

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, November 2, 2011 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: David Webber, Chair; Jonathan O’Keeffe, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Richard Roznoy and Stephen Schreiber

ABSENT: Connie Kruger and Sandra Anderson

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:07 PM. He announced that the meeting was being recorded by town staff and by Amherst Media and was being broadcast live and that it would be rebroadcast by Amherst Media at a later date.

I. MINUTES October 19, 2011

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the October 19, 2011. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-0.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

SPR2012-00001/SPP2012-00001 – The Lord Jeffery Inn, 30 Boltwood Avenue, Amherst Inn Company

Combined public hearing to amend previously granted Site Plan Review approval (SPR2010-00008) to extend hours of operation for the accessory restaurant and outdoor dining and to allow the accessory use of live and pre-recorded entertainment in the restaurant, bar, banquet and outdoor patio pursuant to Sections 3.327.1, 5.041, 5.042 and 12.22 of the Zoning Bylaw. (Map 14A/Parcels 267, 269 & 270; General Business District)

Mr. Webber read the preamble and opened the combined public hearing.

Peter MacConnell, of Bacon and Wilson/Monsein and MacConnell, attorney for the applicant, presented the application. He explained that there were two requests: 1) to amend the Site Plan Review approval (SPR2010-00008) to extend the hours of operation to 1:00 a.m. and 2) to allow live and pre-recorded entertainment, via a Special Permit. In February 2010 the Planning Board approved a Site Plan Review application to renovate the Inn. At that time the applicant had presented a Management Plan that included a closing time for the restaurant of 11:30 p.m. Now the applicant is requesting to be allowed to keep the restaurant open until 1:00 a.m. on an occasional basis, to serve guests at special events such as trustee meetings, alumni reunions and conferences. Some of these events might involve late evenings. Usually the restaurant will close at 11:00 p.m. In the two previous Site Plan Reviews (2008 and 2010) the restaurant had been approved as a use accessory to and part of the Inn. The restaurant operation will not be contracted out. The purpose of the restaurant is to serve guests of the Inn and members of the public. The applicant has submitted a new, updated Management Plan.

Mr. MacConnell asked the Planning Board to grant the amendment to the Site Plan Review to allow the restaurant, as an accessory use to stay open to 1:00 a.m. and to grant a Special Permit to allow live and pre-recorded entertainment. He noted that the entertainment had been discussed in the two previous Site Plan Review public hearings. At the time of those hearings no one realized that Porter House, a residential building in a residential zoning district, was within 150 feet of the Inn, requiring a Special Permit for the entertainment. The music offered in the restaurant and on the porch will be quiet pre-recorded music. There is no intention to

have live music in the restaurant or on the porch. In the banquet hall there will be occasional events that may have live or pre-recorded entertainment.

Mr. MacConnell introduced Robert Reeves, General Manager of the Inn.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the waivers that had been requested. Mr. MacConnell stated that the requested waivers were related to the Site Plan Review application. There are no changes proposed for the site, so the following waivers have been requested:

- Soil Erosion Plan
- Landscape Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Sign Plan
- Traffic Impact Study.

Mr. Webber stated that the Board did not hold a site visit for this application because Board members are familiar with the site and site visits were held for the previous Site Plan Review applications.

Mr. Webber reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that the Inn is located in the Municipal Parking Zone, where inns are not exempt from parking requirements but restaurants are exempt. Mr. Webber further noted that the Inn has negotiated a parking agreement with the town and that the Board had modified the parking requirements for the Inn during the previous Site Plan Review applications.

Mr. Webber reviewed the waiver requests. He stated that there had been no comments submitted by the Fire Department or the Town Engineer. There are no physical changes being proposed so the lack of comments is not a concern. Mr. Webber noted that the applicant's attorney had explained the requests well.

Mr. Crouner asked about the Management Plan. He asked if the restaurant would be open to the public when it is open to Inn guests, or would it be open to Inn guests only, to the exclusion of others, after 11:30 p.m.?

Mr. Reeves stated that the demand for the extension in hours of operation was driven by occupancy of the Inn. The hours wouldn't be extended for the public alone. The Inn will not encourage members of the public to come into the restaurant late, but will not ask them to leave if they are already there.

