

# MINUTES

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting – June 15, 2021  
115 Pleasant Street, Via Zoom.  
Gardner, MA 01440

Sitting in on Hearing:

Raymond LaFond      Mel Cornett.  
Michael Gerry        GETV  
Randy Heglin.

In Attendance:

Roland Jean	Sandra Stevenson	Richard Jellyman	Nico Recine
Rachel Taylor	Brenda	Brian Marchetti	Mark Schafron
Steve Rockwood	Sean Macfee	Julie Palmer	Bill Hannagan
Robert Libby	Paul Cormier	Josh Levy	Bobby Young
Dawn Casavant	Jason Piland	Alan Belanger	Stephen Fleshman
Moriah Day	Carol Grave	Gustafson	Linda Blake
Ahmed Hatim	Todd Helwig	Richard	Trevor Beauregard
Attorney C Tree	Frank Yarorosky	Chris Keenan	Karen Graves
Tim Hunt	Iphone chcpHII	Gary Martin	Boaventurea Furt
Patrick Marchetti	Alan Belanger	Chris Daly	Stanley Hunt
Linda Begley	Gloria Fournier	Svetlana Christakova	

Meeting Called to Order by Chairman Raymond LaFond at 6 PM

Mr. LaFond went over the ground rules for the Zoom meeting and how the proceeding will take place, stating “In pursuant to Governor Baker’s March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §20, and the Governor’s March 15, 2020 Order imposing strict limitation on the number of people that may gather in one place, this meeting of the Gardner Zoning Board of Appeals will be conducted via remote participation and on the City’s YouTube Channel. The audio or video recording, transcript, or other comprehensive record of proceedings will be posted on the City’s website as soon as possible after the meeting. Since this meeting is being conducted via Zoom, all votes taken will be by roll call and all participants to raise their hands to be recognized”. Mr. LaFond explained the requirements that must be addressed for a Variance or Special Permit. He then noted the meeting is usually streamed live to YouTube, but due to a meeting conflict tonight this meeting will be uploaded to YouTube at a later date this week, a request was made if anyone objected. There were no objections.

<u>Case #</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Address / Request</u>
Case #2021-04-02:	<u>V</u> Alan Belanger (con)	161 Chelsea St. Prof Office & Warehouse.
Case #2021-05-02:	<u>V</u> Martin Bros (con)	Timpany Blvd. Parking Forward of Building
Case #2021-06-01:	<u>V</u> Richard Jellyman	57 Clairmont St. Variance for Frontage.
Case #2021-06-02:	<u>SP</u> BCF Group Inc	75 Oak St. Multi-Family Home
Case #2021-06-03:	<u>SP</u> Heywood Hospital	242 Green St. Surgical Center.
Case #2021-06-04:	<u>SP</u> Heywood Hospital	242 Green St. Medical Building.

Tonight's first case – 2021-04-02, will be chaired by Mr. LaFond, the Clerk Mr. Gerry and third member, Mr. Heglin. The Chair will be then be handed to Mr. Heglin for all others cases on tonight's agenda. Items on this agenda may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chairman.

Case # 2021-04-02 Alan Belanger - 161 Chelsea St. Office and Storage Units for5 a use variance, Continued.

Mr. LaFond opened the meeting to Mr. Belanger or his representation to recap the case, and add any new information if there was any.

Patrick Marchetti – Standing in for Brian Marchetti - Engineer for Mr. Belanger.

The applicant is requesting a variance for a building at 161 Chelsea St. The existing building has been vacant for a long time, it was originally built in 1930 and used as a warehouse for many years. The location and size is a good fit for Mr. Belanger's plans as he would like to use part of the building as office space and the rest will be used as storage bays.

Mr. LaFond informed all present that a site visit had be conducted on May 24, 2021. The tour of the property showed that both the inside and outside were in a state of disrepair, significant work would need to be done. The applicant had supplied a new set of plans at the site indicating a change to the parking lot area, which would be less intrusive to the abutting properties.

Mr. Heglin requested a screen share of the plans as he had not received the new plans.

Mr. Marchetti screen shared plans. Explaining the white area on the left side of the plan was originally going to be for pod storage but the new plan is to have this area as parking. Everything from the left side onwards would be landscaped, there is no plan for larger lighting poles but downwards facing lights will be wall mounted on the building facing down towards the parking.

Mr. Heglin requested indication on the plan as to where the lights would be placed on the building.

