

SOUTH HADLEY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING:

Proposed Site Plan and Stormwater Management Permit for South Hadley Dog Park

MINUTES OF JUNE 17, 2019

As Approved

Present: Mark Cavanaugh, Chair; Diane Mulvaney, Clerk; Brad Hutchison, Member; Joanna Brown, Member; Larry Butler, Associate Member; Richard Harris, Town Planner; and Colleen Canning, Recorder; Doug Serrill, Landscape Designer from Berkshire Design Group; Jeff Squire, Landscape Architect from Berkshire Design Group

Chair Cavanaugh called the Public Hearing into order at 6:48 PM.

Ms. Mulvaney read the Public Hearing notice:

The South Hadley Planning Board, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40-A, Section 11, Massachusetts General Laws and Section 200-10 of the South Hadley Stormwater Management Bylaw will hold a public hearing on Monday June 17, 2019 at 6:45 p.m. in the Selectboard Meeting of the South Hadley Town Hall at 116 Main Street, South Hadley, MA to consider and discuss the application of the Town of South Hadley, 116 Main Street, South Hadley, MA 01075 for Site Plan Review under Article XII of the Town's Zoning Bylaw and an application for a Stormwater Management Permit under Chapter 200 of the Town's Bylaws. The applicant is seeking Site Plan Review and a Stormwater Management Permit to allow development of a Dog Park. Additional elements of the development include parking, landscaping, utilities, Stormwater management systems, open space and trails, and similarly related items.

The subject property is located along the north side of Mulligan Drive and identified on Assessor's Map Number #23 as a portion of Parcel #48.

Plans and the application may be viewed at the Office of the Planning Board during normal office hours (8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.). Additionally, the plans and application are posted on the Planning Board's "Project Plans M through Z" page on the Town's website www.southhadley.ma.gov in a section titled "Mulligan Drive – South Hadley Dog Park".

Any person interested in, or wishing to be heard regarding, this application should appear at the time and place designated.

*Diane Supczak-Mulvaney, Clerk
South Hadley Planning Board*

*Publication: Friday, May 31, 2019
Friday, June 7, 2019*

Doug Serrill, Landscape Designer from Berkshire Design Group, and Jeff Squire, Landscape Architect from Berkshire Design Group, were present at the Public Hearing.

Chair Cavanaugh invited the consultants to speak to the proposed project.

Doug Serrill opened by describing the proposed Site Plan. He addressed the existing conditions of the proposed Dog Park site and presented plans for reference. The proposed site was located on Town owned land. To the south of the site was Ledges, the Town Golf Course. To the north of the site was private land.

Doug Serrill continued by explaining that the project had been reviewed by the Conservation Commission at a Public Meeting. The Commission issued a *Negative Determination #3* which determined the project would not alter the area subject to protection under the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act.

The proposed layout of the Dog Park included a gravel parking lot with 18 spaces. The design consisted of two park areas; a large dog park to the west and a small dog park to the east. Pet waste stations and pet water fountains were components of the design. Doug Serrill explained that the park was funded through a Stanton Foundation Grant. The grant required that the park be ADA accessible. Pathways will be constructed along the slopes of the site. Fill will be required to bring the paths to an appropriate grade for ADA accessibility. The material used along the paths would either be stone dust or asphalt. Stone dust had an initial low cost but would require ongoing maintenance. Asphalt had high initial cost but would require less ongoing maintenance than stone dust. Available funding will largely inform that material used. The site will be landscaped with native trees and shrubs along the embankment. The upper area will be left alone to allow for natural woodland. The landscape design was intended to reduce that amount of intervention required after construction. Two storm water basins would be installed with native vegetation.

Doug Serrill turned the conversation to Jeff Squire to present the proposed Stormwater Management Plan.

Jeff Squire opened by explaining that the Stormwater review requirements set forth in the Town's bylaw require that all projects that disturb over one acre of land must file a Stormwater Management Plan. Jeff Squire presented maps showing the area of disturbance. He explained that the disturbed area was just over one acre. Stormwater controls were present in a series of raingardens throughout the site with overflow safeguards in subsurface systems.

