

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, March 21, 2012 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair; Jonathan O’Keeffe, Rob Crouner, Bruce Carson, Connie Kruger, Sandra Anderson, Stephen Schreiber, Richard Roznoy (7:10 PM) and Kathleen Ford

**ABSENT:** none

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:05 PM. He announced that the meeting was being broadcast live by Amherst Media and recorded by Amherst Media and town staff.

**I. MINUTES** March 7, 2012

Mr. Crouner MOVED to approve the Minutes of March 7, 2012. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 6-0-2 (Ford and Schreiber abstained).

**II. PUBLIC HEARING**

**A-03-12 Residential Parking Design Requirements**

To amend Sections 7.000 and 7.1 of the Zoning Bylaw to clarify the design requirements for parking, including paving and lighting requirements for residential parking.

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

Mr. O’Keeffe presented a report on the zoning amendment and discussions held by the Zoning Subcommittee on the amendment. The zoning amendment proposes design guidelines for parking. It would require that:

- 1) Parking shall be located on a paved surface, with no parking on “dirt”;
- 2) Parking shall be paved with certain types of materials;
- 3) A parking plan shall be submitted for parking areas containing 5 or more parking spaces (no plan is currently required);
- 4) Paved parking areas shall be counted in the calculation of maximum lot coverage;
- 5) For areas with 5 or more parking spaces, those spaces parked within the front setback must be arranged to allow for unrestricted passage;
- 6) For areas with 5 or more parking spaces, individual spaces must be marked and delineated;
- 7) Lighting must be provided for parking areas used at night.

There would be no revisions to the number of parking spaces required per dwelling unit, which currently stands at 2 spaces per unit. Existing uses would be “grandfathered”. A related set of parking requirements is being developed for the General Bylaws. It is hoped that these General Bylaws will be ready for Fall Town Meeting.

The Zoning Subcommittee voted 3-0 to recommend that the Planning Board recommend this article to Town Meeting.

Mr. Crouner noted that the Board members had two different versions of the amendment, both dated March 15<sup>th</sup>. One version contains more recent revisions.

Ms. Anderson asked about the meaning of “substantial renovation” and whether the need for a Building Permit constitutes “substantial renovation”. There was

discussion about the definition of “substantial renovation”.

Mr. Tucker noted that “grandfathering” protects uses that legally exist at the time that a zoning amendment is adopted. The new parking design requirements would apply to illegal uses; substantive changes and new uses, he said.

Ms. Kruger expressed concern that 5 parking spaces was a low threshold, especially considering that many of the requirements of the current Bylaw apply to parking areas with 10 or more parking spaces. She noted that many families have teenagers who drive cars and may have other family members living with them, potentially boosting the number of cars on a property to over 5 cars. She expressed concern about additional paving and noted that overflow parking spaces are often on “dirt”. She also objected to increased lighting in neighborhoods. Mr. Webber shared Ms. Kruger’s reservations.

Mr. O’Keeffe stated that the regulations were intended to exclude normal single-family use, because single-family homes usually do not have 5 or more cars parked on the premises. He agreed with Ms. Kruger’s concerns about lighting, however normal residential lighting will not be on all the time, as it might be for a business or commercial use.

Mr. Tucker explained that the zoning amendment states that “adequate lighting” shall be required. The regulations will capture new and expanded uses. The five car limit would normally exempt most single-family homes. In addition, this type of regulation is usually enforced based on complaints.

Mr. Roznoy also questioned the threshold of 5 cars. He expressed concerns about the vagueness of the phrase “where 5 or more cars are regularly parked”. He suggested that the regulations should be placed in the General Bylaw rather than in the Zoning Bylaw. He also thought that the regulations could be enforced “retroactively”.

Mr. Tucker explained that Town Counsel had been consulted in the development of the proposed amendment. He also noted that the Building Commissioner often takes photographs every few days of problem properties to document the conditions, including number of cars parked.

Ms. Anderson asked about the situation where a single-family home becomes a rental. How can this Bylaw be used to regulate these changes that happen “under the radar”? There was discussion about whether this situation constituted a “change in use”. There was discussion about whether a rented single-family dwelling was the same use as a single-family home occupied by a “family”. There was discussion about the various definitions of “family” in the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Tucker stated that the proposed zoning amendment was an attempt to control a change of use that does not require a land use permit.

