

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 2, 2010 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Jonathan Shefftz, Chair; Jonathan O’Keeffe, Denise Barberet, David Webber, Stephen Schreiber, Bruce Carson, Rob Crouner, and Sandra Anderson

**ABSENT:** Richard Roznoy

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

---

Mr. Shefftz opened the meeting at 7:04 PM.

**I. MINUTES** Meeting of: April 21, 2010

Mr. Shefftz stated that the applicant, Hampshire Mosque, had withdrawn its Site Plan Review application.

Ms. Barberet noted that she had already given Ms. Brestrup a number of grammatical and typographical comments. One error of substance was that the date of the Minutes which were approved on April 21, 2010, should read March 17, 2010.

Mr. Webber MOVED to approve the Minutes of April 21, 2010, as amended. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 8-0.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**SPR2010-00009/M4678 – 264 Harkness Road, Hampshire Mosque**

Request approval to operate a non-profit religious institution (Hampshire Mosque) under Section 3.330 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 18D, Parcel 100, R-N Zoning District) *(continued from April 7, 2010 and April 21, 2010)*

Mr. Shefftz read the letter from Hampshire Mosque requesting that its application be withdrawn without prejudice. Mr. Shefftz noted that he was disappointed that the Mosque had withdrawn its application because he thought that the Planning Board had developed a good set of ideas and goals that would have allowed the Mosque to function. However, he acknowledged that the Mosque might be better served at a more central location, where the abutters are more used to traffic and where the parking arrangements are better.

Ms. Barberet noted that the Mosque would be better served by a location that allowed it to expand.

Mr. Shefftz predicted that with a permanent home, the Mosque would have higher attendance. He acknowledged that the owner of the property was losing patience with the protracted process, leading the Mosque to withdraw its application. He pointed out that the Site Plan Review process has a lot of elements to it and that it often requires multiple sessions to work out the details of a permit. The process takes time. This was an especially complicated application since the neighborhood is split between two towns.

Ms. Brestrup presented a letter, received from Dana McDonald, Chair of the Pelham Conservation Commission, withdrawing the Conservation Commission’s request for an impact study, based on the conditions that the Planning Board had drafted for the Site Plan Review.

[See vote to accept withdrawal, later in the meeting]

#### IV. NEW BUSINESS

- A. SPR 2010-00007/M3954 – Jason Brown for Clearwater Restaurant – 178 North Pleasant Street – seeks advice on whether an amendment to the Site Plan Review approval is required for minor changes proposed to site plan.

Mr. Brown explained that he planned to install a walk-in cooler at the rear of his restaurant, near the handicapped ramp. The cooler will be 8' x 8' and will be placed in a location where there is currently a set of stairs. It will function as an exterior, walk-in refrigerator. The distance from the cooler to the nearest parking spaces will be at least 17 feet, providing enough room for vehicles to enter and exit the parking lot. There will be a concrete base. The existing ramp will not change.

Ms. Brestrup noted that Mr. Brown would be discussing the proposed changes with the Design Review Board on June 8.

Mr. Brown explained that he also wanted to enclose the entryway on the north side of the building. It has to be reconstructed to accommodate elevation changes. The door currently opens into the dining room and enclosing the entryway will protect the diners from wind.

Mr. O'Keeffe MOVED to accept the proposed changes, subject to review by the Design Review Board. Mr. Carson seconded.

Mr. Shefftz asked if any members of the public would be interested in these changes. Ms. Barberet asked about noise. Mr. Brown stated that the cooler would not produce noise.

Mr. O'Keeffe amended his previous motion and MOVED that, finding that these changes are "de minimis" changes, the Planning Board will accept the changes, subject to review by the Design Review Board.

Ms. Anderson noted that the applicant should consider installing a bollard to protect the cooler.

Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 8-0.

- B. Planning Board Rules and Regulations

Discussion and decision about whether to hold a public hearing on proposed revisions regarding submittal requirements.

The Board discussed scheduling a public hearing on proposed revisions to the Planning Board Rules and Regulations and decided to hold the public hearing on July 7, 2010.

Mr. O'Keeffe noted some typographical errors in the text of the proposed amendment.

