

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, November 18, 2020, 6:30 PM**

Pursuant to Governor Baker’s March 12, 2020 Order Suspending Certain Provisions of the Open Meeting Law, G.L. c. 30A, §18, this meeting of the Planning Board was conducted via remote participation.

**VIRTUAL MEETING:** <https://amherstma.zoom.us/j/84625510019>

The Minutes of the Planning Board are not intended to be a transcript of the meeting. The recorded meeting can be viewed here: <https://youtu.be/8woOifoZpIk>

**MINUTES**

**Planning Board Members Participating Remotely and Present by Roll Call:**

Maria Chao, Jack Jemsek – Chair, Thom Long, Andrew MacDougall, Doug Marshall, Janet McGowan, Johanna Neumann

**Absent:** None

**Staff Participating Remotely:**

Christine Brestrup, Planning Director  
Pamela Field-Sadler, Administrative Assistant

**Others Participating Remotely:**

Vinsu Shah, Senior Associate – CBT Architects  
Eileen Casciari, Senior Designer – CBT Architects  
Mark Dupont, Diocese of Springfield  
Father Gary Dailey, Director – Newman Catholic Center  
Bruce Carson, 8 Strong Street  
Rob Crowner – Amherst Affordable Housing Trust  
John Hornik – Amherst Affordable Housing Trust

**6:32 pm:** Chair Jack Jemsek opened the meeting. Mr. Jemsek announced this Planning Board (Board) meeting is being conducted via remote participation. Mr. Jemsek explained the process by which to be recognized to speak or submit a public comment.

Mr. Jemsek determined by roll call that all Board members were present.

**I. MINUTES - None**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – None**

**III. PRESENTATION – NEWMAN CATHOLIC CENTER**

Presentation under Section 3.211 of the Zoning Bylaw by Vinsu Shah, CBT Architects – new building for Newman Catholic Center on UMass Campus – ED zoning district

Mr. Jemsek said representatives for the Newman Catholic Center on the UMass Campus would provide a presentation for a new building in accordance with Section 3.211 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Vinsu Shah, Senior Associate – CBT Architects introduced herself and began the presentation. Ms. Shah showed a Locus Plan of the UMass Campus and pointed out the current Newman Center location and the proposed site for the new building which is across North Pleasant Street and off Thatcher Road. Ms. Shah showed a variety of renderings and explained the following project details:

- The proposed site is currently a parking lot.
- The proposed building would be L-shaped with an entry courtyard.
- The chapel portion of the building would be white brick masonry and the student center would be white fiber cement.
- An existing stormwater retention area would be made larger to create more of a bioswale rain garden.
- A new curb cut is proposed along Thatcher Road to access the parking for the Newman Center and the existing lot. There will be new parking up against the building for the Newman Center.
- The 2-floor plan for the new building is similar to the existing building and includes student lounges, the chapel with about 400 seats, a café and supporting kitchen, a research center, choir loft and offices.
- The existing stain glass windows would be moved to the new building.

### **Board Discussion**

The Board discussed the capacity of the proposed building. Father Dailey said the capacity for the new building would be the same as the existing building. Father Dailey said the new building would not have the side door that is available in the existing building that is opened on Christmas Eve and Easter morning for increased capacity.

Ms. Brestrup reminded the Board that this project is proposed within the Educational Zoning District and the submittal of plans to the Board is the only requirement. The presentation is additional and for informational purposes only. The Board can make comments or recommendations; however, there is no Board permitting role.

Mr. MacDougall asked about the need of additional parking. Father Dailey said that on the weekends the UMass parking lot behind the new building could be utilized and that discussions are occurring with UMass regarding parking for daily masses.

Father Dailey confirmed the café would be part of the UMass Dining Services.

A question was raised regarding energy efficiency features of the building. Ms. Shah said the new building would meet all general energy codes. The use of many energy efficient and green materials is planned; however, LEED Certification is not being pursued. Ms. Casciari added the glass would be high-energy efficiency and the building walls will be well insulated and highly thermal. Ms. Casciari confirmed the building

would need to meet the standards of the International Building Code and would fall under the purview of the town to meet local Building Code requirements including the Stretch Energy Code.

