

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, July 18, 2018, 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: Stephen Schreiber, Chair, Michael Birtwistle Greg Stutsman, Jack Jemsek, Christine Gray-Mullen, David Levenstein

ABSENT: Robert Crowner, Maria Chao and Pari Riahi

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

Mr. Schreiber opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

I. MINUTES

There were no Minutes available for review.

II. APPEARANCE – Sarah la Cour, Executive Director of Amherst Business Improvement District – Town Common proposed band shell competition

John Kuhn of Kuhn Riddle Architects and also a member of the BID appeared before the Board in place of Sarah la Cour.

The BID would like to build a permanent band shell on the Town Common. They plan to hold a competition for the design with an RFP issued to seek entrants for the competition. The RFP will be open to the public. Each team will be required to have an architect or an engineer or other design professional as a team member.

There will be a jury of seven to judge the entries, with representatives from the BID, the Planning Board, the Design Review Board, the Historical Commission and two others, possibly one from the Public Arts Commission. A \$1,500 reward will be offered to the winner of the competition. The RFP calls for the design of an open band shell to be located on the east side of the Common., a location included in the Frederick Law Olmstead's 1874 design for the Common. There will be a public process, with a chance for the public to vote on their choice. Designs will be displayed publicly. The BID is inviting one Planning Board member to join the jury. The entries will probably be due in mid-October with a November award. Michael Birtwistle volunteered to serve on the jury as the Planning Board representative. Planning Board members agreed by consensus to name Mr. Birtwistle as their representative.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING BYLAW

Zoning Bylaw – Renumbering

To see if the Planning Board will vote to request that the Town Clerk make non-substantive corrections to the Amherst Zoning Bylaw, in accordance with Section 11.01 of the Amherst Zoning Bylaw, by renumbering certain sections of Articles 3, 4, 5, and 6, to accommodate zoning amendments that have been adopted by Town Meeting.

Mr. Schreiber read the preamble and opened the public hearing.

Ms. Brestrup explained that Town Meeting had approved (by Article 34 of Warrant, Annual 2017 Town Meeting) a mechanism by which the Planning Board could request that the Town Clerk

make non-substantive corrections to the Zoning Bylaw, including the following: reordering, renumbering, and correcting cross reference numbering where needed throughout the Bylaw.

The Board reviewed marked-up pages from the May 2017 Zoning Bylaw, showing the proposed renumbering. Most of the changes proposed to the numbering are the result of zoning amendments approved at last fall's Town Meeting. There are also corrections that are proposed from previous Town Meetings, or errors that were noticed during a recent review of the Zoning Bylaw.

There were no public comments.

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED to close the public hearing and to request that the Town Clerk make the non-substantive corrections as shown, for Articles 3, 4, 5 & 6 of the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW & SPECIAL PERMITS

SPP2018-03 – Simple Gifts Farm, LLC – 1089 North Pleasant Street

Request a Special Permit to construct an oversized sign, in accordance with Section 8.101 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 5C, Parcel 22, R-N zoning district)

Mr. Schreiber read the preamble and opened the public hearing. He disclosed that his daughter used to work at Simple Gifts Farm last summer, but doesn't work there currently. That fact won't affect his decision on this matter.

David Tepfer, co-owner of Simple Gifts Farm, resident of 255 Pine Street, presented the application. Simple Gifts Farm built the farm stand store/building last summer. There was a proposed sign location shown on the original Site Plan Review plan. There is currently a temporary sign near the driveway which is somewhat representative of the proposed sign, in the sense that the size and design of the sign panels are the same.

Mr. Birtwistle asked about the orientation/location of the smaller sign attached to the larger sign and whether it would be closer to the street or farther from the street.

Mr. Tepfer stated that the smaller sign will be on the street side. The sign will be about 3 or 4 feet from the sidewalk and will be located farther to the north than the temporary sign, as indicated on the Site Plan. They will probably have a flag that says "Open" that will be put up and taken down as appropriate. An "Open" sign could also hang from the bottom of the small sign, as an alternative to the flag.

The sign is required to be at least 30" back from the back of the sidewalk.

Ms. Gray-Mullen reported on the site visit. Mr. Birtwistle, Mr. Levenstein and Ms. Gray-Mullen had attended the site visit. They saw the "lay of the land" and the existing/temporary sign which has "rickety" lighting.