The storm water management had been reviewed by Fuss & O'Neil to confirm that the proposed storm water management satisfied the Town's bylaw requirements. Fuss & O'Neil complied a comment letter date June 13, 2019 addressing a few concerns in the plan. Berkshire Design submitted a redlined response to the peer review that was received June 17, 2019 (the day of tonight's meeting). Jeff Squire explained that the Planning Board uses 10 standards to assess Storm water management as follows: 1) no new untreated discharge, 2) peak rates, 3) recharge, 4) water quality, 5) high pollutant load, 6) stormwater in critical areas, 7) redevelopment, 8) erosion control, 9) operations and maintenance and 10) illicit discharge. In Fuss and O'Neil's

peer-view, they identified 30 items that needed to be addressed. Jeff Squire explained that many of the comments related to the same observations. The two major points of comment included recharge calculations and water quality volume. Pertaining to recharge calculations, the standard requires that runoff within each sub-watershed must discharge within the sub-watershed. There were five sub-watersheds present on site. Jeff Squire explained that the overabundance of discharge in some watersheds offsets the sub-watersheds that are not able to discharge because of the topography of the site. Pertaining to water quality volume, each sub-watershed needs to treat its own impervious surface runoff. The standard does not differentiate between surface types (i.e. driveways, walking paths). The standard stipulates an 80% treatment requirement. With the calculations performed by Berkshire Design, water treatment was at +/- 84%. All calculations were performed with the most aggressive conditions; conditions in which all surface materials were asphalt pavement.

Following the overview, Jeff Squire reviewed the 30 items addressed in Fuss & O'Neil's peer-review and spoke to the redlined response from his firm, Berkshire Design. As the response letter from Berkshire Design was received the day of tonight's meeting, Fuss & O'Neil had not been given an opportunity to review and comment. Jeff Squire reiterated Berkshire Design's written responses to Fuss and O'Neil's peer-review and added notes to some comments including:

Comment #16 requested that the contour lines be revised. Jeff Squire did not see an issue with the contour lines as presented. However, Berkshire Design could revise the contours if necessary.

Comment #18 requested that a pipe identified on the plan set for raingarden 1 be identified on all relevant documents. Jeff Squire noted that the identified pipe was an over flow drain and did not contribute to drainage calculations.

Comment #25 sited a requirement for a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Jeff Squire responded that this requirement was noted in the submittal and would be generated by the contactor performing the construction of the park.

Comment #29 wanted to identify a snow management plan. Jeff Squire remarked that, to his understanding, there would not be snow removal at the park.

Mr. Harris noted that comments #16, #18, #25, and #29 were not addressed within Berkshire Design's response letter to Fuss & O'Neil. He requested that another response letter be drafted to include responses as they were verbally addressed at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Brown inquired about information from the Conservation Commission's findings. It was explained that the Conservation Commission issued a negative determination, which determined that the project would *not* have negative impacts

Ms. Brown referenced comment #9. She inquired how dog waste would be managed within the Operations and Maintenance Plan. Jeff Squire responded that the "Friends of the Dog Park" would be managing waste clean-up and he believed trash pick-up would be weekly.

Ms. Brown additionally referenced comments #11, #12, and #13 which speak to maintenance of the park. She inquired about historic record keeping of maintenance activities and asked for specific language that would require it. Jeff Squire responded that the park will likely always be owned by the Town as is the nature of the deed over the land. The ‘Friends of the Dog Park’ will be in charge of ongoing maintenance. Separately, the requirement for a maintenance agreement seemed unclear as it would require the town to make an agreement with itself.

Chair Cavanaugh inquired who would be designing the general Operation and Maintenance Plan for the proposed park. Mr. Harris explained that it would be decided upon by the Selectboard and the ‘Friends of the Dog Park’ organization

Karen McCafferty, Lawn Street, inquired who the responsible party would be if someone got bit by a dog at the park; the Town or the ‘friends of the dog park’? Mr. Harris replied that the decision was up to the Selectboard.

Mr. Harris offered overview of the next steps that would be required to gather the appropriate information necessary to close the public hearing. Berkshire Design would need to resubmit their peer-review response letter to include written responses to comments #16, #18, #25 and #29 and the Operations and Maintenance agreement between the Selectboard and the ‘Friends of the Dog Park’ would need to be understood.

As there was no additional discussion, Chair Cavanaugh inquired if there was a motion to continue the public hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,
As Approved
Colleen Canning, recorder

Appendix

Document	Document Location
Existing Site Plan and Proposed Site Plan of Proposed Dog Park Location	Planning Files
Stormwater Management Plan of proposed Dog Park	Planning Files
Fuss & O’Neil peer review letter	Planning Files
Berkshire Design redlined response to Fuss & O’Neil Peer Review	Planning Files