

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

**PRESENT:** Jonathan Shefftz, Chair; Richard Roznoy (7:17 PM), David Webber, Stephen Schreiber, Bruce Carson, and Sandra Anderson

**ABSENT:** Jonathan O’Keeffe and Rob Crowner

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

---

Mr. Shefftz opened the meeting at 7:07 PM. In accordance with the requirements of the new Open Meeting Law, Mr. Shefftz stated that the meeting was being recorded by Planning Department staff and that ACTV was both recording and broadcasting the proceedings. He also announced that there would be a delay in opening the public hearing for 321 Main Street, pending the arrival of Mr. Roznoy.

**I. MINUTES** Meeting of: June 2, 2010

Mr. Webber recommended an amendment to the wording of Condition #7 on page 9 of the Minutes.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the Minutes as amended. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 5-0.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**C. Other**

**Expiration of Ms. Barberet’s Planning Board membership**

Mr. Shefftz read portions of a letter to Larry Shaffer, Town Manager, (copied to the Planning Board, the Select Board and Jonathan Tucker, Planning Director), dated July 2, 2010, received July 6, 2010, from Martha Spiegelman, Town Meeting member from Precinct 8, regarding the decision of the Town Manager not to reappoint Denise Barberet to a second term on the Planning Board. Ms. Spiegelman wrote in support of the reappointment of Ms. Barberet.

Ms. Barberet, former Planning Board member and resident of 67 North Whitney Street, then read a statement addressed to the public. She explained that she had not been reappointed, quoted from a phone message from the Town Manager regarding his intention not to reappoint her, and then presented reasons in support of her reappointment.

Mr. Shefftz referred to a controversy in 2007 in which a former Board member, Rod Francis, had written a letter to the Town Manager that criticized appointments and other aspects of the Board’s operations. Ms. Barberet referred listeners to the June 22, 2007, archives of the Amherst Bulletin for further information on this controversy.

Ms. Brestrup noted that there had been internal discussions about a Board member’s ability to continue to serve after his or her term had expired. She stated that it was staff’s understanding that Board members do not continue to serve after the expiration of a term. However, there are certain circumstances under which the Town Manager and the Select Board may choose to allow a person to continue to serve after the expiration of a term – if the Board member is involved in a case that continues past the expiration date and if the Board cannot achieve a quorum without the continued services of a Board member whose term has expired.

Mr. Shefftz commented that, as Chair, he has no role in the appointments of fellow Board members, and that he has no opinion on or insight into the matter.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Norwottuck Rail Trail Rehabilitation Project** – Environmental Notification Form (ENF), prepared by Stantec Consulting Services, Inc

Ms. Brestrup stated that the Planning Board had received a copy of the EENF (Expanded Environmental Notification Form) for work that the Department of Conservation and Recreation is planning to do along the Norwottuck Rail Trail. The deadline for comments is July 23, 2010.

Ms. Brestrup gave a summary of the work that is being planned, including the fact that the trail is proposed to be widened from 8 feet to 10 feet, the trail will be repaved, rest stops and overlooks will be added. The Planning Boards and Conservation Commissions of Northampton, Hadley, Amherst and Belchertown have all received copies of the EENF. Most of the controversial issues relate to the filling of wetlands. The Planning Board may wish to submit comments to MEPA (Massachusetts Environmental Protection Agency) on the plans. There will be one more Planning Board meeting (on July 21<sup>st</sup>) between now and the time that comments are due in MEPA's office on July 23<sup>rd</sup>. Planning Board members may wish to visit the Planning Department to review the plans in greater detail and discuss the plans at the July 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

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

**7:05 PM SPR2010-00012/M5717 – 321 Main Street, Patrick Kamins c/o Kamins Real Estate**

Request approval of a site plan for the entire parcel of shops and offices under the B-N zoning district. (Map 14B/Parcel 28, B-N Zoning District)

Since Mr. Roznoy was now present, Mr. Shefftz read the preamble and opened the public hearing for this application.

Bill Gillen of Ford Gillen Architects, Pat Kamins of Kamins Real Estate and Ewen Chen, son of the property owner, Gordon Chen were present to represent the applicant.

