

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, February 21, 2018, 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: Greg Stutsman, Acting Chair, Stephen Schreiber (late), Robert Crowner, Michael Birtwistle, Jack Jemsek, Christine Gray-Mullen, and Pari Riahi

ABSENT: Maria Chao

STAFF: Christine Brestrup, Planning Director
Steven McCarthy, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Stutsman opened the meeting at 7:05 PM.

I. MINUTES – There were no Minutes available for review.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – ZONING AMENDMENTS

A. A-05-18 - Zoning – Recreational Marijuana Retail Locations (Planning Board)

To see if the Town will amend Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.3, Use Classifications and Standards, Section 3.362, Recreational Marijuana Retailer, Standards and Conditions, paragraph 5, to clarify that the limitation of no more than eight (8) RMRs permitted to be located in the Town of Amherst applies to the locations of RMRs and not to the entities themselves.

Mr. Stutsman read the preamble and opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Crowner described the intent of the article, which was to clarify that the limit of eight refers to the locations of RMRs, not to the entities themselves.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if it was a good idea to limit the number of retailers, as well as the number of outlets.

Mr. Crowner said that he wasn't sure if the Town could regulate such a thing; also, the ZSC is trying to do a simple technical fix to reflect the intent of the drafters, not pursue something more complex.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if this article failed, would the interpretation revert to eight owners for eight locations?

Ms. Brestrup confirmed that that was the Building Commissioner's interpretation.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to close the public hearing, and that the Planning Board recommends the article as written. Mr. Jemsek seconded.

Mr. Birtwistle said he wanted to vote against this; the idea of eight different owners is better than eight stores owned by fewer than eight people.

Mr. Crowner warned that that interpretation might not survive a legal challenge.

Mr. Stutsman noted that Town Meeting had discussed the article as if the intent was to limit locations, not operators.

Ms. Brestrup noted there are already four entities that have received letters of support from the Select Board, and at least three are planning to go forward as OMMDs. Those entities will have priority when applying for recreational licenses from the state. She said she was fairly confident there would be at least three entities doing retail sales in town.

Mr. Jemsek asked how marijuana cafes are to be regulated within the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Brestrup noted that there is a discrepancy between the rules the Cannabis Control Commission are drafting and the legislation passed; the legislation requires that every town that wants to offer on-site consumption has to take an active action, in other words, a referendum vote. That issue won't come up until sometime over the summer.

The vote was 5-1-0 (Birtwistle opposed). The motion passed.

B. A-06-18 - Zoning – Medical Marijuana Treatment Center and Off-site Medical Marijuana Dispensary – (Planning Board)

Mr. Stutsman read the preamble and opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Crowner described the intent of the article, which was to get the local zoning in line with state regulations. Also, the state is allowing medical facilities to be co-located with recreational establishments; that would complicate the not-for-profit status of any co-located medical facility.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to close the public hearing, and that the Planning Board endorse the article as written. Mr. Birtwistle seconded. The vote was 6-0-0. The motion passed.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

**SPR 2018-09 – Ryan Karb – Many Hands Farm Corp/Amethyst Farm –
132 Pelham Road/89 North East Street**

Request Site Plan Review approval for salesroom or farm stand for sale of nursery, garden or other agricultural produce (including articles of home manufacture from such produce), (Map 15A, Parcel 29, R-N zoning district)

There were no disclosures.

Mr. Karb, manager at Many Hands Farm Corps, a CSA, presented the application. Currently, the farm share's distribution operations are conducted under a rickety lean-to,

and they would like to put up a timber structure better accommodate their business of interacting with members and distributing produce.

Mr. Birtwistle noted issues that came up at the site visit; the presence of the large trailer in the front of the property, which would block the view of the structure from most of the traffic going by, and the question of whether/how/when that should be relocated; and the width of the driveway, which felt narrow.

Mr. Karb said the trailer is new and was delivered in September; it could be moved elsewhere on the property. The structure will look nicer than the trailer, which could be moved by June 1st. The driveway is over 12 feet wide – generously, 18 feet wide - but they could bring in fill to make it a bit wider when they move the trailer.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked about the posts – they are the pinch point of the driveway. Mr. Karb said the posts were 20 feet apart.

