

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, February 3, 2010 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

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

**ABSENT:** None

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

---

Mr. Shefftz opened the meeting at 7:02 PM.

**I. MINUTES** Meeting of: January 20, 2010

Ms. Barberet and Mr. Roznoy offered grammatical and substantive amendments to the Minutes of January 20, 2010, pages 1, 8, 9, and 11.

Ms. Barberet objected to the way her comments had been paraphrased in previous Minutes, with respect to the Planning Board Report on Article 13, Green Building and Lot Coverage, and she requested that the Minutes of November 4, 2009, (page 2) and January 20, 2010, (page 1) be corrected in accordance with the statement quoted below:

“Again, the specific words that I have asked to be stated for the public record on November 4<sup>th</sup>, 2009, once again what I said and what is being reported are two different things. So, I will repeat that I had stated on November 4<sup>th</sup> that the reason I abstained on a 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. And the reason I was appalled was not because it was an erroneous report but because a vote that had been reported to Town Meeting was a vote that never took place. And that was the reason for my being appalled, that essentially a vote had been fabricated. So, that is what I wish the record to state. I think that this is about the fourth time now that I have said it. So, I don’t know if that’s going to happen or not. I think that does indicate that this does need to be pursued further.”

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham MOVED to approve the Minutes of January 20, 2010, as amended. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 8-0-1 (Barberet abstained).

**II. PUBLIC FORUM**

**Master Plan – Presentation and Public Comment on Draft Master Plan**

Mr. Shefftz thanked everyone for attending the public forum on the Master Plan and stated that this was the culmination of a very long process that started in the 1990’s. He gave a brief history of the process and introduced Jim Wald, the last chair of the Comprehensive Planning Committee, for a more complete description of the history of the Master Plan.

Mr. Wald stated that the Comprehensive Planning Committee was formed in 1998. In the fall of 2004 a state court decision effectively rendered the Phased Growth portion of the Zoning Bylaw illegal unless it was being used to protect a community while it was developing a Master Plan. The “Planning Amherst Together” process began in 2006. Previous Planning Board members had reported that the Planning Board was often in the position of reacting to things, doing things on an ad hoc basis and not with a sense of long-term planning and a sense of deliberately looking to the future.

Mr. Wald referred to a document entitled “Developing Amherst’s Master Plan – A History” and gave a summary of what the master planning process entailed. The process was on-going and stretched over many years. There were a number of attempts that contributed to the process, some successful and some that did not secure public support. Mr. Wald observed that there was remarkable consistency in what people wanted and this [Master] Plan is really the culmination of this process.

Mr. Wald stated that under Massachusetts General Laws, the Planning Board has sole authority to adopt the plan and make it legal and yet the Mass. General Laws also mandate a very strong public participation process. At the end of the process, a lot of the results will take the form of zoning changes. Zoning changes are approved by Town Meeting and must be adopted by a 2/3 majority. Mr. Wald went on to say this really was a public enterprise, that reflected public desires, drew upon public input and, in his opinion, the resulting Plan reflects the public preferences. He described the *Planning Amherst Together* process, beginning with the hiring of the consultants in the fall of 2006 and proceeding to a draft Plan being turned over to the Planning Board in November of 2008.

Mr. O’Keeffe then described the master planning process since November of 2008. A Master Plan Subcommittee of the Planning Board was formed to review the plan and make final edits. Three or four members of the Planning Board reviewed and edited the goals, objectives, and strategies. The structure of the Plan remained intact throughout the editing process. The Subcommittee had respect for the public process and had made very few substantive changes to the Plan’s contents.

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that the Master Plan Subcommittee finished its work on both the text and the Land Use Map in the fall of 2009 and turned the whole Master Plan over to the Planning Board at that time. The Planning Board voted to approve the draft of the Master Plan in December 2009.

Mr. Shefftz then asked if there were any comments from Planning Board members. There were none. He announced that the public comment would be taken chapter by chapter, but that if anyone had general comments to make, those would also be taken.

Carol Gray of 815 South East Street stated that there were two “big picture” items that she wished to address. She expressed concern about the Land Use Policy Map and stated that the location of the Village Centers was enormously important. She asked the Planning Board to incorporate the idea of Smart Growth and to focus dense development in the Village Centers. The Land Use Policy Map has circles representing the Village Centers that take up half of the town, she said. In South Amherst, the Village Center circle encompasses farmland, open pasture and conservation land. The circles need to be more narrowly drawn. Ms. Gray also asked that the Appendix contain a summary of the random survey, which is the most objective representation of what people want the town to be. People do not want the town to change dramatically, she said.