There was discussion as to whether a change in use occurs when a single-family home becomes a rental. Mr. O’Keeffe stated his understanding that the uses are described in the Use Chart and a single-family home occupied by a “family” is the same whether it is rented or owned by the “family”.

There was discussion about whether a change in parking numbers or patterns of parking would constitute a change in use. Mr. Tucker explained that if the scope of the parking changes in a marked fashion it would come under the jurisdiction of the regulations.

Ms. Kruger expressed concern that enforcement of this set of regulations would be difficult.

Mr. Webber asked if someone could get a waiver from the requirement for painted lines in parking areas with 5 or more cars. There was discussion of waivers and Mr. Tucker stated that there would need to be a provision allowing the Building Commissioner to waive the requirement for situations that did not need a land use permit.

Ms. Anderson expressed concern that this zoning amendment may not be clear to the general public. She asked why the previous parking-related zoning amendment had been voted down at Town Meeting.

Mr. O’Keeffe explained that many concerns revolved around changes to the number of parking spaces that would be required. During the previous attempt to change the parking requirements, the Planning Board had proposed to reduce the minimum number of parking spaces required for certain uses and some people had objected to that change.

Mr. Webber asked about restrictions related to parking in the side setback and Mr. Tucker stated that the requirement applies only to the front setback. There are no restrictions about parking in the side setback. Mr. Tucker also asked if the Planning Board believed that the Building Commissioner should have the authority to waive parking requirements. Amherst has no history of granting variances, he noted.

Mr. Webber suggested adding language similar to that in Section 7.9 to allow the Building Commissioner to waive certain parking requirements. There was discussion about this suggestion; however it might require that Section 7.9 also be changed. Mr. Tucker explained that changes to Section 7.9 were not included in the legal advertisement for this zoning amendment and therefore such a change could not be included at this time.

Mr. Roznoy expressed further concern about enforcement. He stated that if someone were parking 5 or more cars for the past 10 years, then he would be grandfathered. In his opinion this regulation should be in the General Bylaw so that it could be enforced now.

Mr. Tucker noted that such a change is being proposed for the General Bylaw and will probably be considered at the Fall Town Meeting. He noted that there are approximately 2,400 single-family homes in Amherst that are being rented.

There was discussion about how this regulation would affect lot coverage. Mr. Tucker noted that lot coverage provides the ultimate control over how many cars can be parked on a property, because lot coverage includes paved areas. A provision has been proposed for Section 7.104 to state that areas paved for parking will be included in lot coverage.

There was further discussion about authorizing the Building Commissioner to waive portions of Section 7 of the Zoning Bylaw. It was decided by consensus that the Building Commissioner should be authorized to waive certain provisions of the parking section of the Bylaw for reasons of “safety or design”, but not for “aesthetic” reasons.

Ms. Kruger stated that she is opposed to this zoning amendment for the following reasons:

- 1) The threshold number should be changed to a higher number, perhaps 7 or 8;
- 2) The threshold number should be tied to the number of parking spaces required for a particular use rather than the number of cars parked on the site;
- 3) She thinks the town should be cautious about being too extreme with this Bylaw because it will become the template for the General Bylaw that will be

brought to Town Meeting this fall.

There was discussion about whether there should be an exemption from these requirements for single-family homes and houses with 4 or fewer dwelling units, as is currently provided in Section 7.1 for grading and setback requirements. It was determined that such properties could in fact have many cars parked on them and therefore it would be counterproductive to exempt them from the requirements of the proposed zoning amendment. In fact one of the goals of this Bylaw is to control parking on properties containing single-family home rentals with more than 5 cars parked on a regular basis.

Ms. Kruger stated that even with certain exemptions for single-family homes, she would still be opposed to this zoning amendment because the threshold is too low.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to close the public hearing. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 8-1 (Kruger opposed).

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED that the Planning Board recommend that Town Meeting approve the article on Residential Parking Design Requirements at the 2012 Annual Town Meeting. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 8-1 (Kruger opposed).

