

36 Mr. Trefethen explained to the applicants that the Board has reviewed the documents they
37 submitted to the Planning Office, he requested the applicants to make their presentation.

38

39 Mr. Bacon explained that they bought their home in 2018 which was built in 1963, it is a 1,350
40 square foot home on a 9,656 square foot lot. It does not mean the current bylaws for setbacks, but
41 it also doesn't meet their needs. Cars do not fit in the garage, and there is a steep driveway that is
42 unsafe during snow and ice. The original construction did not have insulation in the walls. The
43 size of the home does not fit their growing family's needs. They are asking to add a 2-car garage
44 with living space on top, as well as replace an existing shed with a new shed. Mr. Bacon shared
45 renderings of the proposed plan.

46

47 Mr. Trefethen stated that they received a letter from the Building Commissioner dated March 17,
48 2024 (sic/should be 2025) noting the setback requirements for the RA Zone District, which is 40-
49 feet for the front yard, 10-feet for the side, 30-feet for the back yard. The home is pre-existing
50 non-conforming, and why they were required to come before the Board.

51

52 Mr. Sullivan inquired, and Mr. Bacon confirmed, that the intent is to preserve the backyard for a
53 play area.

54

55 Mr. May inquired, and Mr. Bacon confirmed, that the renderings were done by licensed architect
56 Trisha Kendall; they have not yet been through the engineering phase for the retaining wall and
57 structural.

58

59 Mr. Forestal inquired, and Mr. Bacon responded, that the kitchen window/back wall is the starting
60 point of where the addition would begin, rather than redoing a new kitchen.

61

62 Mr. May inquired as to whether the 22-foot setback line for the proposed addition is with slope;
63 Mr. Bacon stated that there is a good amount of distance between that setback line and the street.

64

65 **Public Comment**

66 Mr. Trefethen read a letter that was received from Jim F. Raton, 124 Olive Street, who is a direct
67 abutter. Mr. Raton expressed his approval of the project.

68

69 Mr. Trefethen explained the criteria of the granting of a Special Permit, the Board must determine
70 that the adverse effects of the proposed use will not outweigh its beneficial impacts to the Town
71 or neighborhood.

72

73 Mr. May stated that what is being proposed is reasonable; his only concern would be the elevations
74 and ensuring that retaining walls are structurally built to code.

75

76 Mr. Sullivan agreed, and stated the reason why they are moving it forward and not back makes
77 sense. It will not be a detriment to the neighborhood, and building the addition would enable the
78 family to stay in Ashland.

79

80 Mr. Siegel believes it is a reasonable request and would support it.

81

82 Mr. Trefethen would support it also, and feels it would be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

83

84 Community Needs: Allowing a family to grow and continue to be part of the Ashland community.

85 Traffic Flow: There will be a garage and there would not be parking on the street.

86 Adequacy of Utilities: It does not appear there would be an increase in utilities.

87 Neighborhood character and social structures: The applicant set forth what the neighborhood is
88 like.

89 Impacts on the natural environment: Little more asphalt but nothing of significance.

90 Potential fiscal impact: There would be a small time of employment, there would be an increase
91 in the tax base.

92

93 Mr. Esparza will draft the hearing Decision in favor of the proposal, based on the conversation.

94 Mr. Trefethen explained that they will rotate the voting Members, for tonight's hearing the three

95 voting members who will vote on the hearing decision at the next meeting will be Mr. Trefethen,

96 Mr. Forestal and Mr. May.

97

98 **Motion:** Mr. Forestal motioned, and Mr. May seconded, to continue the hearing to the next
99 meeting on April 22nd at 7:00 PM which passed with the following vote: 5-0-0.

100 Mr. Trefethen: Aye

101 Mr. Forestal: Aye

102 Mr. Siegel: Aye

103 Mr. Sullivan: Aye

104 Mr. May: Aye

105

106 The Board took a five-minute recess.

107

108 **Continuance of Public Hearing – 10-60 Main Street; 40 B Comprehensive Permit**

109 Mr. Trefethen read the Public Hearing Notice: *The Ashland Zoning Board of Appeals will reopen*

110 *the Public Hearing to hear the petition from SLV Ashland, LLC, requesting a Comprehensive*

111 *Permit per M.G.L. Chapter 40B, Sections 20-23 to allow for the development of two (2) multifamily*

112 *story buildings for 250 apartment units, and 337 concealed podium parking spaces. The applicant*

113 *also proposed to restore and convert the northernmost mills 7,500 sq. ft. int., commercial and*

114 *retail space, some of it open to the public. The property in question is located at 10-60 Main Street,*

115 *Assessors Map 14, Lot 128, in the Ashland Overlay Downtown District A (ADD-A) and Industrial*

116 *base zoning.*

117

118 Mr. Trefethen noted that public meetings have been held on January 7, February 11, March 11 and
119 March 25, 2025. At the conclusion of the last meeting, they discussed completing the review of
120 the traffic studies. At the request of the traffic peer reviewer, that discussion will be continued to
121 the next meeting on April 22, 2025, so he can finish his report and discuss with the applicant. Jeff
122 Engler confirmed that MDM Transportation has some lingering issues and they want to bring the
123 outstanding items to closure, and therefore will focus tonight's meeting on Civil Engineering.