#### **Public Comment**

Jack Czajkowski said he was a new member to the Building Committee for this building and he asked why LEED Certification was not being sought. Ms. Casciari said the way the building is designed it would probably be LEED certifiable, but the Diocese did not want to commit to the expense.

The Board thanked the representatives for the presentation.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **A. Chapter 40R – Discussion – Planning Board’s potential interest in moving forward**

Mr. Jemsek explained that because there is a revised Chapter 40R Bylaw for review, many public comments and new members on the Board, that it is important to revisit this topic.

Ms. Brestrup provided a summary of the process of exploring Chapter 40R and the work done with consultants to:

- Learn what Chapter 40R is and why the state wants to promote it
- Hold public forums
- Create a matrix to consider potential areas and choose a location for a potential Chapter 40R District
- Draft a set of guidelines
- Consultants made a preliminary presentation to the Planning Board in May 2020
- After the fourth public hearing in October 2020, there seemed to be more positive interest shown by some of the Planning Board members to revisit the topic

Ms. Brestrup said at this time we are considering if Chapter 40R is a good fit for Amherst and would it open the zoning and allow more properties to be developed, and increase the housing stock. Currently there is not a way to gain density over existing zoning in the B-G Zoning District. The advantage of choosing the downtown area for Chapter 40R would be to make it easier to develop residential developments and mixed use developments in the downtown and adjacent B-L (Limited Business) areas.

Ms. Brestrup noted there are other areas in Amherst that can be considered for Chapter 40R and East Amherst is probably most realistic. She said the Chapter 40R Bylaw is a draft and changes could be made. Ms. Brestrup said that neither the Board nor the CRC has made the decision to move forward in the exploration of Chapter 40R. If the decision were made to move forward, the specifics of the guidelines, such as building height, setbacks etc..., would need to be closely

examined. Mr. Jemsek added that reducing the extent of Chapter 40R district in the downtown is an option for consideration too.

Mr. Jemsek welcomed John Hornik and Rob Crowner to the discussion. Both are members of the Amherst Affordable Housing Trust (Housing Trust) and have been closely involved in the Chapter 40R work. Mr. Jemsek asked if Mr. Hornik could speak to these questions:

- What is the current housing situation in Amherst?
- Should Chapter 40R be considered in Amherst?
- Is the downtown area the best location to consider now?

John Hornik explained the Housing Trust originally proposed this project with the funding formally awarded to the town from Mass Housing Finance. The Housing Trust's interest is primarily with increasing affordable housing and housing production in general. Having a Chapter 40R district means development comes with a requirement that 20% of new units be affordable and design guidelines are instituted for the district; currently there is not an affordability requirement in the downtown area. Mr. Hornik pointed out there would be advantages to the town to adopt a Chapter 40R District including:

- The town would receive some offset costs from the state.
- Favored status with regard to the MassWorks state program that supports roads and infrastructure development in town.

Mr. Hornik said there is a shortage of affordable housing in town and the Housing Production Plan recommended the development of 525 affordable units. A small number of affordable units have been gained, but the issue remains unsolved.

Mr. Hornik praised the work of the consultants and specifically the inclusion of design guidelines. Mr. Hornik said this is an important opportunity and he is pleased the Board has agreed to closely consider the relevance of Chapter 40R for Amherst. He acknowledged that some people have objected to the process and the details of the 40R proposal. Mr. Hornik looks forward to exploring how the proposal might be improved.

Rob Crowner shared he is a former Planning Board and Zoning Subcommittee member and a current Housing Trust member. Mr. Crowner said he is interested in this proposal as a means to expand the housing stock, but it is also an opportunity to address the long recognized problem of the zoning districts around the B-G zoning such as the B-L district and the transitional zones around that area. He said that the Chapter 40R initiative would:

- Allow the transitional zones to be built on
- Allow for the development of form-based design standards
- Increase affordable housing across multiple sectors

## **Board Comments and Discussion**

In answering a question from Mr. Jemsek regarding in-kind building, Mr. Crowner said most could not be built in-kind, that is many of the existing buildings in the B-L zoning district would not be allowed under current zoning. It is difficult to build just an office or retail building; a housing component is needed for a project to be cost effective and the current zoning dimensional requirements prevent the housing portion of this equation.. Adopting Chapter 40R would allow the dimensional requirements to be fixed in the B-L and some of the R-G zones.