Mr. Tepfer reported that the new sign will have better lighting and that it will be downcast, mounted on the top of the sign.

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED to close the public hearing and to grant approval of the Special Permit as requested. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

SPR2018-15 – Town of Amherst, c/o LSSE – Groff Park – Mill Lane

Request Site Plan Review approval for improvements to Groff Park including new playground, splash pad, picnic shelter, shade pavilion, site furnishings, handicapped parking, associated walkways, drainage and landscaping (Map 17C, Parcel 13, R-N & FPC zoning districts)

Mr. Schreiber read the preamble and opened the public hearing.

Nate Malloy, Senior Planner, Amherst Planning Department, and Mike Liu, Landscape Architect with Berkshire Design, presented the application.

The project has been presented to the Design Review Board, the Conservation Commission, and the Disability Access Advisory Committee and final comments have been received from all except the Conservation Commission. The Con Com was generally favorable to the project and was just waiting to hear from the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife about Natural Heritage Review before making a final determination, which is expected to be favorable. The project will be reviewed again by the Con Com on August 8.

The project is ready to bid and construction will start this fall and be completed next spring. The work is mostly contained on the mid-level terrace of the park.

Mr. Liu presented the Site Plan and described the project. The splash pad will use a recirculating water system because water use is very expensive and a drain-away system uses much more water. There will be an open shade pavilion and many of the furnishings can be moved. The old picnic pavilion is proposed to be replaced if there is enough money in the budget. A new picnic pavilion in that location will have a concrete pad in place of an earthen floor. There will be seasonal shade sails near the existing bathroom structure.

Ms. Gray-Mullen reported on the site visit. There were three Planning Board members in attendance, Mr. Birtwistle, Mr. Jemsek and Ms. Gray-Mullen. They walked the site and talked about trees to be removed, benches to be added, other places to sit, especially near the play area and splash pad for the little children.

Mr. Liu stated that there is time to rearrange the seating and that the sitting area near the younger play area can be expanded. The retaining wall is proposed to be about 15” to 18” tall, sitting height. It will be constructed of South Amherst basalt stone, quarried in the Notch, with flat tops and sides that can be butted up against each other.

Mr. Jemsek noted that the Board had received a copy of an email from Beth Willson regarding the Conservation Commission’s review of the project.

Mr. Liu explained about the interaction of the trail that runs along the river and the points of access to the river. He noted that the project will attempt to reduce disturbance to the shoreline and to block some of the points of access to the riverbank. The riverbank will be restored with native plantings, both trees and shrubs. Split rail fencing will also be used to control access, intermittently along the bank. Some access to the river will be maintained.

The grills around the lower level pavilion will remain.

Susan Sheldon, a Landscape Architect and resident of 145 Mill Lane, read letters from a neighbor, Kathy Mullin, and from herself regarding speeding on Mill Lane. John Sheldon, of 145 Mill Lane also spoke about speeding along the road. Robert Cann of 189 Mill Lane agreed with the concerns of his neighbors.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the issue of speeding is really an issue for the DPW and the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC).

There was discussion about whether a Traffic Impact Statement should be required for this project. Planning Board members noted that a TIS is usually relevant for a larger project where the increase in traffic is significant enough to potentially require improvements to be made to the nearby intersections or turning lanes to be added to the road itself.

Ms. Brestrup offered to send the two letters to the Transportation Advisory Committee.

Mr. Jemsek noted that the intersection of Mill Lane and South East Street has poor visibility. There was further discussion about the expected increase in traffic at Groff Park. Mr. Malloy stated that the town can tell people to use West Street rather than South East Street to approach Groff Park on Mill Lane.

Ms. Gray-Mullen encouraged the neighbors to talk to the TAC about their concerns regarding traffic and speeding on Mill Lane.

There was a brief discussion about play equipment. Mr. Liu stated that final decisions have not been made about play equipment. Final decisions about play equipment will be made by the Working Group that consists of members of the LSSE Commission, DPW staff and Conservation & Development staff.

Mr. Birtwistle expressed support for the concept of the park and did not see a need for the proponents to return to the Planning Board with the final choices for play equipment.

