

Joint Public Hearing Minutes
Stormwater Authority & Planning Board
SITE PLAN REVIEW – LYMAN TERRACE REVITALIZATION
 (meeting is being recorded)

On Tuesday, September 23, 2014, the Holyoke Planning Board held a Joint Public Hearing with the Stormwater Authority regarding a Site Plan Review for the Lyman Terrace Revitalization submitted by the Holyoke Housing Authority. The meeting was held at 6:00 p.m. in the 4th Floor Conference Room of the City Hall Annex, 20 Korean Veterans Plaza, Holyoke, Massachusetts.

Attendance:

Planning Board

John Kelley Chairman
 Mimi Panitch Vice-Chairman
 Mark Joy..... Secretary
 Christian LaChapelle Member
 Eileen Regan Member

Planning Department

Marcos Marrero..... Director
 Jeffrey Burkott Principal Planner
 Claire Ricker Senior Planner
 Sharon Konstantinidis..... Head Clerk

Stormwater Authority

Dave Moore Chairman
 Jose Garcia Member
 Matthew Sokop City Engineer

Others Present

Anne Darcy Holyoke Housing Authority (HHA)
 Matthew Mainville Holyoke Housing Authority (HHA)
 Jay Viamari Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers
 Dan Boulais Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers
 Chris Scheufler Copley Wolff, Design Group

Others Present

Michelle Williams MassLive
 Ed Owens 120 Front Street
 John Furman Vanesse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
 Marya Piasecki DHK Architects, Inc.
 Rachana Crowley The Community Builders, Inc. Northampton

JOHN KELLEY, at 6:05 p.m., called for a motion to open the Planning Board Public Hearing. A motion was made by MIMI PANITCH and seconded by EILEEN REGAN. The motion carried 5-0.

DAVE MOORE opened the Stormwater Authority Public Hearing.

MATTHEW MAINVILLE thanked the City Departments and Planning staff for their thorough review and comments. He stated that the current 167 unit development (proposed 160) has been in the planning stages for years. The planning process with Mass Development & Housing has been completed as well as a "Request For Proposal" to secure a development partner. He introduced John Furman, Marya Piasecki and Dan Boulais.

JOHN FURMAN explained that the project team consisted of himself as the VHB Civil Designer for the stormwater and utility portion, DHK Architects for building related plans, Copki Wolff for Landscaping, VHB for site utilities and stormwater, and Tighe & Bond for everything outside the site (utilities, sidewalks, etc.).

JOHN FURMAN stated that there are two Finding of Impracticalities submitted:

- 1) Recharge of the Stormwater. OTO performed the testing (0.4 feet per day); It was determined that infiltration was non-existent; and
- 2) Total Suspended Solids Removal. Six new driveways are proposed which would connect all of the streets. The majority of the site is roof structure; all the water is collected into downspouts reducing the opportunity for erosion. The site is considered clean.

A waiver was requested for:

- 1) A performance bond since the work to be done was by another City entity;
- 2) Section 402 #14 Low Impact Development techniques which encompass how to treat stormwater and reduce runoff.

MR FURMAN stated that none of the remedies were applicable; and
3) Section 502, Low Impact Development techniques, is repetitive of Section 402.

MR FURMAN reviewed sheet C_4 of the plans. He stated, with regards to meeting the 25% reduction requirement, a storm chamber unit was proposed which would allow water to quickly enter and slowly exit.

MR FURMAN reviewed the comment letter dated September 15, 2014 submitted by the Department of Public Works. He stated with regards to:

#1, a Performance Bond was requested.

#2, sweeping would be done four times a year.

#3, schedules would be available at a later date and requested that the requirement be a condition of approval.

JEFFREY BURKOTT asked if the removal work would be limited to Phase 1 only or include Phase 2 as well (i.e. tree removal, sidewalks). MR FURMAN responded that Phase 2 was contingent upon funding therefore would be limited to Phase 1. MATTHEW MAINVILLE added that most likely work in the right-of-way of Phase 1 & 2 would be completed under the Mass Works Grant and on-site removal and construction would be Phase 1 until additional funding was secured.

#4, inspections during construction would be forthcoming.

#5, will be determined.

#6, will consider traps in the Landscape area drains.

#7, all existing trees are proposed to be removed as the entire footprint will be disturbed. An extensive landscaping plan will be provided. Reasonable efforts will be made to meet number 1, 2, and 3.

#8, off site TSS removal alternatives would require an agreement with another entity. HHA prefers to oversee the system as staff is on-site.

#9, the listed criteria were mostly statements. MATT SOKOP asked if HHA could address meeting the 80% TSS removal in the structures in the parking area. JOHN FURMAN responded that the catch basin systems all have hooded outfitters and perhaps they could look at adding a Stormceptor, although twice as expensive.

#10, A Finding of Impracticability has been requested.

#11, A draft of the O&M plan was submitted.

DAN BOULAIS stated that Tighe & Bond was to review everything within the right-of-way relative to replacing the concrete sidewalks, curbing, 4-foot tree belts, and catch basins.

Oliver Street – from the VHB discharge point, allotted for a drainage manhole, new piping and catch basins.

Hampden Street – is the same; sanitary would be separated out.

John Street – work is limited to the north side of the street and would accommodate what is to take place as part of the Front Street improvements.

EDWARD OWENS asked for clarification regarding where the stormwater would go once it reached the new system. JOHN FURMAN replied that the water flows to a catch basin, enters the underground chamber and is detained. When the water backs up it will flow into the new piping system designed by VHB.

EDWARD OWENS asked if the rising water situation would become worse with the new changes. JOHN FURMAN replied that the situation would change for the better even with the additional pavement and rooftops. Per the Stormwater regulations, they are required to reduce the stormwater flow by 25%.

