

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

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

ABSENT: none

STAFF: Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:08 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 November 16, 2011

Ms. Anderson MOVED to approve the Minutes of November 16, 2011. Mr. Schreiber seconded and the vote was 8-0.

II. PUBLIC HEARING

SPR2012-00002/M11396, 27 Pomeroy Lane – Amherst Montessori School

Request approval for the construction of a 5,463 SF addition to an existing building, revised parking layout and drainage improvements. (Map 20C/Parcel 85, R-VC District)

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

Ms. Anderson disclosed that she lives on Pomeroy Lane, about ¼ of a mile from the site, but she is not an abutter, and the proximity of her house to the site will not be an issue in her consideration of this application.

Jeff Squire of The Berkshire Design Group presented the application. The site is a 2 acre parcel of land. There is a paved access drive with a looped circle at the end and playgrounds on the north and south sides of the building. Mr. Squire showed on a plan where these features are located, including the existing building.

The applicant is proposing to build a two-story addition of approximately 5,400 square feet and to improve the existing circulation and driveway. The east edge of the driveway will be maintained and parking will be added to the west side of the driveway. There are wetlands to the east, west and south of the site. The site improvements are limited by the wetlands and other site constraints.

There is some existing, informal parallel parking on the west side of the driveway. This parallel parking will be improved and paved. The loop turnaround will remain but the parking around the loop will be realigned. A defined entry plaza will be constructed, leading to the front door.

The school will institute a “car line” with staff helping children in and out of cars, so that there will be no need for parents to get out of their cars when dropping off their children.

In terms of drainage there will be a low point at the southeast end of the site where a combination sandbox and drainage catchment area will be constructed. The existing drainage structure in this location will be removed and a subdrain will be installed with a new drain line exiting the area. Clean roof drainage will be directed to the sandbox area.

Lighting on the site is not expected to be used often. The building is only used during the day, except for special evening events. The lights will be “dark sky compliant” and shielded to prevent light spilling beyond the property line.

Mr. Squire presented the plan for handling storm drainage. A stormwater management plan has been submitted to the town. The drainage system will improve the quality of water running off the paved areas of the site. A rain garden is proposed for the front entry area. The drainage plan will capture 80% of the paved surfaces. Now there is no stormwater treatment, only catch basins and pipes. Currently, untreated stormwater leaves the site. The rain garden will treat a portion of the stormwater and remove 90% of TSS (total suspended solids). The drainage plan also proposes a subsurface detention basin on the west side of the building. Groundwater is about 24" below the surface of the ground, so both the subsurface detention basin and the rain garden will be lined so that groundwater does not seep into the basin or the garden and each can act to catch and hold runoff.

The drainage plan matches pre and post construction flows.

The applicants have received comments from Town Engineer, Jason Skeels.

Mr. Squire asked that the Board grant a conditional approval, since Montessori School is hoping to begin construction in early spring. The School will not need to use modular classrooms if it can take advantage of the summer construction season.

Mr. Squire stated that a Notice of Intent had been submitted to the Conservation Commission two months ago.

He described the location of the site and showed surrounding parcels on a Locus Plan. The existing building was originally built as a home and was later converted into a school. When Kingdom Hall (Jehovah's Witnesses' building) was approved, a detention basin was approved as part of its site plan. The drainage from Kingdom Hall flows to the detention basin, into a wetland and then into Muddy Brook, to the south. When Kingdom Hall was developed the site construction created a dam, preventing the flow of water across the site from the east. The Montessori driveway also created a dam. Mr. Squire pointed out a pipe that runs under the middle of the driveway, carrying water from the east side to the west side. There is another pipe that runs under the driveway farther to the south. It flows into the detention basin on the Kingdom Hall property. The approved plans for Kingdom Hall called for a pipe to run from the Montessori property cross the Kingdom Hall property and into the wetland to the south and eventually into Muddy Brook. The pipe was installed incorrectly. It flows directly into the detention basin instead of flowing across the site.

Mr. Squire stated that currently none of the stormwater is treated. The proposed plan calls for TSS removal via a rain garden, which is considered to be an acceptable low-impact design. The driveway runoff will be treated. The roof runoff will not be treated because it is considered to be clean.