Sarah la Cour of 124 North Whitney Street stated that she had been a member of the Natural and Cultural Resources working group. There was a lot of public process in the development of the Master Plan and it is a “stellar” plan. We run the risk of losing the integrity of the public input [if we alter it]. She respectfully requested that the Planning Board move forward and adopt the plan.

Alisa Brewer of 5 Fairfield Street stated that she had been a member of the CPC from 2002 to 2006. She also chaired the CPC. The circles on the Land Use Map were not significantly different from past maps. Those circles do not represent the new zoning. There will be a much more detailed process which may result in zoning changes.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the Planning Board had had discussions about the circles, which represented about a three-quarter mile radius.

Jean Miller stated that people objected to the circles. She asked why the circles were there.

Mr. Shefftz and Mr. Webber noted that the circles represented potentially walkable distances from the centers.

Mr. Tucker read sections from the end of Chapter 3, Land Use, Section E., Land Use Policy Map, paragraphs 3 and 4, which describe the “Areas designated as ‘centers’ on the Land Use Policy Map” and state that “Amherst has yet to complete a center-by-center and neighborhood-by-neighborhood geographic planning process . . .” He stated that the community has not yet “done the work” and that Town Meeting will decide on zoning changes.

Aaron Hayden, Select Board member and resident of South East Street, stated that he was a member of the CPC from 2004 until the present. He stated that there was a huge process to get to this point. He encouraged the audience to read the document. He stated that the town was “crossing a threshold”, after 30 years and 1000’s of hours of work.

Mr. Shefftz went through the Master Plan text chapter by chapter and asked if there were any comments. There were no further comments on Chapters 3 through 9. He asked for comments on Chapter 10.

Elisa Campbell of 27 Pine Grove congratulated the town on “getting a Master Plan after 40 years.” However, she stated that she did not think that it could be implemented. The plan would work for a town starting now, with more space or more dollars. Most choices in Amherst have already been made and we do not have any money. She hopes that we will do the best that we can. The document can guide us, but people who live in neighborhoods are not going to welcome infill. We can’t say that we’re going to preserve the historic character of neighborhoods and have dense development in already built-up areas at the same time, and not expect people to choose sides on which of those things they want. However, the Master Plan is a good step and she wishes that it had been done 40 years ago.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham commented on Objective IM.1, Provide Sufficient Resources to Implement the Master Plan. There is a flaw in the outline of the steps. In 2001-2002 funds were appropriated for a “build-out analysis” but only for residential uses. The analysis did not focus on economic development. We need to get support for a build-out analysis for commercial and business properties.

Walter Wolnik of 8 Hillcrest Place made the following comments:

- He was a member of the CPC and attended meetings of the Master Plan Subcommittee;
- Chapter 2 includes priority implementation steps;
- The Select Board should create a Master Plan Implementation Committee;
- There should be biennial progress reports;
- Creation of the Master Plan Implementation Committee is a priority action.

Mr. Hayden noted that state law is vague about implementation, but Chapter 10 is the most exciting part of the Master Plan.

Mr. Shefftz asked for final comments.

Tanya Cushman of Leverett, who is affiliated with J & J Farms on Meadow Street, noted that the Master Plan states that Amherst cares about agriculture, scenic views, and open space.

The Board discussed whether it wished to refer the comments heard this evening to the Master Plan Subcommittee which could meet and edit the Plan and then return it to the Planning Board.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham stated that she would prefer to vote on the Plan. Mr. Crowner stated that he would like to include the random survey in the Appendices.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham MOVED that the Board adopt the Master Plan with the addition of the survey. Mr. Schreiber seconded and the vote was 8-1-0 (Barberet opposed).

