



City Council

Hearings Meeting

~ Final ~

36 Court Street
Springfield, MA 01103
<http://www.springfieldcityhall.com>

Gladys Oyola-Lopez

Monday, January 27, 2025

7:00 PM

City Hall -- Room 200

Hearings

7:00 PM Meeting called to order on January 27, 2025 at City Hall -- Room 200, 36 Court Street, Springfield, MA.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Kateri B. Walsh	At-Large Councilor	Remote	
Timothy C. Allen	Ward 7 Councilor	Present	
Jose Delgado	City Councilor	Present	
Lavar Click-Bruce	Ward 5 City Councilor	Present	
Zaida Govan	Ward 8 City Councilor	Remote	
Malo Brown	Ward 4 Councilor	Remote	
Victor Davila	Ward 6 Councilor	Present	
Sean Curran	At-Large Councilor	Present	
Brian Santaniello	City Councilor	Remote	
Melvin A. Edwards	Ward 3 Councilor	Present	
Tracye Whitfield	At Large City Councilor	Present	
Maria Perez	Ward 1 City Councilor	Absent	
Michael A. Fenton	President	Present	

Moment of Silence - Pledge of Allegiance

Petitions

1. Petition (ID # 8396)

EVERSOURCE - 306 Pasco Road

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

HECTOR VELEZ, CITY OF SPRINGFIELD ENGINEER, SPOKE ON THE ITEM - THIS WILL BE A CHARGE STATION FOR ELECTRIC CARS. EVERSOURCE WILL NEED TO INSTALL TWO POLES.

RESULT:	APPROVED [12 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Santaniello, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton
ABSENT:	Maria Perez

2. Petition (ID # 8416)

Granger Street- Stop Sign

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

HECTOR VELEZ, CITY OF SPRINGFIELD ENGINEER, SPOKE ON THE ITEM:

CREATION OF A FOUR WAY STOP SIGN. INTERSECTION CONTAINS TWO STOP SIGNS ALREADY. THE 16 ACRES CIVIC ASSOCIATION REQUESTED TWO ADDITIONAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF GRANGER STREET AND FAIRLAWN STREET.

COUNCILOR CLICK-BRUCE ENCOURAGED THE BODY TO APPROVE THE PETITION.

RESULT:	APPROVED [12 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Santaniello, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton
ABSENT:	Maria Perez

3. Petition (ID # 8417)

VERIZON- Dwight Street

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

HECTOR VELEZ, CITY OF SPRINGFIELD ENGINEER, SPOKE ON THE ITEM:

INSTALLATION OF 235 FEET OF CONDUIT FOR FIBER OPTICS FROM THE MAN HOLE ON DWIGHT STREET TO BUILDING ON CAREW STREET.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Report Varizon Dwight St (PDF)
- Dwight St petition (PDF)
- Dwight St. Plan (PDF)

RESULT:	APPROVED [12 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Santaniello, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton
ABSENT:	Maria Perez

Special Permits

4. Special Permit (ID # 8348)

For a Special Permit for the Expansion of an Operations and Maintenance Facility to Include the Installation of a Paint Booth (Motor Vehicle Painting/Bodywork), at the Property Known as 665 Cottage Street (03310-0221) (Certificate #35842/20538), as Authorized by M.G.L. and the Springfield Zoning Ordinance, Article 4, Table 4-4, Section 12.3(5).

Request:	See Above
Owner:	Pioneer Valley Transit Authority
By:	Sandra E. Sheehan
Petitioner:	Pioneer Valley Transit Authority
By:	Sandra E. Sheehan

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

MICHAEL PETRIN, SPRINGFIELD LAND DEVELOPMENT TEAM LEADER FOR VHB, REPRESENTING THE PVTA. PRESENTED THAT THE PVTA IS LOOKING TO ADD A PAINT BOOTH AT THE 665 COTTAGE STREET SITE.

KATHLEEN BROWN, EAST SPRINGFIELD NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, SPOKE IN SUPPORT OF THE SPECIAL PERMIT.

COUNCILOR DELGADO ASKED FOR DETAILS ABOUT THE PAINT BOOTH AND IF NEW JOBS WOULD BE CREATED.

JOHN BURKE, MANAGER OF CAPITAL PROJECTS, PVTA DID NOTE THAT THE MAY BE NEW JOBS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROJECT IN THE FUTURE, BUT MOST WILL TRANSFER OVER FROM MAIN STREET.

COUNCILOR SANTANIELLO ASKED HOW MANY NEW JOBS WOULD BE CREATED AND, IF SPECIAL CERTIFICATION WAS REQUIRED.

COUNCILOR ALLEN ASKED IF THE BUSINESS HAS CHANGED AND IF THE 2808 MAIN STREET IS STILL PART OF THE PVTA OPERATIONS.

MR. BURKE GAVE AN EXPLANATION ON THE USE OF THE 2808 MAIN STREET PROPERTY. THIS PROPERTY IS MORE OF A VAN FACILITY.