There is flooding on an adjacent residential property [the Sullivan property at 37 Pomeroy Lane]. When the water freezes in the vicinity of the Sullivan property, the storm runoff can't get into the pipe that runs under the driveway. The drainage plan proposes that a structure be built at the edge of the wetland to the east, in the form of a catch basin and grate that is lower than the Sullivan property, to capture runoff and make sure that it gets into the pipe.

Mr. Schreiber noted that this type of structure will require maintenance.

Mr. Squire stated that the standard for TSS removal is 80%. The stormwater management plan proposes the removal of 90% TSS [for the portion of the runoff that is captured by the rain garden].

Ms. Anderson asked if the applicant had considered using permeable pavement or permeable asphalt for the expanded driveway and parking lot areas.

Mr. Squire explained that permeable paving or permeable asphalt had been considered. In this case the degree of permeability of gravel was not substantial enough to accommodate the

runoff. Permeable paving can also be a problem in winter. Permeable asphalt is expensive when prepared for such a small site because of the way asphalt plants operate. In addition, in this case groundwater is so high that permeable pavers won't provide enough benefit. Traditional asphalt pavement can be maintained more easily and the edges are more clearly defined [than gravel paving].

Mr. Webber asked if the applicant had heard from the Fire Department.

Mr. Squire stated that a former colleague of his had had discussions with the Fire Department. As a result of those discussions the building (which is not sprinklered at this time) will be sprinklered and a new fire hydrant will be added at the turnaround. There have been no recent comments from the Fire Department on the plans as submitted. Mr. Squire explained that emergency access to the building had been improved on the site plan, but the loop cannot be made big enough to accommodate the ladder truck. However, the loop has been widened, he said.

Mr. Squire stated that the firm of Kuhn Riddle is the new architect on the project.

Mr. Squire offered to review the Town Engineer's letter and to respond point by point to each item. The Board agreed to hear Mr. Squire's responses.

The following are the consultant's responses to the letter of Jason Skeels, Town Engineer, dated December 7, 2011:

- 1) The survey issue requires an adjustment to the elevation numbers and does not affect the design.
- 2) The fact that the test pits were not witnessed by town staff is not important since the drainage plan does not rely on infiltration. The drainage basins (rain garden and detention basin) will be lined, to create a "closed system". Water will not be able to get into the system. The drainage system is designed to drain water off the site.
- 3) The drainage systems of Kingdom Hall and Montessori School are combined. All agree that there is a need for drainage easements to be obtained.
- 4) The drainage system will provide more than 80% TSS removal for the portion of the water that is captured. 80% of the drainage will be captured. Of this 80% drainage, 90% TSS will be removed. A stormceptor structure could capture the rest, but at a cost of \$10,000 it was not deemed to be a reasonable expenditure for the expected benefit [at the time that the design was prepared].
- 5) The plans should include the Kingdom Hall drainage system; however there has been no survey of the Kingdom Hall property. The plans will show the drainage system that was approved for the Kingdom Hall property.
- 6) The plans for the Montessori School will include construction of the pipe that was to have been constructed across the Kingdom Hall property, avoiding the detention basin and out-letting near Muddy Brook.
- 7) There have been changes to the Kingdom Hall site. It shouldn't be Montessori's responsibility to fix the Kingdom Hall's problems. The applicants will confirm whether the last piece of pipe from the detention basin to the wetland and Muddy Brook was installed.
- 8) A catch basin will be constructed at the edge of the Sullivan property to assure that stormwater runoff enters the pipe on the east side of the driveway.

- 9) The stormwater drainage report is inaccurate. The pipe under the driveway drains toward the Kingdom Hall property and not back to the Montessori property.
- 10) This item refers to the need to look at the whole drainage area and analyze it. To survey the entire site [including 7 Pomeroy Lane and the Kingdom Hall property] and do a drainage analysis on the entire area is beyond the scope of this project, Mr. Squire asserted.
- 11) Details of the structures were included in the plans.
- 12) Regarding the sewer line, there is no record information and none will be available until the project is started. However, the consultants are confident that the pipe is of adequate size.
- 13), 14) and 15) There is no disagreement about these statements.
- 16) Handicapped spaces are shown on the Site Plans.
- 17) There is no disagreement about this statement.