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

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

- 11.2400 – The project is in conformance with all appropriate provisions of the Zoning Bylaw and with the goals of the Master Plan;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected because detrimental or offensive actions will be minimized; Mr. Webber noted that the Inn contributes to the town;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use; the potential for noise and lights was discussed by the Board and there are no concerns about these issues;
- 11.2403 – Adequate amenities will be provided because the Inn itself is an amenity;
- 11.2410 – N/A;
- 11.2411 – Proposed methods of refuse disposal are adequate and were reviewed during the previous permitting process;

- 11.2412 – N/A; the ability of the proposed sewage disposal and water supply systems to serve the proposed use was addressed during the previous permitting process;
- 11.2413 – N/A; the proposed drainage system was reviewed during the previous permitting process;
- 11.2414 – N/A; a waiver from the requirement for a Landscape Plan was requested and granted; landscaping was reviewed during the previous permitting process; no changes are proposed;
- 11.2415 – N/A; a waiver from the requirement for a Soil Erosion Plan was requested and granted;
- 11.2416 – N/A; the Board has no concerns regarding this item;
- 11.2417 – N/A; a waiver from the requirement for a Lighting Plan was requested and granted; lighting was reviewed during the previous permitting process; no changes are proposed;
- 11.2418 – N/A
- 11.2419 – N/A
- 11.2420 – N/A
- 11.2421 – N/A
- 11.2422 – N/A
- 11.2423 – N/A
- 11.2424 – N/A
- 11.2430 – N/A
- 11.2431 – N/A
- 11.2432 – N/A
- 11.2433 – N/A
- 11.2434 – N/A
- 11.2435 – N/A
- 11.2436 – N/A; a waiver from the requirement for a Traffic Impact Report has been requested and granted;
- 11.2437 – N/A.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED that Site Plan Review application SPR2012-00001 be approved, with the waivers as requested and with the applicable standard conditions. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 6-0.

The Board found, under Section 10.38 of the Zoning Bylaw, Site Plan Review, as follows:

- 10.380 – The proposal is suitably located in the neighborhood in which it is proposed and/or the total Town; live and/or pre-recorded entertainment will occur in the B-G zoning district; the residential building to which it is adjacent is a college dormitory;
- 10.381 – The proposal is compatible with existing Uses and other uses permitted by right in the same district; other establishments in the B-G zoning district are permitted to offer live and/or pre-recorded entertainment;
- 10.382 – The proposal would not create a nuisance because the applicant has stated that the restaurant and the outdoor dining area will offer only pre-recorded music which will be played at a low volume; the banquet hall will offer live entertainment only on occasion as part of a special event;
- 10.383 – The proposal would not be a substantial inconvenience or hazard to abutters, because the entertainment to be offered in the restaurant and the outdoor dining area will be played at a low volume; the banquet hall will offer live entertainment only on occasion as part of a special event;
- 10.384 – Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use, as described in the Management Plan;

10.385 – The proposal reasonably protects the adjoining premises against detrimental or offensive uses on the site because the entertainment in the restaurant and outdoor dining area will be played at a low level and the entertainment in the banquet hall will occur only occasionally and will be in a self-contained space, as described in the Management Plan;

10.386 – N/A

10.387 – N/A

10.388 – N/A

10.389 – N/A

10.390 – N/A

10.391 – N/A

10.392 – N/A

10.393 – N/A

10.394 – N/A

10.395 – N/A

10.396 – N/A

10.397 – N/A

10.398 – The proposal is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this Bylaw and the goals of the Master Plan.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED that the Board approve the Special Permit Findings under Section 10.38 of the Zoning Bylaw and grant the Special Permit 2012-00001. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 6-0.

Since it was not yet 8:00 PM, the scheduled time for the presentation by The Cecil Group on Form-Based Zoning, the Board turned to other business.

IV. TOWN MEETING

A. Town Meeting Articles – Mr. O’Keeffe began to report on the ZSC meeting of this evening. He reported that the ZSC had discussed Town Meeting Warrant Article 17, Form-Based Zoning. He noted that the ZSC had discussed and voted on several proposed changes to the text and maps associated with the Article. Mr. Schreiber recommended that this report and subsequent discussion should occur after the presentation to the Board by The Cecil Group on Form-Based Zoning. The Board members agreed by consensus to postpone Mr. O’Keeffe’s report and the Board’s discussion until after The Cecil Group’s presentation.

B. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

V. OLD BUSINESS – none

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Upcoming Planning Board Schedule – The Board members agreed to cancel the Planning Board meeting scheduled for November 30th. They agreed to discuss the scheduling of other meetings in November after the presentation by The Cecil Group.

B. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – Ms. Brestrup reported that the Amherst Montessori School was planning to submit a Site Plan Review application for a proposed expansion of its building on Pomeroy Lane. If the application is submitted within the week, the public hearing would most likely occur on December 7th.

X. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Zoning – Mr. O’Keeffe gave the ZSC report as part of the discussion on Form-Based Zoning, later in the evening.

XI. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Mr. Schreiber reported that he had received a letter from the PVPC offering free technical assistance to towns. He would like to put this on the agenda for a future meeting and discuss ways in which the PVPC might be of assistance to Amherst.

Community Preservation Act Committee – none

Agricultural Commission – Mr. Webber reported that the Agricultural Commission would be meeting the following week.

Transportation Plan Task Force – Mr. Roznoy reported that there had been no action yet on the Transportation Plan Task Force.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – none

Design Review Board – Mr. Schreiber reported that he had asked a few people if they would be interested in serving as the Planning Board’s representative on the Design Review Board. Of these people, none had formally expressed interest at this time.

Other Boards and Committees – none

XII. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – Mr. Webber noted that the Board might consider the recent storm when approving site plans in the future. He recommended that the Board consider that street trees do, at times, cause problems when they are growing adjacent to power lines.

Mr. O’Keeffe reported on the recent success of the Planning Board team in the Trivia Bee. Mr. Carson, Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Crouner and Mr. O’Keeffe composed the team. Mr. Schreiber provided costumes in black. The team was named the “Minority Report” and was sponsored by Greenfield Savings Bank. Mr. Webber congratulated the team members on winning the final round.

III. PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION

Form-Based Zoning – The Cecil Group – purpose and function of form-based zoning and unique features of Amherst’s proposed zoning

Mr. Webber introduced Steve Cecil of The Cecil Group as the consultant who had orchestrated the proposed Form-Based Zoning for North Amherst and Atkins Corners. Mr. Cecil announced that he would give a brief presentation and then answer questions on Form-Based Zoning. He introduced Ted Brovitz, also of The Cecil Group, and stated that Mr. Brovitz has substantial experience developing Form-Based Zoning for other communities.

Mr. Cecil reported that The Cecil Group had been working with the town for some time to translate the planning concepts that the town had been developing, to focus on the quality and character of development in North Amherst and Atkins Corners, so that the future can be managed to reflect what the community has said that it wants through its Master Planning process.

Mr. Cecil stated that Form-Based Code is about creating the character and reinforcing the qualities, physically, visually and environmentally that the community values. It is based on a thorough process that builds on an understanding of the existing conditions and context. Mr.

Cecil noted that there had been a planning process a number of years ago that focused on the development of Atkins Corners and the roadway.

Several other communities in New England have developed Form-Based Codes, including Lowell, MA and Southfield, in South Weymouth, MA. The shape that places take is part of the quality and character of the community. Mr. Cecil described the existing conditions in North Amherst Village Center and in the Atkins Corners area. He noted that Atkins Corners is more of a corner or crossroads than a village center, and that it was built around the Atkins Farms Market and Hampshire College. The unusual layout of the roundabouts and the rural roadways need to be factored into the development and layout of the land.

Mr. Cecil described the visual character of the North Amherst Village Center and stated that the new zoning should preserve, protect and enhance what is there. He noted that there would be a transition area along Montague Road which would be zoned R-VC (Residential Village Center, an existing type of zoning already in the Zoning Bylaw). A Form-Based Overlay district would be applied to the R-VC areas to control the way developments look.

Mr. Cecil described the Form-Based Zone proposed for Atkins Corners and also talked about the areas around the Atkins Corners core. Some of the areas around the core will be re-zoned R-VC or ED (Educational) and some of these areas will have a Form-Based Overlay district applied to them.

