

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 1, 2011 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Jonathan Shefftz, Chair, Jonathan O’Keeffe, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Richard Roznoy, Sandra Anderson, David Webber, Stephen Schreiber and Connie Kruger

**ABSENT:** None

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

---

Mr. Shefftz opened the meeting at 7:05 PM. He announced that the meeting was being recorded by Planning Department staff and was being recorded and broadcast by Amherst Media.

**I. MINUTES**

Mr. Schreiber MOVED that the Minutes of April 13, 2011 be approved. Mr. O’Keeffe seconded.

Mr. Schreiber noted that he had been present at the meeting. Mr. O’Keeffe noted that the meeting had been held in the First Floor Meeting Room. Mr. Shefftz noted one minor amendment on page 2.

The vote was 5-0-4 (Roznoy, Shefftz, Anderson and Kruger abstaining), to approve the Minutes as amended.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED that the Minutes of April 27, 2011 be approved. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 6-0-3 (Schreiber, Anderson and Kruger abstaining).

Mr. Schreiber MOVED that the Minutes of May 4, 2011 be approved. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 6-0-3 (Webber, Anderson and Kruger abstaining).

**IX. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Shefftz welcomed the new Planning Board member, Connie Kruger, and asked her to introduce herself. Ms. Kruger stated that she had experience as a professional planner, that she had previously worked in the Amherst Planning Department and that she looks forward to her new role as a member of the Amherst Planning Board.

**II. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Review of Landscape Plan and Sign**

SPR2010-00007/M3954, 178 North Pleasant Street, Barry Roberts and Paul Hathaway

Review of revised Landscape Plan in accordance with Condition #3 for Class I restaurant and review of sign for Chez Albert (existing sign to be relocated from 27 South Pleasant Street)

Paul Hathaway of Chez Albert and Barry Roberts, owner of the property, presented the proposal for the sign and revised landscape plan.

Ms. Brestrup explained that there was a previous Site Plan Review approval for Clearwater Restaurant at this location on North Pleasant Street [SPR2010-00007]. The Building Commissioner was being asked to waive the requirement for Site Plan Review for Chez Albert since no exterior changes were being proposed other than a new sign. The use would be essentially the same as that proposed by Clearwater Restaurant. Mr. Hathaway may wish to install some different exterior lights at some point, but he is not ready to present those to the Planning Board yet.

Mr. Shefftz asked, "What if the Clearwater Restaurant had opened and had been operating for some time? Would a new Site Plan Review be necessary then?" Ms. Brestrup stated that it would depend on whether the new restaurant was changing anything on the site and whether the original restaurant had been out of operation for more than two years. Ms. Brestrup explained that the Building Commissioner is authorized to waive the requirement for Site Plan Review for uses in town that do not involve any kind external changes other than signs and lighting.

Mr. Hathaway is proposing to relocate the sign for Chez Albert from its current location at 27 South Pleasant Street to the new location at 178 North Pleasant Street. The Planning Board reviewed a drawing showing the proposed location of the sign, which consists of individual wood carved letters.

The property owner, Mr. Roberts, is fulfilling a condition of the previous Site Plan Review by submitting a revised Landscape Plan in accordance with Condition #3 of that SPR approval. The Planning Board reviewed the drawing showing the revised landscaping.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the Design Review Board had already reviewed both the sign and the revised Landscape Plan at its meeting on May 24<sup>th</sup> and had recommended approval of both.

Mr. O'Keeffe asked about the free-standing sign near the sidewalk that Clearwater Restaurant had originally proposed. Mr. Hathaway and Mr. Roberts stated that they planned to remove the free-standing sign.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the sign and revised Landscape Plan. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 9-0.

**B. Signing of Decisions**

SPR2011-00007 – Mango Mango – 61 Main Street. The Planning Board signed the decision.

SPR2011-00008 – Amherst Gourmet Inc. d/b/a Ginger Garden – 351 Northampton Road. The Planning Board signed the decision.

**C. Other Old Business** – Mr. Webber noted that he had been distracted during the first part of the meeting and the vote on the Minutes of May 4<sup>th</sup>. He had seen the tornado that hit Springfield that afternoon. He saw it from his office window. It was about 300 yards south of the building. He reported that it had caused a lot of damage.