COUNCILOR DAVILA CONFIRMED THAT THE PVTA RECEIVED APPROVAL FROM THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION AND ASKED WHY THAT APPROVAL WAS NEEDED. THE APPROVAL WAS NEEDED BECAUSE THERE IS A POND IN THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD NOTED THAT HER FATHER WORKED FOR PVTA FOR 37 YEARS AND WAS VERY HAPPY TO SEE THE INSTALLATION OF THE VENTILATION SYSTEM.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Cottage_St_665_Tax_Formal (PDF)
- Cottage_St_665_2025 (PDF)

RESULT:	ADOPTED [12 TO 0]
AYES:	Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Santaniello, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton
ABSENT:	Maria Perez

5. Special Permit (ID # 8349)

To Amend an Existing Special Permit (Motor Vehicles Sales), Granted February 2001, by Allowing a Change in the Petitioner, at the Property Known as 731 Liberty Street (07770-0522) (Book#L125/Page#LC51), as Allowed by M.G.L. and the Springfield Zoning Ordinance Article 4, Table 4-4, Section 12.3(1).

Request:	See Above
Owner:	Muhammad Ali Saleem
By:	Muhammad Ali Saleem
Petitioner:	Abdallah F. Alazzam
By:	Abdallah F. Alazzam

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

ABDALLAH ALAZZAM, OWNER OF 731 LIBERTY ST, SPOKE ON THE SPECIAL PERMIT. HE NOTED THAT HIS LICENSE ALLOWED FOR UNLIMITED NUMBER OF CARS WHEN HE APPLIED IN 2021.

PHIL DROMEY, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, GAVE DETAILS ON THE SPECIAL PERMIT. THE ORIGINAL SPECIAL PERMIT WAS GRANTED IN 2001 TO THE PETITIONER BUT THE NEW OWNER/OPERATOR MUST COME BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL.

THE ORIGINAL SPECIAL PERMIT WAS GRANTED TO IN 2001 FOR 10 CARS. PHIL CANNOT SPEAK TO WHY THE LICENSE WAS ISSUED FOR UNLIMITED CARS.

THERE ARE CURRENTLY MORE THAN 10 CARS. A NEW LICENSE WILL NOT BE ISSUED UNTIL THE PETITIONER COMES INTO COMPLIANCE.

COUNCILOR CURRAN ASKED IF MR. ALAZZAM WOULD BE WILLING TO LIMIT HIS LICENSE TO 10 CARS.

PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT THERE IS NO SPECIAL PERMIT FOR UNLIMITED CARS TO BE SOLD AT THIS LOCATION. THE UNLIMITED CARS LICENSE CAME FROM THE LICENSE COMMISSION.

MR. ALAZZAM NOTED THAT IN 2022 AND 2023 HE WAS GRANTED A LICENSE TO SELL UNLIMITED CARS.

COUNCILOR CURRAN REQUESTED THAT IT BE CONTINUED, SECONDED BY COUNCILOR DAVILA.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD INQUIRED IF HE WOULD STILL BE ABLE TO OPERATE HIS BUSINESS? PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT ZONING FOUND HIM IN VIOLATION OF THE SPECIAL PERMIT FOR 10 CARS BACK IN 2024. UNTIL THE SPECIAL PERMIT GETS ISSUED, THE LICENSE TO SELL CARS CANNOT BE ISSUED. COUNCILOR WHITFIELD STATED THAT SHE HAS NEVER HEARD OF A LICENSE FOR UNLIMITED CARS. UNLIMITED IS BROAD AND IT IS A SMALL SITE.

COUNCILOR BROWN STATED THE SITE CAN ONLY HOLD SO MANY VEHICLES. HE SUGGESTED TO JAZZ UP THE AREA WITH GREENERY FOR CURB APPEAL.

COUNCILOR SANTANIELLO INQUIRED ON HOW MANY BAYS? THERE ARE 3 BAYS. HE ASKED WHERE THE CARS THAT ARE THERE FOR SERVICED GET PARKED? AND HOW MANY CARS THEY HAVE ON SITE TO SELL? THERE ARE 2 LIFTS AND 1 BAY FOR STORAGE, AND CURRENTLY 15 CARS TO SELL AT THE LOCATION.

COUNCILOR WALSH IF THIS IS JUST A CHANGE OF PETITIONER, OR INCREASE IN VEHICLES SOLD? ASKED HOW APPROVAL OR CONTINUATION WOULD AFFECT THE PETITIONERS CURRENT OPERATIONS? IF THE PETITION WAS APPROVED, THEN THE BUSINESS WOULD BE IN VIOLATION DUE TO HAVING MORE THAN 0 VEHICLES.

COUNCILOR GOVAN ASKED IF WE CONTINUE THE ITEM, CAN THEY STILL SERVICE VEHICLES, AND NOT SELL CARS? PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT THIS WAS ACCURATE.

COUNCILOR DELGADO ASKED IF THERE IS A LIMIT ON THE SERVICE END OF THE BUSINESS. HE ASKED WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE BUSINESS IS SALES AND WHAT PERCENTAGE IS SERVICE. HOW MUCH TIME IS SPENT SERVICING CARS?

MR. ALAZZAM NOTED THAT THEY MAINLY SERVICE THE CARS THAT THEY ARE SELLING. THE SALES OF CARS IS THE MAJORITY OF THEIR BUSINESS. THE CAR SALES PAYS FOR ALL THE BILLS.

