

AGAWAM COMMUNITY MEETING SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Prepared by JM Goldson 4/13/17

Summary

The purpose of the public forum in Agawam on April 4, 2017 was to conduct an interactive community meeting to solicit public opinion on a set of strategies and goals to include in the Housing Production Plan.

Main Conclusions

The participants of this community meeting supported several strategies and development sites, which are listed below. Some themes of conversation in this meeting were the focus on the aging population of Agawam, the desire to meet the necessary SHI percentage in the town, and the different types of housing that could be introduced in Agawam.

Strategies

The five following strategies were given the most support by participants:

- Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.
- Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.
- Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments
 - Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert.
 - Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units.
- Secure federal CDBG funds for “Aging in Place Program” to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.
- Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.

Development Sites

The following development sites were identified most as meriting further consideration in the group discussion period.

- Tuckahoe Turf Farm
- Games & Lanes
- Brady Village
- Agawam Bowl Property

Workshop Design

The public forum took place at the Agawam Senior Center at 5:30 pm on April 4, 2017. Roughly thirty people attended, the majority of which were Agawam residents. The meeting was interactive and informative, including an open house exercise, a presentation, and two group exercises where participants conversed in their individual tables. There were several means for participants to record their feedback including options for comments and dot voting on the seven goals presented and space for comments

discussed by the group on each of the twelve strategies presented. The recorded comments are transcribed in the Appendix.

Methods

Attendees were given a nametag and a table to sit at upon registration. Four tables lettered A-D had about six or seven people at each. Before the presentation there was time for attendees to participate in the open house exercise. This exercise involved seven boards with a goal on each, offering space for participants to vote on the importance of the goal using dots and a space for comments on each goal. Lastly there was a board for general comments or questions.

After all attendees were seated, Jennifer Goldson began her presentation. The presentation gave the background of the Housing Production Plan and a brief summary of the concepts discussed in the previous community meeting. The twelve strategies were then introduced and explained. Jennifer answered several questions that were brought up by participants in this segment.

Each table then received the first discussion exercise. They were given thirty minutes to discuss as a group each strategy, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and decide whether they believe the town should pursue the strategy. Next, Jennifer described the ten suggested development sites and their location in Agawam. Participants were given a map and thirty minutes to identify sites that merit further consideration for creation of affordable/mixed-income housing, with the option to identify sites that weren't already mentioned in the presentation.

Open House Exercise

The open house exercise involved seven boards with a goal on each of them, space to vote that the goal was "very important", "somewhat important" or "not important", and a space to leave comments on the goal.

Goal 1

Encourage the creation of multi-unit, mixed income rental housing in areas that could become walkable mixed-use areas with commercial and residential development opportunities.

Eight people found this goal to be somewhat important, while only five found it to be very important. A concern regarding this goal was that the attitude in town regarding multi-family homes is generally negative, though some positive attributes noted were that walkability is an important feature to expand upon in the town and that housing for working people is important if businesses expect to thrive in the town.

Goal 2

Support home rehabilitation needs of low-income homeowners and apartments owners with low-income tenants, such as for health and safety improvements, accessibility, code compliance, exterior renovation, and septic system upgrades.

This goal received a generally positive reaction—thirteen participants found this goal to be very important, and just three marked it as somewhat important. One person commented that this goal would help keep people in their own homes for a longer time, and another remarked that any improvements in this area are necessary. Energy efficiency was noted as a possible addition to home rehabilitation needs. A concern with this goal was the possibility of this goal putting a strain on property values.

Goal 3

Provide technical assistance and counseling for financial literacy for foreclosure prevention.

Responses to this goal were mixed, with just over half of the responses (nine) saying that the goal was very important, four saying it was somewhat important, and three saying it was not important. Proponents of this goal commented that preventing foreclosures and keeping people in their homes is very important because a foreclosed home will sit vacant for years before being released by the bank, and that help in this area is very important to the town. A critique of this goal was that this counseling should offer solutions, not just advice.