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the Site Plan Review application as submitted, with waivers as requested. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

SPR2018-16 & SPP2018-04 – Archipelago Investments LLC – 26 Spring Street

Request Site Plan Review approval for a mixed-use building, under Section 3.325 of the Zoning Bylaw, with 58 apartments & 1,000 s. f. of retail space, with associated site improvements (a modification of SPR2017-10) and request Special Permit for modification of height by less than 2 ft. and rear setback requirements under Footnote “a” of Table 3 of the Zoning Bylaw (a modification of SPP2017-03) (Map 14A, Parcel 265, B-G zoning district)

Mr. Schreiber read the preamble and opened the public hearing. There were no disclosures.

Mr. Schreiber noted that most of the current members on the Planning Board were on the Board when a similar project was presented last year. This is a new Site Plan Review application but it can be considered a modification of the previously approved project.

Kyle Wilson and Dave Williams of Archipelago Investments presented the application.

Mr. Wilson noted that this proposal is similar to the earlier one in some ways, yet different in others. The dormers featured on the last proposal have been eliminated. The sloped roof surface will be used to accommodate a solar array. The solar panels will be black framed, which will blend better into the roof.

The building will be four stories tall instead of five stories.

More glass has been added to the building. It now has approximately 45% glazing on the facades. The location of the building has shifted to the west. It is effectively a slab-on-grade building, with three different slab heights. This is because there is a ten-foot grade change from the back northwest corner to the front southeast corner of the property. The emergency egress path has shifted from the east to the west side of the building. Utility access doors will be located behind the retail space along the egress path. There will be landscaping on both sides of the building and more outdoor terraces for ground floor units. The retail space is slightly bigger.

Lot coverage will be 76.1%. Building coverage will be 63%. Setback will be 0 on the street side. The height of the building is proposed to be 56'-3", above the average finished grade on the street side, to the mid-point of the sloped roof.

Mr. Wilson was considering eliminating the eave on the back side of the building to avoid a Special Permit for rear setback in that location.

The roof will have a 12:12 pitch with a well between the peaks for mechanical systems. Hot water will be electric.

The unit count has increased from 38 to 58 and the size of the retail space has grown. The unit mix has also changed. There are now 6 one-bedroom units and 52 studios of various sizes. The underground parking garage included in the last proposal has been removed and instead there is some storage space for residents in the basement. There will be an eave on the roof and a canopy at the entryway that may slightly protrude over the lot line – this will be worked out with the Select Board. There is to be an area for outdoor seating in front of the retail space.

Mr. Wilson showed an image of the front elevation of the building and how it would look if power and telephone wires were buried, power poles were removed, and the sidewalk was built into the space of the existing parking spots.

The corridors for floors 2, 3, and 4 are glassed entirely at the north and south ends; the interior finish of the corridor is dark, and the lighting will be just above the minimum to avoid excessive brightness, something the developer has received complaints about regarding other projects.

Mr. Wilson showed examples of the brick that will be used for the veneer of the building, and the cedar that will surround the windows.

The downspouts for stormwater runoff from the roof will be exposed. Planted areas along the sides of the building, including a swale on the east side, will be used for stormwater retention.

Mr. Wilson presented the lighting plan. He also described the proposed streetscape in the town's right-of-way. There are four power poles along the street. Public way improvements might include burying the power lines, cable and telephone lines. Conduits and concrete structures were placed underground when Spring Street was rebuilt a few years ago. There is a possibility of planting street trees and creating a landscaped island in front of the building, if the town desires.

Some of the existing trees on the adjacent (Jones) property may be able to be saved.

Mr. Wilson noted that this project had been presented to the Design Review Board.

He showed a context plan made up of 3D Google images, noting that there are several large buildings on this block, including Town Hall, the Police Station and Grace Church.

Ms. Gray-Mullen reported on the site visit. Mr. Birtwistle, Mr. Jemsek and Ms. Gray-Mullen were present. Questions were asked about whether the utility poles in front of the site will be removed for landscaping. The developer plans to work with the Town and WMECO/Eversource to bury the wires in the public way. It is unclear where the funds for this project would come from. What will happen to the parking spaces in the right-of-way in front of the property if the area is landscaped. The developer would prefer to have the space used for landscaping. A Town streetlight will have to be moved if the project is constructed.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted there are currently 58 units proposed, each with a single bedroom; how many bedrooms were there in the old design?

Mr. Wilson said that they expect 60 tenants in the current design; the expectation for the previous design was 45 tenants.

Ms. Gray-Mullen said she had counted 48 bedrooms in the old design, and there were now 58 proposed. She noted the old plans showed the square footage of the units, but the new plans do not; what is the range of studio sizes?