### III. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Local Historic District Study Committee – Discussion about Preliminary Study Report for the Proposed Dickinson Historic District that was presented to the Planning Board on March 7, 2012

Mr. Webber introduced the topic and summarized the proposal to establish a Local Historic District (LHD). He noted that the Planning Board had heard a presentation on the proposed LHD at a previous meeting.

Nate Malloy, Associate Planner and staff liaison to the Historical Commission and Local Historic District Study Committee (LHDSC), presented a summary of the previous presentation. He invited the Planning Board to offer comments and recommendations on the proposal.

Mr. Malloy made the following comments:

- The regulations governing the LHD are not zoning;
- One hundred communities in Massachusetts have LHDs;
- There are over 200 LHD’s in Massachusetts;
- One-third of the LHD’s have guidelines;
- The LHDSC studied and worked on templates for guidelines for Amherst;
- The LHDSC would work with the Design Review Board and the Planning Board to draft guidelines for this LHD;
- In terms of the boundaries, the LHDSC believes that it is better to include all properties, to protect the context of historic buildings;
- The proposed district contains many different architectural styles;
- The LHD guidelines would be similar to those of the Design Review Board;
- The LHD would not affect uses of the properties;
- Certain items are exempt, such as paint color, maintenance, in-kind replacement, and anything on the ground;
- The LHD can protect properties that are financially strained;
- The LHD can prevent demolition unless there is a plan in place to show what will replace the demolished structure;
- The LHD will have seven members who will be appointed by the Select Board;

- There are fewer than 40 properties proposed for this district;
- The Building Commissioner will have 5 days to determine whether a project is exempt from the regulations of the LHD;
- The Local Historic District Commission will have 14 days to determine whether it wishes to review a project, 45 days to hold a public hearing and 60 days to make a decision;
- The LHD will meet two times per month; members can also come in one time per week to review applications with staff.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the genesis of this proposal. He also asked what people fear will happen if the LHD is not adopted.

Mr. Malloy explained that the Historical Commission has been working on this proposal for a decade. The 2005 Amherst Preservation Plan recommends the establishment of Local Historic Districts in Amherst. The Massachusetts Historical Commission states that LHDs are the best tool for preservation. The Amherst Historical Commission has supported forming an LHD.

Mr. Malloy stated that LHDC members would be appointed for three year terms. The Local Historic District Study Committee was formed 2 ½ years ago. The Dickinson National Register Historic District was formed in 1977.

Mr. Malloy explained that if the LHD is not adopted the town may lose some historic buildings. He cited the book Lost Amherst, which shows photographs of buildings that have been demolished. This is a forward-thinking plan and a good planning tool, he concluded.

Ms. Kruger asked about the town's increased ability to obtain grants if the LHD is adopted and she asked if the town had lost grant opportunities as a result of not having an LHD.

Mr. Malloy explained that the grants are historic preservation grants. The town can apply for Certified Local Government status if an LHD is established. Ten percent of the money available for historic preservation is earmarked to go to Certified Local Governments. The town has been denied grant money in the past. The establishment of an LHD will make Amherst more competitive. The Historical Commission would like to obtain a grant to survey outbuildings and barns and farm properties with outbuildings. This would be one use of grant money.

Tom and Missy Ehrgood of 94 Lessey Street spoke in opposition to the establishment of an LHD. Mr. Ehrgood stated that of the 11 or 12 properties in the proposed district that are owned and occupied by families, the majority of which are historic, not a single property owner supports the establishment of an LHD. The Amherst Woman's Club is opposed, he said. Mr. Ehrgood reported that his wife had spent approximately \$100,000 on upkeep of her house since 1993. The establishment of an LHD will extend the Building Permit process. He expressed concern that the LHDC may require that properties be improved. He questioned how much it would cost homeowners to abide by the regulations. He cautioned that homeowners might be required to submit financial information in order to claim hardship. He characterized the LHD as a coercive and intrusive mechanism that has no support from residents. He asked the Planning Board not to recommend that this proposal be brought forward to Town Meeting.

Phil Shaver, President of the Amherst Historical Society, stated that he would like to see Local Historic Districts established in town.