Mr. Belanger indicated that a light would be placed between every second bay door. Three lights in total on the left side of the building, two on the front and four on the right and four more in the court yard area. All would be downwards facing and of a soft color.

Mr. LaFond asked what the hours of lighting would be.

Mr. Belanger stated the lights in his other locations are on from dusk to dawn, so this is what he intended to stick to here but he would be open to other times if it was requested by the board.

Mr. LaFond asked if Mr. Belanger had talked to the abutters yet as he had mentioned he would do so at the site visit.

Mr. Belanger clarified that he had not reached out yet as he was waiting to see if the variance would pass in order to move forward with the purchase, he would arrange a meeting with abutters once he knew if the project could move forward.

Mr. LaFond asked what the hours of business would be.

Mr. Belanger planned that the hours of operation would be 7am to 7pm five days a week, Saturdays will be 8am to 2pm with no business on Sundays and Holidays.

Mr. LaFond asked if the bays would have inside lights as what will stop people for working inside the bays.

Mr. Belanger stated that he purposely will not have power inside the bays to avoid them being used as anything other storage.

Mr. Heglin asked if the lot would be gated and fenced, if not how would, renters be stopped from using facility outside of regular hours.

Mr. Belanger currently has no intention on fencing in the lot but would be open to the discussion of it, should renters try to enter bays outside of stated hours they would be sited with a warning and receive an eviction letter if offence was repeated.

Mr. Marchetti added that security cameras would be installed so recording could be reviewed at any time.

Mr. LaFond asked if all these rules would be documented and made clear to the renters.

Mr. Belanger said that there is always a rental agreement which clearly states what the rules are and what is expected of the renter. Each of these rule has to be initialed before the final signing of the contract.

Any reps from the city to speak.

Mr. Roland Jean – City of Gardner Building commissioner and Zoning Enforcement Officer

Mr. Jean asked about the location of the parking lot stating that if the lot starts less than 5 feet from the property line they would need a variance to keep it where it is.

Mr. Marchetti stated that the current plan has the parking 3 feet from the lot line but this can be moved to give the 5 feet needed.

Mr. LaFond asked if a plan could be submitted with the parking moved to fit the 5 feet, also asking if there would be parking on the right side of the property also.

Mr. Belanger insisted that the only parking would be on that left side but vehicles will be able to get down the right side to unload and load the units.

Any questions from abutters.

Linda Begley – 30 Blake St, is in full support of the project and look forward to the building being repaired and used again. Mr. Belanger is a very nice man and does a great job.

Gloria Fournier – 18 Blake St, Also pleased that Mr. Belanger is taking on this job. He is a very hard worker, he has done some work at her home and was a very fast, clean and honest worker.

No further questions.

Mr. LaFond informed the board that a decision meeting should be scheduled for next week as tonight's agenda is very full. The board understands that there is a time issue with the sale of the building but in order to give the case the time it needs a decision meeting on Monday is the best option for this case.

Mr. Belanger stated that this would incur a cost to him with the realtor but he would make it happen.

Meeting closed.

Mr. LaFond handed the chair to Mr. Heglin for the remainder of the meeting.

All cases will now be heard by Mr. Heglin, Acting Chairman, Mr. Gerry, Clerk and Mr. Cornett third member.

Case # 2021-05-01. Martin Brothers/CHC. 0 Timpany Blvd, Variance for Parking in front of building.

Mr. Heglin requested that CHC or representative to outline the variance request.

Mr. Tim Hunt – Rep of Martin Bros Construction.

Mr. Hunt informed all present that the community health connection planned on using this land to open a second location for an urgent care facility and primary care medical office. Reps from both the CHC and the civil engineer are present on this zoom meeting as well as the legal rep Mr. Todd Helwig. All are ready to answer any questions the board may have. In brief, the variance is requested so the parking lot can be in front of the building so as to use the natural topography on the land for drainage. Should the parking to be placed at the rear it would incur a larger cost and the need for extensive fill. A review has been conducted by the conservation committee and they stated that there is wet land present in the rear which would cause problems if the parking need to be back there.

Mr. Heglin stated that the board has no such record from the conservation board and cannot submit this information without having a document to support it or a verbal statement from the Conservation Agent.

Mr. Chris Keenan – Quinn Engineering.

Mr. Keenan stated that the CHC proposed the 20,000 square feet facility for medical, dental and behavioral services. Entrance would be off Timpany Blvd and the Walmart access road. Traffic will be separated with regular traffic in front and the access road entrance at the rear would be for trucks and deliveries. The lot has a natural incline which aids in natural water drainage to pail factory brook. Current plan to try and keep as much of the topography as possible.