Ms. Gray-Mullen also noted that the traffic would increase quite a bit if the farm stand ever became open to the public.

Ms. Laura Ricard, of Jenks Street, said she had been a member of the farm since the first fields were plowed, and an adequate farm stand/sales room is desperately needed. A new farm stand with more structural integrity would be a big improvement and in keeping with the high quality of the rest of the operation.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to close the public hearing and that the Board finds the application meets all the relevant criteria of Section 11.24 of the Bylaw, and that it be approved as presented. The vote was 6-0-0. The motion passed.

SPR-C 2018-10 – Apple Brook West LLC– Apple Brook Cluster Subdivision – 1194 West Street

Request amendment to SPR-C 2017-00014 to allow relocation of trailhead & parking from Lot 7 to a portion of the Southerly Open Space; siting of a single family home on Lot 7; elimination of a two family home on Lot 8 & replacement with a single family home; revision to Lot 2 driveway & dwelling; modifications to approved building designs & request for flexibility in design based on market conditions. (formerly Map 25B, Parcel 29; now Map 25B, Parcels 29, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, & 76, R-O & R-LD zoning district)

David Berson, attorney at Bacon/Wilson, LLC, presented the application, along with Paul Cole, developer, and Carlos Nieto, the designer, of the Berkshire Design Group.

Mr. Berson described the history of the subdivision, including the original application in 2007, the appeal, the modified plan approved in 2017, and this revision. He noted the 2007 Zoning Bylaw was in effect for this project as confirmed by Town Counsel.

Mr. Berson stated that the biggest change to the previously approved subdivision plan is that Lot 7 will no longer be purchased by the Town to build a trailhead. There were concerns regarding the duplex and access issues over a common driveway, and instead, a single family house will be put on Lot 7 and the trailhead will be put on the

existing open space that will be deeded to the Town. Lot 8 will now be a single family home instead of a duplex.

Other changes include:

Lot 1 has had a separate driveway provided for it, instead of a common driveway shared with Lot 2.

Lot 2's building footprint has been revised back to the 2007 footprint, which is larger, and the plan provides for a separate driveway. The applicants think the new design will look better for a New England town.

Lot 4's building footprint has been decreased, and its style is now the same as the rest of the subdivision.

Lot 5 will have the building footprint slightly increased, and will be of the same style as the rest of the subdivision.

Lot 6's building will be slightly enlarged, and its style made consistent.

The Conservation Commission approved the plans, and requested some very minor changes.

Mr. Berson also requested to remove the condition to construct a crosswalk across West Street; the design must be approved by the Select Board and Transportation Advisory Committee, and if they were not able to get such approval, the applicant would lose the ability to build the development. They are willing to pay for a crosswalk, and have studied similar crosswalks.

Ms. Brestrup stated that the Site Plan Review application did not include a request to remove the condition about the crosswalk.

Mr. Stutsman noted that the Board had received a Development Application Report, and no site visit was conducted.

Mr. Crouner asked if the applicant was envisioning significant footprint changes involved in changing the style. He would want to set a limit in that case.

Mr. Berson said they studied what the largest feasible house would be, (3,024 sq ft) and even if that was built – which they do not necessarily plan to do – the buildings would comply with all setback, coverage, and other zoning regulations.

Mr. Schreiber arrived. Mr. Stutsman continued to chair the meeting.

Ms. Brestrup suggested language for returning to the Board in the event of a significant footprint change.

Mr. Berson requested such a return be to a Public Meeting, not a Public Hearing.

Mr. Nieto clarified there would be plantings between Vista Terrace and the Moriarty property, and a six foot fence between that property and Lots 7 & 8.

Mr. Birtwistle asked why one parking space was dropped in the trailhead. Mr. Cole said that that number was agreed upon with Dave Ziomek.

Mr. Jemsek asked if there were any comments from the Town Engineer. There were not any comments.

Ms. Riahi asked if staff had any idea of the Town's interest in the crosswalk. Ms. Brestrup said she believed the Town was interested, and that she did not advise the Board approve the crosswalk modification, as the request was not included in the application or the legal ad. She also noted the Planning Board could not agree to pay for part of the crosswalk.

