

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

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

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



ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Minutes of September 13, 2012
Department of Planning and Development
114 Main Street

The meeting was called to order by Chair, Tom McLellan at 7:05 p.m. with the following members:

PRESENT: Tom McLellan, Chairman
Mark Maloney, Clerk
Howard Barnard
Scott Conti
Christopher Joseph
Steven Ronhave, Alternate

ALSO PRESENT: Laura DiNardo, Conservation Agent, and members of the public.

7:00 p.m.: Application of Ford-Toyota of Greenfield for property located at 1 Main Street which is located in the Central Commercial (CC) Zoning District, for a Special Permit, Site Plan Approval, and Major Development Review pursuant to Sections 200-4.7(C17), 200-7.12, 200-8.3 and 200-8.4 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow the redevelopment of the Ford-Toyota of Greenfield automobile dealership at this location.

McLellan explained public hearing process to applicant – procedure/appeal period.

Maloney read the notice of hearing.

Representatives: Tony Wonseski
Robert Cartelli
James Malarkey
Members of the Public: Marcia Starkey, Historical Commission
Peter S Miller, Historical Commission

Cartelli explained the pressure from factory to build new facilities. By end of 2013, they want a new facility. Originally, they did not want a dual facility. After five years of work and compromise they are proposing the plans as submitted to the Department of Planning and Development. Cartelli explained that this would be positive to Greenfield; it will add local employment (construction etc.) Since the traffic count on Main Street is far superior to anywhere else in Greenfield, even Federal Street, the most important thing is the address. They do not want people to think they have gone out of business if they have a new address. Between Malarkey and Wonseski, Cartelli believes they have a great team.

Malarkey added that this was the second dual facility out the 50 sites he has completed, very difficult achievement.

Wonseski did a site presentation. Currently, there are two structures on site. Site is tiered; there is a 35-foot drop from the easterly side to westerly side of property. There is access from four curb cuts off Main Street. He pointed out business in surrounding area to become acquainted with the site.

Environmental factors: riverfront, wetlands, and listed habitat – no concerns on site.

Site Plan – Because of the 35-foot drop, they need to cut and fill site. This will minimize the curb cut from four to one; one 30-foot wide entrance across Colrain Street.

Technical Review – DPW requested traffic evaluations/counts. This was prepared by beta group who determined this was much better access.

Utilities – site has Town water, sewer, electric, and gas hookup. They will tie into the existing systems and will be coordinating with Western Mass and Berkshire Gas Company on service connections.

Grading – They are building retaining walls on both sides, one can be seen from Main Street. They will enhance planting on Main Street side to create a street tree look. It is more important to enhance the front near road then out back near railroad.

Storm water – The new development will have deep pump catch basins with hoods throughout site. They will channel storm drains to an underground detention/filtration area and bleed it out through an 8-inch pipe. This reduces the amount of offsite flows.

Flow test – Requested by DPW. Site has great pressure/flow so there is no problem serving the site with water.

To be built in two phases:

- (1) Service and Parts.
- (2) Showroom.

Cartelli added that the service and sale departments could not merge together during transition. Service and parts will be built first so that they can take 6 months to cure any problems they face with the new systems, etc.

McLellan asked why they were not renting a space. Cartelli stated that they looked into rental space on Federal Street. The biggest thing is the address; they really want to keep the site in same location. Customers will be excited to see the changes and improvements to access, etc.

Lighting – 21 16-foot lighting structures to be colored white. Two options (1) LED - more expensive and efficient, (2) traditional metal lighting. There will be a LED pad for security at night.

McLellan asked about spillage and glare from traffic when drive up hill. Wonseski confirmed no spillage and stated that there are 10-15 different settings for use on LED lighting. Lighting types will be a nice with an attractive look.

Cartelli added that there was been major theft of catalytic converters on site. They need to illuminate that area with camera at night. Each time one is stolen it cost the company \$2,700.

Fencing - Barnard asked about fencing. Wonseski stated that there would be fencing all around property but not on the railroad side. There will be a four-foot high pedestrian guard around the landscaped area and roadside (which will be safer for bikers). Access is ADA accessible to the front of the building.

Signage – 125 square feet is allowed. There is an estimated 232 square feet proposed; they have multiple special permits granted for signage increase. Signage will be on building ONLY, not freestanding signs. There will be a 32 square foot reduction from present to proposed.