### III. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW

#### **SPR2010-00003/M3408 – Amherst Enterprise Park – Meadow Street Climate-controlled Storage Building – Andrews & LaVerdiere – (continued from December 2 and 16, 2009 and January 6, 2010)**

Request to construct a 24,700 s. f., three-story, masonry construction, climate-controlled storage facility with access drive and parking on 9.3 acres on Meadow Street (Map 4D, Parcels 1 & 2, LI and FPC zoning districts)

Ron LaVerdiere presented the application. He reviewed what was discussed the last time the Board met on this project. He noted that several Board members had asked that he work on the design of the building. He introduced Emily Anderson of Ford Gillen Architects. The original building was a big block, which Mr. LaVerdiere characterized as “1960’s Stalinist”. He stated that there are two challenges in trying to improve the building – the look of the building and trying to keep the construction cost within limits. He noted that a building needed to be financially feasible to build, for the owners to make a profit so they would have enough money to maintain the building. Mr. LaVerdiere and Ms. Anderson presented computer-generated images of a new building design, showing a stepped façade on the north, east and south sides. This new design results in a building footprint that is slightly larger than the original by 5,000 square feet. However, the total square footage of the interior will be slightly smaller than that originally proposed. The project has already gone through review by the Conservation Commission and has received an Order of Conditions. The changes being proposed occur outside of the area of jurisdiction of the Conservation Commission. The applicants wanted to soften the look of the building. In order to accommodate storm drainage from the increased roof area, a rain garden is being proposed on the west side of the building. The rain garden has been designed to be oversized relative to the amount of stormwater it might have to handle.

Bill Garrity of Garrity and Tripp, consultants to the applicant, described the rain garden, including the grading, planting and surface treatment proposed for the garden area. The re-grading and planting resulting from the installation of the rain garden will result in the bottom three feet of the building being partially concealed.

Mr. Garrity stated that the stormwater management plan had been revised and that the applicants had received final comments from the Town Engineer indicating that the revisions were acceptable. Mr. Garrity described how the rain garden was connected to the rest of the drainage on site, including an overflow weir, a subdrain and an outfall control for a storm of greater magnitude than the 100-year storm. A culvert under the driveway will connect the rain garden with a low-lying mowed meadow to the north of the driveway, the site of a compensatory storage area for the future office building. Mr. Garrity noted that more trees had been added to the plan. The trees will be arranged in a shallow “V” shape along Meadow Street, to allow clear sight distance by cars exiting the site. Mr. Garrity referred Board members to an existing rain garden on Route 9 (at the site of the former Eddy’s Cruisers building), where river stones and boulders line the bottom of the basin. The proposed rain garden will be similar in its visual appeal.

Ms. Anderson described the proposed building, stating that the setbacks in the façade will soften the planes of the building. She presented a computer-generated video of the building, showing views from all sides.

Mr. LaVerdiere described a recent experience attending a storage conference. He stated that there is a need for boxed storage for paper that can extend up to 22 feet vertically. That is why he has maintained the straight, three-story-high façade on the building faces that abut the parking lot, in order to have an area of the building where it would be possible to have a tall, vertical space inside of the building to accommodate stacking of boxed storage for paper.

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham asked about the HVAC units on the building. Mr. LaVerdiere noted that these were shown in the computer-generated images and that the units will be in the middle of the roof.

Mr. O'Keeffe noted that the computer-generated images do not show the proposed change in grade in front of the building, due to the rain garden.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the potential for standing water in the rain garden. Mr. Garrity stated that, depending on the intensity of the storm, approximately one-half to one day after the storm the basin would be empty, due to infiltration. However, when the ground is frozen, there may be standing water for a while. Placement of pebble and stone ground cover on a gravel bed at the bottom of the rain garden is intended to lessen the possibility of standing water. However, during a January thaw, with heavy rain, there will be some standing water.

Mr. Tucker asked why the applicants were proposing to clear the woods along the road, rather than leaving the succeeding wooded areas intact.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that Joe [Waskiewicz, the abutting farmer] was concerned about brush being a fire hazard for his house. By clearing the brush the fire hazard would be lessened. Other reasons for clearing include: the need for a staging area during construction; the need to create a compensatory storage area on the next lot, north of the driveway and the need to remove soil to create the compensatory storage area.

Mr. Tucker noted that an exclusive planting of Red Maples was being proposed for the site and he questioned the wisdom of using only one species. Mr. Garrity stated that Sugar Maples were being considered for planting along the road.

Mr. Webber stated that the existing scrub and trees provided a great bird habitat. Mr. LaVerdiere stated he plans to leave as much of the existing vegetation as he can.