#### II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

**7:30 PM            SPR2010-00011/M5254 – 1150 West Street, Atkins Farm Market**

Request approval to construct an attached 8,420 SF warehouse and 2,062 SF front sales area to the existing building. An enlarged and reconfigured parking lot to coincide with the Route 116 realignment project is also proposed. (Map 25B, Parcel 51, B-L Zoning District)

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

Jeff Squires of The Berkshire Design Group, Hugh Boyd of Hugh Boyd Architects and Pauline Lannon of Atkins Farms Country Market presented the application.

Mr. Squires gave a summary of the roadway work that is being done in the area of Atkins Corner. He presented a plan showing the new road alignment for Route 116, the new access road behind Atkins Farms Market and the location of the Atkins Farms warehouse that had been removed to accommodate the new road. To the west and south of the Market lies land owned by Hampshire College. The new access road is planned to continue to Applewood. Atkins Farms Market is proposing to add warehouse space, to replace the demolished warehouse across the road, and to add vestibule space at the front entry.

The parking lot will also be expanded to replace parking that was lost on the east side of the road. Having an expanded parking near the building will eliminate the need for pedestrians to cross Route 116 to get to Atkins Farms Market. Employee parking will be in the back of the lot. There is now a large gravel overflow area at the back. The new property line, on the east side, will coincide with the back of the new sidewalk (which will be a 10-foot wide multi-use path). There will be better ADA accessibility with ramps at the entrance and exits. The grades in the parking lot will also be improved, with a maximum grade of 4 to 5%.

The existing stepped outdoor display area and patio will remain. There will be a ramp from the building to the south parking lot, making access to the building easier.

The new addition on the west side will include two stories. There are currently 3 loading docks and 2 more will be added. The trash compactor will be enclosed. In terms of architectural design, the stone band at the lower portion of the building will be carried around the enclosure of the trash compactor, to visually connect it with the building.

The loading docks and trash compactor area will be screened with a buffer of plantings along the north side.

Access to the second floor of the addition will be from the west. This space may be rented out as a retail space.

Mr. Squires described the proposed plantings and site lighting. The existing lights will be replaced with wooden poles and shoebox-style lights. The poles will be 18 feet high, not 20 feet as shown on the plans. They will be similar to the existing lights.

With reference to the Fire Department's comments, there is an existing fire hydrant near the sign. There will be a new fire hydrant near the ATM machine and an emergency access aisle that will be striped along the front of the building. All of the other issues noted in the Fire Department's memorandum will be addressed. The planting along the north side of the building will be modified to accommodate Fire Department access to the Fire Department connection on the north side of the building.

Some of the proposed site lighting on the east side of the parking lot will be eliminated from the plan because there will be new street lighting along West Street. The applicant does not wish to "over light" the parking lot. The new street lights will be on 22 foot high poles and will contribute to lighting the parking lot. Therefore about 6 or 7 light fixtures can be eliminated from the site plan.

The path to the south and west sides of the warehouse addition has been changed from the original submission. Mr. Squires distributed a revised copy of the Overall Site Plan.

The ATM will be relocated and a drive-through ATM is planned. Mr. Squire showed where the stacking lane for the ATM would be located. The ATM will also be accessible as a walk-up facility. There will be a crosswalk and a pathway to connect the building to the new multi-use path along the road.

Mr. Squires described the storm drainage system. There are now two catch basins in the east parking lot and two in the south parking lot. The soils are sandy and good for drainage. The

plan proposes a subsurface detention system, 3 ½ feet deep. The parking lot drainage system will be connected with this subsurface detention area. The outfall for this system (the discharge point) is on the north side of Bay Road. This outfall currently exists.

Ms. Anderson asked if the applicants were required to put in oil separators. Mr. Squires stated that they were not required to do so for a lot of this size.

Mr. Squires explained that the project will be phased in coordination with the road project. The construction in front of the building cannot happen until the roundabout is completed. Therefore the south parking lot will probably be built first. If this happens, the drainage system may need to be split into two systems, with two subsurface detention areas. This potential change has been discussed with the Town Engineer.

Hugh Boyd described the elevations of the building, including the warehouse, the loading docks and the trash compactor and transformer area. "The vista will be improved," he said.

Ms. Anderson asked where the parking for delivery vehicles would be located.

Mr. Boyd explained that there would be two more parking spaces for trucks than there are now. All of the delivery trucks will fit into the spaces provided. The loading dock will be a totally-enclosed system. The public will not be able to see the boxes, etc. being unloaded.