Mr. Berson noted his disagreement with the crosswalk condition - it requires other Town boards to approve designs and plans, which takes the satisfaction of the condition out of the applicant's hands.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if Route 116 is owned by the Commonwealth.

Ms. Brestrup stated the Town owns Route 116 to Country Corners Road.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted the need to be precise with the language about the crosswalk – there is also a crosswalk proposed on Vista Terrace.

Debbie Jacque, abutter, said she wanted to clarify what the fence situation on the border of her property would be; earlier, they had agreed on a partial fence, but more recently, she requested and the applicant agreed to put in a full fence.

The applicant clarified they would put the fence across the whole property.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if now the building styles are all consistent and uses are consistent on all lots, is this still a cluster subdivision?

Ms. Brestrup clarified that all the requirements for a cluster subdivision were met.

Mr. Cole clarified that the applicant was performing all the work for the parking area for the trailhead.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the Fire Department had approved the changed plans.

Ms. Brestrup said the new plans had been sent to the Fire Department, and no comments were received.

Mr. Crouner MOVED to close the Public Hearing and find the application meets all conditions of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, and that there should be a condition requiring that the applicant submit a revised plan showing the fence at the Jacque property to the Planning Department, and that the applicant should return to the Planning Board if there is a significant change in the footprints of the buildings for approval at a Public Meeting. The vote was 6-0-1 (Schreiber abstained). The motion passed.

IV. PLANNING & ZONING

A. ZSC Report

Mr. Crowner said the article heard today was not the end of the marijuana articles the ZSC will be proposing, and it might not be the end for Spring Town Meeting. The ZSC might want to allow micro cultivation or craft cultivation in outlying zones. That is a different type of use than a farm use; the ZSC will consider that.

Mr. Crowner said they had already held two Public Hearings, and they were working on a few other articles for the spring. Two deal with small-scale infill, supplemental dwelling units, and detached supplemental units.

There is also a proposal to allow smaller lots in the R-G zone to be buildable, as long as they conform to the existing character of the neighborhood. The proposal would allow for a Special Permit to decrease the lot area and frontage requirements as long as the lot in question matches a similar existing built-on lot within 300 ft. They expect this will affect 40-45 lots in the R-G zone. They will be smaller lots, therefore likely smaller houses.

The Historical Commission is considering changes to the Demolition Delay bylaw, including changing terms and procedures. The ZSC is considering dealing with other potential marijuana uses. There are two petition articles, which will be discussed tonight.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the potential smaller lots in the R-G zone - at face value it sounds problematic. It could have a cascading effect; it could lead to investors buying properties, demolishing houses, and splitting them up into small lots, tearing up the neighborhood. Also, why is this proposal not shared among all zoning districts? All zones should take the impact of densification, not just the R-G.

Mr. Crowner said that that was not their intention, and that it was doubtful houses would be torn down all across town. He said he had done an analysis of the R-G zone, which was supposed to be the densest residential zone.

Ms. Brestrup noted the R-G has much more nonconformity than other districts; it would be hard in other districts to find nonconforming lots.

Mr. Schreiber said he could see it two ways- which is the pattern of the neighborhood, large lots or small lots?

Ms. Brestrup noted that rather than proposing a change to the basic dimensional regulations, this proposal requires a Special Permit. She has noticed that investors are in business to make money; they tend to shy away from things that require Special Permits.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if there was any way to attack this issue by suggesting that divisions of lots and reducing frontage when an existing house was on a property would require the house to not be torn down?

Mr. Crowner noted any house could fall down, burn down, etc... there are ways around such regulations.

Mr. Stutsman stated that the ZSC could study the issue further.

B. Inclusionary Zoning – Petition Article – presentation by Gerry Weiss

Gerry Weiss, author of the citizen zoning petition on the issue, asked if when the current interpretation of Article 15 was conceived, was the Planning Board aware that that interpretation precluded any development downtown from ever triggering Inclusionary Zoning?

