075

Re: Amendments to Section 255-26, Agricultural Zone By-Law

Dear Anne and Committee members:

I appreciate being able to attend your meeting on January 14<sup>th</sup> when you reviewed the proposed amendments to 255-26.

I recognize that preserving agricultural land is a benefit to South Hadley and that “enhancing the economic viability of active farmland operations” is a good thing.

However, “enhancing the economic viability of active farmland operations” ought to be truly helping a farmer to farm. On the other hand if we’re going to help a farmer to increase their income by running entertainment businesses other than farming on farm land, so called “Outdoor Recreation,” then the welfare of residents must be considered. I fear that consideration is lacking.

During your meeting, you changed the 50 acre requirement for “Outdoor Recreation” to five acres. This change was made at the recommendation of a town employee. The friends and neighbors I’ve talked to who live in the Ag Zone are very disturbed, as I am, at the possibility of having “batting cages” on a mere five acres.

Batting cages in no way enhance the economic viability of farming. They may put money in a farmer’s bank account, but they do not enhance farming, and we ought to be up front about that.

Batting cages are a significant source of noise pollution. The incessant crack of the bats can readily drive neighbors insane.

The noise from batting cages is also harmful and disruptive to wildlife, especially to birds and other wildlife when they are nesting or raising young. The netting that surrounds many types of batting cages is an extreme hazard for birds, especially birds of prey and for other wildlife and wildlife babies.

Section 255-26 allows nearly two dozen businesses that are ‘Accessory to Commercial Agriculture’ or ‘Farm-Related.’ Why is it a good thing or a necessary thing to allow a nuisance like batting cages?

Why don’t we see how farmers do financially with these numerous other businesses before we start allowing commercial “Outdoor Recreation” on farms?

**Therefore, I am asking if you please remove batting cages as an allowed “Outdoor Recreation” in section 255-26.**

I live in the Ag zone, as do many other people. When I moved here, I expected farming. I live across the street from a cornfield owned by the Olesiuk farm family. I love the cornfield. Once a year a giant machine comes and spreads manure. Sure, it’s loud and smells for an hour or two. I don’t care because I expected such. Then all summer I get to watch the corn quietly growing, until it’s tall and beautiful and gives me added privacy from the traffic headed east on Pearl St.

At night the cornfield is blessedly dark and I have no lights shining into my house; neighborhood owls hunt mice without the interference from artificial lights; bats hunt insect pests; small mammals feed in peace and moths do their pollinator thing. Stars come out in a beautifully dark sky, dark as it is meant to be. Once a year a big noisy thresher comes and cuts all the corn down – it’s no bother as it doesn’t take long and it’s totally expected. All winter I have a view of the field, especially lovely in the snow, and a view of gorgeous sunsets.

If you do not remove the proposed batting cages, I urge you to have concern and compassion for residents and restore to 50 acres the land required for such a noxious, non-farm related outdoor activity.

I also urge you not to allow miniature golf on less than 50 acres and to prohibit artificial lighting, in other words, operating after dark.

I grew up in rural Ohio, surrounded by farms, fields and forests. They were my playgrounds and I loved them all. I went on hayrides and blueberry, blackberry and apple picking. There were no batting cages. Allowing batting cages in an agricultural area is not a form of progress. They are retrograde. Allowing them on farms evinces a disdain for residents' peaceful enjoyment of their homes and for the welfare of wildlife which are also inhabitants of our town.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Linda Sachs  
193 Woodbridge Street  
South Hadley, MA 01075  
[lsachsnyc@earthlink.net](mailto:lsachsnyc@earthlink.net)

**Linda Sachs  
193 Woodbridge St.  
South Hadley 01075**

March 5, 2026

**TO:**

South Hadley Planning Board  
Diane Mulvaney, Chair  
Nate Therien, Vice Chair  
Brad Hutchinson, Clerk  
Robert Szklarz  
Rob Watchilla  
Planning Director Anne Capra

**RE:** Draft Agricultural Uses Bylaw, Accessory to Residential Use, 255-25 (E) (1-5)

Dear Planning Board Members and Planning Director:

As you conduct your discussions on The Agricultural Uses Bylaw Amendments, I kindly request that you consider deleting 255-25 (E) (1-5) which as of this writing, is in the February 23 draft.