Mr. Webber noted that the Dickinson Historic District already exists. He

acknowledged that the Woman's Club is opposed to the establishment of the LHD, but clarified that the Woman's Club had not communicated this opposition to the Planning Board.

Mr. Crowner stated that consideration of the LHD is important to the work of the Planning Board, especially since the Board often proposes zoning changes in historic areas. He recommended that the Board support this proposal and let Town Meeting decide on the outcome. It is part of the Planning Board's planning for Village Centers, he said. The Planning Board is committed to preserving historic resources and it is important to support this idea.

Mr. Webber stated that he was in favor of the proposal until the presenters talked about establishing a North Amherst and South Amherst Historic District.

Mr. Roznoy stated that he would oppose a positive recommendation to Town Meeting on this proposal. There are so many commissions and boards in town that it tends to restrict what happens in town. The Commission would have considerable control. None of the residents are in favor of it and the Board should listen to the residents. The boundaries of the area are amorphous. He cautioned against establishing excessive requirements. He asked about the jurisdiction of the Design Review Board.

Ms. Brestrup clarified that the Design Review Board has limited jurisdiction, which includes properties within the B-G zoning district, the B-L zoning district abutting the B-G district, the area within 150 feet of the Town Common and projects on town-owned properties.

Mr. Schreiber expressed his support for the establishment of the LHD.

Ms. Anderson observed that the town was established in 1759. She owns a house in another town with a historic district and she has been both denied and supported in her requests to make changes to her property. She expressed support for the establishment of an LHD and stated that LHDs are not cumbersome.

Mr. O'Keeffe expressed his support for the LHD for the following reasons:

- 1) It would classify historic resources that need preservation for the town's long term interest;
- 2) He agrees with Mr. Crowner's comments that this is relevant to the Planning Board's work; during review of applications, the Board and the public often have concerns about how projects will impact historic areas; it will make the Board's job easier; he is in favor of extending the protection to North and South Amherst and protecting Amherst's nine existing National Historic Register Districts.

Ms. Kruger stated that she could not support the LHD in its current form because the district is too large, she is uncomfortable with the boundaries, with the process and with the authority that the Commission would have.

Ms. Ford asked who will craft the changes to the proposal. Mr. Shaver stated that no changes will be made to the proposal before it goes to Town Meeting.

Mr. Malloy clarified that the Preliminary Study Report had gone to the Massachusetts Historical Commission for its review and that the MHC could recommend changes. He also reported that there is a public hearing scheduled for the Local Historic District proposal on April 26<sup>th</sup>. In addition, Town Counsel and staff are reviewing the proposal.

Ms. Ford expressed her general support for creating this type of district. She would

appreciate having flexibility in the requirements and has some open questions about the proposal but is generally in support of the LHD.

Mr. Carson stated that he understood his colleagues concerns but he will support the proposal as it exists. The Planning Board can have input into the guidelines.

Mr. Malloy stated that Jerry Guidera and Bill Gillen, both property owners in the area, support the LHD. He stated that the Woman's Club had sent a letter of opposition. They were concerned about costs of repairs and maintenance. Mr. Malloy reiterated that maintenance and paint colors are exempt from the regulations. The Woman's Club purchased its property with the understanding that the Club maintain the property as it was in the 1920's, so the Club is already committed to preserving the property.

Mr. Crouner MOVED to recommend that the Select Board bring this proposal forward to Town Meeting. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-3 (Webber, Kruger and Roznoy opposed).

Mr. Malloy noted that comments on the proposal were still welcome until the date of the public hearing on April 26<sup>th</sup>.

**B. Village Center Rezoning – Update on the status of Village Center Rezoning and Form-Based Code**

Mr. O'Keefe reported on the progress of Village Center Rezoning. He presented an update and offered to facilitate discussion about the comments submitted by Ms. Kruger. The Zoning Subcommittee is at the end of its process with regard to Village Center Rezoning. The Select Board will sign the warrant at the end of next week. The first complete version was sent to Planning Board members in their packets. He described recent changes to the proposed zoning amendment:

- 1) The number and format of maps has been changed to make them easier to understand;
- 2) As a result of technical feedback, the height of buildings and number of floors has been reviewed and language was added for an exemption or waiver for buildings with pitched roofs;
- 3) Language on the height of the first floor relative to ground level has been adjusted because of problems with accessibility;
- 4) Photographs of local buildings have been included among the various building types, in response to comments from the public that local examples should be included.