Ms. Brestrup said she had measured smallest unit as ~330 square feet.

The developer chose to redesign for smaller units because they had seen in their other developments in downtown Amherst that the demand for one bedroom and studio apartments is very high. The parking garage proposed for this building was driving everything in the design, eliminating space for a plaza and patio, and pushing the building to one side of the lot. Therefore, they chose to remove the parking area. Most of the people signing leases in the other Archipelago buildings are graduate students and post-doctoral professionals at UMass and are looking for small units without parking. UMass now enrolls 8,000 graduate students and the new ILC and science buildings are drawing people. The developer is looking for a new approach to bring the missing 25-35 demographic to downtown.

There was discussion about the term of the leases. Mr. Wilson said that a year is the default term. They have not considered the lower end they would allow for lease terms, but they are not expecting to rent the units on Airbnb.

Mr. Schreiber noted that many of the units were fully furnished. There was discussion about whether the units might be rented out on Airbnb.

Mr. Wilson said units are not permitted to be sublet. The tenants can find someone to take over the lease and then the unit can be re-let.

Ms. Brestrup noted the Town doesn't have any regulations of Airbnb's – the town would be more concerned about vacant units being used as Airbnb by the owner of the building than about tenants doing it every now and then while they are on vacation or away for a short time.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the developer had any plans to rent out vacant units on a short-term basis.

Mr. Wilson said the best-case scenario is that they would never do so. There is a Kendrick Place unit on Airbnb now – a tenant abandoned their lease and the unit was put on Airbnb to see what it could earn. He asserted that it had been listed by the tenant.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked the applicant to clarify his answer – if they had empty units that weren't rented, would they put them on Airbnb for short term rental?

Mr. Wilson said that was a big question. Right now, there are 300 listings in Amherst on Airbnb. Boston has very publicly been wrestling with that problem in recent months.

There was discussion about at what point a project moves into the 'hotel' category of the Zoning Bylaw and away from the mixed-use category.

Mr. Stutsman said that one of the draft conditions from staff would prohibit short-term rentals of less than thirty days.

Mr. Williams said that they have had no problems filling units given the growth of UMass graduate programs. Long-term rentals drive their bottom line. They would prefer to keep long-term tenants and not have to manage short-term rentals. The issue of short-term rentals should be resolved at a municipal level, not a project-by-project level.

Ms. Gray-Mullen said that it appeared line #16 of the residential lease bans all subletting.

Mr. Birtwistle said that if it was better for residents not to regularly have transients and suitcases in the hallway, the applicant could themselves stop tenants from offering short-term rentals.

Mr. Wilson said enforcement is very difficult; Boston now has regulations requiring tenants or landlords who rent their property more than some number of times to register as a rental.

Mr. Levenstein thought this was a concern as many of the studios are fully furnished. He was also curious about the height of the adjacent buildings – it was not clear whether the project would be overwhelming to the neighborhood.

There was discussion about how the developer settled on the roof design, which was mostly due to the design constraints of solar panels. It was noted that the previously proposed building was to be the same height as the currently proposed building.

During the permitting process for the previous building, the applicant had provided a series of renderings showing the proposed building in context from a variety of angles.

This time the building had shifted a bit on the site since the last proposal, but the form and shape was very similar.

There was not yet a written report; the public meeting was continued and the DRB was planning to make its recommendations at a future meeting.

The DRB meeting was complicated, with lots of public comment and lots of different points of view aired. Mr. Birtwistle reported that the DRB was still considering its position and the report will have to wait.

Ms. Gray-Mullen said that the issue she had was that the bedroom count went up by ten, while the on-site parking was removed. Currently, in front of the site are three or four parking spaces that are to be lost with the current proposal. If utilities were to be buried – as attractive as the proposed curb bump-out with landscaping is – that space could instead be used for six or seven parking spaces. As chair of the Downtown Parking Working Group, she felt that with the loss of the 17 spots in the parking garage, the Town has to think twice about letting that space go for landscaping and not instead reworking it for parking if the utilities are buried. The expanded retail space will demand more parking as well.

Mr. Wilson said that that is the tradeoff between street trees and parking – it was not the applicants' decision to make.

Mr. Schreiber expressed surprise that the design went from five stories to four stories and didn't lose any height – had the applicant rendered what the building would look like with a flat roof? Such a design would substantially lower the height of the building, and it could still have solar panels.

