

Joint Public Hearing Minutes
Stormwater Authority & Planning Board
SITE PLAN REVIEW – LYMAN TERRACE REVITALIZATION continuation
SPECIAL PERMIT, MULTIPLE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURES
SPECIAL PERMIT, REDUCTION FROM THE PARKING REQUIREMENTS
STORMWATER PERMIT
 (meeting is being recorded)

On Tuesday, October 28, 2014, the Holyoke Planning Board continued the Joint Public Hearing with the Stormwater Authority (Sept 23 and Sept 30), regarding a Site Plan Review and Stormwater Permit for the Lyman Terrace Revitalization submitted by the Holyoke Housing Authority. The meeting was held at 6:30 p.m. in the 4th Floor Conference Room of the City Hall Annex, 20 Korean Veterans Plaza, Holyoke, Massachusetts.

Planning Board

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

Planning Staff

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)
 Dan Boulais Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers (T&B)
 Jay Viamari Tighe & Bond, Consulting Engineers (T&B)
 John Furman Vanesse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB)
 Alberto Cardenas DHK Architects

Others Present

Edward Owens 120 Front Street
 Zan Bross The Community Builders, Inc. Northampton
 Chris Schultz Copley Wolff, Boston, MA

MIMI PANITCH, at 6:30 p.m., called for a motion to reopen the Planning Board Public Hearing. A motion was made by EILEEN REGAN and seconded by JOHN KELLEY. The motion carried 5-0.

DAVID MOORE opened the Stormwater Authority Public Hearing.

JOHN FURMAN stated that Tighe & Bond and VHB met with the City Engineer on September 30th to address outstanding comments. He submitted and reviewed the response letter dated October 21, 2014 and noted that T&B would address details within the municipal right-of-way and VHB would address those on-site. He stated, with regards to #2, that the request was to redirect the stormwater from the on-site outlet onto Lyman Street to assist the City with the TSS removal. The standard catch basins were designed a deep sump with hooded outlets. The request was to substitute the catch basins with Stormceptor units to increase the TSS removal. As a result there was no longer a need to redirect the outlets onto Lyman Street. In addition, an alternate standard collection system was suggested instead of their extensive stormwater management system to provide an opportunity to mitigate the stormwater impacts elsewhere; doing so would be difficult on abutting property.

JOHN FURMAN stated that they were requesting a waiver of a Performance Bond and a Finding of Impracticality due to existing poor soil conditions. The 25% reduction has been maintained, a draft of the Stormwater Management was submitted, and a draft of the Stormwater Management Plan and Operation and Maintenance Plan (O&M) with the Holyoke Housing Authority. MATT SOKOP stated that within the Notice of Decision would be the request that the TSS sizing be provided to the Stormwater Authority for the structures.

Members of the public were asked to speak in favor or against, or to ask questions relative to stormwater related concerns.

EDWARD OWEN asked where would the off site water main be located and questioned what would happen if the holes in the stormwater drainage system became blocked. MR FURMAN replied that there would be no main shut of and the inlets are protected by a debris trap.

The Stormwater Authority closed the Public Hearing, opened the Stormwater Meeting, read the Notice of Decision, and approved the issuance of a Stormwater Permit.

MATTHEW SOKOP reviewed the 6 comments outlined in the SWA response letter dated October 28, 2014. JOHN FURMAN stated that they would comply.

JEFFREY BURKOTT reviewed the Planning Department outstanding comment letter dated October 28, 2014.

Regarding #7, he replied that there was a discrepancy between Sheet C-9 and A-001 as to what the direction of travel was. ALBERTO CARDENAS replied that the direction of travel would be clockwise as laid out on the plan. FURMAN stated that the Fire Department was able to enter from either direction.

Regarding #9, he asked that a letter be submitted to verify that the number of plantings proposed and noted that the species used are non-invasive. CHRIS COPLEY stated that a letter would be forth coming.

JEFFREY BURKOTT asked how many of the existing trees are proposed to be saved. The Landscaping Plan was viewed. CHRIS COPLEY answered that every tree was represented by a circled color; street trees-yellow, onsite trees-green, and the 5 potential trees to save are blue. The majority of the existing trees can not be saved due to the grading. Phase 1 will be completed prior to removing the existing trees of Phase 2. JEFFREY BURKOTT added that the Planning Department should be notified to schedule an inspection prior to the installation of the plantings.

