

# South Hadley Housing Production Plan

## Survey #2 Open-Ended

### Responses

This document is an appendix to the analysis of South Hadley HPP Survey #2 results presentation. Survey #2 asked a series of open-ended questions, and all responses to those questions are shown here. Duplicate comments and instances of personal address information have been removed.

### Goals

<b>Use this space to respond in detail to the draft goals if desired.</b>
The regulatory potential strategy #2 I do not agree at all with at all because it will legalize undersized nonconforming lots. There is not assurance that these small lots will hold Affordable or smaller houses. They may hold very large, expensive houses. So this would not align with Market Affordability above at all.
I do realize that these strategies are something like non-binding resolutions, but they overlook some obvious solutions that hopefully will be discussed later in this survey.
Stop trying to include low income, subsidized housing except for the elderly. This type of housing places excessive burden on town resources and taxpayers.
Meeting our legal requirements in a manner that fosters sustainability, environmental justice, energy efficiency and minimizes loss of open space, noise, traffic and light pollution should be paramount, over-arching goals. "Economic development" is a meaningless catch-all term that frequently portends wholesale abdication of choices to a developers' monetary desires and often involves construction that harms neighborhoods and residents' quiet and peaceful enjoyment of their homes.
Single adults, in particular, have almost no options for finding anything they can afford, as most new housing builds include few small units and even a unit with one bedroom assumes there are two incomes supporting the costs (a problem with the tables for rent subsidies, as well). My first apartment (in Boston) was a studio, with an alcove for a bed and a separate small kitchen. There was plenty of space for one person, but this type of housing is impossible to find in western MA. All new housing/apartments should include storage for bikes (those who use them often will have more than one) and have space inside the unit for one bike to be readily accessed (many people do commute via bike, even if they have a car).
Goals are vague and do not strive to ensure or guarantee affordability, diversity, equity or inclusion and that is why I disagree strongly with them.
Missing is any specific goal related to preservation and amelioration of the environment. In the 21st century, we need to develop solutions that preserve green space in neighborhoods and maintain and add trees, both of which are crucial in combating climate change and improving quality of life for

South Hadley Housing Production Plan  
 Survey 2 Qualitative Comments

<b>Use this space to respond in detail to the draft goals if desired.</b>
residents.
We are in dire need of affordable and flexible housing in South Hadley. If we are able to meet these draft goals we will have more vibrant and growing town.
If 40% of SH folks are in poverty or low income, we need to address this.
Not enough information ... Please see D. Presley's questions for the consultant (Outwith Studio+Utile) and the HPP Advisory Committee, dated June 30, 2023.
All unrealistic given the cost to build.
In the falls area, particularly at the Elm St/Bardwell intersection, there are potentially twelve vacant units that could become affordable rental or duplex units if the current owner could be incentivized to sell. Perhaps a combination of funding options discussed would allow for this.
There is desire for young families to move to South Hadley, but housing at all levels is scarce which drives up the cost for all housing and excludes many people from the community.
I would think that developing more varied types of housing, where appropriate denser and mixed use developments, would enhance connections and perhaps mark a step in tying SH center to the Falls.
I don't think that we have an infrastructure to radically shift demographics. In partical, schools already make up a sizable portion of the budget and yet they need work. Moving forward, a slow paced change may work, but lots of other things such as schools, utilities, and other infrastructure need to be considered.
Work toward bringing CPA to town: allows offering \$ toward developers of affordable housing. Urge caution to zone or other changes such as what led to the disaster in the Baystate section of Dlorence in Northampton.
Love the inclusiveness. I fear that little thought has been given to the need to provide housing that conserves energy and is all-electric - imp for affordability and sustainability.
Goals align with Master Plan
I agree with the draft goals. Through the master plan process many South Hadley residents stated they would like to see development that is affordable and inclusive for younger individuals and families and older adults looking to downsize.
Entry level one and two family homes and Mixed income apartments would be vital additions.
Goals fail to account for density considerations of land and population growth outcomes that may outpace the community resources. There should be a goal that provides such a balance.
I think that is it going to be hard to address diversity & inclusion when many residents don't want any change.
From attending meetings and forums I'm still struggling to understand what problems the HPP Advisory Committee is trying to fix, currently I don't believe that has been established.
I am not totally clear about what "Deed Restricted" means.
Among strategies for SH Comprehensive Plan are aspirations for enhanced DEI. Affordable Housing coupled with employment opportunities limits meaningful achievement of these aspirations. Broadening housing choice will move SH toward a more elevated DEI plateau.

