

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, January 20, 2010 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: Jonathan Shefftz, Chair; Jonathan O’Keeffe; Denise Barberet, David Webber, Ludmilla Pavlova-Gillham, Richard Roznoy, Stephen Schreiber and Rob Crowner

ABSENT: Bruce Carson

STAFF: Jonathan Tucker, Planning Director; Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

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

I. MINUTES Meetings of: September 2, 2009
November 4, 2009
December 16, 2009

December 16, 2009 – Mr. Roznoy offered the following amendment:

Page 14, Sally Fitz had spoken as a representative of the Agricultural Commission and she had submitted a new letter from the Commission. These facts should be added to the Minutes.

November 4, 2009 – Ms. Barberet requested an amendment as follows:

Page 2, “The reason I abstained on the vote that I would normally have voted ‘yes’ on was that I wished the record to reflect the disparity between the vote that’s recorded and the vote that actually took place. That was the reason for my being appalled, that essentially a vote had been fabricated.”

Mr. Shefftz agreed that the Minutes of November 4 should be rewritten to reflect Ms. Barberet’s actual comments. He stated that Planning Department staff had drafted the report in anticipation of a vote and incorrectly distributed it before the vote took place. However, he characterized the event as a mistake rather than a malicious act. He expressed hope that this type of event would not occur in the future.

September 2, 2009 – Ms. Barberet offered the following amendments:

Page 12, the map to which Mr. O’Keeffe had referred had been developed by the Master Plan Subcommittee, not the Zoning Subcommittee;

Page 12, Ms. Ashby had been a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, not the Comprehensive Planning Committee.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to approve the Minutes of September 2, 2009 and November 4, 2009, as amended. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 7-0-2 (Barberet and Crowner abstained).

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to approve the Minutes of December 16, 2009, as amended. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Ms. Barberet noted that there had been a change in the regime regarding preparation of the Planning Board Minutes. She wanted to publicly thank Sue Krzanowski for the years that she had spent taking Minutes and the reams of Minutes that she had produced. Mr. Shefftz added that the Minutes were impressive, long and detailed. He noted that they were the best Minutes that he had ever seen.

II. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2010-00008/M4294 – 30 Boltwood Avenue and 23, 31 & 37 Spring Street, Amherst Inn Company, The Lord Jeffery Inn

Request to renovate an existing historic inn building, including minor exterior changes and the addition of a one-story assembly space, plus associated site improvements, including seasonal outdoor dining. No change in use. (Map 14A, Parcels 267, 268, 269 and 270, B-G zoning district)

Mr. Shefftz read the preamble and opened the public hearing. Mr. Shefftz and Mr. Crouner disclosed that they were both Amherst College alumni. Mr. Shefftz asked who among the Planning Board members had participated in the previous application for The Lord Jeffery Inn. Ms. Barberet, Mr. Shefftz, Mr. O’Keeffe and Ms. Pavlova-Gillham raised their hands.

Tom Davies presented the application on behalf of the Amherst Inn Company. He stated that he is employed by Amherst College. The current project is significantly different from the last one in that it is about half as large. The previous project had proposed 72 rooms, the rebuilding of a portion of the inn and a large addition. The current economy precludes this larger project from happening at this time. The present project entails a full renovation of the existing inn and the addition of a new one-story ballroom. The effect will be “the same, but less”.

Mr. Davies stated that the applicant had been through the review process with all of the required committees and boards and that most of the committees and boards had submitted comments. Mr. Tucker stated that although no written comments were submitted by the Historical Commission, the members had voted 5-0 to support this project and to support the newly revised application for National Historic Register status for the Inn.

Mr. Davies presented a computer model of the building, showing that the renovation will result in minimal changes. The emphasis has been on providing handicapped access and returning some elements of the building to their historical configuration. For instance, on the Spring Street side, where there is now a roll-up garage door, there will be a new entry to the ballroom, with two sets of double doors. A service entry will also be provided nearby. This portion of the building will be opened up and restored to its former appearance as an arcade. The building as a whole will be improved and fixed up, but not be significantly changed.

Mr. Davies stated that the site will be improved, with new sidewalks and “bump outs” to organize parking. Shade trees will be added along the street.

The new ballroom will accommodate up to 200 guests, with support spaces surrounding it. There will be a patio space and a garden space in back.

Mr. Davies described the new 20-car parking lot that is proposed behind two houses on Spring Street. The structures will shield the parking lot from the street and the grade drops five feet from Spring Street to the parking lot, which will further aid the screening of the parking lot.