COUNCILOR DAVILA ASKED IF THE PETITIONER HAS MET WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL AND SUGGESTED THAT THEY MEET WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL. HE EXPLAINED THE CONSEQUENCES OF A NO VOTE BY THE COUNCIL TONIGHT.

COUNCILOR CLICK-BRUCE ASKED IF THE PETITIONER HAS ANY PAPERWORK ON THE FACT THAT HE WAS GRANTED UNLIMITED VEHICLES.

MR. DROMEY HAS NOT SEEN ANY LICENSE THAT STATES UNLIMITED.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD ASKED THE PETITIONER IF HE WOULD BE WILLING TO ABIDE BY THE 10 CAR GUIDELINE ATTACHED TO THE CURRENT SPECIAL PERMIT.

COUNCILOR EDWARDS NOTED HIS SUPPORT OF SENDING THE SPECIAL PERMIT TO COMMITTEE.

COUNCILOR DELGADO ASKED HOW QUICKLY THE PETITIONER WOULD BE ABLE TO GET THE PROPERTY IN COMPLIANCE. HE NOTED THAT THE CITY SHOULD BE HELPING BUSINESSES UNDERSTAND THE RULES/GUIDELINES ON OPERATING A BUSINESS WITHIN THE CITY.

THE PETITIONER NOTED THAT HE OWNS ANOTHER BUSINESS WHERE HE CAN MOVE THE CURRENT INVENTORY OF CARS.

COUNCILOR EDWARDS NOTED THAT THIS ISSUE IS A REFLECTION OF A BIGGER PROBLEM. HE PROVIDED EXAMPLES OF OTHER CAR DEALERSHIPS THAT ARE IN VIOLATION.

COUNCILOR DAVILA REITERATED THAT THE PETITIONER HAS NOT YET MET WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL AND HE WOULD NOT BE IN SUPPORT OF THIS PETITION. CONTINUING THIS ITEM WOULD BE THE BEST OPTION FOR YOU AT THIS TIME.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD NOTED THAT MR. ALAZZAM IS A SMALL BUSINESS OWNER AND SHE SIDES WITH HIM. SHE ASKED HIM IF HE WOULD BE ABLE TO MOVE CARS TOMORROW AND COME INTO COMPLIANCE. SHE WILL NOT SUPPORT A MOVE TO COMMITTEE

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD ASKED IF THE PETITIONER WOULD BE ABLE TO SELL CARS IF THE COUNCIL CONTINUES THE MATTER?

MR. DROMEY NOTED THAT THE LICENSE WILL NOT BE ISSUED UNTIL THE SPECIAL PERMIT IS GRANTED. HE GAVE A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF HOW THE CURRENT PETITIONER ARRIVED BEFORE THE COUNCIL TODAY.

HOW LONG HAS THE PETITIONER BEEN OUT OF COMPLIANCE SINCE HE WAS NOTIFIED. HAS THE CITY CLOSED HIS BUSINESS?

PHIL DROMEY - ONCE THE SPECIAL PERMIT IS APPROVED THE ZONING DEPARTMENT WILL INSPECT THE BUSINESS, DETERMINE IF THEY ARE IN COMPLIANCE ISSUE A LICENSE.

MR. DROMEY EXPLAINED WHAT OCCURS WHEN A BUSINESS IS OPERATING OUT OF COMPLIANCE.

COUNCILOR CLICK-BRUCE ASKED THE PETITIONER IF THERE IS ANY PAPERWORK THAT STATES "UNLIMITED" THAT HE CAN PROVIDE? THE PETITIONER STATED THAT HE SENT THE PREVIOUS 7 LICENSES FROM THE PAST. PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT HE HAS NOT RECEIVED ANYTHING.

COUNCILOR CURRAN WANTED TO RENEW HIS MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM TO THE NEXT HEARINGS MEETING.

COUNCILOR DAVILA NOTED THAT APPROVING THE SPECIAL PERMIT WHILE THEY ARE OUT OF COMPLIANCE SETS A BAD PRECEDENT. HE ASKED THE PETITIONER IF THEY WERE AWARE THAT IF THE PETITION IS DENIED THAT THEY COULD NOT APPLY FOR ANOTHER SPECIAL PERMIT FOR 2 YEARS.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD ASKED IF HE WAS WILLING TO GO DOWN TO 10 CARS UNTIL THIS GETS RESOLVED. THE PETITIONER AGREED.

COUNCILOR EDWARD SUPPORTS THE CONTINUANCE SO THE OWNER CAN IRON OUT ALL THE ISSUES. DOES NOT WANT TO GRANT THE PERMIT WHEN THERE ARE 25 CARS ON THE LOT. THIS WILL GIVE THE PETITIONER TIME TO COME BACK TO THE COUNCIL WITH "CLEAN HANDS."

COUNCILOR DELGADO ASKED HOW FAST CAN YOU GET DOWN TO 10 CARS? THE COUNCILOR IS UNSURE WHAT THE CITY S DOING TO EDUCATE RESIDENTS ON THE

CORRECT WAYS OF DOING BUSINESS. THE PETITIONER CAN MOVE THE CARS TOMORROW OVER TO HIS OTHER BUSINESS ON MAGAZINE STREET.