This section would permit an Objectionable Use -- specifically the raising of farm animals/livestock as an accessory to residential use, primarily for residents' personal use,

I attended the January and February meetings of the Agricultural Uses Bylaw Amendments Advisory Committee. The Committee's clear advice was to prohibit this use, except for poultry and horses. The Board of Health and Health Department representatives on the Committee agreed with this advice.

Keeping livestock as an accessory to residential use is so problematic, that the Advisory Committee member representing the MA Department of Agricultural Resources (MDAR) told the Committee in February: "The chance of mistreatment of non-farm livestock is very high."

Allowing livestock to be raised (and butchered) as an accessory to residential use has the potential to ruin a neighborhood and home property values. It provides no benefit to our town or the greater good. (I understand allowing some chickens or a horse/pony. But no other farm animals.)

Attempting to adequately regulate raising livestock as an accessory to residential use, ensuring the humane treatment of animals, and responding to neighbors' complaints would require hiring more municipal employees. South Hadley does not have the budget or staff to handle the increased work load.

This accessory residential use poses a threat to the fundamental right of neighboring homeowners to the peaceful enjoyment of their homes. It would create nuisances, strife with neighbors, health and environmental threats

South Hadley's Budget Task Force noted that a dearth of high-end residential properties hurts our tax base. Who will want to build or buy a high end home when the neighbors are raising and even butchering pigs?

If a resident wants pork chops but can't afford them, our local food pantry, Neighbors Helping Neighbors, distributes beef, chicken, pork, fish, milk, eggs, and cheese twice a week.

Raising farm animals as an accessory to residential use is not adequately regulated under South Hadley's laws. It would be largely an honor system where we could hope and pray that residents raising pigs or baby calves for veal would do the right thing. (The number of allowed calves and piglets would be unlimited according to this draft.)

Who is going to ensure that non-farm animals are sheltered from cold, wind, sun and precipitation; properly fed and given clean water (unfrozen in the winter); vaccinated and given veterinary care? Who will monitor the proper storage of feed to prevent vermin and rodents? What municipal employee will be responding when a neighbor can't stand the smell or flies from a mismanaged pig manure pile? Will the police respond if an animal is being abused or neglected, a felony under MA law?

As defined in Section 255-10, "Livestock" is incredibly broad: Pigs, cattle, goats, sheep, chickens, roosters, ducks, geese, mink and other fur bearing animals, to name just a few.

The list of diseases that livestock carry is long and many are transmissible to humans. For example: Rabies, COVID, Bovine TB, ringworm, bird flu, botulism.

Since state law permits residents to butcher livestock in their yards, as long as it's for personal use, I'm wondering which municipal employee will respond to complaints stemming from cruelty or noise from that activity? What about the waste from the slaughter? What if a pig or ducks are being slaughtered 25 feet from a neighbor, within earshot and eyeshot of their home?

I hope you will consider these reasons and the advice of the Advisory Committee to delete 255-25 (E) (1-5) and prohibit the raising of livestock (other than poultry and horses) as an accessory to residential use anywhere within the Town of South Hadley.

Thank you,

Linda Sachs  
193 Woodbridge Street

---

Anne Capra  
Director of Planning  
Town of South Hadley

Dear Anne,

I am writing to in regards to the Advisory Meeting on the Agricultural zoning bylaw. I found the meeting informative and helpful in understanding the proposal.

The next meeting will cover Agricultural Uses Accessory to Residential Use, 255-25. In that section I have a couple of questions that I would like clarification on.

Paragraph B states that the keeping and raising of livestock is prohibited in all districts except Agricultural and Industrial A. Paragraph E seems to rule out the use in Industrial A.