He described the proposed streetscapes for the Village Centers, noting that one side of the street should reflect what happens on the other side. He described how the new zoning is set up in the new section of the Zoning Bylaw, stating that the character of the streets and sidewalks will be very important. Private property owners will be able to predict how the public infrastructure will be formed. Models for building types have been drawn from other towns, but prototypes are also available in Amherst. Off-street parking and access to parking lots, as well as landscaping is described in the new Zoning Bylaw Article 16. There is a provision for "Alternative Compliance". He emphasized that the difference between the existing zoning and the proposed zoning, in terms of uses allowed, was modest.

In response to a question, Mr. Brovitz stated that although several communities have adopted Form-Based Codes, not a lot of new development has occurred under the new zoning because the economy is not conducive to much development. However, the communities that have adopted it seem to be happy with it, he observed. Buzzards Bay is one such community. Mr. Brovitz also discussed the experience of Manchester, CT, which has a relatively unsuccessful strip development that the town is trying to redevelop, with more residential development.

Mr. Cecil mentioned that Southfield, at the South Weymouth Naval Air Station, has begun to develop housing, based on Form-Based Code. Mr. Brovitz stated that Newport, New Hampshire, near the Canadian border, is seeing results from good infill development. However, a lot of the Form-Based Codes in New England are too new to have seen much of a result yet.

Mr. Cecil noted that some towns control the way things look and feel through design review, rather than Form-Based Code. If the Design Review process is mandatory, then this can work. Other methods to control the look and feel of a place include establishing local historic districts and designating areas as 40R sites. In these types of designated areas design standards can be imposed on proposed developments.

Mr. Brovitz stated that much of the resulting character of a place comes from the range of setbacks that is allowed, the relationship of buildings to streets and the types and functions of open spaces.

Mr. Tucker noted that concerns have been raised that Form-Based Code might result in areas looking like Disney World. Form-Based Code does not dictate architectural detail or style, only the form, he said.

Mr. Schreiber asked about Form-Based Code versus “New Urbanism”.

Mr. Cecil described “New Urbanism” as referring to a group of people who practice or promote a type of development, often on “green fields” or undeveloped properties. They are trying to establish developments that reflect the type of character that New England towns already have. New Urbanism usually takes on the character of a traditional New England style of development. However, Form-Based Code does not need to be associated with traditional development. It can be whatever the people in the community want. He noted that a few principles in New Urbanism ring true – particularly its stress on the needs of the pedestrian and its focus on balancing the requirements of the automobile, the pedestrian and open space.

Janet Keller of 120 Pulpit Hill Road stated that one of her concerns with the proposed zoning is its flexibility. How does the town administer flexibility? She noted that she has experience working on zoning in Providence, RI and also in Northern Virginia. Those places have “deep experience”. What does a small town have? She also asked what provisions had been made for bicycles.

Mr. Cecil stated that the different street types handle bicycles differently. There is a hierarchy of streets and each is coordinated with a bicycle strategy. In some, there will be a dedicated bicycle lane. In others the bicycles will share the road with cars. In still others the bicycles will share multi-use paths with pedestrians. Bicycle paths and lanes will have markings on the pavement. He noted that there is a professional planning staff in Amherst, which can help to administer the Form-Based Code.

Mr. Tucker described “alternative compliance” as being a discretionary process. The permitting Board will decide. The Town has had Special Permits since the 1960’s. Special Permits involve a discretionary process. He noted that Amherst also has a Design Review Board.

Ms. Brestrup observed that Amherst is fortunate in having the UMass Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning close by. Most of Amherst’s Planning Department staff members hold degrees in landscape architecture and planning. In addition, all Site Plan Review and Special Permit applications are thoroughly reviewed by town staff, including the Town Engineer, prior to coming before the permitting Boards.

Mr. Tucker noted that many applications are also presented, either formally or informally, to the Historical Commission on a regular basis. The town requires applicants to address all of the public interests before applications are presented to the permitting boards.

Sarah la Cour of North Whitney Street and an employee of W.D. Cowls asked about street types, particularly Montague Road, where the right-of-way is 60 feet wide. She asked if there is a proposal to downsize Montague Road.