The Board re-took its vote on the Minutes of May 4<sup>th</sup>, with Mr. Webber abstaining. The record reflects the corrected vote.

**III. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Town Meeting**

1. Signing of Attorney General's forms – The Planning Board signed the Attorney General's forms for the 2010 Annual Town Meeting Warrant Articles that had passed – Articles 30, 31, 32 and 33.
2. Discussion about Annual Spring Town Meeting

Mr. Shefftz expressed thanks to the Zoning Subcommittee for its careful and well-crafted zoning amendments. He expressed his opinion on the chicken article(s), noting that Mr. Roznoy had dissented from the majority opinion and noted his disappointment in the votes on the previous Monday regarding

parking and duplexes. There was general agreement on the goals of not allowing people to park on lawns and of making sure that duplexes really fit the definition of duplexes rather than two big houses attached to one another, and making a distinction about owner-occupied duplexes. Much of the discussion about the parking and duplex zoning amendments was not related to the zoning amendments themselves. The discussion was confusing, he said. Mr. Shefftz encouraged people to come to the Zoning Subcommittee and Planning Board meetings to learn about proposed zoning changes.

Mr. O’Keeffe reported that the Zoning Subcommittee was not able to hold its meeting on June 1<sup>st</sup> due to a problem with posting the meeting. There would be a ZSC meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup> to go over what happened at the Annual Town Meeting and to prepare for Fall Town Meeting and a Zoning Forum on June 15<sup>th</sup>. He invited the public to come to the Zoning Forum to talk about what their zoning priorities are.

Mr. O’Keeffe noted that he shared Mr. Shefftz’ disappointment in Town Meeting’s failure to pass the two more substantive items on the Warrant [the parking and duplex zoning amendments]. These articles had majority support but failed to get the 2/3 needed to pass zoning amendments. Three technical amendments did pass. Town Meeting is often distracted and subject to attempts to create confusion. The Planning Board could have done a better job in crafting and explaining the articles. There is a need to be really clear and simple in what the Planning Board brings to Town Meeting.

Mr. O’Keeffe noted that the “chicken article” did pass by a fairly substantial margin. There was an attempt to remove rabbits from the amendment which was resoundingly defeated. Mr. O’Keeffe felt that the Planning Board worked well with the petitioner to bring forth something that reflected what people in town wanted. Mr. Roznoy had good arguments [in his minority report]. The Planning Board tried to address everyone’s concerns.

Mr. Roznoy had some comments to make about Town Meeting and will talk about them at the next Zoning Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Schreiber observed that this was the first time he was both a Town Meeting member and a Planning Board member. He was frustrated that the duplex article failed. If three more people had voted in favor of it, it would have passed. Attendance at Town Meeting was very low and if attendance had been higher it would have made a difference.

More time should be spent explaining the zoning articles. All Planning Board members should attend Town Meeting sessions where zoning amendments are being discussed so that people can see who is on the Planning Board and to show support for the zoning articles.

Mr. Schreiber noted that Phil Jackson did a very good job of explaining the Finance Committee articles. The use of graphics was particularly effective and should be considered for use in explaining zoning articles.

Finally, Mr. Schreiber noted that having two classes of duplexes was jarring for people. We need a provision for all duplexes. There should be an assumption that all duplexes are owner-occupied and there should be a standing condition that the permit-granting board should require a resident manager if a property is not owner-occupied.

He expressed appreciation for those who spoke and those who developed the articles.

**B.** Letter from Massachusetts Historical Commission regarding nomination of The Lord Jeffery Inn to the National Register of Historic Places

Mr. Shefftz acknowledged receipt of the letter and asked if designation to the National Register was a double-edged sword that might require one to do certain things. Ms. Brestrup explained that such designation is only a potential “double-edged sword” if one were applying for state or federal funds to do work on the property. In that case, certain requirements would come into play. Otherwise there were no requirements and designation doesn’t put any restrictions on the property owner.