Mr. Heglin asked if there was a plan of the actual building yet

Mr. Keenan stated that the CHC had a preferred look in the works but final plans had yet to be finalized. They intend to have this site look very much like their other sites.

Mr. Heglin inquired about the distance from the lot to the brook.

Mr. Keenan stated that is was about 500 feet from the banking to the brook.

Attorney Todd Helwig – Legal Rep for the case

Attorney Helwig re-iterated Mr. Keenan’s explanation of the hardship should this variance not be granted. Land water and storm drainage would be costly to the project which would be money better used in the building and facilities. Keeping the parking in the current location would be more visible and convenient to patients using the urgent care and medical facility. The Walmart access road will grant easy and quick access for deliveries without disruption to patrons. Walmart also has their parking out front so it will actually be in keeping with the look of the area.

Mr. Heglin requested a screen share of the plot plan to get a better idea of the project.

Mr. Keenan screen shared current plot plan of the land.

Mr. Heglin asked how the amount of parking spaces had been calculated.

Mr. Keenan explained that 100 spaces are present, which is more than adequate for the normal use for these facilities.

Mr. Heglin asked how close the street on Timpany the first row of parking would be

Mr. Keenan indicated on the plan where the first line of parking would be, stating that it is currently 30 feet from property line then you have 15 of public sidewalk, so from parking to street its about 45 feet. This can be altered at the request of the board.

Mr. Heglin informed the Board that the code states that landscaping need to be 4.2 of the gross area, so to the area you have it would be 84 parking spaces. So you would need 15 Square feet of landscape to ever 100 Square feet of parking. What is the square footage of the parking lot and can you make changes to accommodate more landscaping.

Mr. Keenan confirmed that the parking lot to be 25,000 square feet and it would not be a problem to re arrange the plan to add more if requested. The plans are in the very early stages so changes can be made if needed. The case still needs to go through a site review with planning. This zoning variance application is the first step of many for this project.

Mr. Cornett asked if the facility would be open 24hrs for the urgent care.

Mr. Keenan stated that there is no intention to have this location be 24hr.

No further questions.

Mr. Gerry stated that the board are familiar with the site and does not feel the need to conduct a site visit at this time.

Mr. Heglin made a motion to close the hearing, seconded by Mr. Gerry.

Unanimous Vote to close hearing.

Mr. Jean informed the Board that the state of emergency restrictions on public meetings is lifted today so moving forward all meeting will be back to in person.

Case# 2021-06-01 Richard Jellyman Variance 57 Clairmont St. Access Driveway.

Mr. Heglin opened the floor to M. Jellyman to explain his application.

Mr. Jellyman addressed the Board and all present stating that he has owned this pot of land for over 15 years. It is on the end of a dead paper street. A dwelling was present back in the 1960's but now there is just a foundation left. City water and sewerage is present so the lot is buildable once an access driveway, is installed. He is proposing to place a 12 inch thick gravel driveway, 24 feet wide off the end of the current road on Clairmont St, which will make his land accessible. This area is currently a paper road and there is no other cost effective way to access the property. The driveway will have a turnaround at the end.

Mr. Cornett asked what the distance was from the end of Clairmont to the plot of land in question.

Mr. Jellyman stated that he would need about 200 feet to reach his land and this was also why he planned a turn around, no need to pave all the way down the property line.

Mr. Heglin asked what the available frontage was.

Mr. Jellyman said there was a significant drop off to the side and at one time he could drive down the paper street to get to the lot but now it has become so overgrown that any access at all is impossible.

Mr. Heglin stated that the lot in question was once two lots, 40 and 43. Do you plan to sub divided these lots or are they combined to be just one.

Mr. Jellyman confirmed that the lots were combined as one and registered as one plot in the registry if deeds.

Mr. Heglin inquired if Mr. Jellyman had considered access on Pine Grove as an option.

Mr. Jellyman stated that Pine Grove is a higher elevation and would be extremely costly to consider.

Mr. Heglin asked who is responsible for the current maintenance of the area.

Mr. Jellyman believes it is the city, but cannot confirm that. He will hire a contractor for snow removal if he needs to but it would eventually be the responsibility of the owner/resident.

Mr. Heglin asked if Mr. Jelly if he planned to build a dwelling himself or was he selling the land.