Mr. Gillen presented the application and described the proposed site plan. He stated that 15 parking spaces were proposed in the new site plan. One of the spaces in front of the building will be a handicapped space with an 8 foot wide access aisle. There will be a loading zone at the northwest corner of the building for trucks delivering goods to the building. An area of gravel paving will be added to the parking lot on the west side of the building to accommodate two dumpsters.

There will be a new low fence installed near the northeast corner of the building which will act as a barrier for cars that try to cut through the lot to Dickinson Street. The electrical transformer at the northeast corner is not on the Chen property. The parking spaces on the Dickinson Street side of the building are not fully on the Chen property. T

The proposed building coverage will be 13% (versus 35% allowed) and the proposed lot coverage will be 36% (versus 65% allowed).

Mr. Gillen stated that the building is required to have 15 parking spaces, based on the Zoning Bylaw and 15 spaces will be provided, all on the Chen land.

Mr. Gillen described the existing site plans, including a lower area of the site that is 6 feet lower than the lower floor level on the building. The lower area of the site (the southern portion) is undeveloped and vegetated.

Mr. Gillen described the existing floor plans of the building, including the following:

- A lower level, with two storefronts on Dickinson Street and three storage areas;
- A first floor area with three storefronts on Main Street – two shops and an office;
- An upper level (connected to the first floor office space) that is also used as an office.

Mr. Gillen presented the elevations of the building, with sign locations and lighting for the signs. He asserted that the signs were all in conformity with the sign regulations.

The exterior lighting will all be downcast gooseneck spot lighting. The existing lighting on the Wheatberry sign which is now mounted to shine horizontally will be replaced with gooseneck lighting.

A directory sign is also proposed for the site. It will be a two-sided, wood-frame structure with a copper roof. It will be visible from the east and west, when driving or walking along Main Street and will be located adjacent to the low fence, at the northeast corner of the property.

There are also proposed signs on the Dickinson Street side, mounted on the wall and hanging (blade sign) on the wall. On the west side of the building there is a proposed sign shown mounted on the wall.

Mr. Gillen noted that the handicapped/van-accessible parking space is the one labeled #15 on the plans. There is an 8 foot access aisle shown next to this space.

Mr. Shefftz summarized the Site Visit Report. There were three Board members in attendance, plus Mr. Shefftz' baby daughter. The site is located at a "difficult" intersection. The property has the opportunity to be a "pleasant, charming and old timey" place, although there are vacant spaces in the building and the pavement is in poor condition. There are currently buckets and a chain in the front parking lot to prevent cut-thrus to Dickinson Street.

There was discussion about where signs should be placed on the façade.

Ms. Brestrup asked about the square footage of the sign shown for the Amherst Grocery space. It appears from the drawing that the façade area is 440 square feet for that tenant space and that a sign on that wall could be 44 square feet, in accordance with the 10% maximum size limitation in the Zoning Bylaw. She noted that the Building Commissioner often refers to the Site Plan Review files when granting Building and Sign Permits and that it is important that the information in the files be accurate. Perhaps the drawing should be altered to reflect the maximum size of the sign that is allowed. Ms. Brestrup also noted that there is a perspective tenant who would like to reuse the Amherst Grocery sign and repaint it for her own purposes, and that this sign is larger than the sign depicted in the drawing. She acknowledged that the Board could require that the signs be smaller than the allowed 10%, as part of the conditions of Site Plan Review, if it felt that smaller signs were warranted.

Mr. Gillen stated that he and Mr. Kamins had met with the Building Commissioner and that she had suggested that signs be made to fit within the recesses of the building.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the Wheatberry sign is attractive and seems to work well. It fills the recessed area and extends about one brick row above and one brick row below the recessed area. It is nicely proportioned. The design of the Amherst Grocery sign is not in keeping with the site, he said. He did not have a problem with the size of the sign.

He asked why there is no repaving planned until the fall of 2012.

Mr. Kamins stated that there are two different sections of the site that need to be repaved. One is along Dickinson Street. There is no point in repaving this section until the town repaves Dickinson Street, since this area is so closely integrated with the street.