According to the Development Application Report there are no dimensional issues. Some non-conformities will continue to exist but these will not be affected by the renovation.

A Traffic Impact Statement (TIS) was prepared for the previous application, which involved a larger building with more rooms. The proposed number of rooms has been reduced from 72 to 49. The TIS stated that there would be no impact to traffic as a result of the larger project. Therefore a reduced project will also have no impact.

In terms of landscaping, four trees will be added along Spring Street. The applicant is working with the Tree Warden to choose appropriate species. There will be low shrubbery around the front and rear of the building and some trees planted in the garden space, for privacy.

Mr. Davies described the proposed lighting fixtures. There will be two types of lighting – fixtures on the building and site lighting. For the fixtures on the building the applicant will reuse historical fixtures and also use historically accurate reproductions. These will be lantern-type fixtures. For the site lighting, there will be post-lantern lighting along the street that will be the same as the historical fixtures in the downtown area. These will be spaced in accordance with town standards. The lighting on the site will be Amherst College standard post lantern lighting. There will be two fixtures in the parking lot and bollard lighting within the garden area.

The sidewalk along Spring Street will be concrete with a brick border, the same as the town standard in the downtown area. The applicant is working with the Department of Public Works on the design for the reconstruction of Spring Street, including lighting fixtures and pavement patterns.

With regard to grading and drainage, there will be some re-grading of the site to protect significant trees, but the site will remain mostly as it is. There will be slight modifications to Spring Street to create the curbs and to control storm drainage.

There will be two ways of entering the parking lot, one from Spring Street and one from Churchill Street.

Regarding signs, there will be no change to the signs. The old “Lord Jeffery Inn” sign will be reinstalled and there will be a sign for the new restaurant that will be similar to the Boltwood Tavern sign, only with a different name. There will also be signs for handicapped parking and other parking signs.

The parking plans are consistent with the previous proposal. The Inn plans to continue with the system that has been working in the past. Hotel guests will park in public areas and also in the new 20-car parking lot as well as in the Churchill lot, owned by Amherst College. The hotel parking in the Churchill lot will be “out of sync” in terms of timing with staff and faculty parking in that lot. Hotel guests will use the parking at night and staff and faculty will use the parking during the day. The applicant is requesting that the Board waive the requirement for off-street parking for over 120 spaces.

The property boundaries will be reconfigured to accommodate the required setbacks for the new ballroom. The southern boundary will be extended farther to the south.

A van-accessible space will be provided in the 20-car parking lot.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the use of the word “waiver” with respect to the parking requirements. Mr. Tucker explained that the word “waiver” applies to specific plans that are required under the Rules and Regulations of the Planning Board. In this case, what is being requested is a “modification” of the parking requirements under Section 7.90 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Shefftz reviewed the Site Visit Report and commented that the building is not as old as it appears.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the configuration of the sidewalk on Boltwood Avenue and noted that it would eliminate one parking space.

Ms. Barberet asked how many parking spaces will be lost when the bump outs are installed.

Mr. Davies explained that the “bump outs” at the corner [of Boltwood Avenue and Spring Street] will reduce crossing time. At the south end of the Boltwood area the proposed bump out will protect an existing tree. The sidewalk here has buckled. The Inn would like the sidewalk to be both level and accessible. There will be four parking spaces lost on the south side of Spring Street with the installation of four bump outs on that side.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to close the public hearing. Ms. Pavlova-Gillham seconded and the vote was 9-0.

The Board found, under Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, Site Plan Review, as follows:

- 11.2400 – The project is in conformance with all appropriate provisions of the Zoning Bylaw;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected because detrimental or offensive actions will be minimized by careful management of service deliveries and trash removal and the storage of trash in an indoor refrigerated storage area;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics because lighting will consist of town-standard lighting fixtures along the street and college-standard lighting in the interior of the site; the building is an attractive historic landmark and the renovations are intended to restore much of the building’s original appearance;
- 11.2403 – N/A;
- 11.2410 – The project protects unique or important historic and scenic features because it will renovate the historic building and it will open up scenic views from the building to the south and west across the common;
- 11.2411 – The proposed methods of refuse disposal are adequate because there will be a new service door provided on the north side of the building, and trash will be stored inside in a refrigerated storage area, which will eliminate smells;
- 11.2412 – The project will be connected to the town sewer and water supply systems and the applicant is working with the town Department of Public Works on the design of these systems;
- 11.2413 – The proposed drainage system within and adjacent to the site is adequate to handle stormwater runoff because the only increased building area (the ballroom) will have a green roof and the drainage systems around the building and in Spring Street will be improved in conjunction with this project;