Mr. Jellyman confirmed that the land was currently for sale and granting the driveway will make the sale more desirable.

Any questions from City reps.

Mr. Roland Jean – Building Commissioner and Zoning Enforcement Officer for the City of Gardner.

Mr. Jean stated that this lot is completely land locked so the frontage is to zero. The only access to this lot is via a paper street. Under the definition of frontage in the zoning ordinance 675-210-B\* (quoted and end of minutes). No frontage exists at all for this lot as its entrance is on a paper street.

Any Abutter for or against

Mr. Christopher Daly – 65 Summit Ave.

My lot is an L shape and kind of abuts this property with the paper street Pine Grove running between the two lots. The suggested site for this driveway is on a paper street also, would the construction of this driveway stop the paper street from ever becoming a usable city street? From what he understands Mr. Jellyman wants to remove a paper road for his personal driveway, the turn-around will prevent a paved road from going any further.

Mr. Heglin asked if it would be possible to screen share a plot plan of the area so people could clearly see the proposed site.

Rachel Taylor – Zoning Admin screen shared current plot plan.

Mr. Daley stated that in the future more homes could be built in the area and the city may want to create a real street on the paper road, with the city utilities already accessible it would be feasible option to want to increase the land use. It seem extremely unfair to take this option away by granting a personal driveway at this location.

Sean Finney – 3 Pine Grove/ 1 Clairmont St.

Mr. Finney asked to be shown on the plan the exact area for the proposed driveway. He then went on to explain that he purchased his home back in February of this year and that the lot is heavily wooded. He was concerned that this driveway will affect both the value of his home and the look of the yard as trees will need to be removed.

Mr. Jellyman stated that the paper road was extremely overgrown but does not believe that it would take too much to clear the area for paving. He is not expanding the road merely granting access to the land locked plot he owns.

Mr. Heglin asked, of the financial hardship and how great the cost would be to gain access from another location, say Pine Grove.

Mr. Jellyman stated that any other are of access would exceed the cost of the land itself.

Mr. Cornett requested a site visit.

Mr. Daly reiterated that this proposal was on a paper street and that this was not the private property of Mr. Jellyman, he cannot remove the right to pass an on a city owned street, even though this is just a paper street right now, it may become more in the future.

Mrs. Karen Graves - 30 Clairmont St.

Mrs. Graves stated that she is against this proposal as the driveway will take away from the right for anyone else to use the paper street. Granting this application is giving Mr. Jellyman land that is not just his.

Mr. Heglin clarified that the Board would be looking to grant access to the paper street for a driveway not give the street itself to Mr. Jellyman.

Site visit scheduled for Saturday June 19, 9AM.

Motion to close meeting.

Unanimous vote to close case 2021-06-01.

Case #2021-06-02 BCF Group 75 Oak St. Special Permit. Multi-Family use.

Attorney Christine Tree – Legal Representation for BCF Group.

Attorney Tree screen shared to show photos of the property in question, and began her presentation explaining that, 75 Oak St is located in a mixed-use area with several other multifamily homes in the surrounding area. The property has been vacant for over two years so it has lost its multifamily status by right. Mr. Furtado plans to renovate the property inside and out to bring the building up to code and to create a pleasant environment for occupants. Some siding and windows will be replaced as well as renovations to all kitchens and bathrooms. One unit will be a three bedroom apartment with the other two units being two bedrooms. There will be no expansion to the foot print of the building, landscaping will be up kept and tended. The main issue for this case is the lack of parking. There is a narrow driveway on the left side of the property which has just enough width for one car. On the left of that is a retaining wall about 75 feet long. There is no other space to accommodate parking. It is proposed that tandem parking for three cars would be the only parking option. Granting the Special permit will be of benefit to the city and an occupied structure is safer than an un-occupied structure. There is no land to the rear of the property and as seen in the photos shared all areas are tight. Trash and debris shown in the current picture will be cleared away by now as some time has passed since the images were taken. Triple decker homes are very common in this area and all surrounding homes suffer from lack of parking.

Mr. Heglin asked just how long the property had been vacant.

Atty Tree informed that the foreclosure deed was dated 2017 but the Building Department may be able to clarify the date. She continued to address the 9 criteria for questions of a special permit.

- 1) This application is suitable for the area as there are many triple decker homes, so it is in harmony with the neighborhood.
- 2) Vehicle movement in this area would only be an issue when people pull in and out of the driveway.