McLellan asked about the color. Red and blue/white – with text “Ford”, “Toyota” and “Service” signs. No directional signs, only one entrance

Maloney asked about the westerly retaining wall elevation. Wonseski stated that it varies from 5 feet to 3 feet to 9 feet to 16 feet. Maloney asked how close the new building would be to insurance company. Wonseski stated 50 feet from backside, 60 feet from front side.

Barnard asked if there would be a fence along railroad. Wonseski stated it was not in the plans. Maloney asked about safety concerns with no fencing there. Wonseski stated that the railroad would have an access easement. They have a meeting with the railroad property manager at public hearing.

Malarkey did a brief overview. The new and the old floor would be at the same elevation. Both Toyota and Ford wanted to have two drive ups with the same parts department entrance. McLellan asked where he would bring his car if he wanted service. Malarkey stated that he would enter the parking lot through the single entrance, Ford is one way, and Toyota is the other way. Attendant takes the car and drives it around back; customer never drives around back.

Maloney asked about employees, how many now and in the future. Cartelli stated that there are 52 now, around 75 in the future.

Cartelli stated that they found perfectly preserved newspapers used for stuffing from the 1900s onsite. He relayed that to the Historical Commissioners at the meeting. Cartelli stated they are going to have molds made of limestone structures and donated to the town.

Maloney asked about the parking. Cartelli stated the numbers were adjusted to fit employees; 241 parking spaces total.

Joseph asked about the appearance of the building when looking up the hill (coming from Mohawk trail to Main Street). Wonseski stated there would be a retaining wall, 4 ft fence, and additional landscaping. Joseph asked about advertising and signage. Would ramps and cars be used as signs and are they concerned that the signs are only facing Main Street with no side signs. Wonseski stated that no cars would be used. Cartelli reiterated that the address was the best advertisement.

Barnard asked about the cars on the other side of the street. McLellan stated that there is a permit for that lot already with restrictions.

Malarkey discussed the appearance of the building, silver ACM material, back sides are freezer panels, all signage in front, and entry port.

Joseph asked about a comparison in size to the North Hampton dealership. Cartelli stated that the Greenfield dealership would be smaller.

Maloney asked if the signs would be internally illuminated. Malarkey stated that Toyota's signs would be and he was unsure about Ford.

Maloney asked about the hours. Cartelli stated that the hours would be M-F 7am-8pm, Sat. 8am-5pm, and Sun 12pm-4pm. There will be security lighting around perimeter.

Correspondence

Maloney read letter from Planning Board – positive recommendation

Maloney read letter from DPW – Sara Campbell

Maloney read meeting notice for the MassDOT/Railroad hearing.

Maloney read letter from Eric Twarog, Department of Planning and Development

Maloney read letter from Historical Commission.

Peter Miller expressed concerns about height of building/mountain view. Wonseski stated that the grade was basically the same but the large set back will open up area. Will be about to see about 6-feet of roof from the street.

Maloney asked what the set back was. Wonseski stated that currently it is around 10 feet; it will be around 120-feet after construction.

Joseph asked about the snow removal/rubbish removal. Wonseski stated that the rubbish would be onsite. Snow would be removed into small areas of parking lot if only a few inches. In major snow events, it will be plowed into parking spaces and hauled offsite.

McLellan asked if they were nervous about contamination under building. Cartelli stated that they hired someone to access the site for any contamination.

McLellan asked about the delivery of vehicles. Cartelli stated that right now they come from Colrain Road but that they hope company will be reasonable.

McLellan asked about safety issues and the small sloped area that is currently not landscaped. Cartelli stated that all cars will be bought to customers and that he will call about getting that slope landscaped.

Steve, alternate ZBA Meeting, asked if this was a permanent plan. Cartelli stated that they would contract with amendments if needed. They are nervous that Toyota might be too small in the long run.

Barnard asked about the timeframe. Cartelli stated that the parts and service department hoped to commence as soon as possible but the overall goal is December 31, 2013.

Joseph asked about the flow of traffic during construction. Cartelli stated that the phased approach helps with traffic problems. Wonseski stated that hoped to start next week.

Joseph asked if the lights would be LED and if the signs would be internally lit; Cartelli stated that they would be LED, that Toyota would be internally lit, and that they were unsure about Ford.

Marcia Starkey asked about the efficiency. Cartelli stated that they were going for 13 stalls to 23 stalls. Ford will have three cars in showroom and Toyota will have five. Overall, they believe that efficiency will be increased.

Public Hearing Closed at 8:12 p.m.