Goal 4

Encourage creation of affordable housing options for households including individuals with extremely low incomes including permanent affordable housing and transitional housing.

The majority of people (eight) found this goal to be very important, while four people marked it as somewhat important and one found it to be not important. One concern marked was that public attitude will need to change—“they need to feel absolute that this low-income housing will not degrade their properties”. One comment remarked that housing should be built at Games & Lanes as it seems that no one else wants to build there.

Goal 5

Encourage conversion of existing homes for affordable large-family housing and creation of more affordable homes for very low-income households and middle-income small families.

Responses to this goal were mixed, with about half the responses marking “very important”, about half marking “somewhat important”, and one person marking “not important”. The only comment left stated that change of any kind will be difficult.

Goal 6

Encourage creation of affordable, accessible housing options, including service-enriched housing, for physically and mentally disabled and elderly households.

Seventeen people voted that this goal was very important, and there were no dissenting votes. Comments stated that the creation of this type of housing should include young people with disabilities as well, and that more housing for elderly should be created to lessen the time for those on waiting lists. Another suggestion supporting service-enriched housing was for elderly housing that would provide meals, transportation services, and on-site activities.

Goal 7

Strive to support the creation of 300 units that will count on the SHI over five years through conversion of existing buildings and new construction and that are affordable to a range of household incomes.

The majority of participants (nine) marked this goal as very important, and four marked it as somewhat important. One concern was that it may be difficult to get support from the town’s administration, but one comment suggested again that Games & Lanes would be a good location for this type of housing to be developed.

Discussion Exercise Part I—Strategies

Twelve draft strategies were presented to the participants, and each table was given a sheet to respond on whether they thought the town should pursue each strategy over the next five years, to identify strengths and opportunities for the strategies, and to point out weaknesses and concerns about each strategy. The strategies presented and the general responses from the participants are detailed below.



1. *Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.*

All four tables responded that the town should pursue this strategy over the next five years. Some strengths noted were that this strategy seeks outside funds and resources, would survive varying economic climates, and would be a more organized, controlled, and stabled approach. One potential weakness would be the effect of political influence.



2. *Build local capacity by utilizing CPA funds to hire or contract a part-time housing coordinator – could potentially partner with nearby towns to share services.*

The groups were split on whether they supported this strategy, with tables A and B agreeing that the town should pursue it and tables C and D saying that it should not be pursued. Strengths of the strategy were that the planning board would be able to focus more on housing and that planning would become more of a coordinated effort. Table D stated that they would support this strategy if it were funded by the town, but not if it was funded by CPA. Concerns were the lack of authority with the new hire, and questions on if they would have the necessary knowledge and skills.



3. *Consider proposing special legislation to create local property tax incentives for conversion of existing apartment complexes to affordable rental units.*

Two tables agreed that the town should pursue this strategy, one was undecided and split 50/50 within the table, and one agreed that the town should not pursue the strategy. Some strengths of the strategy were that it would spread the SHI units over the community instead of concentrating them in one location, it would increase the affordable inventory to the necessary amount, and that it would help incentivize improvements and conversions in properties. Some concerns in implementing this strategy were its ability to overcome council objections and the potential lack of participation.



4. *Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.*

All four tables agreed that this strategy should be pursued. Table D, however, said they would support it only if it was deed restricted for SHI apartments. The concerns listed were only that it might be difficult to come up with guidelines for the program.



5. *Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments*

- a. *Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert.*
- b. *Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units.*

All four tables agreed on this strategy. One table questioned how this would be best put together, but no other comments were made.



6. *Secure federal CDBG funds for “Aging in Place Program” to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.*

The four groups all agreed that this strategy should be pursued as well. One group commented that even if the Aging in Place program doesn't count on the SHI, it will improve the quality of life for the seniors in town. Another commented that as part of the “package” of strategies, this would be a good sell for the less attractive parts.