- 3) Parking is adequate but not ideal, occupants would be made aware of the tandem parking upon purchase and that they would have to come to an arrangement as two units will be able to park but a third would not.

Mr. Gerry asked what plan would be in place for other parking and what would happen with the parking ban for snow removal.

Attorney Tree believes that West St, has parking available for public parking.

Mr. Heglin stated that only one row is available on West St for overnight parking to the public for winter storms and these are normally used by the residents of Franklin Court.

Mr. Cornett added that these spaces are also first come, first served so parking cannot be relied upon at this lot.

Attorney Tree informed that she would look into this further to find other parking options for future tenants.

- 4) The property is serviced with city water and sewage.
- 5) No additional lighting is planned with the possible exception of a small light above the entry way.
- 6) This is an existing building with only entrance and exiting from the driveway to cause any issue.
- 7) Granting the Special permit will not derogate form the intent of the code but convert the property to a more substantial use.
- 8) There will be no negative impact
- 9) This is consistent with the city master plan and will increase the tax base.

Mr. Furtado – owner and applicant. Clarified that the first floor unit would be a three bedroom apartment and the other two floors would be two bedrooms only. He intends to sell the units and not rent them out.

Reps for the City

Mr. Roland Jean- Building Commissioner for the City of Gardner.

Overnight parking in the city of Gardner is very limited with West St parking lot having just one row available for such, this may not be a viable answer to the parking problem at this location and more thought should be put into other options. Also Mr. Furtado can by right, covert the building as a two family, which would also solve the problem of the parking.

Trevor Beauregard – City of Gardner Community Development. Asked what the size of the investment would be to bring this place up to code should the ZBA grant the special permit?

Attorney Tree informed the board the current estimated cost of the improvements would be around \$135,000. The roof looks good so far but extensive work needs to be done including windows, siding, replacement of kitchens and bathrooms, along with some repaving. All work will be permitted and inspected along the way.

Mr. Heglin asked if there are plans for a sprinkler system to be installed.

Attorney Tree said not at this time.

Mr. Jean advised that should the renovation be more than 50% of the building a sprinkler system would be required.

Attorney Tree took note of this and re iterated that the only real issue with this lot is the parking and she will be looking into the city parking options.

Motion to continue case to the next meeting in July.

Unanimous vote to continue.

Case #2021-06-03 and 2021-06-04. 242 Green St. Heywood Hospital Special Permit for Medical Office and Surgical Center. Two Special Permits – Hospital use is permitted by Special Permit in the RR2 zoning district, and proposed medical office is a preexisting nonconforming use and the expansion of the use is permitted by Special Permit

Mr. Heglin opened the floor to Applicant or Representation.

Bill Hannigan – Hannigan Engineering

Mr. Hannigan started the presentation with a screen share and informed all present that this was part of large project with many people involved most of whom are on this meeting tonight, should the board have questions, someone from the team may be able to answer it better than himself.

242 Green St is the home of Heywood Hospital and it has served the community for a very long time. In recent years the hospital has purchased several lots of land and now has enough space to expand. Recently they expanded on the North side of the campus with a new ER unit and the solar parking area. The area to the left of the building currently has a small parking lot and entrance for deliveries, both of these use the same access driveway. The plan to expand, and renovate this area will need a Special Permit from the Zoning Board, as well as going through the Planning Board. Waterstone properties has been commissioned to construct a new surgical building, in the location of the current MRI unit. This will be a two-story building housing the new surgery unit on the first floor with six OR's. The second floor will accommodate 12-15 medical offices. The structure will be made of steel frame and be in the same finish as the rest of the hospital. The truck delivery area will be utilized as a parking area and deliveries will be relocated to the rear area. Catch basins and underground infiltration will be installed to deal with storm and surface water, directing it back into the ground. All work will be brought up to the current code guidelines.

Screen share show's a bird's eye view of the location of the MRI unit and proposed parking area.

The plan is to demo the MRI unit and rebuild on the existing footprint of the building. All plans were provided in the ZBA application packet.

The Applicant's representative addressed the 9 criteria for a Special Permit.

- 1) The Hospital is a pre-existing, non-conforming use, it was constructed back in 1907 so it pre dates zoning code. The new construction will be for the same use as the rest of the

hospital. The plan is for a full two-story addition but this may change with the cost of materials to not include the full second floor.