**C.** Planning Commissioners’ Journal – Mr. Shefftz acknowledged receipt of the Planning Commissioners’ Journal.

**D.** Summer Schedule

The Board members discussed the summer schedule. They decided to meet as follows:

- June 15<sup>th</sup> – Planning Board meeting (Zoning Forum scheduled for ZSC)
- June 29<sup>th</sup> (leave open for possible joint meeting with ARA) – Mr. Shefftz will not be available.
- July 6<sup>th</sup>
- July 20<sup>th</sup> (may drop this unless necessary)
- August 3<sup>rd</sup> – Public hearing to be held jointly with Community Development Committee (CDC) to obtain public input on the Draft Community Development Strategy
- August 17<sup>th</sup> – no meeting; Mr. Roznoy and Ms. Anderson will be unavailable.
- August 31<sup>st</sup> (leave open, to be scheduled if necessary) – Mr. O’Keeffe prefers not to schedule meetings for the fifth Wednesday of the month.

Mr. Webber reported on the status of the ARA’s work regarding the Gateway Project. The ARA would like to schedule a joint meeting with the Planning Board for June 29<sup>th</sup>. The time will be announced. Jonathan Tucker will coordinate this meeting. The consultants are expected to present their report on the Visioning process at that meeting.

**E.** Other new information

Mr. Carson invited everyone to a potluck picnic, with partners and families, at his home on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, a Wednesday. Several members of the Board are not available on that evening. Mr. Carson will email Planning Board members about another date.

Mr. Roznoy announced that Town Meeting had approved \$50,000 to hire a consultant to prepare a Transportation Plan for the town.

**IV. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS**

**ANR 2011-00005 – Valerie Hetzel – 16 Adams Street (Map 15D, Parcel 22)**

Determination as to the status of a private way known as Adams Street

Mr. Shefftz gave a brief history of this case. He referred to a memorandum from the Planning Board dated March 25, 1997, to the Zoning Board of Appeals, conveying a Planning

Board opinion from 1995. The status of Adams Street was discussed in 1995 with reference to a plan to subdivide the property. At that time, the Fire Chief had not seen a problem with Adams Street being used for access to one more dwelling unit. The Planning Board did not make a formal determination about the status of Adams Street, but had informally concluded that Adams Street would be sufficient to support the addition of one more dwelling unit. In 1997, the Planning Board recommended that the Fire Chief and Town Engineer be consulted to see if there were any changes in their opinions about the road, since 1995.

Mr. Shefftz noted that it has been 16 years since the 1997 memo was written.

Ms. Brestrup stated that in 1997 the Zoning Board had been considering the conversion of a garage into a dwelling unit and had not been considering the construction of another house on a new lot.

In 2010 Ms. Hetzel came before the Planning Board seeking to divide her property. Town Counsel advised the Planning Board that it could decline to endorse the ANR plan on the grounds that the Board did not have enough information to determine whether Adams Street was a street for the purposes of providing access to a new lot. The Planning Board declined to endorse the plan on advice of Town Counsel.

Ms. Hetzel then submitted additional information to show that Adams Street was a way in existence at the time of the adoption of the Subdivision Control Law in Amherst.

[Town Counsel, Joel Bard, wrote a letter dated June 10, 2010, in which he stated his opinion “that Adams Street may be a ‘street’ for purposes of creating a new lot if the Planning Board makes a two-part determination: (1) that Adams Street was a ‘way in existence when the Subdivision Control Law became effective in the Town of Amherst’; and (2) if, the Planning Board finds that Adams Street has ‘sufficient width, suitable grades and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land.’”]

Ms. Brestrup stated that staff and Town Counsel believe that Ms. Hetzel has provided the documentation necessary to show that Adams Street was a way in existence at the time that the Subdivision Control Law became effective.

Mr. Shefftz noted that the Board had not been given specific criteria by which to make the second determination. However, the Board had received a memorandum from Assistant Fire Chief McKay regarding Adams Street and all of the Board members had visited the site, some at the scheduled site visit and some on their own.

Mr. Shefftz read a memo from Assistant Fire Chief Don McKay, dated June 1, 2011, which stated that the Fire Department was not able to support the ANR application because trees have grown over the drive restricting Fire Department access to properties on Adams Street, because there is no clarity about the width and travel path of the original drive, because there was no viable plan for improving the roadway and because heavy accumulations of snow would exacerbate the emergency access problems. Vegetation encroaching on the drive will prevent the drive from acting as a fire break between properties. Asst. Chief McKay recommended immediate mediation of these issues.

Board members asked questions about other driveways that split off from Adams Street.