Mr. Jemsek said he recognizes that a housing crisis exists and the pandemic has changed the housing landscape. Mr. Jemsek wondered if Chapter 40R promotes family housing and noted the new Kendrick Park Playground would be a family amenity.

Ms. Chao said she compared the earlier proposal (April 20) to the new proposal (November 10) and she recognized the changes and additions made by the consultants as a response to the public comments. She asked if Mr. Hornik and Mr. Crowner agreed that the new proposal was a better fit for Amherst. Mr. Crowner said the consultants did very well responding to the public comments in the new proposal. He agreed that the November 10 proposal is improved, but there is always room for further tweaking.

Mr. Hornik agreed with Mr. Crowner regarding the consultant's work, but also noted the process may have needed more opportunities to receive public input. He suggested that the Board could review the proposal and think about changes that would make it more responsive to Amherst.

Mr. MacDougall asked if Chapter 40R is a vehicle for creating commercial development along with housing. Ms. Brestrup confirmed that Chapter 40R includes mixed-use development too. Mr. MacDougall also suggested that it might make sense to try Chapter 40R in a village center to test the effectiveness prior to bringing it to the downtown.

Mr. Crowner suggested that the town consider downscaling the zoning in the existing B-G district while introducing Chapter 40R so that it is more attractive to use Chapter 40R. Mr. Crowner is of the opinion that downtown is a good choice for locating Chapter 40R because downtown belongs to everyone. However, he also said it might make sense to try it in a smaller area and he sees East Amherst as a good location too.

Ms. McGowan noted that the proposal has gotten better with the inclusion of the public's input, but she has identified problems with the proposal. In her opinion, the proposal does not resolve the downtown issues in a comprehensive way, the need for inclusionary zoning throughout Amherst or the parking issues. Ms. McGowan asked if the Board should consider fixing the downtown zoning issues holistically versus focusing on Chapter 40R. Ms. McGowan suggested the Board could submit

inclusionary zoning to the Town Council easily, and she likes the idea of considering a smaller location to see how Chapter 40R works.

Mr. Hornik noted that in considering the proposed location for Chapter 40R, it was important to know where developers were ready and willing to develop projects. Through extensive interviewing, the consultants identified that property owners and developers are ready and willing to put projects forth in the downtown area. Mr. Hornik said he likes East Amherst as a location too, but not instead of focusing on the downtown; it could take 10 years to see any results from a pilot project. Mr. Long said that in his review of the materials and public comments he noted that the lack of any specific outcome guarantee seems to be a problem and the Board should foster changing growth. Mr. Long agrees that East Amherst would be a good location for a pilot program; however, he sees that the downtown has the greatest potential to bring affordable housing and business opportunities to create a more robust downtown area. Mr. Long noted that developing bylaws would potentially foster specific outcomes, but he supports the principles of Chapter 40R and supports moving forward with the exploration.

Ms. Neumann said that Amherst has high ideals including the desire for affordable housing and a vital downtown while preserving environmental resources and the historical character of the town. Ms. Neumann said she supports working from the core out and the downtown is the core of Amherst. Although she is excited about the proposal, she noted it is not perfect and suggested that it should be coupled with infrastructure investments. Ms. Neumann supports further Chapter 40R exploration and continued adjustments and improvements to the proposal.

Mr. Marshall said he supports greater massing and density; however, he probably would not create a Chapter 40R District in the B-G zone, but fully supports Chapter 40R in the B-L zones as proposed. Mr. Marshall said that the area between downtown and UMass is prime real estate and locating a Chapter 40R District in that area could be income limiting. Mr. Marshall agrees developers are ready to do projects in town. Mr. Marshall agreed that East Amherst would be a good alternative to downtown and he suggested that University Drive would be another good location for a 40R District.

Ms. McGowan said that a lot of housing has been developed in Amherst over the past 10 years and she provided a variety of examples. She noted that over the same 10 years, UMass has added 4000 students, but not 4000 beds. She said the Chapter 40R timeline would not affect the pandemic economic downfall and the Board needs to make good decisions based on long-term visions and plans. Ms. McGowan supports a more systematic review, and she said that Pam Rooney has suggested that comparison charts for Chapter 40R and other zoning strategies should be developed to get a clearer understanding of the possible results.