Tanya Cushman of Leverett asked about the 150 foot buffer zone between a farm and the property line that is mentioned in the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Tucker stated that the 150 foot buffer applies when residential areas are being built next to farmland and it does not apply to commercial development. [Section 3.28 of the Zoning Bylaw]

Mr. Waskiewicz showed a photograph from 1976. He asked how often the property would be mowed, noting that hay is more of a fire hazard than mown grass. He asked for a stipulation in the permit to require that the grass be mowed to a short height. He asked for permission to encroach on the adjacent property to repair his fence. He also asked whether the front part of the parcel would be built upon.

Mr. Shefftz stated that the front part of the parcel could not be built upon unless the applicant returns to the Planning Board for further review.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that there was a requirement in his Order of Conditions from the Conservation Commission that the grass in certain areas be mown twice a year to avoid disturbing nesting birds. Mr. Webber read from the Order of Conditions the portion regarding mowing.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that the lawn would be mowed to a height that would accommodate Mr. Waskiewicz's concerns (in areas outside of Conservation Commission jurisdiction). He also agreed to allow Mr. Waskiewicz access to the storage building property to mend the fence.

Mr. O'Keeffe MOVED to close the public hearing. Ms. Pavlova-Gillham seconded and the vote was 7-0-2 (Crown and Carson abstained).

Ms. Pavlova-Gillham asked that the applicant review the rationale for the waivers that were being requested. Mr. Tucker noted that only the request regarding the Traffic Impact Statement was a waiver under the Planning Board's application requirements. The other items were really modifications to requirements as authorized under Section 7.90 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. LaVerdiere and Mr. Garrity reviewed the rationale for the requests.

1. Locating the parking in the FPC zone was prompted by a desire to pull the building back as far as possible from the neighbors and also to shield the parking from drivers along Meadow Street;
2. The increased width of the driveway at the property line was prompted by the need for wider turning radii to accommodate large vehicles, including fire trucks;
3. The elimination of landscaped islands in the parking lot was prompted by the need for maneuvering space for large trucks;
4. The request for a waiver from the requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement had been explained by John Dietrich from Fuss and O'Neil at a previous meeting with the Planning Board. The number of vehicle trips per day versus the carrying capacity of the road does not pose a problem.

The Board discussed whether facts related to the proposed office building could be taken into account when reviewing the storage building.

Mr. Tucker encouraged the Board to consider the storage building as an individual event and stated that future possibilities concerning the storage building site should not enter into the discussion at this time. The Board can only evaluate what is in front of them at the time, but may consider the context for a proposal. When the office building is under review then the Board can consider the cumulative effect of development on both properties, since by then the storage building may have been approved.

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 except for the sections for which modifications or waivers have been requested; under Section 7.90 of the Zoning Bylaw “any section or subsection of Article 7, Parking Regulations, may be waived or modified by the permit granting board for compelling reasons of safety, aesthetics, or site design;” waivers or modifications have been requested to allow parking to be located in the FPC district (Section 7.01), to allow the width of the driveway to be wider than 24 feet at the property line (Section 7.104) and to eliminate the requirement for landscaped islands in the parking lot (Section 7.111); the setbacks from property lines are in accordance with Table 3 of the Zoning Bylaw.
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected because no detrimental or offensive actions are being proposed.
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use because the redesign of the building and the conditions of the permit will address the issue of hours of operation of the building, the placement of and noise generated by HVAC units on the roof and the issues about lighting.

The Board discussed the following topics with regard to Section 11.2402:

- The hours of operation that are normal for farmers and for storage buildings; Board members reached a consensus that 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. would be appropriate hours for this building;
- The types of vehicles that might visit the site and the noises that might be generated by different types of vehicles;
- The type of HVAC system that is proposed for this building and the possibility of installing a sound-proof barrier around the HVAC units;
- Whether to limit the number of decibels that will emanate from the HVAC units;
- Whether to require that the type of HVAC units presented during the public hearing be installed on the building;
- The fact that the proposed building is close to the tobacco barn on the neighboring property and the issues of noise and soil erosion that might disturb the farmer;
- The redesign of the building, by stepping the façade, that will alleviate the prospect of wind tunneling;
- The wattage of lights that are proposed for the parking lot lighting (five 300-watt lights).