<b>Use this space to respond in detail to the draft goals if desired.</b>
No specific goal related to importance of maintaining and increasing trees, forests and green space within neighborhoods. In the 21st century, with climate change issues of greatest importance, this must be considered up front, not as a detail to be filled in later.
With 33% of the housing stock having been built between 1940-1959 utilizing CDBG resources to remove code violations for families & elders of low & moderate income. Good way to upgrade the older housing stock & preserve it for the future. Without going into great detail you could make zero percent loans with no monthly payment from CDBG funds for rehab & accessibility. With a lien - when that house is sold from available proceeds the loan is repaid to the town & then can be used again on other properties. A grant is a one time shot. A zero percent deferred payment loan that is repaid keeps the money working. Good way to both upgrade the housing stock, keep it affordable & safe for income eligible folks, and for future generations. Totally agree that a myriad of housing preservation & housing production options is the way to go. Important that it's compatible with neighborhoods and a good redevelopment tool for blighted neighborhoods or substandard or abandoned buildings.
It is very important to build in high efficiency in these new buildings. Good insulation and proper orientation to the sun cannot be changed in the future. I we will need all electric buildings that cannot create greenhouse gases. And wiring for electric car charging is easy to do now and difficult to do later. It would be best to use the special energy stretch code for this project not just the ordinary stretch code.
One must examine the effects on our school system and growth , increased expense and need for additional teachers.
Accessible housing for people with disability absolutely needs representation in the goals
As others have mentioned, sustainability could be highlighted more in the goals for the plan.
Avoid new paper roads
What is the specific number of housing units that South Hadley needs to have built to achieve the % goal. If it has been stated, it wasn't clear--at least to me.
I think that as the town considers housing options, conservation of natural areas needs to be kept in high consideration. We should not consider housing at the expense of protecting critical conservation areas, whether already so designated or not.
I agree with the first five goals. What's missing from the sixth is the environmental sustainability of the housing (i.e. car chargers, mini-splits that don't use fossil fuels, solar panels, etc. - as well as preserving habitat for creatures that live in South Hadley's wild areas, preserving farmland, and preserving conservation areas.)

# Strategies

## What else should we know about your thoughts on potential strategies?

I am deeply disturbed by strategy #2----infill development including relaxing dimensional standards in established residential neighborhoods to allow smaller lot sizes to be legal. When I and others, who were members of the Master Plan Update Committee, were working on the Master Plan update, we were assured by Anne Capra that this type of infill development

would not be included in the Master Plan, and it was not included. However, this type of "infill" is now included in the Housing Production Plan.

Should the Housing Production Plan not follow exactly from the recommendations in the Master Plan? It seems that the HPP Committee

inserted this strategy as it may reflect their goals and values, but it is not in the Master Plan at all.

When someone buys a home and they are assured that the tiny space next to him/her is too small to qualify as a building lot, this person is assured that there will never be a house next to them. Now with the doing away of dimensional regulations, houses can be build any and everywhere. A homeowner's quality of life and the character of the neighborhood are destroyed. Property values also decrease when houses suddenly appear where they were never supposed to be permitted.

I would like to see this Strategy #2 deleted from the survey as it is in violation of the goals and recommendations of the Master Plan. Many houses in town are on nonconforming sized lots for many reasons. Some were granted illegal variances before I became Chair of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Many houses were built before zoning was passed by Town Meeting. These small green spaces, often with trees, in residential areas provide green places of refuge, absorb water to prevent flooding, and sequester carbon. To build out our residential neighborhoods so that every space has a house on it does not support the Town's goals to combat climate change, and is not in line with the goals of the Master Plan. I feel that certain members of the Housing Production Committee favor infill. This is their own personal goal, so they have included it as a strategy which is antithetical to the Master Plan and which will completely negate our dimensional zoning by laws.

I know for a fact that one member of the Housing Production Advisory Committee lives on a large estate, and cannot be impacted at all by infill development.

I urge the Housing Production Plan Advisory Committee and June to delete this strategy altogether. I cannot believe it is on the survey in the first place. I feel that certain members of the advisory committee are advancing their own agendas and desires and objectives, contrary to the Master Plan.

There are many other strategies that could achieve the goal of more space for housing without compromising and violating our single family neighborhoods.

The climate crisis affects all that we do in housing, yet no mention is made of assuring proper designs of structures and surrounding environments as well as materials to minimize impacts on climate.

<b>What else should we know about your thoughts on potential strategies?</b>
<p>South Hadley is a middle income community. Stop trying to encourage low income development, financed by taxing middle income earners. Let Longmeadow focus on low income development. Encourage businesses to move here to help the tax base. Ask any town business how difficult the town makes it for business to move and thrive here.</p>
<p>They are all rather useless unless the HPP and the Planning Board demonstrate a commitment to sustainable development, sustainable architecture and ecological landscaping.</p>
<p>All of these are good, but the devil is in the details, and while I support pretty much everything in principle, every initiative must be sensitive to any impact existing residents may experience as well as needs for new housing options. Time to educate the public and 'sell' a given plan is essential, and communications must be robust, easy to digest, and sensitive to those whose set point is to resist change (while I supported the recently enacted ADU bylaw, the effort clearly lacked a good communication plan and the timeline did not really allow for much give and take; while no-change people can probably never be wholly satisfied, providing an opportunity for them to be able to say that they lacked adequate info and time to digest it is something that can be fixed). Also, not quite sure what 'historic pattern of development' means--if that's houses on large lots like a typical subdivision, then no; if it's denser and more walkable like older neighborhoods, then yes.</p>
<p>There is no meaningful difference between the stated draft goals of "housing options" and "equity and Inclusion." The so-called "strategies" do not directly address these goals. In fact, the "strategies" fail to state which of any of the "draft housing goals" they are directed to. The whole thing is a mess of verbiage.</p>
<p>Taxes from short-term rentals should be earmarked for affordable housing fund.          Collect 2% tax on each private institution tuition in South Hadley to goto General Fund.</p>
<p>nothing-thanks</p>
<p>Please see D. Presley's questions for the consultant (Outwith Studio+Utile) and the HPP Advisory Committee, dated June 30, 2023.</p>
<p>I would like to see more analysis done regarding increases costs to the people who are already here. Loss of open space, increased density, loss of habitats.</p>
<p>This may be implicit here, but I'm thinking more specifically about identifying development and housing opportunities that unfold from key anchors in town. In particular, the SH Public Library is a fabulous facility--adjacent to the falls and park--and attracts significant traffic. The area to the south on Main Street seems an opportunity waiting to happen. This was a zone identified earlier by the Rise of the Falls initiative as ripe for investment.</p>
<p>I do not believe we should change dimensional requirements. This could lead to building on property that was not intended to be built on. Changing is not mentioned in the Master Plan.</p>
<p>My points at the beginning probably better stated here: caution in zoning or other changes noting unexpected consequences and value of CPA toward bringing developers to town. See Vimeo of our presentation re CPA value before it was defeated several years ago, note Easthampton's Planner presentation.</p>
<p>effect on taxes and importance of equal distribution of new housing..and improvements in access to parks, grocery stores, and transportation.</p>