7. *Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.*

All of the tables agreed that this strategy should be pursued. One concern stated was that residents of the town may agree with the strategy but adopt a “not in my backyard” attitude.



8. *Age-targeted housing design through zoning amendments that specifically call for “visitability” by design would help to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities, and others with a need for barrier-free housing.*

Three out of four tables agreed that this strategy should be pursued, and only table D held the opposing view. One table agreed on the premise that this housing would be affordable, and another said that it should be done in a way that counts towards the SHI. One group commented that they would like to see more active older living complexes such as American Inn and Keystone—assisted living for seniors.



9. *Provide density incentives through an inclusionary zoning bylaw for a minimum percentage of affordable homes or fee-in-lieu to the housing trust.*

Three out of four groups said that this strategy should be pursued, and one group disagreed. The only comment expressed confusion as to what is meant by “density incentive”.



10. *Adopt mixed-use business districts in additional areas in town that are served with sewer and water infrastructure and could present attractive redevelopment opportunities, such as existing commercial strip plazas.*

Three out of four tables agreed that this strategy should be pursued in the town. A noted strength of this strategy was the idea of housing above businesses, as long as the architecture is done well, although the same group agreed that there has to be some limitations on the type of business included.



11. *Adopt an accessory apartment bylaw to expand housing options.*

Three out of four groups supported this strategy being pursued. One of these groups agreed, but mentioned that restrictions would have to be put on these accessory apartments.



12. *Adopt Natural Resources Protection Zoning (NRPZ) to encourage moderately sized and priced housing in cluster developments. Bylaw would encourage smaller house lots and/or cluster developments with a greater percentage of conserved open space and provide density bonus as incentive for inclusion of affordable homes.*

Only one group fully agreed that this strategy should be pursued—other groups were split amongst themselves about whether they believe this strategy should be pursued by the town. Some concerns listed were that this may not be good for the children in town, and that people want to keep open space in the town. However, groups stated that cluster housing would promote better protection for the environment and would suit the housing needs of small families or single people well.

Discussion Exercise Part II—Development Sites/Areas

In the second part of the discussion exercise, each table was asked to identify one or more sites that merit further consideration for creation of affordable or mixed-income housing in the next five years. The sites presented as options are listed below:

1. Silver Street
2. Tuckahoe Turf Farm (back side on S Westfield St)
3. Benoit Property (former Legion Hall)
4. Zielinsky Land 311 Shoemaker
5. 349 Shoemaker
6. Ralph DePalma on South Westfield
7. HAP Housing on Mill Street

8. Brady Village - field behind
9. Game and Lanes
10. Agawam Bowl Property Owned by Liberty Pizza Owner

The most popular options were **Tuckahoe Turf Farm**, where several groups mentioned the option of cluster housing, **Games & Lanes** for mixed-use, **Brady Village**, and the **Agawam Bowl property**, depending on parking. HAP housing on Mill Street was mentioned as well, as an “already done deal”.

APPENDIX I: OPEN HOUSE EXERCISE

Goal 1

Encourage the creation of multi-unit, mixed income rental housing in areas that could become walkable mixed-use areas with commercial and residential development opportunities.

Five people marked this goal as “Very Important”, and eight people marked it as “Somewhat Important”.

Comments:

- Negative attitude in town about multi-families
- If any businesses expect to thrive within the town we need to recognize that there has to be active buyers and adequate housing for working people
- As we age it would be important to walk to stores, restaurants, services, or have vans available

Goal 2

Support home rehabilitation needs of low-income homeowners and apartments owners with low-income tenants, such as for health and safety improvements, accessibility, code compliance, exterior renovation, and septic system upgrades.

13 people marked this goal as “Very Important”, and 3 people marked it as “Somewhat Important”.

Comments:

- This puts a great strain on property values.
- Get business owners included via donations. CPA funding?
- Any improvements are necessary
- Also energy efficiency
- This help could keep people in their own homes for a longer time

Goal 3

Provide technical assistance and counseling for financial literacy for foreclosure prevention.

