

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, July 18, 2012 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

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

**ABSENT:** none

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

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

Mr. Webber congratulated Mr. Schreiber, Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Crowner on their reappointments to three-year terms on the Planning Board.

**I. MINUTES** June 27, 2012

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the Minutes of June 27, 2012. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 8-0-1 (Anderson abstained).

**II. APPEARANCES**

**Chris Curtis and Josh Neiderbach of Pioneer Valley Planning Commission**

Presentation on Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) and Draft TDR Bylaw and Model Solar and Wind Bylaws

Mr. Curtis presented general information about Transfer of Development Rights and a preliminary draft TDR Zoning Bylaw developed specifically for Amherst. He noted that this project was being conducted at the request of the town as part of the District Local Technical Assistance Program, a state-funded program that provides assistance to about six communities each year on issues related to smart growth and sustainable development. The program is free of charge to the community.

The purpose of Transfer of Development Rights is two-pronged:

- To protect important natural resources (including farmland, aquifer recharge areas, river corridors, upland areas, etc.);
- To promote compact development around village centers and town centers.

The case for TDR’s in the Pioneer Valley can be made by looking at threats to farmland and residential sprawl.

TDR allows development rights to be purchased in a sending area and transferred to a receiving area. The land in the sending area is permanently protected and the land in the receiving area is allowed to be developed in a denser fashion than would ordinarily be allowed, or there are certain incentives offered other than increased density. The increased density and other incentives are usually allowed by Special Permit.

Five communities in the Pioneer Valley have adopted TDR – Hadley, Hatfield, Westfield, Easthampton and Palmer.

In Hadley the transfers occur from residential areas to the commercial and industrial areas.

In Easthampton, the river corridors and Mount Tom range are part of the sending areas.

In Hadley the entire town except for the town center and Route 9 corridor are sending areas. Each lot designated in a sending area is equal to a certain type of incentive in the receiving area. Development rights can be exchanged for an increase in floor area in commercial

buildings, an increase in density in residential areas (by a factor of 1.2) or a reduction in parking requirements. Cash payments in lieu of direct purchase of rights from farmers are also allowed.

Hadley has had 10 transactions so far. To date the other towns have not had any transactions.

In Hadley, over \$300,000 has been contributed to the town to purchase APR's. These contributions have leveraged money from the state to the extent that \$3.8 million worth of farmland in Hadley has been preserved as a result of this program.

The income stream from the TDR program is unpredictable. It is good to have a provision for cash payments. Costs and timeframes associated with direct purchase of development rights from farmers can be burdensome for developers. A town can keep a list of interested sellers. But it is often hard for developers to make contact with farmers. Towns need to market their TDR programs to developers and farmers.

Mr. Curtis summarized features of the Draft TDR Bylaw that are unique to Amherst. The purposes of the TDR Bylaw include a list of resources that can be protected, including historical resources. The purposes of the TDR Bylaw also include encouragement of development in traditional neighborhoods and village centers. The Bylaw outlines how sending and receiving areas would be established. A Special Permit would be required to transfer development rights to a receiving area. The Special Permit Granting Authority would need to determine (with the applicant) the number of lots or development rights available for transfer.

The applicant can work with the town to identify the holder of the Conservation or Historical Restriction. The Conservation or Historical Restriction would be reviewed by Town Counsel and then voted on by the Select Board and either the Conservation or Historical Commission. The Special Permit Granting Authority could choose to grant, deny or grant with conditions the Special Permit for the land in the receiving area.

Mr. Curtis described the "menu of options" that would be available for exchange of development rights. He described the difficult process for release of a restriction, which would involve a vote of the state legislature. He described the process for "banking" development rights and noted that a Special Permit is not needed until a transfer to the receiving area is proposed.

Mr. Tucker explained that in the draft Amherst TDR Bylaw Historical properties were added as part of the "sending area".

Ms. Brestrup noted that the draft Bylaw still needs to be coordinated with the footnotes in Table 3, Dimensional Requirements. Mr. Webber encouraged the Planning Board to read the draft carefully and be able to discuss it at a future meeting.