<b>What else should we know about your thoughts on potential strategies?</b>
<p>We need to stop burning gas in our homes. It is inefficient, unhealthy, and exacerbates the climate crisis. Fossil gas will be unaffordable in a few decades because the number of homes using it will shrink. Housing built now should be built with a vision of a fossil-fuel free future. EV chargers and all-electric homes are a must. Fossil-dependent homes will be "stranded assets." Those who can least afford it should not be burdened in this way.</p>
<p>I spoke up at the forum on June 22 regarding regulatory question No. 2. I am against changing dimensional requirements. Also, I was not infavor of the ADU By-Law as written.</p>
<p>I do have a concern about the Overlay Smart growth areas where the design does not resemble the surrounding neighborhood. And the comment made that the set back on the fourth floor is more expensive to build than I would recommend redesign so that the building fits the neighborhood and is not a modern box.</p>
<p>Need to revisit the concept of single to 2-family conversions. Reusing existing building is a sustainable approach.</p>
<p>We will need to offer continuous education about why the implementation of any of strategy taken will provide for 1)a documented need and 2)a response to what residents asked for during the Master Planning and HPP process. I think that at the same time an HPP project(s) are being planned and implemented that there should be plans to continue to preserve and prevent treasured open spaces from being developed. This will not only be a good for quality of life in SH, it may appease residents who are worried that development will overtake the town and/or are worried about environmental issues.</p>
<p>Concentrate your efforts on the 40R Districts.</p>
<p>The Town isn't supposed to be a developer but can facilitate development.</p>
<p>I totally disagree with strategy #2---infill development including relaxing dimensional standards in established residential neighborhoods to allow smaller lot sizes to be legal. This was not in the master plan. When you buy a home you expect a certain continuity in the way a neighborhood will be developed. By doing away of dimensional regulations, houses can be build any and everywhere. Property values also decrease when houses suddenly appear where they were never supposed to be permitted.</p>
<p>Important to work with responsible private developers as well as non-profits. Vally Community Development is an excellent organization to work with around affordable rental housing &amp; homeownership options. Where there may be mixed use building options - housing on the upper floors can assist in not only getting the property properly redeveloped but in carry enough of the costs to make the commercial space affordable for a business.</p>
<p>Keep local government from driving what gets developed</p>
<p>Affordable housing should be prioritized in areas offering best public services including recreation. Sewer and water, transportation, and within the developed area to the maximum extent feasible instead of open land areas.</p>
<p>Find ways to encourage sustainable/ green housing (electric, solar ready) that is affordable. How can we assure housing is well located, supportive of green space, part of a wider plan. Form based zoning? Such arrangements could overcome some resistance while also helping to meet affordability goals.</p>

**What else should we know about your thoughts on potential strategies?**

My responses to the questions are mostly negative, as I sense there are potentially negative implications to all of those options that must be guarded against, with knowledge and understanding beyond what I have.

It may be that the State wants to compel us to accept a lower standard of living as normative in Massachusetts. Perhaps that is just the reality of things. It is not what I think any of us can want.

It has seemed to me best that, in coping with the coercive dimensions of Chapter 40B, we must develop supplies of housing stock that will stay affordable, long term. The 30 year time horizon is unacceptable: That just requires us to degrade our community values successively, over time.

I would like to see the Town work on making happen the development I propose. Funding can be from a combination of taxes and of private donations. When considering funding from other sources, we must consider carefully if whatever strings may be attached are acceptable to us.

A likely explanation for developers not using our 40R districts is, they do not see enough profit in doing so. I would like us to use our own funds to leverage the kind of development that we want, and development that will continue to be affordable into a future that any can foresee.

South Hadley should find a way to have a future we will enjoy -- not one that is less pleasant, and is forced upon us. I am hopeful that, when given an opportunity to chart our course as a community in keeping with our town's Master Plan, those with funds to spare might step forward to help financially. Meeting housing challenges should not come at a cost to that open space which has been disappearing in town over the years. Natural flora and fauna do not vote or pay taxes, but benefit all, and all the more require our efforts to safeguard their survival as they are not privy to our human gamesmanship.

The quality of our properties that are zoned as industrial invites attention. There are acres and acres on New Ludlow Road that may not now be well utilized or maintained. To a lesser extent, the same might be said of the Rte. 202 corridor. In South Hadley, we do not have land to spare as future brownfields.

A caveat: Keeping housing affordable can require supplying help with maintenance. Those without dollars to spare will avoid making needed repairs.