Mr. Brovitz noted that Montague Road is a state road. It is 60 feet wide within the Village Center, but expands to 100 feet wide beyond that. For Montague Road the standards for the Commercial Street Type would apply, including 11 foot lanes and bike lanes.

Mr. Cecil observed that narrowing streets often results in traffic calming. An example is Falmouth, which narrowed its pavement and widened its sidewalks.

Melissa Perot of 15 Summer Street asked how Form-Based Code would allow or encourage renewable energy projects at existing buildings or homes. Mr. Cecil said that Form-Based

Code doesn't address renewable energy projects specifically. Mr. Tucker noted that Section 16.87 of the Form-Based Code addresses Sustainable Design and Development Standards. He read portions of this section.

Mr. Cecil noted that there is language in the Form-Based Code about sustainable energy being incorporated into specific projects and that certain energy generators are considered as principle uses.

Mr. Schreiber observed that people who are interested creating a more sustainable community should realize that one of the best ways to do this is to "densify" the already developed areas by encouraging development in the Village Centers and downtown areas. He recommended that people read The Green Metropolis by David Owen, which discusses how "green" New York City is.

Ms. Perot stated that she is concerned about the fact that even in the current Village Center, which is dense, people drive to facilities elsewhere. Mixed use is what everyone wants, but the most profitable uses are not mixed use. The proposed zoning doesn't give us what we want, she asserted.

Mr. Cecil observed that zoning can't compel the marketplace to go in one direction or another. Zoning is about opening the door with the intention of inviting certain uses and certain types of development. He further noted that grocery stores need about 10,000 people to support a modest sized store. Commercial establishments will need to rely on people from the outside coming in to the Village Centers. That is the nature of villages.

Mr. Brovitz stated that it is clear that people want to bolster commercial uses on Sunderland Road. Commercial uses would be allowed to continue there in the future, while Montague Road will remain predominantly residential.

Paola Di Stefano of 115 Montague Road stated that the buildings on Montague Road (which is now in the R-N zoning district) are now about one to one and a half stories tall. She objected to the proposed R-VC zoning because of the building heights allowed.

Mr. O'Keefe noted that the maximum height for buildings in both the R-N and R-VC districts is the same – 35 feet.

Mr. O'Keefe summarized the discussion at the Zoning Subcommittee meeting held earlier in the evening. The ZSC had recommended several changes:

- 1) Montague Road – having listened to the residents who don't support the change from the current R-N zoning to the proposed R-VC zoning along Montague Road, and after much discussion, the ZSC voted 3-0 to recommend to the Planning Board that the properties along Montague Road should be left as R-N, up to the southern edge of the Cowls corner property at 134 Montague Road; in addition the ZSC voted 2-1 to leave the NAVC zoning on the Cowls corner property, rather than returning it to R-N;
- 2) Townhouses – the ZSC agreed by consensus to recommend to the Planning Board that Townhouses be allowed by Special Permit, not by Site Plan Review, in both the North Amherst Village Center and at Atkins Corners;
- 3) Splitting Article 17 – the ZSC voted 2-1 to present the article in two pieces, as follows:
 - (a) Form-Based Code and the Atkins Corners text references and map;
 - (b) North Amherst text references and map.

Mr. Crowner stated his belief that the Cowls corner property (134 Montague Road) should be in the same zone as the rest of the properties on Montague Road.

Mr. Tucker asked the Board, if 134 Montague Road is to come out of NAVC should the Form Based Overlay zone be applied to it?

Mr. Schreiber asked how many of the properties in the R-N district [along Montague Road] were currently non-conforming. Mr. Tucker stated that the Old Mill property north of the Mill River is currently dimensionally non-conforming, but most of the rest are dimensionally conforming.

Mr. Roznoy questioned the procedure that the Board was following, since the Planning Board had voted at a previous meeting to recommend Article 17 as written.

Mr. Crouner noted that it was very likely that someone at Town Meeting would move to divide the article. He recommended that the Planning Board be “pro-active” and present the article already divided to Town Meeting.