Ms. Kruger noted that some of her comments related to trying to describe the buildings without making reference to the historic farmhouse style. She also questioned the inclusion of length of frontage when determining how a building should be oriented to the street. Many of the lots in a Village Center have a small amount of frontage.

There was further discussion about how to describe the "farmhouse style" architecture, about the orientation of entrances and the meaning of some of the terms that are used in the text.

Ms. Kruger agreed to defer to the judgment of the Zoning Subcommittee with regard to her suggested changes.

Mr. O'Keefe explained the Warrant language and how it will give Town Meeting a

chance to vote up or down on North Amherst and Atkins Corners. There will be two separate articles, one for North Amherst and one for Atkins Corners.

Mr. Webber stated that there was general consensus on the Warrant language.

Mr. O’Keefe stated that the Planning Board public hearing for the Village Center Rezoning articles would be on April 4<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Anderson commended the Zoning Subcommittee on its work.

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

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. Chapter 61 Removal – Flat Hills Road – W. D. Cowls, Inc.

Mr. Webber read the letter from Attorney Peter MacConnell, dated March 13, 2012, explaining the owner’s Notice of Intent to sell a parcel of land on Flat Hills Road for residential use. He explained that that the Select Board is the deciding body and that the Planning Board’s role is advisory, to recommend whether or not the Select Board should exercise the town’s right of first refusal to purchase the property for \$90,000. He explained that Chapter 61 qualifies a property owner for a lower tax rate in exchange for using the property for forestry. The owners have found a buyer for the lot. The ANR plan for the lot was endorsed by the Planning Board at a recent meeting. The town has the “right of first refusal” to purchase the property for market value.

Mr. Crower explained that he had objected the last time this landowner had removed a parcel from Chapter 61, further down the same road. He characterized the sale of this property for residential use as sprawl development. He would not be happy to vote to allow this sale to go forward. He recognizes that this may not be one of the most important pieces of land for the town’s acquisition and the property has a monetary value. He would like to issue a finding explaining the Board’s position on this parcel. He stated that other boards and committees, such as the Conservation Commission, would have an opportunity to express an opinion as well. The Planning Board should weigh in on the basis of its understanding of the Master Plan.

Mr. Crowner stated that he intended to make a motion that the Planning Board convey to the Select Board a “finding” that the lot proposed for removal from the Chapter 61 program meets the minimum qualifications for preservation in that it is not in an existing village center, there is no public transportation or pedestrian infrastructure connecting it to a center, and it has been identified as land protectable from development by virtue of being in the Chapter 61 program

Mr. Crowner acknowledged that the decision is the Select Board’s and that the Planning Board doesn’t have the context to say that the town should spend \$90,000 for this parcel of land.

Ms. Kruger expressed appreciation for Mr. Crowner’s thoughtful position. However, she does not view Chapter 61 lands as protection. She sees it as a tax incentive to promote active farming or forestry. She questioned whether the Planning Board should support eliminating single family development in outlying areas. She doesn’t support this idea.

Mr. Roznoy stated that he concurs with the comments of both Mr. Crowner and Ms. Kruger and he would like to repeat his recommendation of January 19, 2011, when a similar topic came before the Planning Board. [He had recommended that a statement be attached to the Board’s vote indicating that, while the development of

the parcel does not appear to fit with the goals of the Master Plan in terms of encouraging development in the centers, the Board does not believe that the town should exercise its right of first refusal based on this particular lot and the circumstances of its situation.]

Mr. Roznoy stated that the Planning Board's task is to advise the Select Board on whether to exercise the town's right of first refusal. He recommended that the Planning Board recommend to the Select Board that the town not exercise the right of first refusal, but forward to the Select Board the concerns of members about development outside the designs exhibited in the Master Plan.