Ms. Brestrup noted that there are no residential uses in the B-G district that require a Special Permit for use; the current interpretation of Article 15 only triggers for Special Permits for use.

Mr. Stutsman noted that only one member of the current Planning Board was on the Planning Board at that time. The then-Planning Director had an interpretation, supported by Town Counsel, which was followed.

There was discussion about whether or not the Planning Board was aware of the implications of their interpretation at that time.

Mr. Crowner said he didn't consider that ramification at that time.

Mr. Schreiber said he hadn't thought of it until this moment.

Mr. Birtwistle said he didn't agree with the current interpretation of Article 15 that the Board had been using.

Mr. Jemsek said he appreciated the work Mr. Weiss had done.

Mr. Weiss said that it seemed accurate that the consequence of the interpretation was not noticed until he had pointed it out. He also noted there was an error in his petition – originally, he was only changing Section 15.10, at which point he wrote the title – later, he made other changes at Mr. Crowner's request to other sections – he will try to get it fixed.

Mr. Weiss noted that Article 15 was passed in 2005 by the Planning Board and then Town Meeting. All agree the intent was that it only apply to projects that require a Special Permit; since 2009, there has been an ongoing fight over the fact that "Special Permit" became interpreted as "Special Permit for use". As he pointed out, that eliminates downtown from Inclusionary Zoning – he asserted that was not the intent of the drafters. He noted the proposed article was focused on alterations of the size of buildings – lot coverage, building coverage, etc. The original article could have been interpreted that way, but it wasn't; this effort is to bring Inclusionary Zoning back downtown. It was pointed out by Ms. la Cour that this may not occur – developers might just build buildings at a size that would be by right – that is fine, that's how it was intended to be.

Mr. Weiss continued, stating more incentives for developers including affordable units would be nice; at the same time, he didn't think it appropriate for him to take on that issue. There are already incentives in Special Permits for use and (if this article passes) dimensional modifications, and tax incentives. That tax incentive has only been asked for once, by Beacon Communities. There have been other Inclusionary Zoning projects, but they haven't asked for tax breaks.

Ms. Brestrup surmised it was because Beacon was not required to construct affordable units, but others were.

Mr. Weiss noted payment-in-lieu schemes could be looked at as incentives, and could be looked at as flexibility too. He said examining such schemes were not his role – the Planning Board could, but he was just trying to get Inclusionary Zoning downtown, as the drafters of Article 15 had intended.

Mr. Birtwistle and Mr. Schreiber noted typographical errors; Ms. Brestrup noted the petition article would go on the warrant, and changes could be made on the floor of Town Meeting.

Mr. Crowner noted that the Planning Board could sponsor an identical article with changes, such as typographical tweaks, a payment in lieu scheme, offset incentives, etc. Mr. Weiss is not able to amend his article, as citizen petition articles are "set in stone". The ZSC tentatively is in support of this article for Special Permits resulting in a bigger building. The Special Permit provides an incentive itself to offset the inclusionary units by allowing buildings to be bigger. This is a compromise approach, less ambitious than what the ZSC has proposed in the past, but it closes the gap between what a lot of people would like to see and what the Planning Board has been applying in the past.

Mr. Weiss added that while he was shown some language tonight from a draft by Mr. Crowner regarding offsite units and payment-in-lieu, he would have to review it more extensively before he could conclusively give his opinion. Tentatively, he could probably support it.

Mr. Crowner noted that the ZSC has the advantage of having more time to craft their article. Ideally, if the Planning Board comes to an agreement with the petitioner, the petition article could be dismissed.

Mr. Schreiber said that after nine years of debate, this was the right approach. Since 2009, the Board has seen, through four projects downtown, more data about risks, approaches, etc.

Mr. Jemsek asked about the payment in lieu concept – how does that further the cause?

Mr. Stutsman said that the ZSC has seen trouble on the part of developers in administering affordable housing; small developers do not have experience with affordable units, and ill equipped developers might incur more costs and cause more problems – those resources would be better spent by an experienced developer.