Mr. Roznoy questioned whether another Planning Board Report to Town Meeting would be necessary to describe these latest changes. Mr. Tucker noted that the Planning Board public hearing process and report are a statutory requirement. The Board is currently discussing what form the motion should take. Mr. O’Keeffe stated that there are often amendments made to articles after the Planning Board has submitted its report.

Mr. Roznoy objected since it gives the impression of a “shifting target”. It does not provide a unified approach to Town Meeting.

Ms. la Cour objected to changing the properties along Montague Road back to R-N. She stated that the Form-Based Code will already raise development costs. Landowners won’t get anything in return if the R-N zoning is left in place and the Form-Based Overlay is applied to it and if townhouses are only allowed with a Special Permit. There will be no residential uses allowed by right in the NAVC other than in a mixed-use building. If no residential uses are allowed by right, there will not be enough people in the Village Center to support the businesses that people wish to see there.

Laura Fitch of Pulpit Hill Road and a consultant to the Puffer Family agreed that townhouses should be allowed by Site Plan Review, not Special Permit. There is a need to allow something by right to support the businesses. She noted that the Puffer-Garnier Family is interested in providing a connection across their properties from the Village Center to the Mill River Recreation Area and Puffer’s Pond. Ms. Fitch would like to see Montague Road safer for bikes. If we keep Montague Road as R-N we will not be correcting “grandfathered uses”.

Barbara Puffer of 85 Montague Road said that she understood the neighbors’ concerns. Rental properties can be unruly. However she stated that keeping the zoning as R-N along Montague Road would prevent investors from building attractive residences. This would provide incentives for investors to buy up single-family houses in the neighborhood and rent them by the bedroom, as they are currently doing. The idea of the Master Plan was to do something different, she said. Atkins Fruit Bowl has become a sensational draw. Ms. Puffer would like a chance to improve North Amherst, too.

Ms. Keller stated that the town should pull together (town government and the community) to fix the intersection and encourage adaptive reuse of historic buildings before doing the rezoning. She agreed with the concept of putting development where development already exists. Density is needed to protect open space. Puffer’s Pond and Eastman Brook should be protected. Intense commercial development may harm these resources. She noted that the Form-Based Code area at Columbia Pike in Virginia has explicit provisions for protecting the stable residential neighborhoods.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to recommend to Town Meeting that the Planning Board supports changing Article 17 to remove the proposal to change to R-VC the properties along Montague Road and to return them to R-N. Mr. Carson seconded.

There was discussion about the motion. Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Schreiber expressed their opinion that it was a mistake to make this motion. However, it would be good to be prepared if others were to make the motion on the floor of Town Meeting. Mr. Schreiber supported going forward with the Article as it is since it has been vetted and has already received support from the Planning Board. Mr. Webber agreed with Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Schreiber. He stated that these are good ideas but they should come forth at Town Meeting. He was hesitant to make changes to the Article at this time [prior to Town Meeting].

Mr. O’Keeffe withdrew his motion.

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED that the Board supports the proposed changes but will not make a motion to amend. Mr. Carson seconded.

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that the intention of the motion was to be able to provide a recommendation if a motion were made on the floor. Mr. Schreiber objected to this motion as well. The Planning Board should support what it voted on already.

Mr. Roznoy stated that these were substantial changes, and that someone who wished to make these motions at Town Meeting would present them to the Town Moderator ahead of time, in writing. The Planning Board could schedule a meeting prior to the Town Meeting session at which the Article is to be considered, to discuss any proposed motions made by others.

Mr. O’Keeffe withdrew his second motion.

Mr. Crouner noted that two Planning Board members were absent and that a meeting held just prior to the Town Meeting session might include all Planning Board members.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to do nothing. There was no second.

Mr. O’Keeffe suggested ending the discussion and instead considering the Planning Board schedule and a recommendation for scheduling Article 17 before Town Meeting. The Board discussed whether to request that Article 17 be heard on Monday, November 14th or Wednesday, November 16th. Planning Board members agreed by consensus to request that Article 17 be considered on a date certain of Wednesday, November 16th, with a Planning Board meeting scheduled for the same night at 5:00 p.m.

XIII. REPORT OF STAFF – none

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine M. Brestrup,
Senior Planner

Approved:

David K. Webber, Chair

DATE: _____