Mr. Squire concluded by saying that managing stormwater on site and meeting standards is complicated. The pipe across the Kingdom Hall property needs to be installed. The consultants will verify the existence and location of the outfall from the Kingdom Hall property to the wetland and Muddy Brook.

Ms. Anderson asked if there would be more faculty and staff as a result of the expansion of the school building.

Tamara Balis, Head of School, responded that there are 40 students currently in the building and 40 more students in a building down the street [7 Pomeroy Lane], for a total of 80 students. The School plans to expand to a total student population of 120 students.

Ms. Anderson asked about the need for additional parking to accommodate the expanded school population.

Ms. Balis stated that the school is working on an agreement with one of the surrounding property owners to lease off-site parking. The school is also promoting a plan for carpooling. She noted that 50% of the families come from Amherst, 20% come from Belchertown and the rest come from surrounding towns. When the school is at full capacity there will be 25 staff members. Faculty and staff will park off site. Ms. Balis noted that the School would like to increase the population of toddlers whose parents will park and accompany them into the building rather than using the "car line".

Ms. Kruger expressed concerns about several issues:

Parking – Twenty spaces are proposed to be provided, including parallel spaces. Parallel parking will be along the driveway, which will leave a 17 ½ foot drive lane. This seems narrow. There will be limited parking around the circle. The proposal doesn't appear to have adequate parking. There is only one handicapped parking space proposed. Ms. Kruger suggested that two handicapped spaces be provided with a shared access aisle.

Emergency/fire access/safety – The driveway and turnaround may not be adequate for emergency vehicles. There will be no sidewalk and children who walk to school will need to walk in the driveway. The driveway is narrow.

Lighting – Eight lights are proposed. Will these lights affect abutting properties?

Drainage – Ms. Kruger would like to hear back from the Town Engineer on the issue of drainage before making a decision on the application.

Mr. Squire responded that there are now no designated parallel parking spaces. The only way to increase parking on site is to pave the front play area. There is an abundance of parking in the general area of the school that can be shared. There is no required number of parking spaces in the Zoning Bylaw for a school. The plan provides as many parking spaces as is possible given the site constraints. The 17 ½ foot wide driveway is adequate. Standard cars are only 6 to 7 feet wide. Eighteen feet is a standard width for a “low-traveled road”. Fire trucks are 12 feet wide at their widest. The only way to put in a sidewalk is to eliminate the parallel parking along the driveway. The expansion of the building will negate the need to walk on the driveway, since there will be no students walking to the site from 7 Pomeroy Lane. The need for parking outweighs the need for a sidewalk, he said.

Mr. Schreiber observed that it is in the school’s interest to provide an adequate number of parking spaces. It is also in the school’s best interest to provide a safe environment.

Ms. Balis stated that the Montessori School has occupied this building since 1986. She has been Head of School for 3 ½ years. There is a sign along the driveway indicating a speed limit of 7 MPH. She has not seen documentation of any accidents on the driveway. The school is committed to a safe and easy experience for parents at the school. The students range up to 6th grade or 12 years old. There is currently only one student who walks to school and one student who rides a bike. Both are accompanied by parents. The school’s policy requires that students arrive at school with an adult.

Ms. Kruger stated that the school is in a Village Center. As the Village Center is developed, the school may draw more students from the immediately surrounding area. Children and parents will walk and bike to school. She noted that there is an extensive play area in back of the school.

Mr. Webber observed that the plan shows adequate parking spaces to accommodate the school’s needs under normal conditions. He read from Section 7.005 of the Zoning Bylaw which requires “adequate parking spaces to accommodate under normal conditions the cars of occupants, employees, members, customers, clients and visitors to the premises”.

Ms. Anderson observed that there is a UMass bus that serves the area where the school is located and that there is a lot of underused parking in the adjacent Village Center.

Mr. Roznoy noted that it is not uncommon to have agreements with neighboring property owners and that signed agreements are often submitted to augment an application. He recommended that the applicants also have discussions with neighbors regarding easements.