Mr. Roznoy noted that there was little case law regarding width, grades and construction, according to Town Counsel. The Planning Board’s determination should be based on the status of the road now. The road is not considered a statutory private road, according to the letter from Town Counsel.

There was extensive discussion of the issues related to the status of Adams Street.

There were questions about the ownership of the road. Ms. Brestrup stated that Jerry Gates is the current owner of the road. Mr. Gates partner, Richard Johnson, used to be a co-owner and his estate may still hold an interest in the road.

Ms. Brestrup clarified the extent of the roadway property and of Ms. Hetzel's property and noted that Adams Street was part of a "paper" subdivision called the Gaylord subdivision that was created in the early part of the 1900's.

Mr. Webber noted that the GIS map submitted to the Planning Board did not quite reflect conditions on the ground. There is additional driveway area that is not shown on the GIS plan – a second driveway leading into 16 Adams Street [Map 15D, Parcel 22; Ms. Hetzel's property]. Mr. Shefftz stated that the drive becomes wider at this point and that there is space to turn around. Mr. Webber noted that there is a footpath that continues to the west beyond the drivable portion of the road [within the 30 strip that is known as Adams Street].

There was discussion about "rights of way" and "easements" that may currently exist along Adams Street. Owners of houses along Adams Street have easements to drive and access their homes. The Town of Amherst has easements for utilities and for pedestrian access that extend all the way through to Bayberry Lane. The Town of Amherst plows Adams Street, as it has historically plowed certain other private ways throughout town.

Mr. Roznoy asked questions about private rights and whether this could be a public way.

Ms. Brestrup clarified that the Board is not being asked to determine if this is a public way but merely if it has sufficient width, grades and construction to provide access to another lot.

There was discussion about the nature of private ways. Some are owned to the center of the street by abutting land owners. Some are owned by others with no interest in abutting properties, which is the case with Adams Street.

Mr. Schreiber stated that this is really a "skinny piece of land" that is not a roadway that is owned by someone who does not have interest in abutting properties. Mr. Webber noted that the street on which he lives (Ball Lane) is a private road, but is maintained by the town.

Mr. O'Keeffe directed the Board's attention to the issue of the road's condition with regard to access to the properties. The facts on the ground are what must be considered. A new lot needs to have frontage on an existing way. He asked "Does Adams Street provide access to a possible new lot?" The piece of road on the western portion of Adams Street is the piece that must be looked at. It doesn't look like a road, he said. However, he reported that he had researched the issue and had found that courts are willing to accept unimproved roads in a similar condition to that of Adams Street as roads. The question is, "Does it provide frontage?" He encouraged the Board to look at the western portion of the road to answer that question.

Mr. Shefftz asked the Board members to consider what issues or concerns they would have if the applicant wanted to improve the roadway. He noted that the Assistant Fire Chief said that the road doesn't meet the needs of the current use of the land nor of the proposed use.

Mr. Shefftz stated that the property needs to have actual frontage. Ms. Brestrup explained the difference between a "right-of-way" [property associated with a street] and a pavement edge or a road, with regard to the issue of frontage. Mr. Smith's survey says that the piece of property that is owned is about 30 feet wide. Within that is a path or road that someone could drive on.

Ms. Brestrup described her telephone conversation with Town Counsel, Joel Bard, regarding this application. The determination as to the status of Adams Street is an exercise of the Planning Board's discretion, Mr. Bard said. The decision doesn't necessarily need to be based on what the Town Engineer or the Fire Chief says. However, there are grounds to rely on the memorandum from the Fire Department as reason to decline to endorse the plan. There was a court case in Leverett in which a denial of an ANR endorsement was based on a letter from the Fire Department. In the Leverett case the issue was accessibility. There is no basis for imposing conditions on an ANR endorsement, unlike a Site Plan Review.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the Board could make suggestions about how the road could be improved, and that the applicant could come back after the improvements were made. However, the Board can't endorse the plan based on improvements that will be done in the future.

Mr. Shefftz acknowledged receipt of emails from neighbors in opposition to the ANR application.

Jonathan Kane, owner of parcel 15D-110 [18 Bayberry Lane], the flag lot adjacent to Adams Street, commented on the application. The abutters had never received notice of this application. He was concerned about the trees along Adams Street being cut down. He noted that other neighbors had submitted letters in opposition to the application and that a determination on the status of the roadway affects the neighbors.