Josiah Neiderbach of PVPC presented information on model solar and wind bylaws. Model bylaws for solar and wind are provided by the state, to help communities to become designated as Green Communities. The installations that are considered by these bylaws are fairly large – including solar installations of at least 1 acre in size and wind installations at least 250 feet high.

Mr. Neiderbach presented information about bylaws that have been adopted by other communities, including Northampton and Chesterfield.

Mr. Tucker noted that Amherst is already pursuing a solar facility on an abandoned landfill. In addition, our Zoning Bylaw already allows installations of energy-producing facilities under the section that allows transformer stations. The question is "Does the town want more specific controls over these installations?" Ms. Brestrup noted that there are currently no height or size restrictions or specific setback regulations on such facilities in Amherst.

Ms. Kruger noted that there are now no major regulatory problems with respect to wind and solar. She is willing to have this topic remain dormant for now. In addition, there is no forgone conclusion that we want to adopt TDR. Ms. Kruger stated that TDR has not been an effective tool in Massachusetts. Amherst has done TDR “writ large” by preserving so much open space and farmland. The problem is that it is hard to find receiving areas where people can agree to have denser development. She acknowledged that it would be a “benign” addition to the Zoning Bylaw. She questioned the incentive that would allow a reduction in required parking and asked why not just reduce the required amount of parking in the Zoning Bylaw. She questions whether it is a good idea to pursue TDR at this time.

Mr. Webber noted that this presentation was intended to be an introduction to the topics of TDR, wind and solar bylaws.

Mr. Schreiber agreed with Ms. Kruger’s comments. He suggested that the Planning Board look at a zoning amendment for the front setback requirement.

Mr. Tucker noted that the town has been preserving land for 50 years. It is easier to preserve land in outlying areas than it is to develop next to people’s homes.

Ms. Ford asked for a clarification on the cash payments in lieu of purchasing development rights. Mr. Curtis explained that the money goes into a specific conservation fund and that it cannot be used for anything other than conservation (or historic preservation in Amherst’s case). It eliminates the need for a developer to make contact with and negotiate with a prospective seller. In Hadley the cash payments are held in a conservation fund until a farmer applies for an Agricultural Preservation Restriction (an APR). Then the money is used to purchase the APR. The state requires a 10% match from communities for APR purchases. In Hadley all of the transactions have been cash transactions. Both halves of the transactions have taken place, but both halves do not need to happen at the same time.

There was further discussion of the TDR process. Questions that were asked include:

- 1) Can we get an example of a town that has a receiving area in the downtown?
- 2) Is there a way to preferentially make downtown a receiving area over the village centers? Can we have a system that grants 2 credits for development in the downtown area and 1 credit for development in the village centers?
- 3) Can development rights be transferred across town boundaries?

Mr. Curtis stated that the downtown can be designated as a receiving area. He noted that in crossing town boundaries there might be a perception of “winner” and “loser” communities. He suggested that this [crossing town boundaries] might work better in states that have county government and county zoning.

The Board discussed bringing the topic of TDR back again on August 15<sup>th</sup>. There was discussion about whether to consider solar and wind bylaws now or revisit the topic later. Mr. Crowner agreed that it would be useful to have guidelines on the books but that solar and wind were not a priority at this time, given the other things that the Planning Board is working on.

There was further discussion and the Board agreed to revisit the topic of TDR after Fall Town Meeting, in December. The Board members requested that the presentation about TDR be put on the town website.

### **CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) Advisory Committee**

Discussion about public process for 2013 Community Development Strategy

Jana McClure and Mary Jane Laus appeared for the CDBG Advisory Committee. Ms. McClure reported that Amherst, along with 10 other communities in Massachusetts, has been a Mini-Entitlement Community since 2006. The money that is received from the CDBG program is expected to be \$900,000 and will be distributed as follows:

- 60% for non-social service projects
- 40% to social service projects
- 20% to administration.

Last year the Planning Board helped the CDBG Advisory Committee to develop the Community Development Strategy and held a public hearing on the Strategy with the CDBG Advisory Committee.