In the front of the building there will be an expanded seating area inside. A gable end will be added to the front to give it scale. The arcade effect in the front of the seating area will be maintained. There will be an open shed area to hang and display flowers and other goods for sale.

Mr. Shefftz summarized the site visit report. Three Planning Board members attended, although he noted that all of the Planning Board members were familiar with the site. It is a busy business adjacent to a busy roadway. His daughter, Micayla Faye Shefftz attended the site visit with him. He noted that the site visit report was lengthy and had appropriate details.

Mr. Carson asked the applicants to describe the driveway on the north side of the building, which might be eliminated in a later phase of the project.

Mr. Squires explained that along Bay Road one driveway will be widened to accommodate trucks. For now the second driveway will need to remain to accommodate other traffic. In the future the loading docks may move. If that happens, the second driveway will be eliminated. Once it is complete, the loop road is expected to be used as the primary access to the market from the west. There will be two new entries to the Market off the loop road.

Ms. Anderson asked about the possibility of blocking off the truck entrance. Mr. Squires described how the trucks will enter and exit the site, and stated that the truck entrance cannot be blocked off.

Ms. Barberet expressed concern about people exiting onto Route 116. There is a safety issue, with people speeding down from the Notch.

Mr. Squires explained that there will be median islands constructed to slow people down as they approach the Atkins Corner area from the south. In addition, traffic will exit from Atkins Farms Market in a safer fashion because of the redesigned entry. Ms. Anderson noted that there is a line of sight issue on Route 116.

Ms. Brestrup explained the plans for the redesign of Route 116, including regrading, realignment and installation of traffic calming devices. These improvements will help to alleviate line-of-sight problems.

Mr. Schreiber asked if drive-through facilities were allowed in this zoning district. Ms. Brestrup referred to Section 5.0431 of the Zoning Bylaw, which allows accessory drive-through facilities in the B-L zoning district.

Ms. Barberet asked who will build the loop road. Mr. Squires explained that it will be partly built by town employees and partly by a contractor.

Ms. Brestrup explained the phasing of the proposed drainage system and stated that the Town Engineer recommends that any changes in the system, from that which appears on the plans, should be presented to him for approval and that this be a condition of the permit.

Referring to the Development Application Report, Mr. Shefftz asked about the Green Ash trees proposed as street trees along the loop road. Mr. Squires stated that Ashes predominate on the plans along the loop road, but these trees will be planted as part of the road project. They will be "by others". He will update the plans and has no problem with changing the species of these trees.

Ms. Barberet asked about the Sugar Maples proposed for the front of the site, noting that they are susceptible to salt damage. Mr. Squires explained that they will be separated from the roadway by the curb or berm, by a grass strip, and by the multi-use path. They are a columnar type of Maple. They should not experience salt damage from the roadway.

Ms. Barberet asked about the Sweet Gum trees proposed for the northwest corner of the property. Will there be gumballs? Mr. Squires stated that they would be at the back of the site, away from the loading docks.

Mr. Shefftz and Ms. Barberet asked about the height of the site lighting. Mr. Squires stated that with 18 foot high poles, there would be a need for fewer poles. If the poles were lower, there would be more of them. The plans are to eliminate poles along the front of the property because of the roadway lighting. The new lights on-site will be 18 feet high, with wood poles, a wood cross arm and a shoe-box style light fixture. They will be more residential and pedestrian in scale than the roadway lighting. They will be the same as they are now, only taller. They will be downcast, with full cut-offs.

Mr. Boyd described the lighting on the building. Up-lights are planned for the columns to accent the vertical posts. The designers do not want bright lights to shine into the seating area. The lights on the gable end will be small spot lights. There will be hidden light sconces in the roof area to light the public walkways.

Mr. Webber questioned the wisdom of up-lights, stating that he preferred a "dark sky". Mr. Boyd explained that the lights will be aimed back toward the building.

Mr. Webber asked if the lights could be positioned under the eaves and point down.

Ms. Anderson asked if the expanded parking and additional lighting would have any effect on abutters, in terms of increased footcandles. Mr. Squires stated that the plan shows that there would be less than one footcandle maximum at the property lines. The site will have plenty of light, but will not be "over-lit". Atkins is sensitive to this issue.

Mr. Carson asked if the town planned to add street lights to the loop road and Mr. Squires stated that there were no plans to do so.