- 2) The existing conditions of traffic, patients, and deliveries will be greatly reduced in this area as truck traffic will be relocated to the rear of the hospital. The proposed upgrade will provide a safer pedestrian access. A new side walk will be added to the Woodland Ave area to add to the safety.
- 3) As stated there will be a reconstruction of the parking area at the south of the building, this will include 166 additional parking spaces with a looped drive to segregate the incoming truck traffic and patient traffic. The loading areas will not change. Parking will grant easier access to the building with a better pick up/drop off area for patients.

Mr. Cornett asked if there will be an increase of traffic to this area after the new construction.

Mr. Hannigan explained that there would be an increase in surgeries performed at the location so traffic may increase a little but there has not yet been a traffic study conducted.

- 4) There will be a new service connection for domestic water and sewage. Other utilities are still under review. Fire protection will be expanded from current building. New drainage will be designed in compliance to the Mass DEP Stormwater Management Standards. The majority of water drainage will be captured into underground chambers and released to the soil after filtration.
- 5) The building itself will be upgraded to match the rest of the current building. Any noise will be from the construction only which should only last for a short period of time. The lighting plan is yet to be finalized but will be in compliance with regulations of direction and brightness. Landscaping will be in place as a buffer to all abutters, but has also yet to be finalized. During construction screens/ fences will be used to obstruct the view of job site.

Mr. Heglin asked how close the abutters were on Woodland Ave. Would there be a tree line left to shield that abutter.

Mr. Hannigan stated that the more detailed plan for landscaping will be completed this week, and will look into this area.

- 6) Reconstruction of the parking lot will grant better access to the building and the loop driveway will separate truck traffic from patient traffic making it a much safer use. An addition of the side walk on Woodland Ave will also be safer for pedestrians.
- 7) This is an expansion of the current use and is in harmony with the general purpose and intent the ordinance as stated in 675-110\*(attached to end of minutes). Granting this Special Permit will provide better access to services currently limited at this hospital. As such, the proposal is in harmony with the purpose stated.
- 8) There will be a positive impact on the tax base and the employment increase both long and short term.
- 9) Heywood Hospital is one of Gardner's largest employers in the city, the expansion will bring in new jobs which in turn will bring in new home owners which will then boost local business further adding to the Economic Development plan.

Any Questions from the Board.

Mr. Heglin asked to clarify, that it was stated the second floor of the new surgical unit may not be completed as initially planned because of the cost of construction. Also how did they calculate the amount of parking spaces needed?

Mr. Hannigan explained that it was easier to include the full floor finish in the job cost and should it not run to the full cost then they can push funds to parking development, the size of the build could change from 12,000 feet to 15,000 or even up to 25,000 square feet.

Mr. Heglin asked again how they calculated the amount of parking need in regards to beds.

Mr. Hannigan explained that the parking is calculated from the amounts of bed the hospital has, currently they have 134 beds, 4.2 spaces are need for a medical office. The calculation works on 3 parking spaces per bed, with a 134 Beds and the medical offices, you would need approx. 570 spaces. With the addition you would have approx. 635 so there is sufficient parking. Parking at this site has always been an issue. There are also plans to move the Power/Chilling plant to another area at the rear creating even more space as well as the areas granted by the purchase of the Damon lot.

Mr. Heglin asked if there was a plan for changes should the Damon lot not be purchased.

Mr. Hannigan showed on the plan the option of closing off each end of the parking should the Damon land not be used. Adding that the acquisition of the Damon land was now in the final stages and the reps from Heywood Hospital could explain that part further. The loss of the Damon lot would drop parking from 166 to 118 spaces.

Mr. Heglin inquired on the need for blasting, as in past constructions extensive blasting and boring was needed.

Mr. Hannigan predicted that there would be some blasting needed but they would try to keep it to a minimum, with the intention to then re-use any crushed rock in other areas of the job such as fill to level areas of parking.

Mr. Heglin asked if the parking lot was in need of a lot of fill or excavating.

Mr. Hannigan explained that the entrance ramp which is already present would still be used but the parking itself will be flat and one level. The rear of the lot will drop off which will also help with the drainage.

Mr. Heglin stated that the drainage seems to be a large concern to the abutters and will this question be addressed.

Mr. Hannigan explained that the water drainage issues are all in hand. Water currently runs both towards Crystal Lake, Woodland Ave and down towards the college, following the natural incline of the land. The plan is to continue to allow as much natural flow as possible but also add a drainage systems which will take the surface water and storm water from the parking lots and send to underground chambers for filtration before being directed back into the ground.

Mr. Heglin asked about the how they planned to filter out hazardous materials in the event of a fire for example.