Mr. Crowner, a Planning Board member, attends CDBG Advisory Committee meetings. He noted that the CDBG program provides an opportunity for the town to implement some of the objectives of the Master Plan, using state money.

This year the CDBG Advisory Committee would like to hold its own public hearing with Planning Board members invited to attend. The public hearing is scheduled for August 9<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of the hearing is to obtain input from the public on the development of the strategy. The Advisory Committee requested that Mr. Crowner attend the public hearing as a liaison. Since Mr. Crowner will be out of town, Mr. Webber offered to attend in his place.

If Planning Board members wish to submit comments on the Strategy, they can submit their comments to the Planning Department staff, who will forward the comments to the CDBG Advisory Committee. Ms. McClure stated that the Draft 2013 Strategy is the same as the final 2012 Strategy, so Planning Board members can make their comments on the 2012 Strategy which they received in their packets.

Mr. Webber encouraged Planning Board members to attend the public hearing.

### **III. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. SPR2012-00006/M13239 – 249 South Pleasant Street, Amherst College**

Review of items related to Conditions 4 and 6 of Site Plan Review approval, including a sample lease and Town Engineer's comments

Mr. Webber stated that the conditions of the Site Plan Review approval had required that a sample lease be submitted with certain provisions and that the applicant should seek the Town Engineer's comments on the proposed project.

Mr. Webber noted that the applicant had provided the required documentation. He read from the lease the requirement that the property be kept in good order with no sofas or indoor upholstered furniture in any outdoor locations and he acknowledged receipt of an email from the Town Engineer stating that he had no comments on the project.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to confirm that Conditions 4 and 6 of the Site Plan Review approval had been met. Mr. O'Keeffe seconded and the vote was 9-0.

#### **B. Signing of Decision**

SPR2012-00007/M13281 – 79 South Pleasant Street, Trustees of Amherst College

The Board members signed the decision.

C. Zoning

1. Zoning Subcommittee – Report

Mr. Crouner reported that the ZSC met this evening and was joined by Mr. Schreiber, Ms. Kruger and Mr. Roznoy. The ZSC saw and heard a presentation by a resident of Fearing Street describing the turnover in his neighborhood and changes of residences from single-family homes to “unsupervised non-owner occupied rental units”. Mr. Crouner stated that the concerns that have been expressed in the past (both anecdotally and emotionally) became more concrete as a result of the pictures, graphics and maps presented to the ZSC. He encouraged Planning Board members who had not seen the presentation to watch it on Amherst Media (about 15 minutes into the ZSC meeting and lasting for about 25 minutes).

Mr. Crouner expressed his opinion that many of the recommendations that were brought out in the presentation could be addressed by the proposed residential use amendments. He noted that the second part of the ZSC meeting consisted of an overview of the proposed amendments.

Mr. Crouner summarized the proposed amendments and issues discussed by the ZSC:

- 1) One and two family residential uses would be divided into two classes, one owner occupied and one non-owner occupied. The non-owner occupied uses would have oversight by the ZBA.
- 2) Converted dwelling uses would be clarified and distinguished from two-family dwelling uses. Conversions would be by Special Permit. The converted dwelling section of the Bylaw provides an opportunity for conversions in areas that otherwise do not allow a duplex [the B-G, B-L and B-VC districts].
- 3) Lodging or Boarding House uses would be clarified.
- 4) A condition would be added to all residential rental uses that would require rental registration and permitting, so that problem properties could be more closely monitored and penalized.
- 5) Other residential uses and definitions
- 6) Agricultural processing use
- 7) Watershed protection
- 8) TDR
- 9) A map of a village center with proposed mixed uses on both sides of the street, presented in the context of moving forward with Atkins Corners.

He noted that decisions would need to be made soon as to which amendments will be moved forward so that public hearings can be scheduled as early as the first meeting in September.

2. Zoning Subcommittee – Continued discussion on role of ZSC

Ms. Kruger spoke about the conundrum of wanting the Planning Board to be more fully involved with the development of zoning amendments while being aware that there is limited time in Planning Board meetings. She found it helpful to receive the full ZSC packet. She would have liked all of the Planning Board members to have seen Mr. Karlstrom’s presentation. She may be interested in joining the Zoning Subcommittee in order to fully participate.