COUNCILOR EDWARDS THE CITY NEEDS TO ADDRESS THE CAR SALES BECAUSE MOST ARE IN VIOLATION. THE CODE INSPECTORS NEED TO BE MORE VIGILANT. HE REFERENCED A BUSINESS ON KING STREET AND DOWNTOWN THAT ARE OUT OF COMPLIANCE. ONCE THE CITY COUNCIL GRANTS THESE SPECIAL PERMITS AND THERE IS NO FOLLOW UP.

COUNCILOR DAVILA IS CONCERNED THAT THE PETITIONER HAS NOT MET WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL. HE CANNOT SUPPORT THE SPECIAL PERMIT BECAUSE OF THIS.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD FEELS FOR THE SMALL BUSINESS OWNER BECAUSE THIS IS HIS LIVELY HOOD. SHE WANTS TO SIDE IN TAKING CARE OF PEOPLE, THIS IS JUST AN OWNERSHIP CHANGE. DOES NOT SUPPORT THE CONTINUANCE BECAUSE SHE WANTS TO VOTE ON THE SPECIAL PERMIT TONIGHT.

COUNCILOR CURRAN STATED THAT THE MOTION IS TO CONTINUE AND NOT TO SEND TO COMMITTEE. AGAIN, RENEWS THE MOTION TO CONTINUE TO THE FEBRUARY 24TH HEARING'S MEETING.

COUNCILOR WALSH IS UNCLEAR HOW THIS SITUATION AROSE. THIS IS JUST A CHANGE IN PETITIONER, AND SHE IS IN SUPPORT OF THE ITEM AS IT STANDS.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD WANTED CLARIFICATION FROM PHIL DROMEY THAT THE PETITIONER CANNOT GET A DEALER'S LICENSE UNTIL THIS SPECIAL PERMIT CHANGE IN PETITIONER GOES THROUGH. PHIL STATED THAT HE BELIEVES SO. THE CONTINUANCE ONLY HINDER THE PETITIONER FROM DOING BUSINESS. THE PETITIONER WILL BE OUT FOR 50 DAYS IF THIS GETS CONTINUED. DOES NOT MAKE SENSE WHEN THE PETITIONER AGREED TO DOWN SIZE THE LOT TO 10 VEHICLES.

FIRST MOTION TO CONTINUE FAILED.

COUNCILOR DAVILA ASKED PHIL DROMEY HOW LONG THE PETITIONER HAS BEEN UT OF COMPLIANCE. PHIL STATED HIS UNDERSTANDING IS A COUPLE PF MONTHS. REPAIR WORK HAS NOT BEEN SHUT DOWN, THE CAR SALES LICENSE HAS NOT BEEN ISSUED. COUNCILOR DAVILA INQUIRED ON HOW THE CITY SHUTS DOWN A BUSINESS, PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT HE IS NOT THE PERSON TO ANSWER THAT INQUIRY. COUNCILOR DAVILA MADE SURE WITH THE PETITIONER THAT THEY ARE AWARE OF WHAT WHAT IS GOING ON. IF HE SPECIAL PERMIT GETS DENIED, THEN THE BUSINESS OF CAR SALES SHUTS DOWN AND IT IS ANOTHER TWO YEARS BEFORE YOU ARE ABLE TO RE-APPLY.

COUNCILOR BROWN ASKED THE PETITIONER ASKED WHAT AWARDS THEY HAVE RECEIVED. THEY HAVE BEEN RECOGNIZED BY CAR GURUS AND THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD. COUNCILOR BROWN SHARED HIS KNOWLEDGE OF THE FINE PROCESS FOR THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD WHEN A BUSINESS IS OUT OF COMPLIANCE. SUPPORTS THE SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS.

COUNCILOR FENTON STEPPED DOWN FROM THE PODIUM IN ORDER TO SPEAK ON THE SPECIAL PERMIT. HE NOTED THAT HE IS IN SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUING THE SPECIAL PERMIT. SINCE HE IS THE WARD REPRESENTATIVE, HE IS FAMILIAR WITH THE SITE. HE ASKED THE PETITIONER WHEN THEY WERE FIRST CITED FOR HAVING TOO MANY CARS ON THE LOT? THEY STATED ABOUT 5 MONTHS AGO, THERE WAS A PERSON TAKING PICTURES ON SITE. HE REFERENCED THE STAFF ANALYSIS STATING THAT THERE WERE CARS WITHOUT PLATES ON THE LOT. THE CITY CLERK REFERENCED CODE VIOLATIONS FROM 2023 AND 2023 THAT WERE PAID. COUNCIL PRESIDENT REITERATED THAT HE SUPPORTS THE CONTINUANCE AND NOT THE SPECIAL PERMIT. THIS SITE HAS BEEN A PERIODIC PROBLEM IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE CITIZENS COUNCIL SHOULD BE INVOLVED.

COUNCILOR GOVAN ASKED IF THE HEARING WAS FOR A CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP LEAVING THE CURRENT SPECIAL PERMIT INTACT. COUNCILOR FENTON NOTED THAT THE TWO VIOLATIONS ARE THE NAME AND THE NUMBER OF CARS ON THE LOT. THERE ARE MORE THAN 10 CARS ON THE LOT.