Ms. Brestrup stated that there are no state/local requirements for notification of abutters in the case of an ANR application. The Board's decision won't change the status of Adams Street with regard to whether it is a public road or not. The meeting of the Planning Board was duly noticed on the electronic bulletin board in Town Hall. The legal status of the road will not be changed with respect to the neighbor's interest in the road. Requirements for notification of abutters are very clear for other types of Planning Board applications, but not for ANRs. There are no criteria for notification in the case of an ANR.

Mr. Roznoy noted that there are currently attempts to modify Chapter 40A and that these modifications might include a notice requirement for this type of application.

Mr. Kane suggested that the Planning Board could give Ms. Hetzel advice on improving the road. However, if road widening is necessary the trees may be lost. He suggested that a survey be done to resolve apparent discrepancies in property boundaries and the width of the road. He noted that once trees are taken down they can't be put back. The road needs to be widened to make it accessible and this should be done in a way that protects the interests of neighbors with regard to trees. He noted that Ms. Hetzel may take ownership of the road and would then have the right to take down trees.

Mr. Shefftz stated that emails had been received from neighbors, Kathryn Mahoney and Carmela Gravante. For the most part these emails addressed other neighborhood issues, which were not relevant to the status of Adams Street. He suggested that neighbors should to one another about these problems, or contact the town department that has jurisdiction over the issue.

Ms. Hetzel stated that this situation is complicated because of the road. It doesn't belong to her, although she tries to keep it clear. The trees have grown and she can't take them down because she doesn't own the property. When she applied to convert her garage into a dwelling unit, in 1997, she was told by town staff that she had enough lot area to create additional lots. Ms. Hetzel never converted the garage; however she did put a two-story addition on her house. She also installed an 8" sewer line to replace her septic system, and added a stub for a new lot. Ms. Hetzel granted an easement to the neighbor behind her to tie

into the sewer line. She has used a backhoe to smooth out the road. The road was narrower this winter due to snow. Jerry Gates has told her that he is willing to give her the road so that she can manage it. A large tree was removed two years ago. The property is her “nest egg”. She bought it thinking that she had two or three lots. She isn’t interested in selling at this time, but would like to know that she has a secure investment.

Mr. Crouner listed the criteria for deciding if the road was adequate – sufficient width, suitable grades and adequate construction.

Ms. Hetzel asked if she should make any improvements to the road. She has permission from the owner to upgrade it; however the Town Engineer told her that it looked sufficient.

Mr. Crouner said that there is sufficient width to the road, in that the property itself is wide enough [30 feet], although it is overgrown. Mr. Shefftz noted that the gravel section of the road is not 30 feet wide.

Mr. Crouner said that the road was not too steep and had suitable grades. He questioned whether it was adequately constructed and suggested that the brush could be cleared away. The Board could require that the trees be removed to allow adequate width. The Town Engineer thought that the road was wide enough. The road can be easily improved and the site is adequate for another lot. The Board and the property owner had received conflicting advice regarding the condition of the road.

Mr. Shefftz referred to an email, dated May 25, 2011, from Ms. Brestrup to the Town Engineer, outlining what the Town Engineer had observed on his site visit, that the road was 10 feet at its narrowest and 18 feet at its widest.

Mr. Crouner noted that Adams Street is a dirt road, a former truck path. Grass and brush have been allowed to grow up.

Ms. Hetzel noted that the second part of the road is now wider than it was. However it is not a through way, because two trees have been planted at the end, preventing people from driving through.

The Board discussed the condition of the road from the first driveway to the end of the road where the trees had been planted. They noted that there is a transition to a footpath about 20 feet past [west of] Ms. Mahoney’s house.

Mr. Roznoy suggested that Ms. Hetzel come back with a subdivision plan. Ms. Brestrup noted that a subdivision road would need to meet fairly stringent town standards.

Mr. Shefftz suggested that Ms. Hetzel make improvements to the road and then come back to the Planning Board.

Ms. Kruger stated that on the site visit she had observed the condition of the road. In her opinion, every condition was satisfied except for adequate construction. She suggested that the Board could look at the common driveway standards and noted that the road was owned by an “absentee landlord”. She also noted that the Assistant Fire Chief had stated that a future owner could be required to make improvements. His later memo had a different tenor from what was discussed on the site.