- 11.2414 – Adequate landscaping will be provided because a landscaping plan has been submitted which shows extensive proposed landscaping, and a condition of the approval will require that the landscaping be installed and continuously maintained;
- 11.2415 – N/A
- 11.2416 – Protection of adjacent properties by minimizing noise will be accomplished by the installation of ground-source heating and cooling, which will lead to the elimination of the HVAC units on the south side of the building;
- 11.2417 – Adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of lighting because new lighting will consist of town-standard lighting fixtures along the street, college-standard lighting fixtures within the property and historic light fixtures mounted on the building; the new lighting fixtures are designed and sited to avoid casting a glare onto adjacent properties;
- 11.2418 – N/A
- 11.2419 – N/A
- 11.2420 – The Design Review Board reviewed the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw and has recommended approval of the project, as proposed, with the condition that street and site furniture be brought back to the Design Review Board for its review and recommendations once these items have been chosen;
- 11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits with surrounding buildings and development;
- 11.2422 – N/A
- 11.2423 – The buildings on the site relate harmoniously to each other in architectural style, site location and building exits and entrances because the buildings will remain essentially as they are now, with the exception of the architecturally compatible addition of the ballroom at the rear of the hotel, which will not be visible from the street;
- 11.2424 – N/A
- 11.243 – Traffic and Parking – issues related to traffic and parking have been dealt with in the Traffic Impact Statement, which was prepared for a larger project; this statement determined that there would be no adverse impacts on traffic and parking as a result of this project; there will be bicycle racks located at the front and rear of the building; there will be a loading area adjacent to where it is currently located on the north side of the building, and it will be carefully managed.

Mr. Shefftz asked if there will be suites of rooms available. Mr. Davies stated that there will be; however, there will be a reduction in the total number of rooms from the previous proposal.

Mr. Shefftz stated that no waivers had been requested, that the Board had already discussed the parking issue, and that the property line configuration should be dealt with prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

Mr. Davies asked if the property line configuration could be dealt with prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, since it may take a while to go through the ANR process.

The Board discussed Conditions that it might wish to impose on this project and reviewed the conditions that had been imposed on the previous Site Plan Review approval for the larger project proposed in 2008.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham MOVED to approve the application by the Amherst Inn Company for The Lord Jeffery Inn, with the relevant conditions from the previous Site Plan Review approval, with conditions requiring that one van-accessible parking space be provided in the new parking lot, that the applicant and the town renegotiate the parking agreement within the town right-of-way, that the bump outs be revised to maintain a 22 foot clear width on Spring Street as requested by the Town Engineer, that the usual conditions be applied with respect to landscape plantings, that the property line configuration be resolved prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, and that the applicant return to the Design Review Board for review of site furnishings. Mr. O’Keeffe offered a friendly amendment that the parking requirements be modified as authorized by Section 7.90 of the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. O’Keeffe seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Waivers

None

Conditions

- 1) The property boundaries of the lot shall be readjusted to accommodate the required setbacks for the ballroom addition and the revised plan shall be recorded at the Registry of Deeds prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- 2) The issues described in the Town Engineer’s letter of January 20, 2010, shall be resolved with the Town Engineer.
- 3) All proposed landscape plantings shall be installed and continuously maintained.
- 4) One van-accessible parking space shall be provided in the 20-car parking lot.
- 5) The applicant shall renegotiate with the Town of Amherst the parking agreement for use of parking spaces within the public right-of-way.
- 6) The bump outs shall be revised to maintain a 22 foot clear width on Boltwood Avenue as requested by the Town Engineer, in the letter dated January 20, 2010.
- 7) The applicant shall return to the Design Review Board (DRB) for review of street and site furniture, including railings, as recommended in the DRB memorandum dated January 13, 2010.
- 8) Four (4) copies of the final revised plans shall be submitted to the Planning Department.
- 9) This permit will expire in two (2) years if substantial construction has not begun.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Phased Growth Development Authorization Date

ANR2010-00004 – 24 Highpoint Drive – David Faytell and Dani Pers Faytell

Mr. Webber MOVED to assign a development authorization date of February 2010 for the new lot created by ANR 2010-00004 at 24 Highpoint Drive. Mr. O’Keeffe seconded and the vote was 9-0.

II. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2010-00005/M3724 -Meadow Street, Leigh F. Andrews and Donald A. LaVerdiere, Amherst Enterprise Park, Office Building (*Request to continue to February 17, 2010*)

Construct a 12,800 square foot per floor, two-story, wood-frame office building, with access and parking. (Map 4D, Parcels 2 and 3, LI and FPC zoning districts)

Mr. Shefftz opened the public hearing for SPR2010-00005 and announced that there had been a request to continue the public hearing to February 17, 2010, without taking testimony.

Mr. Webber MOVED to continue the public hearing for SPR2010-00005 to February 17, 2010, at 7:05 p.m. without taking testimony. Mr. Roznoy seconded.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham announced her resignation from the Board, but stated that she would attend the meeting on February 3, 2010.

Mr. Schreiber asked if the Mullin Rule would affect a new member's ability to vote on a case on February 17th, if he or she had not attended tonight's meeting to vote on the continuance.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Mullin Rule accommodations described in the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations are triggered by the taking of testimony and that no testimony had been taken this evening on the office building.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham stated that her resignation would be effective on February 4th, the day after the next Planning Board meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Signing of decisions

SPR2010-00006/M3877- 65 High St., Margaret Bouvier

SPR2010-00007/M3954 – 178 N. Pleasant St., Jason Brown

The Planning Board members signed the decisions.

VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

The Planning Board endorsed ANR2010-00005/M4451, Andrew Olendzki and Kathryn Fanelli, 99 Station Road.

IX. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Zoning

Mr. O'Keeffe gave the report for the Zoning Subcommittee (ZSC). He reviewed the "Priority A" List on the Zoning Subcommittee FY 10 Work Plan and summarized the items that were discussed at the ZSC meeting this evening, including a proposal from the Town Manager, Larry Shaffer, to rezone a property along University Drive from OP (Office Park) to B-L (Limited Business) to allow for housing and mixed-use development. He stated that the priorities for Spring Town Meeting included replacing the Phased Growth Bylaw, inserting language to indicate that the Zoning Bylaw was in conformance with the Master Plan, adding a use category that would accommodate non-profit social service agencies that are not educational or religious, and the proposed rezoning on University Drive.

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that zoning changes for the Atkins Corner area and North Amherst would be considered for next fall.

Following up on the discussion of the University Drive rezoning, Ms. Barberet noted that there had been a request from the Housing Partnership that was being considered by the CPAC for \$750,000 over a 10 year period, for housing development on this site, but the request had been withdrawn. Issues of rezoning and a determination of wetlands boundaries needed to be resolved first.

Mr. O’Keeffe noted that Mr. Shaffer had mentioned that state and federal subsidies would be sought for the proposed development on University Drive.

B. Master Plan

Mr. Shefftz noted that the Master Plan would be discussed on February 3rd at the Master Plan public forum.

III. APPEARANCE

Guilford Mooring, Superintendent of Public Works (DPW)

Proposed improvements to Spring Street, including the Town Common parking lot.

Mr. Mooring presented information on the proposed improvements to Spring Street, both the roadway portion between Churchill Street and Boltwood Avenue and the parking-lot portion between Boltwood Avenue and South Pleasant Street.

The work on Spring Street started out as a resurfacing project for the parking lot. There have been multiple rounds of redesign. The parking lot design is almost complete. It will include crosswalks at Boltwood Avenue and Spring Street. The stage and planter areas that were added to the plans will not be built. The parking lot project will mainly consist of making the parking lot smaller and widening the sidewalks.

Mr. Tucker noted that the parking lot plans had been shown to the Design Review Board, the Historical Commission, and the Farmers’ Market organizers. The basic design does not increase the area of pavement. It keeps the outside edges of the existing sidewalks as the limit of paving, and increases the width of the pedestrian walkways, narrowing the parking and travelled way. It would include standard perpendicular parking spaces. Now the parking lot contains a wide expanse of paving which is confusing for drivers. This proposed layout was called for in the 1986 master plan for the Common.

Mr. Mooring stated that there would be sloped granite curbing to allow the Farmers’ Market trucks to drive up onto the sidewalks. He presented a cross section showing how the trucks and tents would be placed during the Farmers’ Market. Mr. O’Keeffe noted that the sidewalks would be blocked during the Farmers’ Market, with this configuration.