Ms. Balis stated that Kevin Campbell, a consultant who is working with the school, has spoken with Paul Fiszer, an elder at Kingdom Hall, who lives nearby. Mr. Campbell reported that there is no indication as to whether these issues can be worked out. However, Kingdom Hall does want to address the stormwater drainage issues.

Aelan Tierney of Kuhn Riddle Architects presented the building design. She was accompanied by Rachel Chase, also of Kuhn Riddle. Ms. Tierney reported that Kuhn Riddle had been working on the project for about a month. They had replaced the previous architect, who had prepared the plans that were submitted with the application. Ms. Tierney presented new plans and elevations of the existing and proposed building. She noted that the configuration of the building was dictated by the surrounding wetlands.

David Sullivan, a relative of Charles and Helen Sullivan of 37 Pomeroy Lane, the property to the east of the Montessori driveway, asked about the increase in the volume of people who will use the site. He noted that there is a right angle at the corner of the driveway, where it meets the sidewalk and street. People often drive over this corner and drive up on the curb. He also asked about snow removal and where snow will be stored. The driveway will be wider, so there will be more snow. He asked that it not be dumped on the Sullivan property.

Charles Atwood of 69 Pomeroy Lane, a neighbor to the east of the Montessori School property, asked about the additional lighting.

Mr. Squire stated that there is now minimal lighting on the site. Eight lights will be added. The lights will be mounted on 12 foot tall poles. They are being proposed to improve safety. Most of the lights will face towards Kingdom Hall. They will have full cut-offs and will be dark-sky compliant.

Ms. Balis added that the lights will go off at 6:00 p.m., except when there are occasional, infrequent evening events.

Ms. Kruger noted that 14 foot tall light poles were shown on the plans. She asked where the lighting will fall on the ground.

Mr. Webber noted that the lighting plan needs to be clarified.

Mrs. Sullivan of 37 Pomeroy Lane asked if the school is connected to the town sewer.

Mr. Squire stated that the school building is currently on municipal sewer. The pipe goes down the driveway and connects in Pomeroy Lane. There is no town stormwater system in the street, he noted.

Mr. Webber reviewed the documents that had been submitted:

- Management Plan
- Stormwater Drainage Report
- Previous permits and approvals
- Traffic Generation Report
- Development Application Report.

He noted the following with respect to the submittals:

- There have been four previous approvals on the site.
- The setbacks, frontage and dimensional requirements have been met.
- There was a site visit on Monday. Some trees will need to be removed to build the addition.
- There are no waiver requests.
- There have been no comments from the Fire Department about the traffic circle.
- The lighting is dark-sky compliant.
- Erosion control is shown on the plans.
- Traffic Impact Report – Mr. Webber read from the Traffic Impact Report. Under a worst case scenario, there will be approximately 36 vehicles per hour added at the peak hour. This increase is not considered to be significant to the daily or peak hour traffic.
- There is one existing sign that is over 4 feet in height. The ZBA is authorized to grant a Special Permit for directional or informational signs that exceed dimensional requirements. Ms. Tierney stated that the applicants may wish to install a sign on the building. Ms. Brestrup stated that one or two signs, not to exceed 12 square feet, are permitted in the R-VC zoning district for non-residential uses.
- The Conservation Commission will review the project again on December 14th.
- The Town Engineer's comments have been received. Mr. Roznoy noted that the Town Engineer's comments would be addressed at the Conservation Commission meeting. Mr. Squire asserted that there were no remaining issues before the Conservation Commission other than the Town Engineer's report.
- With regard to architecture, Ms. Tierney noted that Hardiplank siding is proposed. The color scheme will be soft neutral colors.
- With regard to planting, Mr. Squire noted that new plantings are proposed in the rain

garden and at the front of the building, in the form of foundation plantings.

Mr. Webber stated that the missing pieces in this application include answers to questions about drainage, parking and circulation.