11.2403 – N/A

11.2410 – The project protects unique or important natural, historic or scenic features because, although there are farms nearby, the development is not in an official farming district [Section 3.28 of the Zoning Bylaw]; the conditions of the decision will make sure that the other parcels are still viable as farms.

Ms. Barberet noted that many of the properties are under APR's and the owners have committed themselves to farming and it is important to protect the ability to farm.

11.2411 – N/A

11.2412 – The ability of the proposed sewage disposal and water supply systems within and adjacent to the site to serve the proposed use has been reviewed by the Town Engineer, who submitted a letter of comment dated November 25, 2009; a condition of the permit will require that the issues listed in this letter with respect to utilities shall be addressed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.

11.2413 – The ability of the proposed drainage system within and adjacent to the site to handle the increased runoff resulting from the development has been reviewed by the Town Engineer and found to be satisfactory.

11.2414 – Adequate landscaping will be provided because a landscaping plan has been submitted which shows proposed planting in the form of street trees, trees along the driveway and plantings in the rain garden on the west side of the building; and a condition of the approval will require that the landscaping shall be installed and continuously maintained; a condition of the approval will also require that other species of trees should be considered (along with the two types of maples that are being proposed), to avoid a case of maple blight.

Ms. Barberet noted that maples are also susceptible to salt damage. Mr. Garrity spoke in favor of Sugar Maples as a street tree in a farming district, where people may wish to tap the trees for syrup. Mr. Webber stated that he is in favor of asking the applicant to use a mix of trees including natives to provide forage for wildlife. The Board members discussed the type of mowing that should occur on the land between the building and the road. Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he would prefer to keep to his agreement with the owner of the adjacent farmhouse, Mr. Waskiewicz, with regard to the mowing. The Board determined that a revised landscape plan did not need to come back to the Board for its review.

11.2415 – Adequacy of the soil erosion plan both during and after construction has been reviewed by the Town Engineer and the Conservation Commission and found to be satisfactory.

11.2416 – The protection of adjacent properties by minimizing noise has been addressed in criterion 11.2402, above.

11.2417 – The protection of adjacent properties by minimizing the intrusion of lighting has been established because the applicant will use lower wattage lights in the parking lot than originally proposed and the lights will be downcast and the lights on the sign will be downcast as well.

11.2418 – Protection from flood hazards has been reviewed by the Board and by the Town Engineer and has been found to be satisfactory.

11.2419 – Protection of wetlands has been reviewed by the Conservation Commission and an Order of Conditions has been issued.

11.2420 – The Board has reviewed the architecture of the proposed building and the applicant has revised the architecture to better address the Board's concerns.

11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits, with surrounding buildings and development because

- the building is set back on the lot, the parking is behind the building, a landscaping plan has been submitted and there is only one entry drive.
- 11.2422 – The building site avoids, to the extent feasible, impact on floodplains, scenic views and wetlands because the building is set back on the site, the building has been redesigned to be more appropriate for the site, more trees have been added along Meadow Street, and work in floodplains and adjacent to wetlands have been reviewed by the Town Engineer and the Conservation Commission.
- 11.2423 – N/A
- 11.2424 – Screening has been provided for storage areas, loading docks, dumpsters and rooftop equipment because most of these items are screened from view by the building and rooftop equipment will be installed in the middle of the building where it is less likely to be seen.
- 11.2430 – The site has been designed to provide for the convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement both within the site and in relation to adjoining ways and properties because the site design has been reviewed by the Town Engineer with respect to vehicular movements and there are sidewalks provided in the vicinity of the building entrance to accommodate pedestrians.
- 11.2431 – The location and number of curb cuts is such as to minimize turning movements, hazardous exits and entrances because there is only one curb cut proposed for this site and there is a large parking lot that can accommodate turning movements.
- 11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, bicycle racks, drive aisles, loading areas and sidewalks has been provided in a safe and convenient manner because the site plan is done in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw and it has been reviewed by the Town Engineer and found to be satisfactory and there are bicycle racks provided near the entrance.
- 11.2433 – N/A
- 11.2434 – N/A
- 11.2435 – N/A
- 11.2436 – A traffic impact report shall be required, unless waived under Section 11.222.