Ms. Brestrup stated that it was her understanding that there was no mechanism during the Building Permit application process that would require the owner of the new lot to upgrade the road. If the Board thinks that the road needs to be upgraded the Board should tell the applicant what needs to be done now. The applicant could then come back to the Board with a new application and a road that meets the requirements of the Planning Board for access.



The eastern portion is fine, Mr. Shefftz said. The western portion needs improvement.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the Fire Department seeks an ideal situation, i. e. a stable surface that is 18 foot wide clear driveway so it can use the ladder truck with its stabilizers. There are common driveways that don't meet this ideal. The decision [as to whether the road is adequate] is ultimately up to the Planning Board, she said.

Mr. Webber commented that the houses are secluded and the neighborhood is exceptionally wooded. It has a nice atmosphere with the presence of large trees. He doesn't want to take an action that would require that the trees be taken down and he is hesitant to push the applicant to widen the road to town specifications. It would adversely impact the neighborhood and the neighbors. "On Cape Cod, this would be considered a wide road", he said. It adequately serves the needs of the houses that are there now. One could easily drive a car to the end of the footpath. He is inclined to endorse the ANR.

Mr. O'Keeffe agreed. "Construction" should be related to the road surface. The road has a drivable surface, although it is not paved. He quoted from the Kopelman and Paige letter that the criteria for the condition of the road should relate to the proposed use. This road could serve one more buildable lot, he said.

Mr. Schreiber disagreed and stated that he interprets adequate construction differently, that it relates to something that is constructed. He referred to the proposed parking zoning amendment which required a prepared surface. Mr. Schreiber sees potential for construction, but doesn't see construction. He is sympathetic with the character of the neighborhood, but he doesn't acknowledge that the road is constructed.

Mr. Shefftz stated that the condition of the eastern portion is debatable but the western portion doesn't seem to be a road. He needed to get off his bicycle and walk. If he were the potential purchaser of the property he would want to have an SUV. It will get worse if not improved, he said. There are clear signs of erosion.

Mr. Carson asked if there were a setback for a driveway and was told that there is no setback requirement for driveways. He suggested that the driveway for the new lot could be very close to the end of the drivable portion of the road.

Ms. Hetzel stated that she can drive on the road next to her property and she doesn't want the road to be paved.

Ms. Anderson disclosed that she is acquainted with the neighbor, Kathryn Mahoney. She was a student of Ms. Anderson's a number of years ago.

Mr. Webber MOVED that the Planning Board finds that Adams Street was a way in existence when the Subdivision Control Law became effective in the Town of Amherst. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Mr. Webber MOVED that the Planning Board finds that Adams Street has sufficient width, suitable grades and adequate construction to provide for the needs of vehicular traffic in relation to the proposed use of the land. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-4 (Roznoy, Shefftz, Schreiber and Anderson voting no).

Mr. Shefftz signed the ANR plan for ANR 2011-00005.

**V. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS** – The Planning Board declined to review the following ZBA applications:

ZBA FY2011-00021 – Amherst Restaurant Group, LLC

ZBA FY2011-00022 – White Hut Amherst, Inc.

**VI. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS**

SPR2011-00009 – Amherst Survival Center, 138 Sunderland Road – approval to construct a new building and site improvements

SPR2011-00010 – Pauline Lannon c/o Atkins Farm Market, 1151 West Street – approval to construct a photovoltaic solar array

**VII. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Zoning – Mr. O’Keeffe noted that he had already given the ZSC report during the discussion about Town Meeting. He reminded Planning Board members and others about the Zoning Forum scheduled for Wednesday, June 15<sup>th</sup>, at 5:00 p.m. in the Town Room.

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

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Mr. Schreiber reported that there would be a meeting of the Commission at the Springfield History Museum on Thursday, June 9<sup>th</sup>. He is not able to attend and he encouraged other Board members to go if they are available.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Ms. Anderson reported that CPAC’s work is complete for now and there will be a summer hiatus.

Agricultural Commission – no report

Public Transportation and Bicycle Committee – Mr. Roznoy reported that work would begin soon on a Transportation Plan.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – Mr. Webber noted that he had already given his report.

**X. REPORT OF STAFF – none**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

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

Approved:

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

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