The other area includes the rest of the site. The owner of the property would like to fill the building with tenants and have some income from the building. He plans to repave the site once the building is filled with tenants and is generating income. He noted that the recent rezoning will help him to rent the spaces.

Mr. Roznoy stated that he would prefer that there be additional landscaping installed on the site and that this be tied to the repaving. He noted that the paving currently goes right up to the building wall.

Mr. Carson stated that he would like to see landscaping associated with the fenced-in area.

Mr. Kamins stated that if tenants wish to use the fenced-in area for outdoor dining they will need to obtain the appropriate permits from the town themselves. One tenant has an informal area of outdoor dining in front of the building which has never been officially sanctioned by the town.

Mr. Roznoy noted that the paving on the property is not in good shape and that the property is not as attractive as it could be.

Ms. Brestrup stated that it is within the purview of the Board to require that the applicant submit a landscape plan. She noted that the applicant had submitted information about existing planting on the site plan and that the Board could determine that the existing planting shown on the plan was adequate as a landscaping plan. She stated that individual tenants may choose to put in planter boxes along the front of the building, as they have done in the past. Ms. Brestrup suggested that the Board consider connecting a timeframe to the issue of planting, if they are concerned that the building owner was not ready to do landscaping at this time. The Board could require that landscaping be installed within the next two growing seasons, or within the next two years, as an example, in deference the fact that the building is not fully occupied and there is not an adequate cash flow to pay for landscaping at this time.

Mr. Roznoy noted that there is a dual approach, one relying on individual tenants to put in landscaping and one relying on the property owner to do so. Mr. Roznoy would like a total building approach with respect to the landscaping, so that landscaping is not dependent on a particular tenant coming or going. He suggested tying the timetable for the landscaping in with the timetable for the repaving.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to close the public hearing. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-0.

Mr. Schefftz reviewed the Development Application Report. He asked about the material and color of the fence, noting that it would be a prominent structure on the site.

Mr. Schefftz stated that it would be appropriate to waive the requirements of Section 7.101 of the Zoning Bylaw. The parking spaces will be 8 feet from the building wall because of the installation of the proposed wheel-stops, and therefore a waiver will not be needed in that instance. However, where the driveway is less than 5 feet from the building, at the northwest corner, the pavement width is necessary for delivery trucks to load and unload their goods. Therefore the waiver is required to allow the driveway to come within 5 feet of the building wall and is appropriate in this instance.

Mr. Webber stated that he was pleased to see the site improving. He encouraged the applicant to continue making improvements when it was economically feasible to do so.

Mr. Carson preferred to see the landscaping of the fence-in area done within the next two years.

Mr. Shefftz stated that it would be appropriate to waive the requirement of Section 7.104 of the Zoning Bylaw, regarding the width of the curb cut at the property line for reasons having to do with vehicular movement within and exiting the site.

Mr. Webber asked about lights over the doors, in particular the lights over the second floor doorway at the top of the stairs. Mr. Kamins explained the floodlights are appropriate in this location as a safety feature. They light up the stairway and the building entrances along the Dickinson Street side of the property.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the waiver of the Erosion Control Plan is appropriate because there will be no substantial earthwork on the property. In addition, the waiver of the Traffic Impact Statement is appropriate because the site plan is not expected to add substantially to the amount of traffic entering and leaving the site.

With regard to signs, there should be a condition that limits the area of signs to 10% of the area of the building wall controlled by each tenant and limits the upper and lower edges of the signs to one brick row above and one brick row below the recessed area of the sign band.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the Amherst Grocery sign currently spans the recessed areas of the sign band and that it may continue to do so.

Mr. Kamins presented the proposed signs on the east side of the building and the sign proposed for the wall on the west side of the building.

Ms. Anderson expressed concern that the signs proposed for the west side may be obscured by the trees in that area.

The Board discussed whether the members would ask the Historical Commission for its recommendations on the proposed site improvements. They determined that such a request was not necessary at this time. However the Board determined that, given the significance of the site's location, across the street from the Dickinson Museum, it would be appropriate to require that designs for signs for the building be submitted to the Board for review and approval.