Must look at impact of what you do expense wise on our schools and other administrative /programs in our community. Our schools esp have been in need of strong leadership for 3+ years and my fear is they will be dealing with insufficient staffing to handle the influx of children. Too many programs have been reduced or eliminated over the years.

I'm very concerned about the disruption of land, cutting down significant trees. There is no reference to this.

Accessibility and creativity can be advantageous. Affordable housing should exist in every neighborhood, but certainly within proximity to other resources.

build more dense housing

I would like to express my feelings regarding the survey as being very challenging because it was not easily comprehensible, as the words, codes and phrases needed to be researched and fully understood in order to make a sound judgment. The public in person meeting was helpful, but seem to be fragmented in the breakout sessions, which did not occur, we're very important and vital!

Also, the delivery of this survey was Chardy, as individuals had to reach out to you, if they were aware, unlike the SHELD survey. The electric light department survey was female to South Hadley residence and easily understood, inviting and questions clearly stated, only taking a small amount of my time . These reasons may very well be responsible for the lack of responses to the HPP Survey! That being said, those responsible for the creation of the serving need to take some responsibility and

<b>What else should we know about your thoughts on potential strategies?</b>
accountability. Do you really feel that receiving such a small number, with some incomplete, truly represent the approximate 18,000 citizens in the community?
I agree w/ Martha Terry that we should focus 1st & foremost on the 2 existing 40R districts. Secondly, focus on the 2 mixed-use areas &, lastly, clarifying & pass the ADU ByLaw. Achieve these by approaching/building relationships w/ reputable developers & offering pre-approved building plans.
The ideas above that deal with repurposing existing structures or lots (i.e. the former Gaylord library space, the former Food Mart space, abandoned businesses or buildings that could be developed) just make good sense. Thanks for thinking about that.

## Opportunity Sites

<b>What questions do you have about potential opportunity sites?</b>
Is this taking flood plain locations into consideration (e.g. SHELD property)? Any plan should do that.
What kind of dwellings would be considered?
Proper environmental quality monitoring (especially air & water) of of all nearby business or manufacturing sites. Access to essential services (health, education) for families with small children.
Town should use available funding (AARPA and other sources) to buy back vacant properties and encourage new businesses to move to town and to provide low interest grants to homeowners to maintain their properties.
Could the 506 Granby Rd and East St be developed in tandem? Doing two projects could make feasible the concept of building out biking/walking connections among new and existing housing (Pine Grove, Hadley Village) in the area, businesses, conservation lands, and possible through connections to New Ludlow Road, etc.
36 Bridge Street and Haas Electric. With a location so close to the Rt 116 gateway to SH via the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Bridge, are there options to combine projects to leverage significant improvement to the gateway?
33/202 Southeast Corner. How can SH work with a builder to address DOT's middle-of-the-road bike lane and pedestrian safety? Whatever the use for this site, a shared bike/walk lane (like the one on Rt 33) around the rear of the property lead bikers and walkers away from busy curb cuts on Rts 202 and/or 33 and directly to housing and any businesses on the site. This could be part of a shared path vision that could create a network of connected pathways in and around residential and business areas all along the now-pretty-unwalkable Rt 202/33 corridor and nearby recreational/conservation resources like Black Stevens and Brook Park. Without good solutions to biker/walker safety, it would be hard to support development of this site, which should not be car-centric.
SHELD Site. Are there ways we can protect and maintain public access to our mostly inaccessible riverfront if housing or businesses are built on this property? The report from an AIA SDAT visit provided

<b>What questions do you have about potential opportunity sites?</b>
a number of interesting ideas for the Falls, including an idea for moving SHELD to a new location and utilizing the site for a Canal-front Amphitheater, which could anchor one end of a BATTERY Brook Greenway to create a community gathering and performance space along the river. As a 'river town' with very limited views of and access to the river, we should be very reluctant to cede any riverfront to non-public use. See: <a href="https://www.brikbase.org/sites/default/files/sdat_aiab095526_southhadley_2012.pdf">https://www.brikbase.org/sites/default/files/sdat_aiab095526_southhadley_2012.pdf</a>
How were these sites chosen.
What was the process by which these sites were identified?
Sycamore/Rawsons site NO, NO, NO; Lower parking area of Village Commons NO, NO, NO (stream nearby)
Please see D. Presley's questions for the consultant (Outwith Studio+Utile) and the HPP Advisory Committee, dated June 30, 2023.
If we build in certain places, will it cost the town in long run? For instance, building near the dump screwed us over. I don't like the idea of completely changing the tenor of certain neighborhoods, ie mostly ranch homes in the woodlawn area. How would this plan affect this?
Why are most sites concentrated in the Falls where there is already more multi family and lower cost housing available?
Is the Bardwell-Elm building being proposed for demolition? Not in favor of that.
Would town have to buy them and find developers?
Traffic, playground access, street safety,
These sites seem to be pretty small - most are a lot or so. The type of mixed-use development that would be preferable requires larger areas.
Concentrate on the 40R Districts.
All or any of these previously discussed sites should continue to be moved forward and acted on.
Why would you even want to consider the grounds of a unique, historic site (Sycamore, Rawson grounds)? To develop that area would greatly degrade one of the land parcels that give South Hadley interest, character and beauty. I also worry that building behind the Commons would destroy the character of a lovely, historic graveyard.
Have only resided in South Hadley for a few years - so not as familiar with many of the neighborhoods/areas of Town.
What do you do with the current uses?
Do you consider that increased housing in attractive areas for commerce and residence are optimal sites to support commerce and attract new young people to our town? I think you should if you do not.
Some sites would be best for certain types of affordable housing. How will housing at any particular site be integrated. What would be the impact on overall balance between retail and housing. How could new housing connect to or even expand green space?
33/202 is an extremely busy section. Not good for little children etc.
All kinda pie in the sky. Whose gonna build this stuff?