Mr. Shefftz asked about an Erosion Control Plan. Mr. Squires stated that the phasing for this site is complicated because of the need to coordinate with the construction of the roadway, so preparation of an Erosion Control Plan is difficult at this time. The consultants have discussed this issue with Jason Skeels, the Town Engineer.

Mr. Shefftz asked if the number of permanent parking spaces would be increased. Mr. Squires stated that there were about 90 to 100 existing parking spaces across the street. The plan takes these spaces and puts them on the west side of the street. Employee parking will likely be at the west end of the parking lot. There will be some increase in the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Shefftz stated that he had no problem with the waiver for the Traffic Impact Statement.

Mr. Squires summarized the plans for signs, showing the locations of the existing and proposed signs.

Mr. Shefftz asked about the consistency of this site plan with the Atkins Corner Plan that had been developed by a consultant for the entire area.

The Board discussed the Atkins Corner Plan. Mr. Shefftz stated that it appears that this proposal does not create any problems with the future Atkins Corner Plan.

Mr. Schreiber asserted that the Atkins Corner Plan was for a walkable, sustainable area and he questioned how "drive-thrus" will help to achieve these goals. The site now has a walk-up ATM. He expressed concern about the traffic configuration and the drive-thrus.

Mr. Shefftz also questioned the drive-thrus. He asked why people can't get out of their cars to use the ATM and get donuts. He also asked if there would be too much parking on the site, stating that he had never seen the overflow parking lot being used.

Mr. Schreiber agreed that there may be too much proposed parking, asking if there is more planned than what is required by the Bylaw. He noted that the expansion of the parking lot along Route 116 takes a potential building site "out of play". He noted that the ideal plan for the area would be to have the buildings up front on the site and the parking in back.

Mr. Squires stated that his firm does a lot of work with Hampshire College [owner of adjacent properties] and that they have looked into shared parking for the area. He also noted that the Atkins Corner Plan was prepared with a different roadway alignment in mind. Mr. Boyd noted that the state design for the roadway had dropped the roadway about 3 or 4 feet. This has taken the roadway "out of the urban context" he said.

Ms. Anderson noted that parking lots are not permanent structures. Something could be built there. She further noted that the parking lots at Atkins Farms Market were used for Antique Car Night and other activities, and were also used for snow removal. The Market will lose spaces in the wintertime to snow storage. She disagreed with Mr. Schreiber's opinion that there is an excessive number of parking spaces.

Mr. O'Keefe stated that Atkins is a special case with regard to parking. It serves as a magnet for people who come from distant locations. They may not be able to ride their bikes or take the bus, but may need to drive. The Market may be better served by more parking spaces.

Mr. Shefftz asked about bike racks. Mr. Squires stated that the plan needs bike racks.

Ms. Barberet stated that she likes the plan, although she agreed with Mr. Schreiber's comments. She stated that a lot of planning had gone into the area and she pointed out that there are problems between theory and reality with regard to planning.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the current zoning does not reflect the Atkins Corner Plan.

Mr. O'Keefe explained to the Board that one of the major items on the agenda of the Zoning Subcommittee is to deal with the zoning of the Atkins Corner area.

Ms. Anderson asked about a bus stop. Mr. Squires pointed out that there is a bus stop on Bay Road as well as one to the south along Route 116. Mr. Carson asked if there would be a bus stop on the loop road.

Ms. Anderson noted that people go to Atkins Farms Market to buy things. They need a car in order to do this. She expressed support for the idea of shared parking in the future.

Mr. Webber stated that he thought this was a great plan, it had the appropriate amount of parking for the reasons that others have stated and he wanted to discuss grading of the parking lot.

Mr. Squires stated that the south parking lot will be dropped to meet the roadway. The parking lot will be improved in terms of grading. It will be less steep.

Mr. Webber asked about the area in front of the building, stating that the existing aisle is narrow and needs to be wider. He also questioned the proposed configuration of the north end, in terms of the proximity of the bank drive-thru, the coffee/donut drive-thru and cars coming in and leaving from the site via the second driveway.

Mr. Squires described the traffic pattern for the drive-thrus.

Mr. Webber expressed concern about drivers coming in off West Bay Road. Mr. Squires noted that the loop road will redirect traffic.