Paragraph H sub paragraph 2 seems to make provisions for the keeping of Livestock in Residences A-1,A-2, B and C zoning districts.

Could you clarify these inconsistencies for me?

Thank you,  
Marc Desrosiers

---

## Re: Equestrian Center and Zoning Bylaw Updates

1 message

---

**Alison Ingellis** <aingellis@mtholyoke.edu>  
To: Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Thu, Jan 8, 2026 at 1:20 PM

Hi Anne,

Thanks for reaching out. I am happy to assist in whatever way I can. In looking at the bylaw standards it all appears reasonable but I would encourage you to cross reference the Massachusetts laws regarding riding academies for continuity, specifically the minimum land requirement and licensing required to operate a riding academy. Michael Gold is the contact for all things equestrian at the department of Agriculture and I am sure he would be happy to offer his thoughts. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance, always happy to hop on a call as well.

Best,  
Ali

On Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 2:26 PM Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov> wrote:

Hi Ali,

Josh Powers provided your contact information to me. The South Hadley Planning Board is working on updates to the Zoning Bylaw regarding agricultural uses. Through this process, we have conducted a comprehensive review of the Zoning Bylaw to understand how and when various agricultural uses are regulated. Stables and riding academies are currently regulated under [Section 255-26](#). Since the collete is one of two commercial equestrian facilities in town, we are seeking your feedback as to whether or not these standards continue to be appropriate and if any changes are needed. Our zoning distinguishes between equestrian uses accessory to residential uses versus "riding academies" which would come under "commercial agriculture".

255-26 Stables and Riding Academies  
[Town of South Hadley, MA Supplemental District Regulations](#)

Please let me know if you would like to schedule to discuss this further before offering any comments.

Thanks,

Anne Capra

--

Anne Capra, AICP  
Director, Planning & Conservation  
Town of South Hadley  
116 Main Street | South Hadley, MA 01075  
(413) 538-5030 x6128  
[acapra@southhadleyma.gov](mailto:acapra@southhadleyma.gov)

**Learn more about South Hadley's community plans [HERE](#).**

\*Do not print this email unless necessary

--

Alison Ingellis '07  
Associate Director of External Operations  
Mount Holyoke College Equestrian Center  
Dressage Team Coach  
413-538-3442  
[Equestrian Center Website](#)



**Confidentiality Statement:** This email message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual(s) to which it was addressed for internal communications only. Disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance to the content of this message by the intended recipient or others is prohibited. If you have received this email message by mistake, please delete the message and notify the sender. Thank you for respecting confidentiality.

---

**RE: Orion Farm**

1 message

---

**Joe Marois** <Joem@maroiscc.com>  
To: Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Sun, Jan 11, 2026 at 2:38 PM

Anne,

It was nice to see you at the Orion Farm, I hope it was informative.

I have reviewed your attachment, 255-26 and generally have the following comments:

The indicated set back requirements are too arbitrary and should be site/use specific.

Sufficient parking should be considered by use, e.g Private Farm, Lessons, Spectators, and should also be site specific.

More important, however, is the lack of reference to the MGL Right To Farm Act which the Town of South Hadley has adopted.

Joe

---

**From:** Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 2:29 PM  
**To:** Joe Marois <Joem@maroiscc.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Orion Farm

Hi Joe,

Do you have any time tomorrow (Thursday) or Monday?

The South Hadley Planning Board is working on updates to the Zoning Bylaw regarding agricultural uses. Through this process, we have conducted a comprehensive review of the Zoning Bylaw to understand how and when various agricultural uses are regulated. Stables and riding academies are currently regulated under [Section 255-26](#). Since Orion is one of two commercial equestrian facilities in town, we are seeking your feedback as to whether or not these standards continue to be appropriate and if any changes are needed. Our zoning distinguishes between equestrian uses accessory to residential uses versus "riding academies" which would come under "commercial agriculture". I believe you would be a riding academy.