<b>What questions do you have about potential opportunity sites?</b>
It's a little hard to attribute low or high priority to the potential sites without knowing the feasibility--e.g., whether the land might become available, the relative challenges and costs for each site, what kind of developer(s) might be interested in the sites. While I know this is something of a theoretical exercise, how much the Town should invest in making one site or another a priority for affordable housing depends on some of these things, from my perspective.
I hope SHELD is not going out of business?
Are the folks who own these properties willing to sell them for the purpose of housing development? I've rated some of these properties highly but I'm not clear about their availability. I've thought about the old factory near e-Ink however, wasn't it closed because of fear of health issues?
Potential for flooding of properties in SH Falls with climate change? How would pedestrians get to Big Y from Southeast Corner? Use that site for senior citizens not families with children due to heavy traffic to get to school and park.

## Scenarios

### 36 Bridge Street

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 36 Bridge Street?</b>
#s 1 and 3 allow more green space on property. Also have more Affordable units.
More houses can house more people.
I prefer scenario 1. I like the neat appearance of working from front to back, yet appearing as individual homes.
Scenario 1 has parking associated with each unit; two units are affordable. Scenario 3 has a smaller overall footprint and maximum number of people housed; two units are affordable.
Prefer the townhomes that allow individual entrances and parking, though the parking count doesn't look realistic.
maintain open space near river instead of trying to shoehorn a building into the available space
Townhomes and Apartment building/Multifamily dwelling are too dense; too many cars will be added and too much concrete.
Don't like the long wall of buildings in #1, and #3 seems very bulky. Like the gap between the two buildings in #2, which feels less walled-in.
I like the plain residential approach here with no need to attract a business for a multi-use aspect. Prefer townhouse to multi-family here.
We need mixed use in this area and though we might lose one or two potential affordable units, the mixed use would bring in business to Bridge St.
I like all the scenarios, but they only net a small number of affordable units.

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 36 Bridge Street?</b>
They all would blend in
Design of the lot. Building height
Townhomes would be more of the same of what seems to be currently built in the area.
I think the town homes would be more appealing to current residents and show people in the Falls that not all housing has to be apartments. There are already business space opportunities, but I like that one next.
Since this area of Bridge St. is semi-commercial--Ebenezer's K-9 Etiquette etc.--a mixed use development seems in character. Including commercial spaces may create more pull into the Falls and stimulate further development.
Seems crowded, access is a busy street, ? if 3 1/2 stories is out of character for that space.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. matches neighborhood where is bus stop play ground</li> <li>2. presents 2 problems-maintaing tenates and parking</li> <li>3. is ugly</li> </ol>
ssTownhomes: most visually attractive and provides 2 low-income units. Apartment buidings seem out of place there. The mixed-use idea is less attractive visually, but that is really what we need - a more walkable community where we meet more needs locally. The townhome concept could have one ground-floor business with an apartment above.
<p>They all seem very tall.          Really like like trees in the back and front.          Can you not make three sets of two townhomes? Give more space between.          The multi-use idea I think it's hard to do at this time. Especially with working from home so prevalent.          Look at the empty places in town.          Better to have people have really nice places to live.</p>
The Town Homes look really crowded and tall in the drawings. The mixed use/duplex would also be an economic development opportunity.
I think any of these could be developed appropriately.
I think the first scenario could be of benefit.
Any one of these scenarios are fine with me. I like the green space in the back and also hiding the parking so it isn't visible to the street. I think off street parking, would probably be desirable for most people, but not necessary from my point of view.
Parking could be an issue with each scenario. Not sure about accessibility.
No zoning relief is a plus.
Flood zone? For years Hass could nut build because of this. What's new?
I like all somewhat because I think a variety of architectural styles and scale provides interest and choice to residence and I find that variety also to be aesthetically pleasing.