Mr. Shefftz acknowledged receipt of the Fire Department's review memorandum. He noted that no comments had been received from the Town Engineer or the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Roznoy stated that the plans that have been submitted are not adequate to satisfy the requirements of a Landscape Plan. There is an area of 8 feet between the building wall and the proposed wheel-stops. Part of this area could be used for planting.

Mr. Kamins noted that the plan will need to leave space for people to walk along the front of the building and for the fronts of cars to overhang the wheel-stops.

Mr. Schreiber stated that "landscaping" includes more than "green". It includes paving. It can include structures such as trellises. He suggested consolidating some of the parking spaces and asked if some of the spaces at the front of the building could be moved to the west side, freeing up some space at the front of the property for landscaping.

Mr. Gillen stated that the area to the west of the building is not large enough to accommodate more parking spaces. He noted that the landscaped area at the northwest

corner of the lot is sloped and should not be sacrificed to provide more parking spaces in this area. He suggested that thin planters could be installed along the building wall.

Mr. Webber and Ms. Anderson agreed with the idea of planters. Ms. Anderson noted that there needs to be room for snow storage in the winter. She noted that planters can be moved.

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; Sections 7.101 and 7.104 of the Bylaw will be waived to allow pavement to remain within 5 feet of the building and to allow a driveway width at the property line wider than 25 feet;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected because detrimental or offensive actions will be minimized; exterior lighting will be downcast, including the existing floodlights on the east façade;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics; nothing on the site is changing substantially other than installation of downcast lighting, signs, a fence and eventual repaving and landscaping;
- 11.2403 – N/A
- 11.2410 – The project protects unique or important historic and scenic features because changes to the site will be minimal; the details of the fence, directory sign and other signs will be submitted to the Board for review and approval, to assure that they are in keeping with the historic nature of the district;
- 11.2411 – The proposed methods of refuse disposal are adequate because there will be a new gravel area created for the dumpsters in the rear parking lot and the Management Plan states that the landlord is responsible for trash removal;
- 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 in the past, for other permit applications for this site, by the Town Engineer; the site is connected to the town sewer and water systems;
- 11.2413 – N/A – There will be no increased runoff as a result of this project;
- 11.2414 – Adequate landscaping will be provided because submission of a landscaping plan will be required as a condition of this permit; another condition will require that landscaping be installed according to the plan and continually maintained;
- 11.2415 – N/A – The requirement for an Erosion Control Plan will be waived because no substantial filling or excavation is being proposed;
- 11.2416 – N/A
- 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 condition requiring downcast lighting;
- 11.2418 – N/A
- 11.2419 – N/A
- 11.2420 – The property is located in the B-N zoning district; the building is a non-contributing in the Dickinson National Historic Register District; the conditions of the permit will require that details for the proposed fence, directory sign, other signs and landscaping be submitted for review and approval by the Board; the Board may choose to use the design principles and standards set forth in Sections 3.2040 and 3.2041 to evaluate these submittals;
- 11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits with surrounding buildings and development; these issues were discussed during the public hearing and deliberations following the hearing;
- 11.2422 – N/A – Although there is a steep slope on the property, to the south of the parking lot, the slope will not be affected by the installation of the proposed site improvements;
- 11.2423 – N/A

- 11.2424 – Screening has been provided for dumpsters because the location of the dumpsters will be pushed back on the site, away from the road, and the new location will be partially surrounded with existing vegetation;
- 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; the problem with cars cutting through the site to avoid the traffic light will be addressed with the installation of a low fence that will act as a barrier;
- 11.2431 – The location and number of curb cuts is such as to minimize turning movements and hazardous exits and entrances because there will be no change in the location and number of curb cuts;
- 11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, bicycle racks, drive aisles, loading areas and sidewalks will be provided in a safe and convenient manner; parking spaces and loading areas will be clearly delineated with pavement markings and a bike rack will be provided within the new fenced-in area;

Mr. Shefftz noted that the bike rack at Town Hall is a good example of the type of rack that works well for bicyclists. It is a simple, modern design that allows bike owners to lock both their frames and their front wheels.

- 11.2433 – N/A
- 11.2434 – N/A
- 11.2435 – N/A
- 11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Report will be waived;
- 11.2437 – N/A

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to approve the Site Plan Review application with the conditions discussed. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-0.