124
125 Joseph Peznola, Hancock Associates, has submitted two reports, dated January 28, 2025 and April
126 1, 2025. Mr. Peznola stated that the April 1st letter includes the initial comment, the applicant's
127 response, and an update. Many items have been satisfactorily addressed. They did meet today with
128 Bohler and will be providing additional responses.

129
130 In regards to the waiver list, Mr. Peznola stated this will evolve as the project progresses, which is
131 normal in 40B projects.

132
133 Mr. Peznola discussed the raceway; DPW has determined that it is blocked off; they are proposing
134 to fill it in. Becca Solomon, Conservation Agent, had mentioned there may be pollutants and sewage
135 leaking into the raceway; they are unsure if this is corroborated, but understand that this site will be
136 monitored carefully due to the contamination issue. A note regarding this should be added to the plan.

137
138 In regards to dewatering, they understand that the site will be under the charge of an LSP during any soil
139 management on site. The applicant should provide a narrative of the options for dewatering, how that will
140 be handled during construction, as a matter of information for the Board.

141
142 In regards to snow storage, the applicant has added snow storage to the plan, but it is a complicated site;
143 their drainage plan will need to be very particular. The snow storage they have provided should be ample
144 for the paved areas.

145
146 In regards to the loading and trash provisions for the commercial portion of the project, they have identified
147 an area for loading and trash; there should be more detail regarding the sufficiency of that space, it is tight.
148 It may require some input from the Board of Health.

149
150 In regards to stormwater, this is one of the two big items that is still open; it is a challenging site. It has the
151 AUL component, as well as floodplain. As a redevelopment project they are allowed some liberties, but
152 they must comply to the maximum extent practicable. Mr. Peznola stated that at this point, they have not
153 gone far enough. They are close, they have asked them to do more. The commercial space on the lower
154 level is at risk of flooding and needs to have precautions laid out.

155
156 Mr. May inquired, and Mr. Peznola responded, that developing the site is better environmentally than not
157 developing the site and remaining vacant.

158
159 Mr. Siegel inquired as to the responsibility to inform the residents that they will be residing in a floodplain;
160 Attorney Mead confirmed that it would be more of a precautionary thing; the Lease Agreement could refer
161 to the Flood Management Plan.

162 Mr. Peznola confirmed that he has dealt with sites in a floodplain, such as this, due to the limited land area
163 available; he confirmed that the applicant still owes a Flood Management Plan.

164
165 Mr. Engler stated he appreciates the thoroughness and diligence of Hancock Associates and Mr. Peznola.
166 Mr. Engler acknowledged that they have some work to do. Mr. Engler stated that dewatering is typically
167 done with a General Contractor involved, at this stage they do not have a General Contractor, but can
168 provide a narrative on some of the possibilities of dewatering. They will provide a preliminary draft Flood
169 Management Plan; but at this time do not have a permit, or a management company.

170
171 Jeff Cusick with Bohler Engineering reiterated that it is a challenging site but feels confident the project is
172 an improvement.

173
174 Mr. Trefethen inquired as to whether it would be helpful for Board Members to have a site walk; the Board
175 agreed it would be helpful a bit further in the process.

176
177 Public Comment
178 Mr. Trefethen asked that comments be limited to 2-3 minutes and be limited to the discussion tonight which
179 is regarding engineering. Mr. Trefethen listed the emails they have received, which will be entered into the
180 record of the hearing.

181
182 Connie Mannell, resident, discussed her opposition to the project; Mr. Trefethen stated that they have to
183 follow the process of Chapter 40B, which supersedes zoning laws.

184
185 Curtis Hoffman, resident, hopes everyone understands the term 100-year flooding; these events are
186 happening more frequently.

187
188 Mark Dassoni, resident, inquired, and Mr. Trefethen responded that tonight's meeting covers those various
189 issues that our peer review engineer has discussed tonight. It was a general civil overview.

190
191 Mr. Johnson, resident, inquired, and Mr. Trefethen responded that the site is a little over seven acres, a
192 playground is located in the middle.

193
194 Mr. Engler asked that he be copied on the emails received.

195
196 Mr. Trefethen noted that the next meeting date is scheduled for April 22nd; Mr. Engler feels that a follow-
197 up meeting on the Traffic could occur at that time although he will not be able to attend; the follow-up
198 meeting for the Engineering could be in four weeks.

199
200 **Meeting Minutes: March 25, 2025**

201 Tabled to next meeting due to receiving late.

202
203 **Staff Updates and Administrative Matters**

204 The Board discussed adding an extra meeting; Mr. Esparza suggested an extra meeting be held on
205 May 6, 2025, Board Members agreed.

206

207 Mr. Esparza explained that in regards to 61 Waverly Street 40B, both of the peer reviewers have
208 been advised to continue their work, we have not yet received a peer review report.

209

210 **Adjournment**

211 **Motion:** Mr. Forestal motioned and Mr. May seconded, to adjourn the meeting, which passed with
212 the following vote: 5-0-0.

213 Mr. Trefethen: Aye

214 Mr. Forestal: Aye

215 Mr. Siegel: Aye

216 Mr. Sullivan: Aye

217 Mr. May: Aye

218

219 The meeting adjourned at 8:50 PM.

220

221 Documents Presented at the April 8, 2025 Meeting

222 1. Letter from the Building Commissioner re: 128 Olive Street

223 2. Special Permit Application for 128 Olive Street

224 3. Engineering Report for 10-60 Main Street from Hancock Associates