Mr. Wilson said they had briefly looked at a flat roof in the early stages of the design, but they wouldn't be interested in pursuing such a design.

Ms. Brestrup said that the Planning Department staff had discussed the streetscape issues – if the Board was to approve the proposal now, they would do so with the images provided – with an attractive streetscape, featuring buried utilities and street trees and landscaping in the parallel parking spots. Should the Board consider that the utilities won't be buried, the poles won't come down, and the road would remain as it is today? The more realistic image could be what the Board actually approves, and if the streetscape improves, so be it.

The Board was in wide agreement with that idea.

Ms. Gray-Mullen said that even without using the ROW, there were some landscaping touches that could be added, such as a tree or two planted on the terrace. The Board would like to see the design with the current right-of-way layout as it exists now. Everyone would like to see the wires come down, but that may not be possible.

There was further discussion about the burying of utilities and what could be done about on-street parking.

Public Comment:

Kenneth Samonds, of 86 Dana Street, a 42-year member of Grace Church, has served as the church historian. He was not speaking as an official representative of Grace Church, but he was concerned about the shadow this building may cast on the east window of Grace Church during early morning services. He described the history of the window and why it was important to parishioners.

Mr. Williams had assured him that the new building would not cast a shadow on the window, but he was still concerned.

Mr. Schreiber said the answer to the question about shadowing of the window can be determined by modelling the building and site.

Mr. Samonds likened the new building to a dormitory with no parking. He expressed concern about noise and activity from the new building affecting Grace Church quiet vigils and services.

Erica Gees, of 33 Cosby Avenue, said she had not seen the original proposal. She had spoken to the DPW to confirm the width of the Spring Street ROW. It is 49 feet, 6 inches wide. She asked whether Amherst had adopted the Complete Streets standards. Complete Streets and similar philosophies hold that the ideal proportion is that for every foot of building height, there should be three feet of street width. Proportionally, this proposed building is huge. She asked if the building could be pushed back or have the height reduced to better fit in with the surrounding streetscape. In the future, the Board should consider whether broad-based downtown zoning works on smaller streets.

Eric Broudy, Chair of Amherst Public Art Commission, had spoken with the DRB about public art being incorporated into private developments. He noted that many other municipalities like Cambridge, Pittsfield, and Easthampton require public art in private developments. This is the fourth downtown development by Archipelago. Despite Kendrick Place marketing materials showing a statue in front of the building, a statue was never installed. He also noted that this proposal removes the art gallery from the earlier proposal on this site and replaces it with another coffee shop. The Public Art Commission supports public art being required in all developments, and it is not too late for this one.

Mary Ellen Shaughan, of 52 Blackberry Lane, objected to the downtown developments that are being permitted.

Chris Freitag, Senior Warden of Grace Episcopal Church, noted that burying utility lines could be quite expensive.

Kitty Axelson-Berry, of 89 Stony Hill Road, asked why this area isn't a historical district. There probably hasn't been a single building built between Spring St and the Dickinson House since 1870, besides the Police Station. She asked that the Planning Board keep in mind the historic nature of entire area. This building appears very large, very flat. Do the windows open? Also, the project will be taking street parking spots. Didn't they request a Special Permit? Will they require affordable units?

Mark Kosarick, of Precinct 9, Shumway Street, said he shared the Amherst College sentiments about the encroachment, size, and parking problems with the proposal. He does not like the way the new buildings look.

Jacqueline Maidana, of the Clark House, Lessey Street, said she was very concerned about the parking issue – the new plan has not taken the parking issue into consideration. She lives with

the impact of having so many students in town. She objects to the new buildings in downtown Amherst. The apartments are too small to attract families or couples. The project should be much smaller, provide parking, and be much more attractive. Many tourists come for the small town feel, and they don't want to see these high rises.

Barbara Ford, of 300 Flat Hills Road, asked that the parking that was in the first iteration of this building not be removed. She said she thought the Board understood the parking issue - some parking should be contained on-site.

Mr. Williams offered to model shadowing and show where the stained glass window is, where the shadow is at different times of day, and heights of the buildings all around.