9 people marked this goal as “Very Important”, 4 people marked it as “Somewhat Important”, and 3 marked it as “Not Important”.

Comments:

- Counseling needs to offer solutions not just advice
- Preventing foreclosures is very important because a foreclosed home sits vacant for years before the bank releases it. Keeping people in their homes is very important.
- Should include finance management basics for homeowners/buyers.
- Help is important

Goal 4

Encourage creation of affordable housing options for households including individuals with extremely low incomes including permanent affordable housing and transitional housing.

8 people marked this goal as “Very Important”, 4 people marked the goal as “Somewhat Important”, and 1 person marked it as “Not Important”.

Comments:

- Concern: Public attitude needs to change and they need to feel absolute that this low income housing will not degrade their properties.
- If building multi-unit affordable housing, should restrictions be put on builder to hire local people already low income to help?
- Build housing at Games & Lanes as it seems no one else wants it and remediation is almost complete.

Goal 5

Encourage conversion of existing homes for affordable large-family housing and creation of more affordable homes for very low-income households and middle-income small families.

6 people marked this goal as “Very Important”, 6 people marked it as “Somewhat Important”, and 1 person marked it as “Not Important”.

Comments:

- Change of any kind is difficult.

Goal 6

Encourage creation of affordable, accessible housing options, including service-enriched housing, for physically and mentally disabled and elderly households.

17 people marked this goal as “Very Important”.

Comments:

- Must include young people with disabilities.
- Why can't we build more housing for elderly, < waiting time for those on lists
- Elderly housing for seniors that provides a main meal and transportation services. Also activities on site.

Goal 7

Strive to support the creation of 300 units that will count on the SHI over five years through conversion of existing buildings and new construction and that are affordable to a range of household incomes.

9 people marked this goal “Very Important” and 4 people marked the goal “Somewhat Important”.

Comments:

- May be difficult to get support from town's administration
- Don't forget to build in energy efficiency
- The old Games & Lanes – warehouse would make great housing for people without cars, can walk, across from the old Buxton – where the flea markets were held it's a big building that could have indoor parking for residents and outdoor parking for visitors.

Comments? Questions?

- Consider an expansion of bus routes for new housing—gardening areas—some garages.

APPENDIX II: DISCUSSION EXERCISES

Discussion Exercise Part I–Strategies

Table A

Draft Strategies	Should the town pursue this strategy over the next 5 years?	Identify Strengths and Opportunities	Identify Concerns and Weaknesses
Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.	Yes	Town would be in control of land	No weaknesses we can identify
Build local capacity by utilizing CPA funds to hire or contract a part-time housing coordinator – could potentially partner with nearby towns to share services.	Yes	Planning dept would be more able to focus on housing	Funding the position, finding proper experience
Consider proposing special legislation to create local property tax incentives for conversion of existing apartment complexes to affordable rental units.	Yes	Would help incentivize improvements – conversions in properties. We have an inventory of older condos that could be repaired	Overcoming council objections
Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.	Yes	Grant money is always good	May be tough to come up with guidelines
Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert. Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units. 	Yes		
Secure federal CDBG funds for “Aging in Place Program” to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.	Yes	Good “sell” for less attractive fact of the package	
Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.	Yes		

Age-targeted housing design through zoning amendments that specifically call for "visitability" by design would help to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities, and others with a need for barrier-free housing.	Yes		Would like to see more active older living complexes like American Inn and Keystone with assistance
Provide density incentives through an inclusionary zoning bylaw for a minimum percentage of affordable homes or fee-in-lieu to the housing trust.	Yes		
Adopt mixed-use business districts in additional areas in town that are served with sewer and water infrastructure and could present attractive redevelopment opportunities, such as existing commercial strip plazas.	Yes		
Adopt an accessory apartment bylaw to expand housing options.	Yes		
Adopt Natural Resources Protection Zoning (NRPZ) to encourage moderately sized and priced housing in cluster developments. Bylaw would encourage smaller house lots and/or cluster developments with a greater percentage of conserved open space and provide density bonus as incentive for inclusion of affordable homes.	Yes	Cluster housing can promote better protection for the environment	

Table B

Some responses on this page were illegible.