COUNCILOR SANTANIELLO ASKED ABOUT THE PROCLAMATIONS THAT THE BUSINESS CLAIMS TO HAVE RECEIVED. SPECIFICALLY THE ONE FROM THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD. THE PETITIONER STATED THAT THERE IS A QR CODE THAT NEEDS TO BE SCANNED AND PAID FOR AND YOU PAY \$200 FOR THE PLACARD.

COUNCILOR BROWN IS CONFUSED ABOUT OWNERSHIP. THE PETITIONER IS NOT THE OWNER. THE PETITIONER STATED THAT THEY RENT THE PROPERTY. COUNCILOR BROWN STATED THAT THE LOT IS NOT LARGE ENOUGH FOR 30 VEHICLES. THE PETITIONER NEEDS TO FOLLOW THROUGH WITH THE SPECIAL PERMIT PROCESS.

COUNCILOR DAVILA MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE ITEM AND WAS SECONDED BY COUNCILOR EDWARDS.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD STATED THAT THE VIOLATIONS WERE FOR TOO MANY CARS ON THE TREE BELT, NOT TOO MANY CARS ON THE LOT. EMPHASIZED THAT THIS SPECIAL PERMIT IS ONLY A NAME CHANGE. THEY DO NOT PARK ON THE SIDEWALK, THERE IS PIZZA SHOP NEXT DOOR, AND THEIR CUSTOMERS PARK ON THE SIDEWALK AT THIS POINT. SHE ASKED THE PETITIONER HOW THE BUSINESS WOULD BE AFFECTED IF THIS ITEM WERE TO BE CONTINUED? THEY WOULD BE OKAY BECAUSE THEY WILL STILL BE ABLE TO REPAIR CARS. THE PETITIONER STATED HE HAS BEEN SELLING CARS FOR 4 YEARS (UNLIMITED AMOUNT). HE IS CONFUSED WHY THE CITY IS GIVING HIM A HARD TIME NOW. COUNCILOR WHITFIELD BROUGHT UP THE FACT THAT CARS AT USED CAR DEALERS DO NOT HAVE PLATES BECAUSE E THEY GET STOLEN OFF THE CARS. THE PETITIONER CONFIRMED THAT THIS IS ACCURATE.

PHIL DROMEY ANSWERED THE PETITIONER NEEDS TO GET IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CURRENT SPECIAL PERMIT. THEY HAVE BEEN CITED FOR SEVERAL MONTHS, AND ALSO HAVE A USED CAR LOT ON MAGAZINE STREET.

COUNCILOR ALLEN CALLED THE QUESTION AND WAS SECONDED BY COUNCILOR DAVILA

COUNCILOR CURRAN - YES
COUNCILOR ALLEN - YES
COUNCILOR GOVAN - YES
COUNCILOR WALSH - NO
COUNCILOR EDWARDS - YES
COUNCILOR DAVILA - YES
COUNCILOR BROWN - YES
COUNCILOR WHITFIELD - NO
COUNCILOR DELGADO - YES
COUNCILOR SANTANIELLO - YES
COUNCILOR CLICK-BRUCE - NO
COUNCILOR PEREZ - ABSENT
COUNCILOR FENTON - YES

MOTION PASSED AND THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO FEBRUARY 24, 2025.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Liberty_St_731_Tax_Formal (PDF)
- Liberty_St_731_2025 (PDF)

RESULT:	CONTINUE VOTE [12 TO 0]	Next: 2/24/2025 7:00 PM
MOVER:	Victor Davila, Ward 6 Councilor	
SECONDER:	Melvin A. Edwards, Ward 3 Councilor	
AYES:	Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Santaniello, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton	
ABSENT:	Maria Perez	

MOTION TO CONTINUE

THE MOTION TO CONTINUE WAS MADE BY COUNCILOR CURRAN

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COUNCILOR DAVILA

COUNCILORS CURRAN, ALLEN, EDWARDS, BROWN AND FENTON VOTED YES

COUNCILORS GOVAN, WALSH, BROWN, WHITFIELD, DELGADO, SANTANIELLO AND CLICK-BRUCE VOTED NO

COUNCILOR PEREZ WAS ABSENT

MOTION FAILED

Zone Changes

6. Zoning Change (ID # 8351)

To Amend the Springfield Zoning Ordinance by Amending Article 4, Section 4.7.100 (Registered Marijuana Dispensary and Off-Site Medical Marijuana Dispensary) and Article 4, Table 4-4, Section 13.4, as Set Forth in the Proposed Amendment Attached Hereto:

PETITIONER:

Springfield Planning Board

ADDRESS:

City Wide

CHANGE REQUESTED:

**Amendment to Article 4, Section 4.7.100
and Table 4-4, Section 13.4**

HISTORY:

01/06/25

City Council

01/08/25

City Planning Board APPROVED

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

PHIL DROMEY, CITY OF SPRINGFIELD PLANNER, SPOKE ON THE ITEM.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA ORDINANCE WHICH WAS IMPLEMENTED BACK IN 2014, WHEN THE STATE GRANTED THE USE OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA. THESE ARE MORE STRICT REGULATIONS, SUCH AS 500 FEET AWAY FROM SCHOOLS AND RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS. THE CITY LIMITED THE ZONING WHERE MEDICAL MARIJUANA COULD ONLY UTILIZE INDUSTRIAL A. IN 2018 THE STATE WIDE REFERENDUM LEGALIZED THE USE OF ADULT RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA, THEY CITY COUNCIL IMPLEMENTED LESS RESTRICTIVE REGULATIONS BASED ON STATE REGULATIONS. OPEN TO BUSINESS A/B/C, RIVERFRONT AND INDUSTRIAL PARK.