255-26 Stables and Riding Academies  
[Town of South Hadley, MA Supplemental District Regulations](#)

Thanks,  
Anne

---

## Agriculture amendments

1 message

---

**MARIE ROHAN** <noon31@aol.com>  
To: Anne Capra <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Thu, Feb 5, 2026 at 8:37 AM

Some of my questions in no particular order:

Legal language is hard to interpret unless you do it on a regular basis.

New ideas are challenging

1. Who will monitor vaccinations are current on every pet, livestock, poultry, reptile, bird kept by residents
2. Given the rise in the cost of every thing I believe an up to \$100 fine is too low.
3. If there is an increase in slaughtering animals for consumption, will this have any impact on the towns waste management systems
4. Why are some situations exempt from site plan review
5. What is a non-exempt farm stand and who makes sure each little farm stand has a permit
6. I have talked with some residents and they independent of Linda Sachs said no to batting cages on farm land
7. Concerts, traffic, and hours of operation and volume management: in the summer I can hear concerts from dockside and the years tavern, and the town commons  
While most of the performers are good it is not tangle wood- level.  
How will profitability and livability be managed for the farmer(s) and the neighbors
8. On first reading the amendments read like an attempt to substitute a variety of farm animals for human animals but continue to work on infill.
9. I know legal language is what it is but I don't understand a lot of this amendment,

Marie Rohan  
Town meeting member precinct D

---

## Agricultural Zoning Draft – Request to Stay Involved

1 message

---

**Nicole Zarba** <nzarba@gmail.com>

Tue, Mar 3, 2026 at 8:37 AM

To: "acapra@southhadleyma.gov" <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Cc: Michael Brignolo <mcbignolo@gmail.com>

Dear Ms. Capra,

Thank you for sending the notice regarding the proposed amendments to §255-25. I appreciate the opportunity to review the draft and stay involved in the process.

As a property owner in an Agricultural zoning district, I am particularly interested in how the proposed rooster prohibition interacts with the draft's definition of "Agricultural Uses, Exempt" under M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 3.

While I do not currently keep a rooster, I do have chickens and appreciate the importance of roosters for flock protection and in maintaining a self-sustaining flock.

My understanding is that agricultural activities conducted on land zoned for agricultural use may qualify as exempt from local zoning prohibition, subject to reasonable regulation. Would small-scale poultry, such as our flock, on an Agricultural-zoned parcel be considered an exempt agricultural use under the draft, or treated as an accessory residential use subject to the proposed rooster prohibition?

I would also be interested to know whether the Agricultural Commission was consulted during the drafting of this language.

Please keep me informed as this proposal moves forward. I appreciate the Town's efforts to clarify the bylaw and look forward to the upcoming discussions.

Thank you,  
Nicole Zarba & Michael Brignolo  
143 Woodbridge Street  
nzarba@gmail.com

---

## Proposed agricultural bylaws

1 message

---

**Bobbie** <bobbiesalthouse@gmail.com>

Tue, Feb 3, 2026 at 11:49 AM

To: "acapra@southhadleyma.gov" <acapra@southhadleyma.gov>

Hi Anne,

We have been made aware of two problematic issues in the Agricultural Bylaw Amendments currently being proposed for acceptance by the Planning Board and if approved, next town meeting.

Article 255-25 proposes allowing all types of livestock throughout residential areas in South Hadley, the other, 225-26, calls for batting cages in agricultural areas of 5 or more acres.

Risk of transmission of bird flu and other animal disease among animals and humans could be increased from chickens and ducks etc. in residential backyards, and there are other health risks associated with excrement in poorly maintained animal dwellings and yards. Who in our local government would be responsibility for monitoring and ensuring safe conditions for both animals and humans?

Batting cages (and any kind of endeavor that causes disturbing repetitive noise that can impact neighbors' mental health) must be considered in the proposed zoning changes.

Thank you for your interest in these issues that affect health and quality of life for residents. I have written to the Health Department separately. Please forward this letter to the working group and Planning Board so they can be considered in upcoming discussions of these bylaw changes.

Sincerely,

Bobbie and Robert Salthouse  
20 The Knolls, South Hadley, MA 01075