DAVE MOORE called for a motion to continue the Stormwater Authority Public Hearing until a time agreed by the Planning Board. JOHN FURMAN requested October 14th as they would need that time to address all the Departmental comments. MARCOS MARRERO suggested Sept 30th.

The Stormwater Authority continued the Public Hearing until September 30, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.

JOHN FURMAN stated that the submittal included: an application for Site Plan Review; a Special Permit for Multiple Principal Structures as a community building is proposed in the center of the development; and a Special Permit for a Reduction in Parking from 270 required spaces down to 24 proposed spaces although the current development has no existing parking.

MARYA PIASECKI stated that the preference of the tenants was to retain the existing number of units but increase their size. Proposed are additions in the yards of each unit ultimately increasing the square footage to include a new kitchen, storage area, bath, and washer/dryer area. Eight units will be handicap accessible; all units will enter from a ground level

entrance. She added that a new community building will be erected to include tenant meeting space, computer lab, meeting offices and a management area.

JOHN KELLEY asked if the markings on the plans were the 24 designated parking spaces. MARYA PIASECKI replied that the markings were graphics representing the no parking zones; signs would be installed. A legend would be added to the plans indicating the markings.

CHRIS SCHEUFLER stated that 4 parking spaces per new street have been created within the boundaries of the property. MATTHEW MAINVILLE added that they may approach the City Council and request the side streets (Hampden, Oliver, and John) be designated for "residents only". JEFFREY BURKOTT noted that there were 44 off-site parking spaces identified on the plans. JAY VIAMARI responded that due to comments received from the DPW, the amount of off-site parking spaces will be slightly reduced.

The color renderings were viewed (page A-601-605 of the Development Impact Statement). MARYA PIASECKI stated that the building additions were of lap sided material; the color has not been chosen but will complement the existing brick. Four foot fencing will encompass the additions. The community building is one-story and intended to look different than the residential units.

CHRIS SCHEUFLER provided an overview relative to the Landscaping. He stated that the redevelopment includes the addition of drives with a series of steps going to the front doors of each unit. Adjacent to the steps are sloped planting beds; there is a 6-7 foot grade change. He added there were new trees, decorative shrubs, and plantings in front of each unit were low maintenance ground cover. Larger trees were to be located at the community building and play area; a community garden space is also proposed. To create an entryway, each unit has its own steel fencing and gate. The backyard has a unit separator fence to provide personal space. Interior site lighting would consist of post top lighting made of durable and simple material while remaining appealing.

MR SCHEUFLER stated that on each drive a dumpster location was set into a sloped planted area with a retaining wall on three sides. A fence exceeding the dumpster height was proposed on the three sides to shield from the pedestrians; a double gate with an opaque fence would be on the front side. Details needed to be finalized for pedestrian access and refuse pickup.

MATTHEW MAINVILLE stated that comments were received from the Police Department (9/5) stating that there were no traffic pattern concerns; and the Fire Department (9/10) raised concerns relative to the road width and turning radii. MR MAINVILLE added that the plans will be amended to reflect the road width changes.

MIMI PANITCH asked if the intent to remove all the existing trees was a financial decision based on the inability to work around them or were the trees just in the way. CHRIS SCHEUFLER responded that although they want to save most trees, the addition of the new drives and retaining walls make it difficult to work with a tree in the way; trees do not do well when disturbed. He added that the proposed interior trees were ornamental and 12-15 feet high. The canopy trees around the play area would be approximately 18 feet high.

MIMI PANITCH asked the location of the HVAC units. MARYA PIASECKI replied that there were only air conditioning units at the community building and not at the apartments as there was no room structurally for new ductwork.

JOHN KELLEY asked if staff had any comments. JEFFREY BURKOTT replied that initial Planning Department comments could be addressed at the staff level and discussed at the continuation of the Public Hearing.

DAN BOULAIS displayed the plans to review improvements to the sidewalks, crosswalks, utilities, curbing, and tree belts from John Street to Lyman Street. He stated that there would be a 5 foot bike lane on Hampden Street that would eventually tie into the existing bike lane at the upper portion Hampden Street.

JOHN KELLEY asked if there were plans to connect a walking/bike lane from the proposed Depot Square project. MARCOS MARRERO responded that a portion of Dwight Street recently had improvements relative to sidewalks, lighting, and installation of trees. The southern portion of Dwight Street will also be done. The Front Street improvement project was discussing a potential bike path, but due to the loss of Dwight Street parking spaces, a "road share" option would be proposed. A Bike Committee has been creating a master map for bike lanes.

CLAIRE RICKER asked if consideration of a bike path or road share on Lyman had been considered. DAN BOULAIS replied that a road share on Lyman Street had not been considered as their purview was Hampden Street.

At this time, JOHN KELLEY asked if there were any members of the public that wished to speak in favor or against the proposed project.

EDWARD OWENS stated that many of the improvements directly affect him as the only immediate abutter. Parking was a contentious issue. The "No Parking" and "Tow Zone" signs do not deter motorists from parking; "Resident only" signs will create a nightmare and the free parking spaces for residents in the adjacent garage are too far away. He has no problem having illegally parked cars towed. He spoke in favor of the project although the parking should be addressed prior to moving forward. He added that another issue was the pet owners that do not pick up after their dogs. Perhaps an area could be designated for pets.

There being no further comments to come before the Planning Board, at 7:55 p.m. JOHN KELLEY called for a motion to continue the Public Hearing to September 30, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. A motion was made by MIMI PANITCH and seconded by EILEEN REGAN. The motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Joy, Secretary
Holyoke Planning Board