Draft Strategies	Should the town pursue this strategy over the next 5 years?	Identify Strengths and Opportunities	Identify Concerns and Weaknesses
Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.	Yes	Keep development off hours quicker	None
Build local capacity by utilizing CPA funds to hire or contract a part-time housing coordinator – could potentially partner with nearby towns to share services.	Yes	“	Have knowledge and skill to help on --
Consider proposing special legislation to create local property tax incentives for conversion of existing apartment complexes to affordable rental units.	No		

Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.	Yes		
Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert. Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units. 	Yes, get bigger chunk	Get to foster --	How to put it together
Secure federal CDBG funds for "Aging in Place Program" to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.	Yes	Even if doesn't count on SHI will improve quality of life for seniors in town	
Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.	Yes		Some residents will object – not in their back yard
Age-targeted housing design through zoning amendments that specifically call for "visitability" by design would help to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities, and others with a need for barrier-free housing.	Yes	Should do it in a way that counts to be subsidized	
Provide density incentives through an inclusionary zoning bylaw for a minimum percentage of affordable homes or fee-in-lieu to the housing trust.	Yes		Don't understand density incentives
Adopt mixed-use business districts in additional areas in town that are served with sewer and water infrastructure and could present attractive redevelopment opportunities, such as existing commercial strip plazas.	Yes	House on top of businesses good, set up to be architecturally correct	Has to be some limitations—not gas station/duplex/funeral home
Adopt an accessory apartment bylaw to expand housing options.	Yes	Have to put restrictions	

Adopt Natural Resources Protection Zoning (NRPZ) to encourage moderately sized and priced housing in cluster developments. Bylaw would encourage smaller house lots and/or cluster developments with a greater percentage of conserved open space and provide density bonus as incentive for inclusion of affordable homes.	Yes – 2:1	Small families or single people	May not be good for children Want to keep open space in town
---	-----------	---------------------------------	---

Table C

Draft Strategies	Should the town pursue this strategy over the next 5 years?	Identify Strengths and Opportunities	Identify Concerns and Weaknesses
Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.	Consensus	ID properties and initiate action. More organized and stable method and approach. Funded approach and controlled approach	Universal support. Private development commitment. Alignment of zoning...
Build local capacity by utilizing CPA funds to hire or contract a part-time housing coordinator – could potentially partner with nearby towns to share services.	Not so much: 4-1	Coordinated effort	No authority
Consider proposing special legislation to create local property tax incentives for conversion of existing apartment complexes to affordable rental units.	50/50	Increase affordable inventory	Lack of participation
Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.	Yes		
Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert. Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units. 	Yes		

Secure federal CDBG funds for "Aging in Place Program" to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.	Yes		
Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.	Yes		
Age-targeted housing design through zoning amendments that specifically call for "visitability" by design would help to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities, and others with a need for barrier-free housing.	Yes – caveat: "affordable"		
Provide density incentives through an inclusionary zoning bylaw for a minimum percentage of affordable homes or fee-in-lieu to the housing trust.	Yes		
Adopt mixed-use business districts in additional areas in town that are served with sewer and water infrastructure and could present attractive redevelopment opportunities, such as existing commercial strip plazas.	Yes		
Adopt an accessory apartment bylaw to expand housing options.	Yes		
Adopt Natural Resources Protection Zoning (NRPZ) to encourage moderately sized and priced housing in cluster developments. Bylaw would encourage smaller house lots and/or cluster developments with a greater percentage of conserved open space and provide density bonus as incentive for inclusion of affordable homes.	2 Y, 3 N		