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 36 Bridge Street?</b>
<p>Town Houses: street relationship seems better, with less mass on the street. And I like that the car park does not separate housing from the green space behind.            Mixed use duplexes: I like that street front would include retail/ service but wonder whether it would not become vacant. Don't like how parked cars separate the two duplexes            Small multi family: Street front might be a bit imposing. Paring at rear would Bo            Lock access to green space.</p>
<p>I think they each have their strength and weaknesses but are all good concepts. I think new development in this part of Town should ideally have ,Ã¸sacrificial,Ã¸ first floors for flood resiliency so projects that don't have residential on the first floor might be preferable.</p>
<p>If we are wanting to defend ourselves from development pressures that are hostile to our community values, a priority must be for us to provide housing that is truly affordable, and will continue to be affordable over the very long term. In deciding what housing to build, we must consider what will best protect us from any further 40B challenges.</p>
<p>Whats gonna hold the most people and whats gonna get built?</p>
<p>I dislike that most of these proposals will be difficult to accommodate accessibility features. The housing is nice, but we also must offer accessible options. The proposals are good uses of that space, but we should be aware these styles are often difficult or prohibitively expensive to modify, if necessary.</p>
<p>Just build more housing</p>
<p>I think Scenario 1 would be challenging for parking with only 2 spaces - otherwise, I like the street front view and extension to the rear.            Scenario 2 is my favorite with mixed use commercial, especially in that location.            Scenario 3 seems fine but uninspired.</p>
<p>Without information about the size of each unit, I like the small multifamily best because I think it would appeal to different kinds of households and it recognizes that, in a town like South Hadley, with few public transit options, there is sufficient parking. It also provides two affordable housing units. I like the mixed use idea, especially close to the Falls, but without knowing what kind of commercial use might be made of the first floor in the street-front, it's hard to know how attractive this might be to families. I also wish it had more affordable housing units. I neither like nor dislike the townhomes concept, although the lack of parking would definitely be an issue because of limited on-street parking in the area.</p>
<p>I like mixed-use in general, but mixed-use buildings on that block seem to have the business portion often vacant. Maybe it's not a great spot for businesses.</p>
<p>I think that more rental units would fit in the 3rd option, so I like that. I think the townhomes also look nice in option 1. Option 2 seemed like a practical choice with 2 separate buildings and a commercial space being available,Ã¸ more residents might be a great way to attract a new business</p>
<p>Due to 40R placement, whichever looks to work well but Scenario 1, w/ in-unit parking would be my choice if I were to live there. Why aren't more units in each Affordable Housing?</p>
<p>It's a very small area. A developer did bring the idea of constructing something similar to what you propose to the Planning Board; not sure what came of that.</p>
<p>Parking spaces are important, as is green space. Parking is why I rated Scenario 3 best. What residents would see outside their front and back windows is unfortunate, though...very close buildings.</p>

## Mill 6

What do you like or dislike about each scenario for Mill 6?
#1: too many units - potentially traffic problems from parking area to street at rush hours. Very "blocky", institutional appearance. #2: feels like apples and oranges - apartment dwellers as 2nd class citizens. #3: most green space; smaller buildings more appealing than 1 large building.
More open space for families to enjoy.
I prefer the look of scenario 1. I believe the refurbished mill is popular in many places.
Scenario 1 is the least overall complicated from the standpoint of constructions and bylaws, and offers the most affordable housing.
Better for the occupants to be off the road a bit, also prefer some open space along the road. The townhomes are more realistic living options for people. Parking numbers must be realistic.
stop forcing low income housing on this community. We have enough!!
Scenario 3 seems to conform to the Town's new Master Plan, with larger setbacks and more open space.
The illustrations for all of these don't have enough detail to really assess visuals and bulk. #1 looks best in the sketch, but the plan feels like it needs ways through from each street as the long building is daunting. In #2, the townhomes look decent in the sketch, but 'project-like' in their repetition and the corridor building seems huge. #3 looks more like something in a Rt 128 office park than housing--needs balconies or other devices to break up the huge walls.
The layouts in all of these seem like they might be able to accommodate some aspects of proposals that have been made over the years by various consultants on daylighting Buttery Brook to create a multi-user path. Could we explore this concept more fully in conjunction with planning of any housing projects?
--AIA-South Hadley SDAT Report, 2012: <a href="https://www.briqbase.org/sites/default/files/sdat_aiab095526_southhadley_2012.pdf">https://www.briqbase.org/sites/default/files/sdat_aiab095526_southhadley_2012.pdf</a> --South Hadley Redevelopment Authority-Executive Summary, 2017 <a href="https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/5452/South-Hadley-Urban-Redevelopment-and-Renewal-Plan-Executive-Summary?bidId=">https://www.southhadley.org/DocumentCenter/View/5452/South-Hadley-Urban-Redevelopment-and-Renewal-Plan-Executive-Summary?bidId=</a> --Planning Dept. Exhibit of UMass Student Falls Concept Drawings (appx. 2011; media/docs not online), with one project focused on daylighting Buttery Brook to create a park with a walking/biking path
the townhouse inclusion makes it seem less industrial and might attract a mix of residents.
I like Scenario 3 because provided open spaces with similar number of affordable housing units.
Accommodate many nice looking units
I like the mixed look and the varied options of townhomes and the larger apartment building.

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for Mill 6?</b>
<p>In my opinion, an 85-90 unit building(s) is way out of character with the neighborhood--it's a social disaster waiting to happen--it's like a public housing project from the 60s come back to unholy life! The townhouses are better--can they be expanded over the whole site? Are recreational amenities part of these development schemes or is it all about parking? What about proximity to E-ink and fuel company industrial site?</p>
<p>Really would like to have this property developed and the density increase but again concerned re access onto a busy road. 1: Utilizes space well, looks like an apartment bldg; 2: Townhouse Entrances are ugly. 3: Too jail-like.</p>
<p>Is a corridor building an apartment building with hallways? I looked it up and still couldn't figure that out. If so - those are not awesome places to live except when they are things like senior communities. I also don't like four stories. Why are all the options mentioned four stories high. This is way out of character for our town. But - the plans with setbacks that allow greenery are much better looking. All future development should be done with the knowledge that our future will include rainfall and heat of a type we haven't yet seen. So we must limit impermeable surfaces in new development. All housing should be surrounded by trees. Let's not intentionally build urban heat islands or places that won't drain in storms.</p>
<p>I LOVE the notion of taking this property which is such an eyesore for housing. Unfortunately all of the designs look like boxes. They do not have the look and feel of the town.        Could we not make them all town homes that are colonial looking or build the buildings like the Village Commons?         Like the trees in the back to block the business adjacent to the property and around the property. This is such a great opportunity.</p>
<p>Any proposal to redevelop/repurpose this eyesore would be great! I would cede any preconceived ideas I have to whatever options are the most practical and feasible.</p>
<p>My first concern is about any contamination that has resulted from previous use of this land. Did the Mill release any chemicals that would be harmful to residents?</p>
<p>Expect analysis of site will reveal need for brown soil remediation. If so, also expect Federal and State governments can be tapped for funding some to the eventual development cost. All would benefit from nearby municipal services and public transportation.</p>
<p>I like 2 because it has a more residential feel than the industrial boxes proposed in 1 and 3.</p>
<p>Like that more units can be developed. Like that there is sufficient parking. And that green space is possible. Interesting project for the redevelopment property to tackle &amp; should interest competent private developers,</p>
<p>Too close to the business uses that are currently there.</p>
<p>This site is not appropriate for residential housing unless there is first a major investment in brownfield cleanup first, to the best of my knowledge.</p>