Ms. Barberet asked if the second driveway at the north side could be exit-only. She asked if the driveways on the north side could be signed to say "trucks only" at the entry near the loading docks and "exit only" at the second driveway.

There was a discussion of the traffic flow.

Mr. Webber asked how someone could use the ATM drive-thru and then come back to shop at the store. Mr. Squires stated that the driveways are "maneuverable" because they are wide. He described the turning movement that would allow someone to use the ATM drive-thru and come back to shop at the store.

Mr. Shefftz suggested that the Board proceed to review the Site Plan Review criteria.

Mr. O'Keefe MOVED to close the public hearing. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 8-0.

Mr. Shefftz asked for and received consensus that the waiver of the Traffic Impact Statement was reasonable.

Mr. O'Keefe asked about a waiver of the Erosion Control Plan. Ms. Barberet suggested checking with the Town Engineer.

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; there are no issues related to this criterion;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics; the conditions of the permit will require that lighting will be downcast and not shine onto adjacent properties, except for lighting of the gable end which will be brought back for review by the Board;
- 11.2403 – Adequate recreational facilities, open space and amenities have been provided because the parking lot is used for special events throughout the year;
- 11.2410 – The project protects unique or important historic and scenic features because the views of the Holyoke Range will be maintained;
- 11.2411 – The proposed methods of refuse disposal are adequate because there will be an enclosed trash compactor;
- 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; the site is connected to the town sewer and water systems;

- 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; the current proposal has been found to be satisfactory; if changes are proposed, a condition of the permit will require that the changes be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer;
- 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 in the parking lots and screening around the loading docks and trash compactor area, in addition to minor plantings on the north side of the building; the Board noted that there is not a lot of planting proposed, but did not view this as a problem;
- 11.2415 – The soil erosion plan has not yet been submitted, due to the complexity of construction phasing and coordination with the roadway project; a condition of the permit will require that a soil erosion plan be submitted to the Town Engineer for his review and approval prior to construction;
- 11.2417 – The protection of adjacent properties by minimizing the intrusion of nuisances has been determined to be adequate by the Board, due to the proposed downcast lighting; the light poles have been reduced from 20 feet to 18 feet in height and the style of the light fixtures and poles will match existing; a condition of the permit will require that lighting of the gable end be submitted to the Board for review and approval;
- 11.2418 – N/A
- 11.2419 – N/A – There was a Negative Determination of Applicability issued by the Conservation Commission.
- 11.2420 – With regard to the proposed architecture, the applicant has submitted architectural elevations, which the Board found to be satisfactory and in keeping with the existing design of the building;
- 11.2421 – N/A
- 11.2422 – N/A
- 11.2423 – N/A
- 11.2424 – Screening has been provided for dumpsters and rooftop equipment because the applicant has proposed that there be a trash compactor that is enclosed by a wall and screened by plantings;
- 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; a condition of the permit will require that the consultant re-examine the traffic circulation patterns at the north end of the site and submit a plan for this area to the Board for review and approval;
- 11.2431 – The location and number of curb cuts is such as to minimize turning movements and hazardous exits and entrances because the project has been designed in conjunction with the realignment of Route 116 and the construction of a loop road; a condition of the permit will require that the consultant re-examine the traffic circulation patterns at the north end of the site and submit a plan for this area to the Board for review and approval;

Ms. Barberet strongly urged the applicant to consider making the second driveway on the north side an “exit only”.

- 11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, bicycle racks, drive aisles and sidewalks will be provided in a safe and convenient manner; the Town Engineer has reviewed the design of the parking lot with respect to size of spaces and drive aisles and found it to be satisfactory, bicycle racks will be added to the plan near the building;
- 11.2433 – N/A
- 11.2434 – N/A
- 11.2435 – N/A

11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Report has been waived;  
11.2437 – N/A

Mr. Webber MOVED to approve the Site Plan Review application as discussed, with the usual four conditions, and others as discussed, to waive the requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement and to have the Soil Erosion Control Plan approved by the Town Engineer. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 8-0.