Mr. Roznoy questioned whether this design would make the parking lot more congested. Mr. Mooring stated that the intent of the design was to keep vehicles from passing cars that are pulling out of the parking spaces. Mr. Tucker stated that the design would force everyone to slow down and it will increase pedestrian and vehicular safety.

Mr. Mooring stated that, in the future, there will be only one lane into the parking lot and one lane out of the parking lot, with a double-yellow line between the lanes.

There was some discussion of angled parking and Mr. Mooring stated that angled parking had been tried for six months in this lot but that it had not been successful.

Mr. Webber stated that he liked the proposed design a lot. It was a design that would be familiar to people. He liked the expanded sidewalks, which could be used by pedestrians when the Farmers' Market is not in session. He liked the benches in the sun. The design will "neaten up" the area.

Ms. Barberet asked about the schedule for the project and asked why there is no basic road maintenance being done, while there are several public works projects that are being done, and more in the works.

Mr. Mooring stated that, regardless of the schedule, there will be little or no road maintenance, because there was no money for it. The DPW needs to do \$135,000 worth of project work per year. Originally the DPW had a project crew and a maintenance crew. Now it has two project crews. Springtime sweeping and roadside mowing in the summer are the extent of the maintenance that will be done. He commented that it would be better to have one crew working on projects and another crew working on maintenance and that he had already spent all of the material budget for 2010.

Mr. Tucker stated that this system had resulted from years of budget cuts. It is cheaper to have town crews do projects than to hire contractors.

Ms. Barberet commented that this division of DPW labor is a "lousy plan."

Mr. O'Keeffe noted that prioritization of the DPW's work and budget issues were outside of the Planning Board's jurisdiction.

There was some discussion of building a stage for performances at the southwest corner of the parking lot, near the Chamber of Commerce booth. There is no money to build a stage at this time but it can be done later, stated Mr. Mooring. The parking meters will stay, but will be moved back to the edge of the sidewalks to allow the Farmers' Market trucks to pull up. There will also be a bike rack.

Mr. Mooring presented information about the redesign of the lower portion of Spring Street, between the Grace Church and The Lord Jeff. The sidewalk will be lowered on the Grace Church side. The grade of the road will also be lowered to allow for a curb on the Lord Jeff side. There will be some places where there will be no parking because of grade changes on the Grace Church side. The utility poles will remain and islands will be created around them. The area will be converted to metered parking. Mr. Mooring is hoping that the proposed retaining wall will be smaller than shown on the plans or that it can be eliminated entirely. The lights at the corner of Spring Street and Boltwood Avenue will be replaced with period lights, and period lights will be added along Spring Street. The other cobra-head lights will remain, along Boltwood Avenue in the vicinity of Town Hall.

There is not enough money to bury the overhead utilities. Mr. Mooring has had no success in finding funds to bury utilities, the cost of which would exceed \$50,000. This can be done in the future if money becomes available. Mr. Tucker noted that this should be a long-term goal for Spring Street, which is now a part of the downtown. Mr. Mooring said that there will be three utility poles that will remain on the north side. The sidewalk will be in much better condition after the project is completed.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Review of revised drawings

SPR2010-00006/M3877 – 65 High St., Margaret Bouvier

Review of revised site plan, building elevations and details in accordance with condition of Site Plan Review approval to relocate fire escape to north side of building; new stairs to be partially enclosed. Existing building is two-family; one apartment w/2 bedrooms; one apartment w/4 bedrooms. (Map 14B/Parcel 90; R-G zoning district)

There were no representatives of the applicant present. Ms. Barberet noted that the project is currently under construction.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the new revised drawings. Ms. Pavlova-Gillham seconded and the vote was 9-0.

SPR2010-00002/M3054 – The Friends of Hospice House

Review of revised plans, including lighting, soil erosion, signs and parking plans in accordance with conditions 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Site Plan Review approval, for an addition to the existing hospice facility. (Map 5C/Parcel 37, B-VC and R-VC zoning districts)

Chris Farley of Austin Design represented the applicant. In accordance with conditions of the Site Plan Review approval for the Friends of Hospice, he presented plans showing lighting, erosion control, the replacement sign and a revised parking plan.

Lighting – There will be three pedestrian-scale post-mounted walkway lights at the parking lot behind the existing building. These will be mounted on 6-foot posts and the lights will be downcast to illuminate the walkway to the new entry. Mr. Farley presented two sample fixtures and stated that the final fixture selection would be similar to one or the other of the fixtures shown.