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for Mill 6?</b>
<p>Conforming. Buildings are blackish with heavy facing on the street. Parking dominates. Little green space.</p> <p>Townhomes and corridor: street front seems less imposing, even more porous. Interior seems to provide ample green space and organic connection to parking, as well as two sections of development.</p> <p>Corridor building redesign: could be the bolder street fronting is better suited to the rest of the street. And I like how the two sections seem connected visually. But has more the feel of an industrial, if verdant, park farther than a residential community.</p>
<p>Housing next to petrochemical storage with high amounts of truck traffic is bad policy from an environmental justice standpoint. The Town needs to make a decision about what is more important - maintaining the medium industrial zone or re-envisioning the Falls as primarily residential. I don't think the Town will get much developer interest in this parcel.</p>
<p>You should put up all of these possible projects for community members to look at outside of answering a survey under deadline.</p>
<p>Area should be thoroughly examined for toxins that would impact health. Chemical plants were there for years</p>
<p>All good,</p>
<p>My biggest hangup about the site is a y remaining pollutants from decades ago (in the soils, for example). I wouldn't want a lot of people living there if it was polluted. (I believe there was a situation decade's ago). Otherwise, I think it's wonderful and would love to see mixed use development to encourage business and small shops, possibly offices and apartments.</p>
<p>Scenario 2 is my favorite - it relates to the context the best. Not sure about wrapping the large building around the back corner - I might extend it fully on Gaylord St. Parking needs to be reconfigured to provide some shared greenspace/playground.</p> <p>I like the shared Greenspace in scenario 3 but I don't think this configuration relates well to the context.</p> <p>I like the street relationship on scenario 1 better than 3 - again, parking needs to be considered to create an accessible and inviting greenspace so the lot doesn't feel overtaken by parking.</p>
<p>Again, not sure what household types would be served by the units in each, but I like the number of units provided by all three scenarios, the percentage of units that would be affordable, and the recognition that parking will be needed by residents in most of the units. The first and third scenarios look a bit brutalist in design, but it's good that no zoning relief would be needed in Scenario 1. I also like the green space imagined around the buildings. Scenario 2 is my favorite, since it offers some diversity in housing choice and, particularly from Lamb St., would offer interesting facades to the public.</p>
<p>Scenario 3 kinda looks like a stereotypical housing project, but still better than the current building. The other two are buildings I'd be quite happy to live next to. (I am a neighbor of this site)</p>
<p>Love the look and the number of units in option 2</p>
<p>Having lived in a converted factory condo for 20 years, I'd need a great deal more information to answer this question.</p>

**What do you like or dislike about each scenario for Mill 6?**

The problem with this location, which I have often thought of as a potential site for housing development, is the nearby use of dangerous chemicals by e-Ink and also the oil company. On top of that, the former industry that was located at the current building was closed I believe because of health issues within the structure (cancer causing????)

Scenario 1 is ugly, ugly, and the dense housing is unpalatable for residents. I would hate living there. In scenario 2, I like how the facade that faces Lamb Street complements the existing homes, and the design mixes choices for people renting. This one is a winner. Scenario 3 is much like the first: blocky and ugly.

- 1) conforming to current zoning.
- 2) open space view for the most residences
- 3) does not encroach on Buttery Brook, making it seem more public than private.

## 506 Granby

**What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 506 Granby Road?**

- #1: could be good option, but traffic concerns - getting onto Rte 202 during rush hours.
- #2: green space good, design around central space pleasant
- #3: see #2. Also like the idea of getting rid of/changing Liquor Town building. But still have traffic concerns.

Looks much nicer and allows mixed use.

Scenario #:3: The overall design is different, unique to the area and complements pedestrian traffic. It is with the extra rule changes needed to implement it.

Realistic parking counts would be important. We don't actually have consistent public transportation in SH, and none of the scenarios would allow realistic bicycle storage.

Commercial property should be developed to encourage businesses to move to town

Scenario 1 seems responsive to what South Hadley needs based on the Housing Needs and Assessment Interim Deliverable.

Scenario 3 seems like it would build up this site way too much without any thought or room for green open space, trees, etc.