The Board discussed waiving the Traffic Impact Report. Ms. Barberet stated that she was not prepared to waive the requirement because she was concerned about the nine loading docks, which leave open the possibility of substantially more traffic. Mr. Shefftz stated that even if there were substantially more traffic, it would not be enough to trigger additional conditions. He stated that it is likely that a Traffic Impact Statement would be required for the office building that is being proposed [on a site to the north, along Meadow Street]. There was further discussion about the intersection of Route 116 and Meadow Street. Ms. Pavlova-Gillham stated that she was concerned about the intersection as well as about farm vehicles. She stated that 12 to 14 trips per day was a reasonable number but 93 trips per day may not be reasonable. Ms. Barberet stated that the Board had not been given good information about traffic. She wanted more information about cars, commuters and farm vehicles.

Mr. Garrity and Mr. LaVerdiere noted that a traffic engineer, John Dietrich, had provided information on traffic for the Board at a previous meeting and that Dan Delaski, also a traffic engineer, had submitted a letter regarding traffic generated by storage facilities. Ms. Barberet stated that she doubted the traffic projections. Mr. Shefftz, Mr. Webber, Mr. O’Keeffe and Mr. Roznoy concurred that it would be sufficient to require a Traffic Impact Statement for the office building.

Mr. Shefftz reviewed the Development Application Report.

Mr. O’Keeffe proposed that the Board could conduct a post-construction study of the noise generated by the HVAC system and if necessary, require noise abatement at that time.

- 11.2437 – N/A – This section is only relevant if the requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement is not waived.



Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to approve the application subject to waivers described in the Development Application Report and conditions developed by the Board. Mr. Webber seconded and the vote was 5-0-4 (Pavlova-Gillham, Barberet, Carson and Crowner abstained).

Waivers

1. Traffic Impact Statement
2. Section 7.01 of the Zoning Bylaw – Off-street parking to be provided in same zone as principle use
3. Section 7.104 of the Zoning Bylaw – Width of driveway at property line
4. Section 7.111 of the Zoning Bylaw – Landscaped islands in parking lot

Conditions

1. The hours of operation for the storage facility shall be 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. daily.
2. The Planning Board shall visit the site to evaluate the noise generated by the HVAC system during the first cooling season to determine if noise abatement measures are needed; if the Planning Board determines that the noise level is unacceptable, noise-reduction barriers or other remediation will be required.
3. Exterior lighting shall be installed in accordance with revised information submitted (5 fixtures at a maximum of 300 watts); exterior lighting shall be downcast.
4. Lighting for the sign at the entry drive shall be mounted above the sign and shall be downcast.
5. The developers shall work with the town to investigate and remediate infiltration and inflow (I & I) problems on the 12” diameter sewer interceptor line as noted in the letter from the Town Engineer, dated November 25, 2009.
6. All of the issues listed in the letter from the Town Engineer, dated November 25, 2009, shall be addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Town Engineer.
7. Trees planted on site shall include a mixture of appropriate and sustainable species.
8. Plantings shall be installed and continually maintained.
9. Four (4) copies of the final revised plans shall be submitted to the Planning Department.
10. This permit will expire in two (2) years if substantial construction has not begun.

Note: The Board acknowledged the applicants’ agreement to allow the neighbor to the south to encroach on the property in order to gain access to the fence for purposes of repair. The Board encouraged the applicants to honor this agreement.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Electronic Meeting Notices & Mailings? - Discussion**

The Board agreed to discuss this topic at the next meeting.

B. **Other** – None

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Signing of Decision**

**SPR2010-00008/M4294 – Amherst Inn Company, The Lord Jeffery Inn, 30 Boltwood Avenue**  
– The Board signed this decision.

B. **Other** – None

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

**VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS** – None

**VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS** – None were discussed

**IX. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

A. Zoning - There was no Zoning Subcommittee Report.

**X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS** – There were no Committee Reports.

- A. Pioneer Valley Planning Commission
- B. Community Preservation Act Committee
- C. Agricultural Commission
- D. Save Our Stop Committee
- E. Puffer's Pond 2020 Committee

**XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – There was no Report of the Chair.

**XII. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

The Planning Director, Jonathan Tucker, strongly encouraged Planning Board members to attend the upcoming Citizen Planner Training Collaborative Conference to be held at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, on March 20<sup>th</sup>.

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT** – The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christine M. Brestrup, Senior Planner

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan Sheftz, Chair

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