Mr. Weiss rebutted Mr. Stutsman's point – Inclusionary Zoning is used in many communities across the country, and developers figure it out. Brookline requires that the town be the first administrator, and eventually they hand it over to developer. He thought developers could learn how to do this – if they can do it elsewhere, they can do it here in Amherst. He agreed with some provision for payment-in-lieu, but if all units are allowed to be deferred by payment-in-lieu, units wouldn't be built downtown. He said he liked more the idea of at least 50% of the units being built, with rest being allowed to be deferred by payment-in-lieu.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if this interpretation of Article 15 had been in effect, would the large buildings recently built have had this apply - they would have.

Mr. Jemsek asked Mr. Stutsman his thoughts on having at least 50% of the units being retained in a payment-in-lieu scheme.

Mr. Stutsman agreed there are a number of communities that have had success – he agreed that at least a percentage of units should be required to be built on-site.

Mr. Weiss stated the argument that it is hard to administer affordable units applies to Article 15 itself, not his amendment. If that's the case, it needs to be taken up by the Planning Board. It is not relevant to his article, which is solely focused on making Inclusionary Zoning apply downtown as well.

C. Public Comment

Kenneth Rosenthal, 53 Sunset Avenue, disclosed that he was not a lawyer and never passed the bar in Massachusetts, but had been corporate counsel and treasurer of Hampshire College. He said generally speaking there are two types of letters requested from counsel, one that is a definitive legal investigation, and one that is asking to confirm a point of view. He submitted that Mr. Tucker's letter in 2009 to Town Counsel regarding the interpretation of Article 15 was the latter, and looking for support for his incorrect point of view.

Maurianne Adams asked if the lot/frontage modifications went into effect, what would be the effect on the Local Historic District? Which pattern would they work off of, small lots or large lots? This was a challenge she had not thought of before.

Ms. Brestrup said that the LHD would have a lot to say about whatever development was proposed for these lots, but doubted the LHD would have a say in the configuration of the lots themselves.

Ms. Adams stated she supported Mr. Weiss's article – this is a good base article that can be worked on further in the future, but holds value for now. She said she now sees a whole spectrum of affordability and homeownership issues for low-income townspeople, from maintaining 24/7

shelter to finding affordable housing. There are many different avenues towards different aspects of affordability; she believes Inclusionary Zoning is a very important component of that. She would not want to see this referred back, because the Town needs a base document we can work from and improve in the future.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting - none

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Palley Village – Lot Release Request – Release of Lot #12

Ms. Brestrup explained the background and need for covenants in Amherst. Palley Village was started in 2004; initially, the Planning Department was vigilant in requiring releases for all lots; some have slipped through the cracks in recent years due to Planning Department staff changes, but the Department is trying to get back on track. The Town Engineer does not have any issues with this lot release request.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to release Lot 12 from the covenant. Mr. Birtwistle seconded. The vote was 6-0-1 (Jemsek abstained).

B. Draft Complete Streets Policy – Presentation by the Transportation Advisory Committee – Review and recommendations

Aaron Hayden, Chair of the Transportation Advisory Committee, presented the newly drafted Complete Streets Policy. He said that a large portion of transportation issues the TAC advises the Select Board on will intersect with issues that the Planning Board has jurisdiction over. For example, takings of property for roadway projects. Mr. Hayden said he was interested in understanding better how relationships between these two boards could work.

The state has a program designed to encourage towns to build infrastructure for transportation to include all five networks that are considered 'transportation' – pedestrian, bike, transit, automobiles, and commerce. Complete Streets makes a lot of sense in Amherst- there were programs along the same lines implemented in the past. The DPW considers bike lanes, bus stops, sidewalks, etc when they rebuild roads.

In the exemptions section, the TAC looked at places they don't want development to happen, including building a complete street. They tried to recognize that there are places where these networks could be as complete as possible and others that observe the Town's desires for open places. Otherwise, it's a pretty general description of our impression of the town, its needs, and expectations.

The process is that the policy flows from the TAC to the Select Board. The Select Board will be making the final recommendations. The TAC wants to include in their advice responses from other committees, such as the Planning Board.

Ms. Brestrup noted that Amherst joined the state Community Compact, and has signed on to two best practices - economic development and to develop a complete streets policy.