Ms. Kruger stated that in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 40A, Section 3, non-profit educational uses have some special exemptions. She read a portion of Section 3 and stated that this exemption might narrow the review and modify what the Planning Board does in the case of this Site Plan Review. The sign size may not be of concern because of the exemption, she said. Ms. Kruger quoted from Section 3 as follows:

“No zoning ordinance or bylaw in any city or town shall prohibit, or require a special permit for, the use of land or structures, or the expansion of existing structures, for the primary, accessory or incidental purpose of operating a child care facility; provided, however, that such land or structures may be subject to reasonable regulations concerning the bulk and height of structures and determining yard sizes, lot area, setbacks, open space, parking and building coverage requirements. As used in this paragraph, the term ‘child care facility’ shall mean a child care center or a school-aged child care program, as defined in section 1A of chapter 15D.”

Board members discussed this issue.

Ms. Brestrup stated that she had spoken with Town Counsel, Joel Bard, about the exemption issue and he acknowledged that Ms. Kruger was correct in that non-profit educational institutions do have certain exemptions with regard to zoning. According to Mr. Bard, in addition to the “reasonable regulations” listed in Section 3, the Board may also consider certain other things that relate to the community’s well-being and to environmental concerns, such as drainage and lighting to the extent that these things affect the environment and adjacent properties. The Board may also consider parking and access. Board jurisdiction is more limited when it comes to design review of building architecture and that type of thing, according to Mr. Bard.

The Board discussed its own past practices, noting that in the past, the Board had reviewed applications by non-profit educational and religious uses in the same manner that it reviewed any other Site Plan Review application. Ms. Brestrup noted that now the Board has more information on this topic from Mr. Bard, indicating that there are certain aspects of this application that the Board cannot scrutinize nor have too much control over.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the public hearing be continued in order to hear from Jason Skeels on drainage issues, and hear from the consultants on pedestrian issues, Fire Department review and parking agreements. Ms. Anderson seconded.

There was discussion about the motion and January 4, 2012 was proposed as the date for the continued public hearing.

Ms. Anderson suggested adding to the list information about parking, including a parking management plan and the vision of commuting and drop-offs. She suggested requesting a parking and vehicle management plan. She also agreed that there is a need for answers to the Town Engineer’s comments. Ms. Anderson would like to see the agreements with the abutters in writing and more information about drainage and snow removal, such as where the snow storage area will be located. She would also like to see what the light pole looks like.

Mr. Roznoy accepted Ms. Anderson’s comments as an amendment to his motion.

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that he was inclined to issue a conditional approval and ask the applicant to come back to present details. He would like to see that the Stormwater Management Plan has received a “sign-off” from the Town Engineer and agreements with neighbors regarding parking. He did not want the applicant to lose the upcoming construction season.

Mr. Crouner agreed with much of what Mr. O’Keeffe had to say, however he said that

drainage is in a different category and he wants to know that the Conservation Commission is okay with the proposal before voting on it. He was especially concerned about the question of how much discharge there would be onto abutting properties.

Ms. Brestrup explained that the Conservation Commission would be mainly concerned with the impact of this project on wetlands.

Ms. Kruger questioned whether the Planning Board should or could postpone its decision in order to hear from the Conservation Commission. Ms. Brestrup noted that, in any event, the Planning Board cannot make its approval conditional on Conservation Commission approval.

Mr. Roznoy expressed partial agreement with the previous statements, but said that there are some substantive issues that need to be addressed. It was unwise to proceed prior to hearing from the Conservation Commission and premature to give approval with these substantive issues unresolved.

Mr. Squire explained that because the site plan does not propose a new point source discharge, but instead uses existing stormwater outlets to wetlands, the Conservation Commission's review is somewhat limited and simplified. He also stated that some of the issues, such as easements and agreements cannot be resolved by the proposed date for continuation of the public hearing – January 4th.

There was further discussion about drainage and easements. Mr. Webber asked about the proposed construction schedule.

Mr. Squire acknowledged that, although January 4th will make the schedule tighter, it may be workable. However, the issue of the easements and agreements with neighbors will not be resolved by the 4th.

Ms. Balis noted that if the public hearing were continued past January 4th, the school would need to consider the use of modular classrooms during construction. The construction manager wants to get into the building on March 15th.

There was further discussion about continuing the hearing.