HAVING BOTH OPERATIONS FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS NOW, THIS AMENDMENT WOULD MIRROR THE MEDICAL REGULATIONS TO REFLECT THE RECREATIONAL ONES. MEDICAL USE WOULD STILL REQUIRE A SPECIAL PERMIT. THERE ARE 4 RECREATIONAL SITES CURRENTLY OPEN, AND 6 HAVE BEEN APPROVED, AND ARE WORKING ON OPENING. THIS HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY THE LAW DEPARTMENT. IF THERE IS A CURRENT ADULT USE RETAILER, THIS WOULD ALLOW MEDICAL SALES ON SITE. PHIL SEE THIS SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTING THE NEIGHBORHOODS.

COUNCILOR WHITFIELD ASKED PHIL TO GO OVER THE CHANGES AGAIN. HE EMPHASIZED THAT MEDICAL MARIJUANA WOULD BE MORE REFLECTIVE OF THE ADULT USE RETAIL USE. BOTH STILL TRIGGER THE SPECIAL PERMIT REQUIREMENTS, AND WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE PROCESS TO BE ABLE TO OPERATE IN THE CITY. COUNCILOR WHITFIELD REFERENCED INSA, AND PHIL CONFIRMED THAT INSA HAS THE ONLY MEDICAL MARIJUANA SPECIAL PERMIT. COUNCILOR WHITFIELD ASKED IF INSA WOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE SPECIAL PERMIT PROCESS, AND PHIL RESPONDED THAT IT IS A TIER 1 SITE PLAN REVIEW VS. A SPECIAL PERMIT. INSA WOULD BE ABLE TO MOVE THEIR MEDICAL FACILITY

FROM COTTAGE STREET TO THEIR RECREATIONAL SITE ON WEST COLUMBUS AVE WITH AN AMENDMENT TO THE SPECIAL PERMIT. COUNCILOR WHITFIELD STATED THAT INSA IS THE ONLY BUSINESS THAT WOULD BENEFIT FROM THIS AMENDMENT RIGHT NOW. PHIL DROMEY AGREED, BUT STATED IT WOULD OPEN THE DOOR FOR EXISTING RECREATIONAL SITE TO BE ABLE TO ATTAIN A MEDICAL AT THE SAME SITE.

COUNCILOR WALSH INQUIRED ABOUT THE ZONING RESTRICTIONS FOR MEDICAL DISPENSARIES.

INSUFFICIENT VOTES - ITEM FAILS

ATTACHMENTS:

- 3250_MM_Formal (PDF)
- Amended_Zoning_Ordinance_Section_4_7_100_Final_2024 (PDF)
- 3250_MM_2025(PDF)
- 3250_City_Wide_MM_2025_PB_Report (PDF)

RESULT:	DENIED [8 TO 2]
AYES:	Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Davila, Curran, Edwards, Fenton
NAYS:	Kateri B. Walsh, Tracye Whitfield
ABSTAIN:	Malo Brown
ABSENT:	Maria Perez
AWAY:	Brian Santaniello

7. Zoning Change (ID # 8352)

To Amend the Springfield Zoning Ordinance by Amending Article 4 by Adding Section 4.7.120 (Accessory Dwelling Units) and Amending Article 4, Table 4-4, by Adding Section 2.9

PETITIONER: Springfield Planning Board

ADDRESS: City Wide

CHANGE REQUESTED: Amendment to Article 4 by adding Section 4.7.120 and amending Table 4-4 by adding Section 2.9

HISTORY:

01/06/25 City Council

01/08/25 City Planning Board **APPROVED**

COMMENTS - Current Meeting:

PHIL DROMEY, CITY PLANNER, SPOKE ON THE ITEM. GAVE A QUICK REVIEW OF THE ADU LAW. IN AUGUST 6 OF 2024 THE GOVERNOR SIGNED INTO LAW THE AFFORDABLE HOMES ACT. THIS LEGISLATION THAT OFFERED 5 BILLION IN SPENDING OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS ALONG WITH 50 POLICY INITIATIVES. ONE OF WHICH IS THE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT LEGISLATION (SECTION 7 & 8) OF THE AFFORDABLE HOME ACT. SECTION 7 IS THE DEFINITION OF AN ADU AND SECTION 8 IS THE LAW.

AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT CAN EXIST IN A PRIMARY RESIDENCE, IE CONVERTING A BASEMENT. COULD ALSO BE AN ADDITION, IE A CONVERSION OF AN ATTACHED GARAGE, OR A STAND ALONE STRUCTURE (COTTAGE OR A TINY HOUSE) IF THERE IS ENOUGH SQUARE FOOTAGE. FEBRUARY 2, 2025 IS WHEN SECTION 8 (THE LAW) TAKES EFFECT. THIS IS WHY CITY PLANNING IS PROPOSING THESE REGULATIONS PRIOR TO THAT DATE. SECTION 3 OF THE ZONING ACT WAS ADU'S WERE PROTECTED USES, IE CHILDCARE, EDUCATIONAL, OR RELIGIOUS FACILITIES.