#### Waivers

1. Traffic Impact Statement
2. Erosion Control Plan
3. Section 7.101 of the Zoning Bylaw
4. Section 7.104 of the Zoning Bylaw

#### Conditions

1. Details of the proposed fence, including materials and colors, shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval.
2. Signs for the tenant spaces shall be no more than 10% of the area of the façade controlled by each tenant, in accordance with Section 8.20 of the Zoning Bylaw. In addition, signs for the front of the building shall not extend more than one brick course above or more than one brick course below the recessed area over the doorways. Signs may extend horizontally and span multiple recessed areas as long as they do not exceed 10% of the area of the façade controlled by each tenant.
3. All exterior lighting shall be downcast, including the existing security floodlights over the door to the second floor office space. Exterior lighting shall not shine onto adjacent properties or roadways.
4. Detailed drawings for the proposed directory sign shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval, including dimensions, materials and colors.
5. Detailed drawings for the proposed fence and fenced-in area shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval, including dimensions, materials and colors.
6. Designs for new signs and substantial changes to existing signs shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval, including location of sign(s), dimensions, materials and colors.

7. A Landscape Plan for the developed portion of the site and building area, showing existing and proposed plantings, including the proposed fenced-in area, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Board.
8. Landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the approved plan by the fall of 2012, in coordination with repaving of the site. Once installed, the landscaping shall be 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.

#### **XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR**

Mr. Shefftz reported on two stories in a recent issue of the New Hampshire Union Leader, in its preview issue that focused on the Mount Washington Road Running Race.

One story had to do with the race. Mr. Shefftz participated in the race, as he has in the last five years, running to the top of the mountain and then proceeding to ski and hike down the mountain and bike back to the starting point of the race. He noted that the newspaper had used a photograph of him from two years ago, on the front page.

The other story had to do with high school students in the town of Amherst, N.H., who are currently in jail, awaiting trial for murder. During a heated meeting and discussion about whether the students were being treated too leniently, Mr. Greg Early was quoted as saying “This is Amherst, N.H. We’re not Amherst, MA. We don’t harbor terrorists or harbor murderers. We run a different set of rules here.” Mr. Schreiber was reminded that terrorists had indeed been arrested in Amherst, N.Y., to which Mr. Shefftz responded that there was a “sleeper cell” in that town.

#### **III. PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNING BOARD RULES & REGULATIONS**

##### **7:30 PM      PBR-1-10      Planning Board Rules & Regulations (Planning Board)**

Article II. Applications – Amendment to add “Architect” to the list of registered professionals who may prepare Site Plan Review Submittals, to clarify requirements for building plans and to require that plans for structures be prepared by a Registered Architect as required by M.G.L. Chapter 112, Section 60A, unless exempted by Massachusetts Building Code

Mr. Shefftz read the preamble and opened the public hearing for this proposed amendment to the Rules and Regulations. Mr. Schreiber explained the genesis of the proposed rule change. He observed that people present themselves as architects before the Board or are doing the work of architects in Massachusetts and are not be duly licensed. The proposed rule change will support staff and Board members in their initial screening to inquire as to whether those who design buildings and present themselves as architects are registered as architects in Massachusetts.

Mr. Webber offered some amendments to the wording of the proposed rule change. He referred to M.G.L. Chapter 112, Section 60L as being helpful in clarifying when the services of a registered architect are required. He suggested that the wording of the rule change should refer only to M.G.G. Chapter 112 and not to any particular section.

Mr. Schreiber noted that in the case of the Hampshire Mosque, flaws in their initial presentation could have been avoided if they had worked with a professional who could have helped their case.

Ms. Anderson asked if it is common that people who come before the Board are not professionals. She stated that, while she does not object to the proposed rule change, she is concerned about the effect on the small business person, in terms of the expense involved.



Ms. Brestrup certain things are exempt from the services of an architect and noted that the phrase “unless exempted by the Massachusetts Building Code” in the last sentence of the rule change would allow certain small structures to be designed without the services of a registered architect.

Mr. Schreiber acknowledged that there may be some additional “up-front” costs, but that the Board wants credibility that what is presented to them has been prepared by or reviewed by a professional.