Table D

Draft Strategies	Should the town pursue this strategy over the next 5 years?	Identify Strengths and Opportunities	Identify Concerns and Weaknesses
Build local capacity with the creation of a municipal housing trust to utilize Community Preservation Act funds and other funding to foster creation of locally-initiated, small scale residential and/or mixed-use development.	Yes	Asset allocations Survives varying economic climates Skilled appointees Seeks outside funds/resources	Political influences
Build local capacity by utilizing CPA funds to hire or contract a part-time housing coordinator – could	No	Not funded by CPA Yes if funded by the town	

potentially partner with nearby towns to share services.			
Consider proposing special legislation to create local property tax incentives for conversion of existing apartment complexes to affordable rental units.	Yes	Spreads SHI over the community instead of small segments Proactive dissemination to current owners	
Secure federal CDBG funds for a home rehab program for homeowners and apartment owners.	Yes	If deed restricted for SHI (apartments)	
Foster private deals to upgrade existing apartment complexes and convert to affordable apartments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targeting local funds (e.g., CPA funds through housing trust) to work with private partner to purchase, upgrade, and convert. • Provide information to local property apartment owners about the Donation Tax Credit for property donations to non-profit organizations to convert existing buildings to affordable units. 	Yes		
Secure federal CDBG funds for "Aging in Place Program" to provide grants of up to \$5,000 for low/moderate income senior homeowners for health and safety improvements to their homes.	Yes	Research deed restrictions for re-sale at a % of actual value	
Adopt an infill bylaw that permits development of undersized lots for affordable homes by private individuals or organizations, such as Habitat for Humanity.	Yes	With size restrictions	
Age-targeted housing design through zoning amendments that specifically call for "visitability" by design would help to accommodate seniors and people with disabilities, and others with a need for barrier-free housing.	No		
Provide density incentives through an inclusionary zoning bylaw for a minimum percentage of affordable homes or fee-in-lieu to the housing trust.	No		
Adopt mixed-use business districts in additional areas in town that are served with sewer and water infrastructure and could present attractive redevelopment opportunities, such as existing commercial strip plazas.	No		

Adopt an accessory apartment bylaw to expand housing options.	No		
Adopt Natural Resources Protection Zoning (NRPZ) to encourage moderately sized and priced housing in cluster developments. Bylaw would encourage smaller house lots and/or cluster developments with a greater percentage of conserved open space and provide density bonus as incentive for inclusion of affordable homes.	Maybe		

Discussion Exercise Part II—Development Sites/Areas

Identify one or more sites that merit further consideration for creation of affordable/mixed-income homes in the next five years.

Sites Presented

11. Silver Street
12. Tuckahoe Turf Farm (back side on S Westfield St)
13. Benoit Property (former Legion Hall)
14. Zielinsky Land 311 Shoemaker
15. 349 Shoemaker
16. Ralph DePalma on South Westfield
17. HAP Housing on Mill Street
18. Brady Village - field behind
19. Game and Lanes
20. Agawam Bowl Property Owned by Liberty Pizza Owner

Table A

#9 – Games and Lane – Good – needs to be improved, mixed use/shops/apartments

#8 – Rear of Brady Village – both properties are smallish

#10 – Agawam Bwl

May have to pick a bigger property in which case we like

#3 Benoit – which has few restrictions and has already been through Con Comm

Table B

1. Mill St done deal
2. Next best—Tuckahoe
3. Brady behind
4. Zeilinsky
5. Like 9 and 10 depending on parking for #10 and for #9 still question of safe for housing

Tuckahoe: cluster would be good.

Behind brady—multi-family, similar to HAP, if possible mixed-income (4 and 5 above put in line for future development)

Not #1

Good #5 and #6

Table C

1. HAP – as-is

2. Tuckahoe - cluster/cottage
3. Southwestfield St. – Farmplex
4. Brady Property – multi-family

Table D

#2—needs sewer and pumping station

^ or any of the contiguous land

#9 and 10

#8