Ms. Brestrup pointed out that if the Board decided to pursue the Chapter 40R, although it would be more work, changes could still be made to the underlying

zoning of the BL, R-G and the downtown. She further noted that Chapter 40R may be better for larger developers, but not well suited to local developers.

### Public Comments

Ira Bryck, resident, shared the following:

- Support for 3-story mixed-use buildings in the downtown area.
- The Board should describe the end result and determine if Chapter 40R is the solution.
- The dangerous South Amherst intersection could possibly receive MassWorks funding if Chapter 40R were to be established in this area.
- The student population at UMass may decline and if more students live on campus, the availability of single-family houses in Amherst could increase.
- The Board needs to have a better understanding of Chapter 40R prior to moving forward.

Pam Rooney, resident, shared the following:

- Chapter 40R is not the only tool available and comparing all the tools would be beneficial to determine which tools would solve which problems.
- The consultants did a minimal job.
- What does “unlock the B-L” mean? What should Cottage Street look like?
- The B-L zone on Triangle and Cottage Streets and the Henion Block would be applicable for Chapter 40R.
- There is a need to visualize the proposal elements to determine the impact to the look of the downtown.
- Adaptive reuse infill behind buildings would increase density while keeping the current streetscape of the downtown.
- How many residential units would be gained if referring to the B-L zone on lower Cottage Street and the Henion Block? Of those units, how many would be affordable?
- What, if anything, is planned for the area where The Pub was located?

Ms. Brestrup reminded everyone that tonight the Board is engaged in an initial conversation regarding Chapter 40R. The Board’s time for this item is limited and there will be more opportunities for discussion. Mr. Jemsek reminded the public that comments would be kept to 3 minutes each.

Joyce Berkman shared the following:

- A comprehensive study is needed to determine a vision for Amherst.
- Rather than housing, business should be the focal point in order to attract families to Amherst.
- With the declining number of students, the population of Amherst could shift and some UMass dorms could potentially be converted into apartments.
- If we have an urban experience in a small town that means Amherst is a city; many residents envision themselves living in a town.

Ken Rosenthal shared the following:

- Although he appreciates the opportunity for this discussion, the Zoom platform and 3 minute public comment limit lessens the opportunity for a cross-sector dialogue.
- More families used to live in Amherst; in the old multi-story office buildings that exist now, the upper floors used to be residential.
- Housing will be needed in Amherst because the pandemic is teaching us that more people can work from home. Amherst is a destination area for people moving out of the large cities.

Jeannie Hardy shared the following:

- Is Chapter 40R appropriate for the B-L zoning district? Would it be better to examine development projects individually to ensure they meet the regulations and promote the determined vision for Amherst?
- How much affordable housing would be achieved by creating a Chapter 40R District in the B-L zone? Chapter 40R requires a small percentage of affordable housing to be included in a project.
- Although the new draft proposal is better than the original, it still does not guarantee any transition from the B-L to neighboring zones.
- Public transportation should be encouraged to lessen the need for parking.

Ted Trobaugh shared the following:

- Supports a comprehensive study in order to achieve a vision for Amherst.
- The demographics are changing and he supports determining what we are trying to achieve and if Chapter 40R is the correct tool to use.

In closing, Mr. Crouner said, although he agrees with some of the criticism, he contends Chapter 40R is worth pursuing. The current zoning has allowed the existing new buildings. If we don't like the existing new buildings, then the zoning must be changed and Chapter 40R should not be avoided as a tool. He also confirmed that the current Chapter 40R proposal would allow 3-story buildings in the B-L zone, which is what several members of the public, said is their preference.

Mr. Hornik encouraged the Board to move ahead and do something irrespective of potential consequences. The Board could fine tune the Chapter 40R proposal for downtown or choose to address the downtown zoning via another plan. There is an opportunity for downtown development and the Board should support that through some action.