Mr. Schreiber noted that some of the concerns the Board received were about this project being a dormitory – which is a different category of the Zoning Bylaw – and the concerns about it being a hotel. He thought it seemed to fit in the mixed-use category, but it brings with it other issues – the parking question is an important one, as there was an earlier proposal that had parking on site. This is on the edge of the Municipal Parking District, but he shared the concerns of people about parking. Either there will be a paradigm shift and nobody is driving cars anymore sometime soon in the future, or there will be a chaotic period when these buildings come online and nobody knows where to park.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted Amherst College had requested that there be lease stipulations prohibiting residents from parking on Amherst College lots. Mr. Wilson said that that issue was addressed in the management plan.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the windows would open. Mr. Wilson said that the windows, per building code, can't open more than four inches above the 2nd floor – that is why they included Juliette balconies.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked what types of people were renting at 1 East Pleasant Street and how much of the parking spaces had been leased. Mr. Wilson reported that they have been renting to people from all categories – from undergrads, to former vice chancellors, to faculty, to families. So far they had 100 units leased and still had some of the 36 parking spaces left unrented. The plurality of tenants are grad students. The studio units at 1 East Pleasant St are approximately 400 square feet, and there is very high demand. In the modern educational sector, there are some grad students with families, but there are an increasing number without families. These days, grad students are much more mobile, and that leads to fewer families and more single students.

Mr. Levenstein asked how many of the 135 apartments in 1 East Pleasant Street were rented to couples. Mr. Wilson said there were some couples in the one bedroom units but the studios are rented almost exclusively to single people.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the plan to manage noise.

Mr. Wilson said that excessive noise was a concern that they shared from a management standpoint and in the lease there is a clause for quiet enjoyment. It is a residential building. They don't expect noise to be a problem, as it hasn't been in the other buildings they have built.

Mr. Williams said the buildings are very secure – there are cameras in every hallway and in all public spaces. People are much better behaved in those environments than elsewhere in town.

Mr. Wilson said that if a café does go in on the first floor, these concerns could be addressed during the permitting process for that. He also noted that the Lord Jeffrey Inn is a hotel with a transient population, a restaurant, a bar, etc.

Ms. Brestrup expressed concern about the setbacks for the propane tank, which were insufficient in this proposal. The proposed propane tank may be smaller than needed, and if it were bigger,

the setbacks would need to be even larger. The applicant would have to move the tank or the building.

Mr. Wilson hopes that the project will get natural gas at some point – the moratorium can't last forever. The building uses electric heat, water, etc. and they would hope the propane would only be used for the fireplace and the café equipment. They wanted to put the tank on the plan because they might not be able to get natural gas.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the applicants had any thoughts about public art.

Mr. Wilson said that if they present this design with the power lines and no street trees, the planted area may have something else. It is something to be discussed – they wouldn't want to add to their obligations at this point.

The Board listed items that are needed to complete this review:

1. Disability Access Advisory Board review of the site plan and the plan for a drop-off area; the drop-off could be shared with ride sharing companies such as UBER and LIFT;
2. Calculations to show how the average grade on the street side of the building was calculated;
3. A report or recommendations from the Design Review Board;
4. Landscape plan without using the public way, leaving parking along the street;
5. A context drawing showing the building in context with its surroundings;
6. A profile along Spring Street, showing the height of the building in relation to the other buildings;
7. A cross section of Spring Street, showing the proposed building in context with what is across the street;
8. A written document showing recommendations to tenants on where to park in town.

Board members acknowledged receipt of letters from the public written to the Board about this project.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to continue the public hearing to August 1 at 7:10 p.m. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 5-1-0 (Birtwistle opposed).

V. PLANNING & ZONING

- A. ZSC Report – no report
- B. Public Comment – none
- C. Other

VI. OLD BUSINESS

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

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Letter dated July 1, 2018, from PVPC regarding Certificate of Assessment for FY19 – the Board acknowledged receipt of this letter.

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

VIII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

IX. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none

X. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS

XI. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS – no reports

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Jack Jemsek and Christine Gray-Mullen

Community Preservation Act Committee – Pari Riahi

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber

Design Review Board – Michael Birtwistle

Amherst Municipal Affordable Housing Trust – Greg Stutsman

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Greg Stutsman and Maria Chao

UTAC (University and Town of Amherst Collaborative) – Greg Stutsman and Christine Gray-Mullen

Downtown Parking Working Group – Christine Gray-Mullen

XII. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none

XIII. REPORT OF STAFF – none

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Approved:

Christine Brestrup
Planning Director

Stephen Schreiber, Chair

DATE: _____