DEFINITION OF AN ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT IS A SELF CONTAINED HOUSING UNIT INCLUSIVE OF SLEEPING, COOKING, AND SANITARY FACILITIES ON THE SAME LOT AS THE PRINCIPAL DWELLING. THE ADU MUST MAINTAIN A SEPARATE ENTRANCE (DIRECTLY FROM THE OUTSIDE OR THROUGH AN ENTRY HALL) . THERE ARE LIMITATIONS ON SIZE. CANNOT BE LARGER THAN HALF OF SIZE OF THE PRINCIPAL DWELLING OR 900 SQUARE FEET (WHICH EVER IS SMALLER).

ONE OF THE RESTRICTIONS THAT THE CITY CAN IMPOSE IS ADU'S CANNOT BE USED FOR SHORT TERM RENTAL, IE AIR B&B. ALSO, CANNOT CUT THE ADU PROPERTY OFF (IF NOT ATTACHED) AND SELL IT SEPARATELY.

ADU'S ARE LIMITED TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIALLY ZONED DISTRICTS - RESIDENCE A OR A1. THEY REQUIRE A SITE PLAN REVIEW AND NOT A SPECIAL PERMIT.

THE LAW DOES NOT REQUIRE OWNER OCCUPANCY. THE CITY CAN ALSO REQUIRE AN ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACE FOR THE RESPECTIVE ADU DUE TO ONLY ONE BUS STATION IN THE AREA. ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION MUST MEET ALL THE STATE BUILDING CODES.

A SPECIAL PERMIT WOULD BE REQUIRED IF THERE WERE TO BE MORE THAN ONE ADU ON A RESPECTIVE LOT.

ALL ADU'S WILL REQUIRED TO GO THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN REVIEW. THIS AFFORDS THE CITY REGULATORY CONTROL TO BE ABLE TO REVIEW WHAT IS BEING PURPOSED FOR THE ADU. THE SITE PLAN MUST BE DRAWN BY A QUALIFYING PROFESSIONAL (ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT). MUST ALSO BE DRAWN TO SCALE, SHOW ALL EGRESS POINTS, AND BE ABLE TO SHOW THAT THERE IS A PARKING SPACE FOR THE ADU. THE OFFICE OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WOULD WORK IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT TO REVIEW THE PLANS. ALL NEW CONSTRUCTION WILL HAVE TO GO THROUGH THE BUILDING DEPARTMENTS PROCESS (ELECTRICAL & PLUMBING) FOR PERMITS.

RESIDENT RICHARD ALLEN - 94 PONDVIEW DRIVE. SPOKE IN FAVOR OF THE ZONE CHANGE, STATING THAT IT IS A THOUGHTFUL AND RESPONSIBLE REACTION FROM THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT TO REFLECT STATE LAW. WANTED TO NOTE THAT THERE ARE OVER TWENTY-SIX THOUSAND SINGLE FAMILY HOMES IN SPRINGFIELD AND APPROXIMATELY THIRTY FOUR THOUSAND RESIDENTIAL PARCELS. THIS GIVES AN IDEA OF HOW PREDOMINANT THE SINGLE FAMILY USE IS IN SPRINGFIELD. APPROXIMATELY TWENTY TWO THOUSANDS PARCELS IN BOTH RESIDENCE A AND A1. SINGLE FAMILY ASSESSED VALUE IS 1/2 OF THE TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE IN THE CITY (RESIDENTIAL, INDUSTRIAL , COMMERCIAL & PERSONAL). SINGLE FAMILY ZONING IS CRITICAL IN

MAINTAINING ECONOMIC STABILITY IN SPRINGFIELD. STRONGLY URGE THE REGULATIONS AS PRESENTED.

COUNCILOR DAVILA - ASKED PHIL DROMEY TO REPEAT WHAT HE WOULD LIKE THE COUNCIL TO APPROVE (FOR THE PEOPLE WATCHING FROM HOME). PHIL GAVE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF HIS PRESENTATION. COUNCILOR DAVILA HAS CONCERNS ABOUT THE HISTORIC DISTRICT. PHIL STATED THE THE HISTORIC DISTRICT CANNOT BE EXEMPT FROM ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS. COUNCILOR DAVILA ASKED IF THERE ARE ANY FEES ASSOCIATED WITH A SITE PLAN REVIEW? PHIL STATED THAT CURRENTLY THERE IS NOT A FEE. PHIL IS UNSURE WHO WOULD SET THE FEE SCHEDULE SHOULD A FEE BE IMPLEMENTED FOR SITE PLAN REVIEWS. COUNCILOR DAVILA IS WILLING TO WORK WITH PLANNING TO DEVELOP A FEE STRUCTURE. COUNCILOR DAVILA IS CONCERNED THAT THIS ZONE CHANGE AND STATE LAW WILL CHANGE THE SOUL OR CHARACTER OF THE CITY.