Mr. Birtwistle noted that many streets are scenic roads, how does the policy fit in with that?

Mr. Hayden said the number of roads that are considered 'scenic' in Amherst is astounding – that is one of the things we identify as unique about Amherst. The TAC recognizes there are requirements for roads that sometimes trump the complete streets specifications; that will affect a lot of their work as they go forward.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked where scenic roads and conservation land is addressed in the Complete Streets Policy.

Mr. Hayden said they are addressed in the exemptions section.

Ms. Gray-Mullen said she didn't see it, and remembered from her time on the TAC when it was removed.

Mr. Hayden said he may have the wrong version. The idea of scenic roads is well understood.

Ms. Brestrup said the Planning Board can communicate with staff to coordinate with the TAC.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted that the TAC Liaison position on the Planning Board is open.

Mr. Stutsman asked if there was an expected adoption date of this plan.

Mr. Crowner said it was important to incorporate references to scenic roads, and that it was good the TAC was undertaking this effort and not the Planning Board or others.

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED to recommend the Select Board accept the policy as written. The vote was 6-0-1 (Gray-Mullen abstaining). The motion passed.

C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting

Mr. Schreiber noted the exhibit on 'Just Big Enough' housing in Northampton is moving to the UMass Design Building in mid-March. Maybe the Planning Board could meet at the Design Building on March 21st, coinciding with the exhibit in the building.

Ms. Brestrup said there were potentially three zoning public hearings that night, and she would ask if people would feel comfortable going there for those.

Mr. Schreiber said there was plenty of public parking at UMass after 5:00 p.m., as well as a major bus stop there.

Ms. Brestrup said she would have to know definitively by next Friday.

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – The Amherst Center Cultural District Signs and an application for a parking modification at The Harp Irish Pub will be heard soon.

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – none

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Jack Jemsek and Christine Gray-Mullen - Mr. Jemsek said he had attended a meeting on Thursday, February 8th, and there were two presentations – one was from the Pioneer Valley Mosquito Control District, and it doesn't seem like Amherst is involved in the process. Many other areas in Massachusetts are better organized against mosquitos and have success. The second presentation was on municipal vulnerability and preparedness – it didn't strike him as something that needed to be discussed here. Ms. Brestrup noted the Town has a hazard mitigation plan that has been completed several years ago. Ms. Brestrup also noted that the Town had been awarded a DLTA grant from PVPC as part of its District Local Technical Assistance program. The work will focus on creating a bicycle and pedestrian network plan. The TAC will be involved in this project.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Pari Riahi – Ms. Riahi let Ms. Brestrup know that due to a shifting CPAC schedule she was not able to make the last and next meetings. She has been to Q&As.

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – Mr. Schreiber said that after a year, the Agricultural Committee finally met. He was not able to attend.

Design Review Board – Michael Birtwistle – Mr. Birtwistle said the DRB met last week and discussed the Cultural District Signs; the DRB was less than enthusiastic about the locations and their mounting methods. They asked that those issues be referred to the committee that proposed the signs. They also considered the expansion of the Spoke restaurant.

Amherst Municipal Affordable Housing Trust – Greg Stutsman – Mr. Stutsman said the Trust met earlier in February and will meet again next week, working on their two CPA proposals and with the Select Board/Town Manager to help the Town draft a property disposition policy. The Trust has also been working with a consultant to do a site feasibility study of the East Street School property. They are also working on drafting a housing policy.

UTAC (University and Town of Amherst Collaborative) – Greg Stutsman and Christine Gray-Mullen – UTAC has not met since the last Planning Board meeting.

Downtown Parking Working Group – Christine Gray-Mullen – The DPWG continues to meet. Hopefully a parking survey will be rolled out through the BID soon, for downtown employees, employers, and property managers. Next meeting is 2/28 at 10:30.

Transportation Advisory Committee – vacant – Ms. Brestrup noted the TAC doesn't definitively need someone from the Planning Board. They have had new member appointed; they are fully staffed.

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none

XII. REPORT OF STAFF – none

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Approved:

Steven McCarthy
Administrative Assistant

Stephen Schreiber, Chair

DATE: _____