

PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF GREENFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS
14 Court Square, Greenfield, MA 01301

413-772-1548
413-772-1309 (fax)



PLANNING BOARD MEETING **Minutes of November 5, 2009** **Greenfield Police Station**

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. with the following members:

PRESENT: Roxann Wedegartner, Chair; Linda Smith, Clayton Sibley.

ABSENT: Alternate Tim Gorts

Members of the public: Rachana Crowley, Project Manager for Community Builders, and Mr. John Halsey.

MOTION: Moved by Smith, seconded Sibley and voted 3:0 to approve the minutes of October 15, 2009.

Mary Newton, Clerk arrived at 7:10 pm.

MOTION: Moved by Smith, seconded by Newton and voted 4:0 to approve the minutes from the Special Planning Board Meeting of October 20, 2009.

Jim Allen arrived at 7:24 pm

Action Items:

ZBA Recommendations:

- a. **TCB Leyden Woods Limited Partnership (AKA Leyden Woods) - Request for a special permit pursuant to Section(s) 200-4.3(C3), 200-5.3(E2), 200-6.5(A4), 200-7.2, 200-8.3, and 200-8.4 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow 1) the redevelopment of a multi-family use property, 2) up to a 20 percent reduction in dimensional requirements for building separation, and 3) a reduction in the number of required parking spaces for property located at 24 Aster Court, which is located in the Suburban Residential (RB) Zoning District.**

Site Plan for Leyden Woods was discussed. Rachana Crowley made a brief verbal presentation of the proposed new construction. She stated that there are currently 201 units in Leyden Woods and the new plan would call for 180 units with more green space and better placement of the buildings to avoid wetlands and areas of poor drainage. The question was raised as to how long this project would take and how many phases were planned. Ms. Crowley stated that there are 3-4 phases planned. Residents would be relocated as the new structures were completed and the old buildings demolished. Construction is expected to start Fall of 2010 or Spring of 2011 and take 5 yrs. to complete all phases. Wedegartner brought up issues of snow removal / storage appearing to be in front of the buildings. Ms. Crowley did not know of any alternate plans but stated that issues of wetlands were involved if treated snow was stored on the other side of the parking areas. Smith questioned the parking spaces, especially regarding Aster Court. A 20% reduction is planned. Smith and Newton had questions about the exterior appearance of the buildings themselves as this was not depicted in the plans offered for reviewed. Ms. Crowley stated that they use hardiplank or vinyl siding, but mostly hardiplank siding on their structures. She also stated that the buildings would meet energy star ratings or ideally be LEED certified and possibly include some solar use depending on grants available. Wedegartner asked if they would continue to be affordable housing. Ms. Crowley stated that they would and that they would be mostly 2-

3 bedroom units, but possibly a few 4 bedroom units as well. Allen asked about using local contractors for the construction,. Ms. Crowley replied that they usually do a bidding process for the contracts, due to the connection to grant funding.

Wedegartner asked for a motion.

MOTION: Moved by Smith, seconded by Newton, and voted 5:0 to forward a positive recommendation to the ZBA on the request for a special permit pursuant to Section(s) 200-4.3(C3), 200-5.3(E2), 200-6.5(A4), 200-7.2, 200-8.3, and 200-8.4 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow 1) the redevelopment of a multi-family use property, 2) up to a 20 percent reduction in dimensional requirements for building separation, and 3) a reduction in the number of required parking spaces for property located at 24 Aster Court, which is located in the Suburban Residential (RB) Zoning District subject to compliance with the Conservation Commission and other local and state regulations.

b. Recommendation on the Sale of 13 Chapman Street (Tax Map 51, Lot 57)

Sibley motioned for a positive recommendation. No second was made. Discussion ensued. Sibley and Newton agreed that the cellar hole is an eye sore and a safety/ liability issue, however, given the location of the site there may be a better alternate use. While all members agree, it would be best to sell the property than retain it, all members questioned parking as the highest and best use for that site given the proximity to downtown. Mr. Halsey suggested that UMass school of Planning and Landscape architecture may be interested in a local town project. Sibley withdrew his motion based on the issues raised. Therefore after discussion and consideration, neither a positive nor negative recommendation was made, due to the following concerns: Parking not being the highest and best use for the land considering that there are 3 other parking lots already close to this location that are not filled to capacity. Also, the issues of the sites proximity to downtown/ Main Street foot traffic, the esthetics of having another paved over lot in Greenfield, the loss of contribution to the tax base of a parking lot vs. a structure and more importantly that the overall goals for the Downtown Development need to be carefully considered.

Therefore rather than a recommendation, the Planning Board respectfully requests that the above concerns be forwarded to the Town Council.

Board & Staff Reports: Allen and Sibley spoke of the training meeting they had attended regarding arbitrary decision making, conflicts of interest, careful consideration of email content, etc.

Wedegartner stated there was no other business for the Planning Board and asked for motion to adjourn.

Adjournment

MOTION: Moved by Smith seconded by Allen, and voted 5:0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary S. Newton, Clerk
Greenfield Planning Board