Discussion

Maloney stated that it was an accurate presentation. The setback is huge, parking more adequate, better signage, it is overall an improvement. Maloney would like to see historical Commission as a condition.

Barnard agreed, it is an overall good plan.

Conti asked if fuel was being stored on site (not being stored on site). Thinks it is a great project.

Joseph had no concerns. Recommends LED lighting. Rubbish onsite is a concern. They will not be dumping waste oil outside.

McLellan would like to see more landscaping,

Maloney would like to add 'maintained landscaping' in conditions.

McLellan reviewed all special permit requirements and the Board agreed all the requirements were addressed adequately in the plans/presentation.

MOTION: Moved by Maloney, seconded by Barnard, and voted 5:0 to approve the application of Ford-Toyota of Greenfield for property located at 1 Main Street which is located in the Central Commercial (CC) Zoning District, for a Special Permit, Site Plan Approval, and Major Development Review pursuant to Sections 200-4.7(C17), 200-7.12, 200-8.3 and 200-8.4, 200-6.7 of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow the redevelopment of the Ford-Toyota of Greenfield automobile dealership at this location with the following conditions:

1. All conditions required in the memo dated September 13, 2012 from Sara Campbell to Eric Twarog be incorporated into the final packet including having to apply for the following permits: curb cut, retire existing water and sewer, excavation, new utility services, and industrial discharge;
2. Applicant shall comply with Condition 1 (meet requirements of DPW) and Condition 2 (As-built Plans shall be submitted to the Department of Planning and Development upon completion) of the memo to Zoning Board of Appeals from Eric Twarog dated September 12, 2012;
3. LED lights shall be used for all lighting; and
4. All landscaping and screening shall be maintained.

Action Items

- a. Extension Request pursuant to Section 200-6.1(B) of the Zoning Ordinance to rebuild the home at 85 Shelburne Road in Greenfield destroyed by Hurricane Irene.

Representatives: Christopher Sadler, Homeowner
Myntron Jaquay-Wilson, Mowry and Schmidt
Members of the Public: None

McLellan stated that the home was destroyed during Hurricane Irene in August, 2011 and the building inspector instructed homeowner to demolish and rebuild. Per zoning, a non-conforming lot needs to be rebuilt within one year. McLellan suggested that they extend the work until December 31, 2013. Maloney added that this was due to an act of nature. Board asked applicant how long they think they will need to rebuild. Wilson stated around 17 months but Sadler might be going to court.

MOTION: Moved by Maloney, seconded by Barnard, and voted 5:0 to approve the Extension Request pursuant to Section 200-6.1(B) of the Zoning Ordinance to rebuild the home at 85 Shelburne Road in Greenfield destroyed by Hurricane Irene until December 31, 2014.

- b. Modification Request to Ethier Management regarding the Birches Condominium Project in Greenfield, MA.

Representatives: Wes Smith, Builder
Gerard Ethier, Ethier Management
Members of the Public: None

Building Five was approved as a two-story building with four two-bedroom units. They are now proposing to build a one-story building with two two-bedroom units. They will be built of the same foundation and location as originally submitted. There is a demand for one-floor living.

Building Four was approved as a two-story building with three three-bedroom units and one two-

bedroom units.

They are now proposing to build all four units as three-bedroom units.

They had requested a two-year extension, which would extend them to February 22, 2015. The extension was issued by the Board at the July 12, 2012 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

Maloney asked if they were changing the decks. Smith stated there was no deck on Building 5.

Joseph asked why they chose the access as it was marked in plan originally. Ethier stated it was the Boards suggestion.

MOTION: Moved by Maloney, seconded by Barnard, and voted 5:0 to approve the Modification Request to Ethier Management for Buildings 4 and 5 of the Birches Condominium Project.

Correspondence

McLellan read a letter from Eric Twarog, Director of Planning stating that the Planning Board had just hired the firm Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) to prepare Greenfield's new comprehensive sustainable master plan. VHB will be conducting a "Community Immersion Day" for Greenfield on Tuesday, October 9, 2012 to kick off the master planning effort. As part of this "Community Immersion Day", they would like to interview several town departments and boards/commissions throughout the day. McLellan read the interview questions and asked a volunteer to be on the steering committee.

Maloney volunteered to be the ZBA's representative on the steering committee.

Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 12, 2012

MOTION: Moved by Maloney, seconded by Barnard, and voted 5:0 to approve the minutes from July 12, 2012 as written.

Adjourn

MOTION: Moved by Maloney, seconded by Barnard, and voted 5:0 to adjourn at 8:40 p.m.