**Motion:** Mr. Long made the motion that the Planning Board continue the Chapter 40R proposal discussion. Ms. Neumann seconded the motion.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Chao – yes; Jemsek – yes; Long – yes; MacDougall – yes; Marshall – yes;  
McGowan – yes; Neumann – yes (7-0-0 to approve)

- B. *Zoning Bylaw, Section 11.2417, protection of adjacent properties by minimizing the intrusion of lighting – legislative history – Janet McGowan*

Ms. McGowan reminded the Board she had abstained from the vote for SPR 2021-05 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street because she was unsure of the meaning of Section 11.241 as it relates to lighting. Since the meeting when the vote occurred, Ms. McGowan said she researched a legislative history and reviewed the warrant article and the town meeting discussion and vote from November 28 2007. Ms. McGowan referred to the memo forwarded to the Board to outline her interpretation of Section 11.2417.

Ms. Brestrup reminded Ms. McGowan that she could not make an argument at this meeting. A public hearing has not been posted and publicized, nor has a public hearing been opened. Ms. Brestrup confirmed that the public hearing needs to be reopened in order to consider a decision made by the Board. Ms. Brestrup read from a memo she forwarded to the Board which summarized the public hearing process, discussion and vote taken by the Board to approve SPR 2021-05 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street. Ms. Brestrup’s memo also advised against reopening the public hearing and suggested the Board could later revisit the language of section 11.2417 and decide if it needs to be clarified or improved as part of the Zoning Bylaw rewrite currently in process.

Mr. Jemsek agreed that the topic was thoroughly discussed during the public hearing and that Ms. McGowan’s research did not produce new information and was based on residential abutters.

**Motion:** Mr. Marshall made the motion to close this discussion and then to vote on whether to reopen the public hearing for SPR 2021-05 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street. Mr. Long seconded the motion.

**Discussion:**

Ms. McGowan said she had not made a motion to open the public hearing.

The Board discussed the necessity for two motions.

**Amended Motion:** Mr. Marshall made the motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Long seconded the motion.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Chao– yes; Jemsek – yes; Long – yes; MacDougall – yes; Marshall – yes; McGowan – yes; Neumann – yes (7-0-0 to approve)

**Motion:** Ms. McGowan made the motion to reopen the public hearing for SPR 2021-05 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street in order to consider the legislative history. Mr. Long seconded the motion.

**Discussion:** None

**Roll Call Vote:**

Chao– no; Jemsek – no; Long – no; MacDougall – no; Marshall – no; McGowan – yes; Neumann – no (1-6-0 motion fails)

- C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting. - None

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Bruce Carson's Letter of October 15, 2020 regarding Converted Dwellings Section 3.3241 of the Zoning Bylaw and the definition of Resident Manager  
Mr. Jemsek said that Bruce Carson of 8 Strong Street was attending the meeting to summarize his letter to the Board. Ms. Brestrup said the purpose of the discussion is to gain a better understanding of Mr. Carson's concerns and consider if this would be a recommendation to address in the Zoning Bylaw (Bylaw) rewrite.

Mr. Carson explained that a situation in his neighborhood whereby the definition of a Resident Manager has arisen. Currently an absentee property owner rents a small home to three students and is proposing to convert an existing attached garage to allow for two additional bedrooms. Under the current Bylaw, the property would need to be owner occupied or require a Resident Manager. Mr. Carson reported the property owner does not intend to live in either dwelling and that he proposes to appoint a Resident Manager from amongst the tenants. Mr. Carson said that neighbors find the proposal untenable and asked how a student could manage peer behaviors and be responsible to maintain the property.

Mr. Carson suggested this could be addressed in the Bylaw by providing a clearer definition of a Resident Manager. He suggested a Resident Manager should be:

- An experienced professional
- Occupy his/her own living unit on the property

Mr. Carson suggested that the Bylaw as written creates a loophole for absentee landlords and strays from what he expects the original intent of the Bylaw was.

Mr. Jemsek thanked Mr. Carson and noted that his letter prompted him to do some research he would share at a subsequent meeting regarding the possibility of owner occupied incentives. Mr. Jemsek recognized Mr. Carson's opinion that this could be considered unreasonable, but it is tough to monitor. Mr. MacDougall added that he is surprised the subject has not come up sooner and suggested the Board further discuss this topic. Mr. Marshall suggested that information regarding property management standards and expectations would be useful for a future discussion.

**Motion:** Mr. Marshall made the motion to include this topic on a future Planning Board agenda for further discussion. Ms. McGowan seconded the motion.