Ms. Anderson spoke in favor of maintaining the Zoning Subcommittee as a separate entity. Board members already serve on other subcommittees and Planning Board meetings are already full. She appreciates having the Zoning Subcommittee being able to delve into the zoning amendments at a greater depth and then synthesizing their discussions for the Planning Board.

Mr. Schreiber volunteered to serve on the Zoning Subcommittee. He suggested that the public comment period might be moved from the ZSC's agenda to the Planning Board's agenda. The ZSC would have working meetings which would still be open to the public. The ZSC report could occur early on in the Planning Board's agenda. Ms. Ford agreed.

Mr. Roznoy expressed ongoing concerns about the ZSC and reiterated his contention that it should be reorganized. He tentatively agreed with Mr. Schreiber's proposal, but expressed concern that such a small group [the ZSC] should have such heavy responsibilities. He suggested that there could be multiple ZSC's each with a different focus, such as housing, TDR, solar and wind bylaws, Atkins Corners rezoning, etc. He noted that the Planning Board makes the decisions about which zoning issues should go forward. He expressed opposition to the massive list of items on the ZSC work list and noted that the work list did not seem to be connected with the current list of priority items that the ZSC was working on. He agreed that the current list reflected what was needed now.

Mr. O'Keeffe expressed his opinion that the question of "What to work on" should be determined by the full Planning Board, but the question of "How the zoning should be structured" should be the work of a smaller group that can write language and deal with minutia. He expressed concern about the idea of having multiple groups with a revolving set of members working on zoning. There is value in having a dedicated group, he said. However he also wants the Planning Board to have meaningful discussions at Board meetings about what should be worked on, because a subset of the Board should not be determining priorities. Having a standing item on the Planning Board agenda early in the evening with a detailed report from the ZSC and time for discussion and setting of priorities would be his preferred method of handling zoning amendments.

Mr. Webber agreed that if the Board has a viable ZSC it doesn't make sense to eliminate it.

Ms. Ford MOVED that Mr. Schreiber and Ms. Kruger be appointed to the ZSC. Mr. O'Keeffe seconded. Mr. Schreiber and Ms. Kruger agreed to serve. The vote was 9-0.

Mr. Webber read from a list prepared by staff entitled "Fall 2012 Special Town Meeting – Potential Zoning Amendments". Items on the list included:

- Residential Rental Use Amendments:
  - Single family & duplexes
  - Converted dwellings
  - Lodging or boarding houses
  - Mixed Use/Live-Work Use
  - Rental registration requirements
  - Functional Family Definition
- Atkins Corner village center rezoning revisions
- Historic Preservation Amendments/Demolition Delay Extension (12

- 18 months)
- Sustainable/Alternative Energy & LID Requirements
- Agricultural Processing
- DEP Zone I compliance amendments
- Identifying site for private student housing
- Transfer of Development Rights
- FPC Remapping & Rezoning

3. Public Comment Period

Gretchen Fox of 90 Fearing Street stated that she had submitted written comments on rental registration. She noted that identifying site for private student housing should be a high priority for the town.

Maurianne Adams of 14 Beston Street spoke in favor of the change that she sees in the attitude of the Planning Board and the Zoning Subcommittee to be more open to receiving input from the residents of areas that will be affected by proposed changes to the Zoning Bylaw. She supports the new emphasis on the “rental dilemma”. The problems associated with student rentals have made it difficult for residents to support rezoning efforts before the basic difficulties are dealt with. She spoke about shifting the “blame” and responsibility for solving problems from students to owners and managers of properties. She expressed concern about the characterization of neighbors as being fearful and she appreciated being able to speak truthfully to the ZSC and the Planning Board. She asserted that the Master Plan, although a foundational document, had not been widely discussed and she asserted that the latest version of the Master Plan differed in its position on some core issues related to development from positions expressed in previous versions of the Plan. She contended that this was partially responsible for the failure of recent rezoning efforts. She appreciates the change that involves hearing from all of the stakeholders in Amherst’s future.