Mr. Hannigan again stated that a filter system was in place and a larger sump for each drain chamber, but for something as larger, such as fire foam chemicals, the system would need to be replaced afterwards. There is currently no real threat of this happening at this location but the question will be noted to the plans.

Mr. Heglin asked if the plan was to re purpose the surgical suites currently used, and would there be a lot of construction noise for the abutters during this project.

Mr. Hannigan explained that there would of course be some construction noise and should blasting be needed it would be in compliance with the fire department and all safety ordinances. Questions about hospital use can be answered by reps of the hospital present.

Ms. Dawn Casavant – Heywood Hospital Representative.

In regards to the question on the surgical unit buildings and the need for expansion, it was explained that the current operating rooms are grossly under sized and inadequate in many ways. The need for new machinery and technology in these rooms is greatly limited due to the size. The new unit will be of higher standard, with robotic tables and in room x-ray and scanning possible. This will be a great improvement to the community and surrounding areas. The current OR will be re used as the endoscopy unit.

Mr. Heglin asked if there was a time line for the estimated work flow, how long they planned to take for the whole project.

Josh Levey – Water-Stone Properties.

Mr. Levey thanked the board for their time and stated that the main body of the construction would take several months as there is the demolition of the MRI unit before construction can begin as well as landscaping and leveling. A long range date would be for about 2 years from start to finish which includes interior buildout and finishing.

Mr. Hannigan predicted a much shorter timescale of 9 to 12 months for completion.

Any reps from the City to speak.

Mr. Roland Jean – City Building Commissioner and Zoning Enforcement Officer.

There is definitely a need for both improvement to the hospital and the increased parking, he questioned the definition of the bed, stating on in discussion with the engineer the definition of a bed at the hospital, was it must be occupied for 23.5 hours, many beds in the hospital would not fall in this category such as ER beds and day units would not be occupied for that amount of time. This number if wrong will affect the parking.

Ms. Casavant stated the hospital is licensed for 134 patient's bed with a census of 200, still with the current expansion the amount of parking is still over the requested amount.

Ms. Casavant stated there is a meeting at the hospital tomorrow for all abutters to come and get more information on the project and to ask any questions they have in regards to this expansion.

Mr. Trevor Beauregard – Community Development.

The Planning Board currently has 2 Special Permits open for this same case which is open until July. A micro-grid power plan in Zone A and an expansion project peer review which is underway by a third party with the site plan review on June 22, 2021. Mr. Hannigan spoke of the use itself which was helpful for him moving forward and any feedback from the Zoning Board would be appreciated.

Mr. Heglin asked how long this type of peer review would take.

Mr. Beauregard stated about two weeks is the turnaround, they will be looking at traffic reports and hazardous materials.

Any Abutters to speak.

Svetlana Christakova – 197 Woodland Ave.

Ms. Christakova began with thanking the board and saying what a great job the hospital does for the community. With that being said she has great concerns for the parking lot, 3 particular concerns were as follows.

- 1) The construction process will need earth removal and some blast work which could bring a threat of damage and collapse for the surrounding homes. The noise and heavy traffic from the construction will be a huge inconvenience to abutters, as well as a danger to the children in the area.
- 2) The water which travels in the ground from storms will be redirected so as not to reach areas it currently does, many people grow vegetables in there yards to feed their children. It cannot be said that this project would change the flow and quality of water in the ground.
- 3) This is a single family neighborhood, and the project is not in keeping with the area. The parking lot will cause many problems including that of the health.

Ms. Christakova continued saying, Representatives of Hospital can say “an elephant is not an elephant”, but it is still an elephant, just like this project in not suited to this area. The fumes that will come of this large amount of asphalt for the project will cause air pollution, which will go on to affect people’s health. This is not an industrial area at all and this location should not be allowed to grow at this rate. The noise from the hospital already makes it impossible to have a conversation outside without shouting. This will also drive down the value of the properties as no one now one wants to live looking at a parking lot. The size of the parking lot will be a suntrap which will then create more fumes. The city needs to put the health of its residents first in this case, as well as protect and conserve the land and water.

Mr. Heglin asked if Ms. Christakova planned on attending the meeting at the hospital tomorrow to which she confirmed she would be at all meetings regarding this project, insisting that all

should be informed that again “an elephant is not elephant” and this project should not move forward.

Mariah & Emma Daley – 11 Beech St

Ms. Daley asked what the meeting event was tomorrow night as they did not know about it and wondered how it had been advertised to the abutters.