**What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 506 Granby Road?**

#1-housing for seniors, small households (including singles) is good and maximizes space, but multistory buildings will require many elevators for those residents, some of whom may be bringing bikes up with them (younger singles). In the drawing the buildings seem rather overpowering--maybe break things up a bit? Would be better without the existing building in the front.

#2- Leaves the existing building and has fewer units, so is less desirable.

#3- Like the idea of replacing the exiting building and adding more housing (is there a roof deck at the rear?), though I'm not totally sold on placement right at the sidewalk. Seems like it needs some landscaping and green space, and perhaps a covered walkway for the shops. Seems too austere and urban for the location. This plan seems to get more out of the site.

One thing I'm not seeing any any of these scenarios is OUTDOOR SEATING. I live in a condo, and since the builder was not required by the town to add this, we don't have it, and it's a real deficiency. The town should insist that builders think about how residents will use outdoor space and provide some gathering places/seating.

Also, please consider possibilities for developing walking/biking path resources to connect among housing projects such this one with other locations like East Street, and existing places like Pine Grove and Hadley Village. Silo vision should be turned off and holistic vision on for all projects. Thanks.

I like the first two since they seem relatively simple and don't depend on attracting additional businesses in order to not look derelict. I prefer the current set back of the business.

Why are we even considering taking away an existing profitable business? Why not the defunct (in my opinion) nursing home across the street?

I like the idea of mixed-use townhomes.

Wonder about parking and the appearance

So, you are looking at a place of business for a home site? Nice.

We need to encourage more housing for families in South Hadley. We have an aging population and need to attract younger families while maintaining housing options for Seniors. A mixed use with apartments for 55+ with low to no outside maintenance would be appealing while making space with central shared green area for all close to businesses, buses and sidewalks would be great.

I am not enthusiastic about this as a site for housing development--off of busy 202--really no pedestrian opportunities. I prefer housing development in sites with some existing density and walkable commercial opportunities. Residents here will be marooned in a cul de sac with no option but to drive, drive, drive!

1: Affordable apartments I would hope; 2. Maybe too upscale for the area, not as affordable?; 3. Why lose a viable business? Whatever would contribute to our tax base in the end.

I haven't mentioned Costs of Coomunity Services. These rate different types of development based on the ratio of costs of services vs revenue generated. The COCS for housing is always greater than 1. See paragraphs 4 and 5 here and note that more than 60% of the costs of services are for schools. So housing that is designed to fit only 1 or 2 people is desirable, and development that includes commercial spaces also defrays the tax burden of residential development.  
<https://web.extension.illinois.edu/lcr/cost.cfm>

<b>What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 506 Granby Road?</b>
First i like the new mixed use that would spruce up the last as a unified presence.
I'm not a fan at all of the design shown. Does not look like the town. Too modernistic and block looking.
If these units are meant for seniors then two or three stories is not a place a senior would like to live at that stage of life. I'm one of them. :) Could you make attached carriage houses on one level?
Seems like a business use on Rte 202 could get some traction. Don't really see the appeal of this site otherwise - living in a unit behind the Liquor Town does not have much appeal
I prefer the buildings set-back from Granby Road and think a mixed use building up against the road would look odd given the other properties/businesses along the road.
I like the idea of providing green spaces for the occupants. Mixed use has been a favorite of mine but I am not sure that I like it in this specific proposal.
On heavily trafficked route, probably needing traffic light for egress onto Rt 202. Option 2 offers a combination of green spaces on-site along with ample parking. Existing viable business adjacencies are retained.
Liquor store is ugly, mixed could provide amenities that seniors and others would enjoy, such as coffee shop, convenience store etc. I like the less dense feeling of option 3.
Actually moderately like all of the design scenarios. But went neutral - because not sure having housing so close to a liquor store could be problematic.
Too close to the current use
This site, to the best of my knowledge, is proximate to the closed town dump and to the industrial area in Granby near the South Hadley town line. If I am correct it is not a suitable area for public investment in housing in my opinion.
Small unit multi family: lots of green but provided smaller housing, which needed badly. Townhouses behind existing: nice cluster around open space Townhouse behind mixed use: same as above with advantage of mixed use connected by pedestrian paths. Ideal!
Extremely busy section of town. Not a good site for children . Wetlands are in the area and must be considered as to impact of units/ building on this site.
I prefer option 1
I actually like a combination of scenarios 1 and 3 - the new mixed use at the front with the larger small units buildings and central shared green at the back.
I don't know very much about this site, so it's harder for me to know what I like and/or dislike about the three scenarios. However, possibly because it would require SO much to accomplish Scenario 3, I think I like it least (although I'm a big admirer of mixed-use developments). The first scenario provides the most housing, of course, and for a senior population that is growing ever larger in South Hadley. None of the scenarios suggest how much affordable housing the town might see from such a development. By the way, I loved this part of the survey.

**What do you like or dislike about each scenario for 506 Granby Road?**

The Liquor Town business owner already went through one business move in recent years. I don't know the details of his situation but, assuming he wants to stay in business there, I would want to be sure any new mixed-use building would be done with careful consideration for his needs and the health of his business.

Is the 3rd option cost-effective?

Well these are great ideas, but what about the current owner???

Scenario 1: I have seen these sort of units in my travels, and I like the number of units that would be created, through an interesting design that isn't blocky and boring. Scenario 2 looks fine, but - only 20 units? We can do better. Scenario 3 allows for businesses that could cater to this, and the existing, neighborhood. That's great! The entire design is attractive.