Mr. Crouner stated that the Planning Board is not obliged to make a recommendation to the Select Board. The requirement is that the Planning Board be notified of the intent to sell.

Mr. Roznoy summarized the legal aspects of the topic before the Board. Ms. Brestrup agreed that the Planning Board needs to be given the opportunity to make a recommendation to the Select Board but the Planning Board is not required to make a recommendation.

Mr. Webber stated that this is a modest sized lot in an area that is already developed with single family homes. There is already a fairly large subdivision in the area and a pattern of single family homes along Flat Hills Road. For that reason he does not believe that the sale of this property for residential use is inconsistent with development of the area nor is it inconsistent with the Master Plan. He does not support the town exercising its right of first refusal nor does he support the Planning Board's issuing a finding.

Mr. Crouner MOVED that the Planning Board convey to the Select Board a "finding" that the lot proposed for removal from the Chapter 61 program meets the minimum qualifications for preservation in that it is not in an existing village center, there is no public transportation or pedestrian infrastructure connecting it to a center (nor is there ever likely to be), and it has been identified as land protectable from development by virtue of being in the Chapter 61 program and therefore approved by a state forester. Mr. Crouner further MOVED to state that the Planning Board's preference is to direct residential growth to the downtown and village centers rather than outlying areas, that it is actively working to encourage this by revising village center zoning and exploring transfer of development rights zoning, but that it recognizes that not all of the town's goals can be accomplished immediately and simultaneously. Mr. O'Keeffe seconded and the vote was 2-7 (Webber, Carson, Kruger, Anderson, Schreiber, Roznoy and Ford opposed)

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the Planning Board recommend to the Select Board that the town not exercise its right of first refusal on this property. Mr. Schreiber seconded and the vote was 8-1 (Crouner opposed).

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

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

The Planning Board endorsed the following ANR plans:

ANR2012-00008 – Kenton Tharp – 371 & 373 Montague Road

ANR2012-00009 – Patrick & Eileen Galvin – 107 & 119 Blue Hills Road

**VI. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none**

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

There are two upcoming Site Plan Review applications:

SPR2012-00003 – Catherine & Morten Jensen Hole – 1156 North Pleasant Street – conversion of a single family home to a duplex

SPR2012-00004 – Amherst College – 96 Northampton Road – conversion of single family house to a duplex

There was discussion about scheduling public hearings for these applications. The SPR for 1156 North Pleasant Street was scheduled for April 18<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Webber asked to have the 1156 North Pleasant Street application first on the agenda for April 18<sup>th</sup>, in case the public hearing for the Village Center Rezoning were to be continued to April 18<sup>th</sup>.

The Planning Board agreed to hold a public hearing on 96 Northampton Road on May 2<sup>nd</sup> even though that is a Town Meeting night. The project appears to be relatively uncomplicated because the renovations are primarily interior renovations. The Board members agreed to meet at 6:00 p.m. in the Town Room, Town Hall, to allow Town Meeting members to attend Town Meeting at 7:30 p.m. at the Middle School.

#### **VIII. PLANNING BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Zoning – The report had been previously given by Mr. O’Keeffe.

#### **IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS**

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Mr. Schreiber reported that a meeting is scheduled for March 23<sup>rd</sup>, from 8:30 to 10:15 a.m., on connecting transportation needs with new financial tools and strategies. He will send the flyer to staff for forwarding to Board members.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Ms. Anderson reported that CPAC had completed its work for the year. She will bring a report to the next meeting.

Agricultural Commission – no report

Transportation Plan Task Force – Mr. Roznoy reported that the TPTF had been meeting over the past several weeks. The members are developing an RFP for consultants to prepare the Transportation Plan. The TPTF has 6 members and two staff coordinators, Guilford Mooring and Chris Brestrup. The RFP is scheduled to be completed by the end of March. Interviews will occur in May. There may be a need to extend the time allotted for completing the Transportation Plan past the end of the year.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – no report

Design Review Board – Ms. Ford reported that she had been appointed to the Design Review Board as the Planning Board representative.

Other Boards and Committees – no report

**X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Webber reported that the weather is lovely.

**XI. REPORT OF STAFF** – none

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
David Webber, Chair