There was discussion about whether there should be parallel parking or a sidewalk along the edge of the driveway. Some Board members would like to hear from the Fire Department regarding the driveway design before deciding on parallel parking versus a sidewalk.

Ms. Kruger preferred both a sidewalk and parking. She expressed concern about the easement issue and suggested that the Town Engineer attend the January 4th meeting. Mr. Webber noted that the easements need to be in place prior to construction. Mr. Squire suggested a condition that requires that easements and parking agreements be in place prior to construction.

Mr. O'Keeffe, Ms. Anderson and Ms. Tierney enumerated the items that need to be resolved and/or submitted by January 4th:

- 1) A letter from Jason Skeels, Town Engineer, stating that the most substantial points of his December 7th letter have been resolved;
- 2) A lease agreement, memorandum of understanding or letter indicating intent to agree, with neighboring property owners regarding leasing of off-site parking spaces for employees;
- 3) Comments from the Fire Department;
- 4) Circulation – pick-up and drop-off policy, consideration of a sidewalk versus parallel parking and getting people up and down the driveway;
- 5) An update on drainage easement agreements;

- 6) Information on snow storage and/or removal from site;
- 7) Information on lighting.

There was further discussion about whether there should be a sidewalk or parking along the driveway. Mr. Carson and Mr. Roznoy stated that a sidewalk was not realistic due to site constraints and should be removed from the list of requirements. Other Board members agreed that the sidewalk or lack thereof would not be a “deal-breaker”.

The vote was 8-0 to continue the public hearing to January 4, 2012, at 7:05 PM.

III. APPEARANCE

Ray Olson – Presentation on proposed plans to redevelop BioShelter site at 500-502 Sunderland Road for hydroponics and aquaculture

Ray Olson, from North Brookfield, MA, presented information about his plans to rehabilitate and reuse the BioShelter site at 500-502 Sunderland Road. He is currently negotiating with the owner, Ken Bergstrom, to purchase the property. “Scrap people” (scavengers) have been removing materials from the site. The 22,000 square foot building has been torn apart and all the wiring has been removed. Mr. Olson is working with Dr. Craig Hollingsworth at UMass regarding establishing aquaculture and hydroponics on the site. Mr. Olson has a background in culinary arts, teaching and operating Olson Seafood and Specialty Foods. He would like to clean up the site and put greenhouses back in place. He plans to produce a “high-end” hydroponic product. The building will be reconstructed as a conventional building, not a “bubble”. It will be about 24 feet high (versus the original 56 feet high) and will look like a manufacturing building.

Mr. Olson was seeking support from the Planning Board regarding his plans to reuse the site. He is in contact with 6 to 8 scientists who want to work with him on the project. It will be green and energy-efficient. He plans to install an agro lab and to use the sludge and byproducts of the waste fish.

Mr. Webber thanked Mr. Olson for his presentation and indicated his support for the project.

Ms. Kruger observed that the BioShelter had been a source of pride for the town. Reusing the site for a similar use would increase the tax base and create jobs. She expressed wholehearted support for the project.

Mr. Webber invited Mr. Olson to return to the Planning Board once his project was more developed.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

- A.** Updating the Master Plan – Incorporating New Plans/Reports – Gateway Visioning Report, others

Ms. Brestrup explained that Jonathan Tucker, Planning Director, had suggested that the Planning Board consider incorporating several documents (Valley Vision Update, Gateway Corridor Report, Survey of Residents Over 50 and Sewer Extension Master Plan) into the Master Plan and that the Board set a date for consideration of all of these documents for incorporation at the same time.

John Coull, Chair of the Amherst Redevelopment Authority, gave a presentation about the Gateway Visioning Report and why it should be incorporated into the Master Plan. There was discussion about whether the Report should be distilled into a smaller document before being incorporated. There was discussion about whether some of the other documents, such as the study of people over 50, should be incorporated into the Master Plan and whether there were documents that the town produces that may not need to be incorporated.

Mr. Crouner asked about the boundaries of the Gateway district and whether adoption of this plan would limit the town's options in the future. Mr. Coull responded that the boundaries of the Gateway area were flexible.