Waivers

1. Traffic Impact Statement

Conditions

1. If there are substantial changes to the drainage system as proposed on the drawings submitted for the public hearing, the revised drainage plans shall be submitted to the Town Engineer for his review and approval, prior to construction.
2. If there are changes to the signs, as to proposed design or location, the revised signs shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval.
3. An Erosion Control Plan (s) shall be prepared, in coordination with the required phasing of construction, and the plan(s) shall be submitted to the Town Engineer for review and approval prior to construction of each phase.
4. The northern area of the site, including the coffee and donut drive-thru, the ATM drive-thru, and the entrances and exits onto West Bay Road, shall be re-examined with regard to safety for pedestrians, vehicles and bicycles. Based on this re-examination, a plan for this area shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval prior to construction.
5. Bike racks shall be installed. A revised site plan, showing the location of bike racks shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval prior to construction.
6. A lighting plan for the front gable end of the building shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval prior to installation.
7. Exterior lighting shall be downcast and/or shielded, with the possible exception of the lighting on the front gable end of the building.
8. Plantings shall be installed and continually maintained.
9. Four 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.

**III. OLD BUSINESS** – Ms. Brestrup presented the Department of Public Works plans for improvements to Spring Street and to the Town Common/Spring Street parking lot, explaining that these had been the subject of a public hearing held by the Public Works Committee on June 1, 2010. The Planning Board did not offer any comments on these plans.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS (Continued)**

- C. Subcommittees – schedule discussion of subcommittee membership and possible re-establishment of Master Plan Subcommittee

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that Master Plan Implementation goes far beyond zoning. He does not support the notion of reconstituting the Master Plan Subcommittee. He recommends that the Master Plan Implementation Committee should be a stand-alone committee. He noted that the Planning Board should communicate this recommendation to the Select Board.

- D. Town Meeting – Signing of Attorney General Forms

Planning Board members signed the Attorney General Forms.

- E. Summer Meeting Schedule – The Planning Board agreed to the following schedule for summer meetings:

July 7<sup>th</sup>; July 21<sup>st</sup>; August 4<sup>th</sup>; August 18<sup>th</sup>

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

**VI. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS - None**

**VII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – Ms. Brestrup noted that there is one Site Plan Review application scheduled for July 7, regarding 321 Main Street, under the new B-N zoning district regulations.**

**VIII. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Zoning – Mr. O’Keeffe summarized the Zoning Subcommittee meeting of June 2<sup>nd</sup>. The ZSC discussed scheduling and priorities. Among the issues that the members will be discussing will be:

- Development Modification amendment (to replace the Phased Growth Bylaw);
- Rezoning of Atkins Corner;
- Rezoning of North Amherst Village Center;
- Rezoning of the Gateway District.

The ZSC plans to have dedicated meetings to talk about each of these topics.

The ZSC has scheduled a Zoning Forum for Wednesday, June 16<sup>th</sup>, at 5:00 p.m. in the Town Room, Town Hall.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the Gateway rezoning. Mr. O’Keeffe stated that because the ZSC had not yet seen a presentation about this topic, the members only know what they had seen in the newspapers and what had been presented at ARA meetings. He noted that UMass owns a large vacant site where fraternities had been located. The town wants private, taxable student housing to be built. Rezoning will be required to accomplish this goal. The development plan will consist of housing and mixed-use buildings.

**IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- A. Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Mr. Schreiber reported that the PVPC will meet in Amherst on June 10<sup>th</sup>.
- B. Community Preservation Act Committee – Ms. Barberet reported that CPAC had recommended everything that was presented to the members, with little controversy.
- C. Agricultural Commission – Mr. Roznoy was not present, so there was no report about the Agricultural Commission.
- D. Save Our Stop Committee – Mr. Schreiber reported that the SOS Committee had not met since February. Ms. Brestrup noted that the Town Manager and Planning Director were continuing their efforts to save the train stop in Amherst.

- E. Puffer's Pond 2020 Committee – Mr. Webber reported that the Puffer's Pond 2002 Committee was nearing completion of its work. Among the changes that the Committee would be recommending are:
- Dredging;
  - Repairs to trails;
  - Expanded use of the North Beach;
  - Encouraging community work days, with the Boy Scouts and other groups;
  - Charging for parking;
  - Making the roadway one-way past the South Beach.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW (Continued)**

**SPR2010-00009/M4678 – 264 Harkness Road, Hampshire Mosque**

Mr. O'Keeffe MOVED to approve the withdrawal without prejudice of the Site Plan Review application for the Hampshire Mosque. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 8-0.

**X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – None**

**XI. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR – None**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

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

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan Shefftz, Chair

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