There was discussion about when the services of an architect are needed.

Mr. Webber recommended that the words “Plans for structures” be replaced by the words “Building plans”, because the word “structures” is too all-inclusive.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to close the public hearing. Mr. Webber seconded and the vote was 6-0.

Ms. Anderson MOVED to accept the proposed changes to the Planning Board Rules and Regulations as amended, for Site Plan Review Submittals. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-0.

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

##### **B. Review of sign**

SPR97-0002 and SPR2005-00001 – 175 University Drive, CRES Development Company, Inc.  
– in accordance with conditions of Site Plan Review, review of sign(s) for new Goodwill Store

Mr. Webber recused himself and left the room. Mr. Shefftz noted that he was not too concerned about signs in this shopping plaza and that this sign was fine and straightforward.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the sign as proposed. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 5-0.

#### **IX. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Zoning** – Mr. Carson and Mr. Roznoy reported that the Zoning Subcommittee had held a Zoning Forum on June 16<sup>th</sup>. The next meeting of the ZSC will be July 14<sup>th</sup>, at which time the Committee members will be discussing the proposed Development Modification amendment.

#### **X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE REPORTS**

A. **Pioneer Valley Planning Commission** – Mr. Schreiber reported that he and Mr. Shefftz had attended a recent event held by PVPC. Ms. O’Keeffe and Mr. Wald from the Select Board also attended. The focus of the event was on farming. In addition, PVPC presented information about their new community design program and talked about the types of technical assistance that they can provide to communities.

B. **Community Preservation Act Committee** – Mr. Shefftz noted that Denise Barberet had been the Planning Board’s representative on CPAC. Ms. Anderson agreed to consider becoming the Planning Board’s representative on CPAC if the meetings fit in with her schedule. She will contact Ms. Brestrup with her decision.

C. **Agricultural Commission** – Mr. Roznoy announced that he had resigned from the Agricultural Commission. He summarized his letter of resignation. The Board plans to ask Mr. Crouner if he would like to serve as the Planning Board’s representative on the Agricultural Commission.

- D. **Save Our Stop Committee** – Mr. Schreiber reported that the SOS Committee had not met since February, but that great work was being done with regard to saving the train stop in Amherst. Mr. Tucker and Mr. Shaffer had been working on this issue diligently.
- E. **Puffer’s Pond 2020 Committee** – Mr. Webber reported that the Puffer’s Pond 2020 Committee had completed its work and submitted its final report to the Conservation Commission. The whole report is available on the town website. The Committee had been a “pilot committee” with a limited duration. It was very successful and is expected to become a model for future projects.

**IV. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Signing of decision**

SPR2010-00011/M5254 – 1150 West Street, Atkins Farm Market – The Planning Board signed the decision.

**C. Other** – none

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Subcommittees and subcommittee membership** (See Subcommittee Reports)

**B. Other** - none

**VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS** – Ms. Brestrup reported that an ANR may soon be filed for a property on Adams Street. Previously the Town Counsel, Joel Bard, had recommended that the Board not sign an ANR plan for property on Adams Street, due to the uncertain status of the roadway. The applicant has since submitted more information and Mr. Bard has issued a letter giving the Planning Board advice regarding the determinations that they will need to make in order to approve an ANR for the Adams Street property. No new application has been received for this property to date.

**VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS** – Ms. Brestrup reported that there are several Special Permit applications coming before the Zoning Board of appeals, including applications for approval of two flag lots Special Permit applications and an application to expand the offices of Dr. DeMaio, an orthodontist with offices at 23 Pray Street.

**VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS** – Ms. Brestrup reported that there is an application for Site Plan Review for a restaurant at 381-383 Main Street, the space formerly occupied by wunderarts gallery.

**XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Shefftz reported that the Glasgow Lands Scottish Festival would be held at Look Park on Saturday, July 17<sup>th</sup>. He extolled the virtues of the bagpipes that one would hear if one attended the festival.

Mr. Shefftz also noted that there would be a KŌ Festival on July 18<sup>th</sup> at Amherst College on the lawn at the Observatory, at 8:00 p.m.

**XII. REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR** – none

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

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

Approved:

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

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