Regarding #11, he asked relative to the pedestrian walkway if there were construction requirements for the proposed 3-1/2 foot high dumpster enclosure and, if not, was it high enough to keep debris out and maintain pedestrian safety. ALBERTO CARDENAS stated that the 42" height requirement was proposed.

The location of the Community Building dumpster was viewed on the map. ALBERTO CARDENAS stated that the dumpster would be rolled out for disposal as it was stored within the building; the slope was maneuverable.

Regarding #22, he asked if the Building Design plans dated 10/21 were the final design plans. ALBERTO CARDENAS stated there would be further development to the building; the footprint would not change. The revised plans are only a schematic. Based on the comments by staff and the public, the revised plan included a new roof configuration, and new window and building materials to become more scaled to the surrounding buildings.

JEFFREY BURKOTT asked if the colors of the new additions would be integrated into the Community Center. ALBERTO CARDENAS responded that the factors to take into consideration will be the surrounding brick, the color of the proposed additions and the Community Building to create a harmonious project.

JOHN KELLEY asked for an update relative to considering eliminating the proposed Community Center, the creation of additional onsite parking, and use an adjacent building for a Community Center. He added that the project as proposed was overcrowded and congested. The need for parking was eminent.

EILEEN REGAN stated that she agreed that additional parking was needed. She added that any money saved could be utilized for central air conditioning units. She did not agree that the structures of the building could not be air conditioned. There are "mini split" units that would serve this project well. Air conditioning would be a compromise for not having a Community Building.

ZAN BROSS recognized that parking was an issue and noted that the Community Building is the heart of the site and would not be a benefit if it were located elsewhere.

MIMI PANITCH asked if there was feedback from the residents. ANNE DARCY responded that the residents were strongly in favor of a Community Center; parking was not their priority as many do not own automobiles. MIMI PANITCH added that the percentage of residents that do not have a car would be a helpful tool in approving the Special Permit for a Reduction from the Parking Requirements.

JOHN FURMAN stated that central parking on site had been considered. The difference in the grade between the buildings, which is in excess of 10 feet, and a required retaining wall around a central parking lot, would gain only 25 spaces. Since the original submittal, they have restriped the area and gained 7-9 spaces on street in addition to the 24 provided on the internal driveways. He clarified that the initial plans, having zero on site parking, proposed 24 parking spaces. The amended submittal gained an additional 7 spaces for a total of 31 parking spaces proposed.

MR FURMAN stated that with regards to the comment that there would be a cost savings by eliminating the Community Building and install air conditioning units, that there was a higher cost associated with a central parking lot.

EDWARD OWENS asked if the concept of "resident only" parking was still being considered. ANNE DARCY replied no.

EDWARD OWENS stated that he believed that the regulations required 1-1/2 parking spaces per unit. The development proposing only 24 on site parking spaces for 160 units was not acceptable. He suggested that the developers visit the area and see the parking situation between the Department of Transitional Assistance and the students competing for parking. He offered his 4,000+ square foot building as a potential location for a Community Building. He thanked John Furman, Marcos Marrero, and Jeffrey Burkott for taking his opinion into consideration. He was opposed to the project until the parking issue was addressed.

JEFFREY BURKOTT continued reviewing the letter dated October 28, 2014.

Regarding #22, asked the location of the HVAC units to be installed at the Community Center and what was used for shielding. ALBERTO CARDENAS stated that the location was not determined, but he would be cognizant of proper and safe shielding.

EILEEN REGAN asked the Board members if they wanted the inclusion of air conditioning on the plans. JOHN KELLEY stated that central air would be esthetically pleasing and safer. MIMI PANITCH stated that not having air conditioning was a potential health concern. JOHN KELLEY reiterated his preference of internal parking instead of a community building for a win/win. MARCOS MARRERO stated that internal facilities were not within the purview of the Site Plan Review requirements.

ZAN BROSS responded that they would look into the suggestion of air conditioning. EILEEN REGAN added that the potential for 320 window air conditioning units was not environmentally friendly.

Adjournment

Due to further information to come before the Board and a scheduled Joint Public Hearing with the City Council Ordinance Committee, at 6:50 p.m., a motion to continue the Public Hearing until December 9, 2014 at 7:00 p.m. was made by MARK JOY and seconded by EILEEN REGAN. The motion carried 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark Joy, Secretary
Holyoke Planning Board