Erosion Control – Regarding erosion control, the fence has been installed. The site is constricted and the contractor needs to get equipment and materials in and out of the work area. Therefore the site cannot be completely ringed with erosion control devices. However, the topography is flat and the contractor is aware that he needs to control debris and runoff from the construction site.

Sign – Regarding the identification sign, Mr. Farley presented a photograph of the sign that was stolen. The intention is to replace the sign with an identical copy. It will be 2 feet x 3 feet and will be placed on the existing post, near the entry drive. The height will be 8 feet to the top of the sign. Mr. Tucker suggested that the background of the sign be a darker gray or darker neutral earth tone so that the words would be more readable.

Parking – The revised parking plan was prepared in response to a letter from Assistant Fire Chief Zlogar. He had concerns about parking along the curve of the driveway. Mr. Farley stated that he had spoken with Chief Zlogar and that the Fire Department wouldn't have a problem as long as there was no parking on the curve. It is fine with them to have overflow parking as shown on the revised plan, with four spaces in front of the building and one additional space near the south side of the garage. Nine parking spaces are required by zoning. There will be nine parking spaces in the rear of the site and four overflow spaces in front of the building.

Mr. Tucker asked how frequently the overflow parking is needed. Mr. Farley stated that most of the time not more than nine vehicles are on-site. Mr. Tucker expressed concern that the overflow spaces will become muddy. Mr. Farley noted that the overflow spaces would be surfaced with crushed stone or TRG (trap rock gravel). It was not intended that cars would park on the lawn.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the plans with the stipulation that the fourth parking space near the garage (the overflow space) be paved. Mr. O’Keeffe seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham stated that she would like to see all of the overflow parking spaces on a dust-free surface.

Mr. Shefftz noted that Margaret Bouvier, owner of 65 High Street, was now present. He informed her that the Board had approved her revised plans in her absence.

VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS

There were no upcoming ZBA applications.

VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS

There were no upcoming SPP/SPR/SUB applications.

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Pioneer Valley Planning Commission

Mr. Schreiber stated that he had attended recent meetings, but he had nothing to report.

B. Community Preservation Act Committee

Ms. Barberet reported that she had attended two meetings, December 17th and January 7th. On December 17, 2009, the CPAC heard and discussed preliminary requests for funding. There will be a public hearing on February 18, 2010, on these requests. We have always complied with the request to have public hearing, she said. The CPAC is required to hold public hearings on requests for funding. On January 7th CPAC met and compiled an extensive list of questions. There is a meeting scheduled on January 21st to hear presentations on affordable housing and historic preservation and another on open space and recreation on February 4th. Ms. Barberet asked if the Planning Board would be interested in weighing in on CPAC projects. Mr. Shefftz expressed his opinion that this is not within the Planning Board’s charge and that the Board is already involved in enough things. Mr. O’Keeffe agreed with that opinion and asked about the property on Meadow Street.

Ms. Barberet stated that the property on Meadow Street has been assigned a high priority. There is a special request for \$150,000 for open space projects, but there is no specific request for the Meadow Street property. On February 4th CPAC will hear more details about the appraisals and negotiations.

C. Agricultural Commission

Mr. Roznoy reported that the Agricultural Commission is compiling a data base on those in the community who are involved in agriculture. The Commission has sent out surveys and is starting to have informal meetings with farmers. The Commission may want to focus on zoning issues related to agriculture. There is a high interest in the Meadow Street property.

Ms. Barberet noted that the current membership of the Agricultural Commission is 7 and should be 9.

D. Save Our Stop Committee

Mr. Schreiber reported that the Save Our Stop Committee has not met since October. Mr. Crowner stated that he is a member of the Public Works Committee and that he had attended a meeting of Route 9 stakeholders. He reported that Dana Roscoe of the PVPC indicated that they were not able to release the Knowledge Corridor Study at this time.

E. Puffers Pond 2020

Mr. Webber reported that he is the Planning Board's representative on the Puffers Pond 2020 Committee. The Committee would like to have one of its members give a short presentation to the Planning Board about its work. Mr. Shefftz suggested that sometime in March would be a good time for such a presentation.

X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

There was no report of the Chair.

XII. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Mr. Tucker reported that a Robert Burns dinner would be held at the Deerfield Inn on January 23rd at 6:00 p.m.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine M. Brestrup, Senior Planner

Approved:

Jonathan Shefftz, Chair

DATE: _____