The Board decided by consensus to wait until March or April to discuss and vote on incorporating these documents into the Master Plan. There was general agreement that the Gateway Report did not need to be distilled prior to being incorporated by reference.

B. Letters from PVPC

1. Request for technical assistance – Mr. Webber reported that PVPC had received Amherst's request for technical assistance. The PVPC will evaluate the request and expects to be able to serve three requests this year.
2. Adoption of Memo of Agreement on Valley Vision – Mr. Webber reported that on October 27, 2011, the PVPC voted to adopt the Valley Vision Plan and the Planning Board had received a letter to this effect.

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

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Town Meeting

1. Signing of Attorney General's forms
 - a. Article 16 – Conversion of Official Zoning Map
 - b. Article 17 – Form-Based Village Center RezoningThe Board signed the Attorney General's forms.
2. Discussion about Fall Special Town Meeting – The discussion was postponed to a future meeting due to the late hour.

IX. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Zoning – Mr. O'Keeffe reported that there was discussion at the Zoning Subcommittee meeting this evening about Fall Town Meeting. The ZSC laid out the schedule in preparation for Spring Town Meeting. The biggest topic at the ZSC meeting was the zoning article and a framework for dealing with it. The consensus of the ZSC is that members wanted to move ahead and make changes to the [Form-based Code] zoning article and bring it to Spring Town Meeting in a form that will be supported by the Board and the community.

Mr. Roznoy asked if transportation components will be included. Mr. O'Keeffe stated that the intent is to work with members of the community and members of the Board to address issues about which they are concerned. He invited Mr. Roznoy to work with the ZSC to include his concerns about transportation.

Ms. Kruger suggested that the Board could schedule a retreat for itself, to discuss the Form-Based Code in a way that is different from the normal meetings. She said that a meeting would be posted, but held in another location, perhaps on the weekend, for a half-day working session. It would be open to the public to observe and listen.

Mr. O'Keeffe announced that there would be a Zoning Forum scheduled for Wednesday, January 4th at the regularly-scheduled Zoning Subcommittee meeting, at 5:00 PM in the Town Room, Town Hall.

Mr. Webber noted that there was an upcoming UMass Campus Planning community meeting scheduled for Thursday, December 15th, from 6:00 to 8:00 PM, at the UMass Police Station

Community Room, at 585 East Pleasant Street, to discuss the draft Campus Master Plan. He encouraged the Planning Board members to attend. However, if there is a quorum of Planning Board members present and the members intend to speak on topics that might come before the Planning Board, the meeting should be posted as a Planning Board meeting.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- B.** Water Supply Protection Committee – Planning Board representative – The discussion was postponed to a future meeting due to the late hour.
- C.** Planning Commissioners Journal – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of the Journal.
- D.** Upcoming Planning Board Schedule – The Board will meet as follows:
January 4th and 18th
February 1st and 15th
Mr. Webber and Ms. Kruger will not be able to attend the January 4th meeting.
- E.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting - none

VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

The Board endorsed the ANR plan for the following application:
ANR2012-00004 – Alexander Haim – 155 East Pleasant Street

VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS

The Planning Board declined to review the following ZBA applications:

ZBA FY2012-00007 – Carlos Ramos - To establish a home occupation, home improvement contractor, under Section 5.013 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 222 Belchertown Road

ZBA FY2012-00009 – Maital London-Levy - To establish a dog washing business, under Section 3.357 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 319-321 Main Street, Suite 5

ZBA FY2012-00010 – UMass Facilities Planning – To install an oversized identification sign under Section 8.41 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 758 North Pleasant Street

VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – none

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Mr. Schreiber reported that the PVPC would meet next on December 15th.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Ms. Anderson reported that CPAC would meet a week from Thursday and the deadline is this Friday [December 9th] for requests for funding.

Agricultural Commission – Mr. Webber reported that the Agricultural Committee would meet next week.

Transportation Plan Task Force – Mr. Roznoy reported that the Transportation Plan Task Force still has not met.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – no report

Design Review Board – no report

Other Boards and Committees – no report

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

XII. REPORT OF STAFF

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine M. Brestrup,
Senior Planner

Approved:

David K. Webber, Chair

DATE: _____