Ms. Casavant informed that the meeting is planned for all abutters to come along to the cafeteria at the hospital to get better informed on this project so that they can find a middle ground to move forward. The information was on a flyer put in mail boxes of abutters, it was also put on social media.

Ms. Daley went on to voice her view on the project stating that she agrees with Lana that this project will not only affect the environment but also the value of their homes. Traffic is a problem and moving the truck traffic to the rear of the hospital is really just relocating the same problem. The current plan for the parking will include the removal of about two acres of woodland, which is removing nature’s natural water filtration system as well as a wind break. The community is losing a large amount of wildlife, as well as about 1000 trees. As Svetlana had stated this is a residential area and should be kept as one.

Julia Palmer – 185 Green St.

Most of the questions have already been answered but was concerned with the length of time it would take to complete the expansion.

Mr. Hannigan stated that the project would run from about 8 months to 2 years to complete, with two years being an exaggerated guess.

Ms. Palmer asked about safety issues for the children in the neighborhood.

Mr. Hannigan said that this project will be following normal safety protocol, the construction zone will be fenced in from view and trespassers. Truck traffic will be monitored but the expectations of daily traffic will not really change once the project is finished.

Ms. Palmer asked if the meeting tomorrow could be advertised in some other way as she knows many more people would like to attend but are unaware.

Mr. Heglin suggested that an abutters list could be requested from the city to create a mailing list for the area.

Ms. Palmer thanked the Board and stated that she fully supports the hospital but does have concerns on the impact to the area.

Martin Gray – 205 Woodland Ave.

Mr. Gray listed off his concerns asking the amount of tree removal should be kept to a minimum. What kind of lighting will be used and will it shine into people’s homes. The water in Gardner is already bad enough so this will only make things worse. Can they not build on the front of the

building rather than clear these lots for construction. Why can't they build the parking lot up as a parking garage, even better is to look for a better location for the hospital entirely.

Ms. Daley agreed that there should be an alternative plan than the parking lot planned, can they not build up over the area where the solar parking is.

Mr. Hannigan stated that the cost of a parking garage is way outside of the project's budget.

Mr. Levey clarified that a parking garage was considered along with several other ideas for parking on this project and this plan is by far the best option economically and financially.

Ms. Christakova states that at some point the city need to decide if the cost of a building is worth the cost of its resident's health.

Any further questions.

Mr. Heglin requested a motion to continue this hearing to the next meeting as the time was getting late and erratic problems with internet connection.

Motion made by Mr. Cornett and seconded by Mr. Gerry.

Mr. Heglin asked that in advance of the next meeting could Mr. Hannigan please supply the Board with a better plan of the landscaping and also clarify any questions about the number of beds to parking.

Ms. Casavant stated that all abutters are welcome to attend the meeting at the hospital cafeteria at 7pm tomorrow night, Wednesday June 16<sup>th</sup>. Please enter through the main entrance and you will be met by a hospital representative to show you the way. All your question can be answered then and hopefully some middle ground can be met by all.

Mr. Heglin informed all present that the next meeting will be held in person at City Hall on July 20.

Motion to adjourn meeting

Unanimous vote to adjourn

Meeting Adjourned at 9.57PM.



Raymond LaFond, Chair



Michael Gerry, Clerk



Mel Cornett, Member



Randel Heglin, Member.



\*

#### 675-210

##### LOT, FRONTAGE OF

The continuous portion of the line separating a lot from a street to which the owner of the lot has a legal right of access and to which the owner could provide for vehicular access from the principal building or a required parking space. When a lot is bounded by more than one street, both frontages and setbacks shall meet the minimum frontage and front yard setbacks. However, in the case of a lot bounded by two streets forming an interior angle of more than 135°, their combined frontage between lot lines may be used to satisfy the lot frontage requirement.

##### LOT, FRONTAGE STREET

A Street to which the owner of a lot has a legal right of access and which provides the required lot frontage.

#### 675-110

These regulations are enacted to promote the general welfare of the City of Gardner, to protect the health and safety, convenience and general; welfare of its inhabitants, to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the City, to preserve the cultural, historical and agricultural heritage of the community, to increase the amenities of the City, and to reduce the hazard from fire by regulating the location and use of buildings and the area of open space around them, all as authorized by, but not limited to, the provisions of the Zoning Act, MGL c. 40A, as amended, Section 2.4 of 1975 Massachusetts Acts Chapter 808, and by Article 89 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.