COUNCILOR ALLEN - BELIEVES THAT THE CITY SHOULD CHARGE FOR SITE PLAN REVIEWS. THE COUNCILOR INQUIRED IF OTHER COMMUNITIES HAVE STRUGGLED WITH THIS? STATED THAT STATE REPRESENTATIVE PUPPOLO HAS A PLACE HOLDER FOR LEGISLATION AT THE STATE HOUSE IF NEEDED. PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT OTHER COMMUNITIES HAVE CHALLENGES WITH THE PURPOSED LAW, BUT IF ANY CHANGES WERE TO BE MADE, IT WILL HAVE TO BE DONE AT THE STATE LEVEL. PHIL MENTIONED THE DOVER AMENDMENT REFERENCING GROUP HOMES HAVE BEEN A PROBLEM FOR 30 YEARS IN SPECIFIC NEIGHBORHOODS. COUNCILOR ALLEN THINKS THIS MAY HAVE A NEGATIVE FINANCIAL IMPACT ON THE CITY, BUT IS NOT SURE. HE WOULD LIKE TO MEET WITH OTHER SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES. COUNCILOR ALLEN INQUIRED ABOUT THE COMMON OWNERSHIP ASPECT. PHIL CONFIRMED THAT THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY MUST ALSO OWN THE ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT. THE OWNER CANNOT SELL OF THE PARCEL WITH THE ADU ON IT AS A "CONDO." COUNCILOR ALLEN TOLD PHIL THAT HE DID GREAT WORK ON THIS AND THE COUNCIL SHOULD SUPPORT THIS ZONE CHANGE.

COUNCILOR DELGADO - BROUGHT UP THE HOUSING CRISIS BUT REFERENCES THAT ONLY RESIDENCE A AND A1 IS PRIVY TO THIS. THE COUNCILOR BELIEVES THAT RESIDENTS WITH A LOT OF MONEY OR OUTSIDE INVESTORS WILL BE THE ONLY ONES THAT CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS LAW. IF THE COUNCIL ATTACHES FEES TO IT MAY BLOCK SENIORS THAT COULD USE THE ADDITIONAL INCOME. COUNCILOR DELGADO INQUIRED IF THE CITY COULD IMPOSE A RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT? PHIL RESPONDED, NO, BUT ZONING ORDINANCES CAN ALWAYS BE AMENDED. PHIL IS CONTACTING THE LAW DEPARTMENT REGARDING THE RESIDENCY PIECE.

COUNCILOR BROWN - INQUIRED ON HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS. PHIL IS UNABLE TO QUANTIFY AN AMOUNT. IF THERE IS A LARGE AMOUNT OF INTEREST, WHAT IS THE TURN AROUND ON PAPERWORK? PLANNING IS UNSURE IF ADDITIONAL STAFF IS REQUIRED TO ASSIST WITH THE EXTRA WORK LOAD OF SITE PLAN REVIEWS.

COUNCILOR GOVAN - ASKED IF THE HOME OWNER GETS THE SITE PLAN REVIEW AND INQUIRED ON COSTS OF AN ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT. PHIL DOES NOT KNOW ABOUT THE COSTS, BUT IT IS A REQUIREMENT FOR THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT. THE COUNCILOR WANTS TO BE MINDFUL OF THE BURDEN OF COST FOR THE RESIDENTS. THE COUNCILOR STATED THAT SHE IS IN FAVOR OF THE ZONE CHANGE.

COUNCILOR WALSH - HAS CONCERNS ABOUT WHO OCCUPIES THE ADU. PHIL DROMEY STATED THAT THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY CAN RENT TO ANYONE.

COUNCILOR ALLEN - BROUGHT UP THE FACT THAT YOU CAN LIVE IN A SINGLE FAMILY HOME BUT NOT IN A SINGLE FAMILY ZONE (IE MAGNOLIA TERRACE). THE LAW DEPARTMENT IS INTERRUPTING THE LAW AS STATED - "SINGLE FAMILY IN A RESIDENTIAL ZONE A OR A1."

COUNCILOR DELGADO - QUESTIONED THE ARCHITECT FOR A BASEMENT OR ATTIC ADU? PHIL WILL ONLY BE LOOKING FOR THE PARKING SPOT. THE COUNCILOR MADE THE POINT THAT HE HAS DONE HOME RENOVATIONS IN THE PAST. THE LANGUAGE STATES "QUALIFIED PROFESSIONAL" BUT THIS COULD BE A CARPENTER. IT IS UP TO THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT ON WHAT THEY ACCEPT FOR PLANS. PHIL NOTED THAT ON STREET PARKING FOR ADU'S IS NOT ALLOWED.

COUNCILOR GOVAN - WANTED CLARIFICATION ON "ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN." PHIL STATED THAT HE REQUIRES A PROFESSIONAL THAT CAN DRAW TO SCALE. THE COUNCILOR WANTS THE WORD "ARCHITECT" REMOVED BECAUSE IT WILL DETER RESIDENTS FROM MOVING FORWARD.

ATTACHMENTS:

- 3251_ADU_Formal (PDF)
- ADU - Zoning - 2024_Final (PDF)
- ADU_State_Law_2024_Final (PDF)
- 3251_ADU_2025 (PDF)
- 3251_City_Wide_ADU_2025_PB_Report (PDF)

RESULT: **APPROVED [11 TO 0]**

AYES: Walsh, Allen, Delgado, Click-Bruce, Govan, Brown, Davila, Curran, Edwards, Whitfield, Fenton

ABSENT: Maria Perez

AWAY: Brian Santaniello