**Discussion:**

Ms. McGowan said the Board is not limited to considering zoning issues and encouraged the future discussion of this item to include the exploration of tax incentives for owner occupied dwellings.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Chao – yes; Jemsek – yes; Long – yes; MacDougall – yes; Marshall – yes; McGowan – yes; Neumann – yes (7-0-0 to approve)

- B. Master Plan Implementation – Report on progress on Implementation Matrix and possible formation of Master Plan Implementation Committee – for information on the Master Plan see link below

<https://www.amherstma.gov/526/Master-Plan>

Ms. Brestrup reported that she and Mr. Marshall have continued to work on the Master Plan Implementation Matrix (Matrix). The process has been very informative. She noted there are activities that need to be started or finished, but the process has shown many things have been accomplished. Ms. Brestrup explained the Matrix is in rough draft form and she encouraged the Board to send her any comments they might have for consideration at a future meeting.

- C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting  
1. Deadline Dispensation

Ms. Brestrup reported that the dispensation provided by Governor Baker with regard to deadlines for permitting processes is going to end on December 1, 2020. Ms. Brestrup said she is preparing four Decisions that will need some current and some former Board members' signatures in order to be filed with the Town Clerk by December 1, 2020. Ms. Brestrup will arrange to obtain the necessary signatures.

**VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS - None**

**VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS**

Ms. Field-Sadler reported the following application is expected to go before the ZBA on December 10, 2020:

**ZBA FY2021-10** – Lawrence Hansen - Request a Special Permit to modify the previously approved Special Permit ZBA FY2004-41 in order to remove condition 9 that requires the permit to expire upon change of ownership and replace it with a condition that requires a new owner to submit a new Management Plan and Compliant Response for the ZBA review and approval at a public meeting, located at 338 Pine Street (Map 5B/Parcel 55), Neighborhood Residence (R-N) Zoning District.

**VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS - None**

**IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS**

**Pioneer Valley Planning Commission** – Jack Jemsek reported that the last PVPC meeting was on October 8<sup>th</sup>. A presentation was provided by Doug Hall regarding the economic impact of COVID-19 in the Pioneer Valley that was very informative and included implications on downtown areas. Mr. Jemsek will try to get the slides to share with the Board. Mr. Jemsek also reported that the Executive Committee of PVPC would meet tomorrow (11-19-2020).

**Community Preservation Act Committee** – Mr. MacDougall reported that CPAC has heard all the application presentations and will begin to discuss the applications and vote on recommendations. He also reported that the state match increased significantly and provides approximately \$300,000 additional funds.

**Agricultural Commission** – Mr. Marshall reported he can attend the Agricultural Commission meetings as a non-voting representative from the Planning Board. Ms. Brestrup reported that the Town Manager would notify the Town Council that Mr. Marshall will serve as the Planning Board representative. She also explained that she had been misinformed regarding whether an appointment by the Town Manager or Town Council is necessary.

**Design Review Board** – Mr. Long reported that the DRB has approved three new bus shelters proposed for downtown and the design will closely match what is existing. The DRB also reviewed an interactive wayfinding sign system that incorporates three units and provides information regarding COVID-19 and advertising and support for local businesses. In addition to the signs, the system would also have three charging stations for phones and other electronic devices. Mr. Long said the DRB approved the project moving forward and that there would be a 1-year test period to see how the signs work in Amherst. If after a year it is determined the signs are inappropriate for Amherst, the town can keep the charging stations. Mr. Long confirmed the sign design has not been approved and will need review by the DRB.

**Zoning Subcommittee** – Maria Chao and Janet McGowan – on hiatus

Ms. McGowan suggested a report regarding the work of the CRC be added to the list of Planning Board Committee & Liaison Reports. Ms. Brestrup said she is willing to provide reports on the CRC work. She said at the most recent CRC meeting the discussion included Chapter 40R and reviewed a matrix that prioritizes zoning changes. Ms. Brestrup noted that CRC meeting packets are available online.

**X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – None

**XI. REPORT OF THE STAFF** – Ms. Brestrup noted how hard the Board and Planning staff are working.

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:                      Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pamela Field-Sadler  
Administrative Asst.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack Jemsek  
Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_