Bill Grohmann of 146 Sunset Avenue spoke in opposition to the conversion of single-family dwellings to student rentals. He urged the Board to take the issue seriously. In addition to changing the neighborhood, the conversions are taking away potential starter homes, homes for retirees and homes for visiting faculty, he said.

Janet Keller of 120 Pulpit Hill Road expressed appreciation to the ZSC for the care that they have taken with their discussions and thanked Planning Board members who attended the ZSC meeting. She stated that there is a pressing need to solve problems related to housing, but there are environmental concerns that also must be dealt with. There are major floodplain and wetland complexes in both North and South Amherst.

Mr. Roznoy recommended that the ZSC focus on the list associated with residential rental use amendments and hold off on considering the other items, except perhaps for identifying sites for student housing.

Mr. O’Keeffe agreed that the focus should be on what is most important. The list of residential rental items will be a lot for Town Meeting to process. He recommended holding off on TDR. He stated that identifying sites for student housing is not an issue for the ZSC. The Planning Board should consider this issue.

Several Board members agreed with these sentiments, but Ms. Kruger stated that the technical fixes, such as the issue of DEP compliance, should also be

dealt with.

Mr. Tucker explained the issues surrounding DEP compliance. The proposed amendment would bring Amherst's zoning into compliance with DEP regulations related to surface supplies for drinking water. He noted that the other listed zoning issues were important too and he enumerated them.

Ms. Ford suggested taking the language developed for the DEP amendment and present it to the Planning Board as written and bypass the ZSC.

After discussion the Board agreed by consensus to hold off on issues that were not related to residential rental uses and to focus on residential rental uses and DEP Zone I regulations for Fall Town Meeting. They requested that the DEP amendment come directly to the Planning Board.

Ms. Kruger noted that the Board is implicitly saying that the Board will not be going ahead with Atkins Corners rezoning until spring.

Ms. Brestrup requested clarification on the preferred format and order of items on the agenda for upcoming Planning Board meetings. After discussion the Board members decided by consensus to keep the format essentially the same for the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. Mr. Tucker suggested that for meetings that include public hearings, the Board could discuss during the previous meeting the preferred order of items on the agenda for the upcoming meeting.

**D.** Planning Board Rules and Regulations – potential changes including requirement for lease submittal

Mr. Webber noted that two changes were being proposed for the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations. These changes relate to submittal requirements. The changes include the requirement for submitting a copy of the lease and the requirement that the applicant submit to the Health Department the Rental Registration form.

Paige Wilder of Fearing Street noted that Julie Federman, Health Director, is working on "best practices" for leases and management plans and she will be appearing before the Planning Board at the next meeting on August 1<sup>st</sup>.

After discussion the Board decided by consensus to hold a public hearing on the matter on August 15<sup>th</sup> and to suspend further discussion of this topic until the public hearing.

**E.** Planning Board Summer Schedule

The Board decided by consensus to hold a meeting on August 15<sup>th</sup> but to wait to decide about the August 29<sup>th</sup> meeting until a later date.

Mr. Schreiber reminded the Board that it is traditional to hold elections after annual appointments have been made and that the Board now has a full complement of members. The Board decided by consensus to hold elections at its September 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

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

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Housing**

1. Comments of John Fox on public input into Housing Market Study

Mr. Fox praised what he viewed as a new attitude on the part of the ZSC and Planning Board to engage with the residents of neighborhoods regarding potential zoning changes and problems in the neighborhoods.

He then read from emails that he had exchanged with Mr. Tucker and with Stephanie O’Keeffe, Chair of the Select Board. He expressed concern about the proposed lack of public input into the Housing Market Study. He urged that the Study include charettes and meetings similar to those that were held during the Gateway Visioning process. The consultants will most likely be from out of town and will need to hear from people who live in the neighborhoods that will be affected. The Study is not merely a data collecting exercise since one of the products will be to make recommendations about zoning changes.

Mr. Tucker noted that the recommendations requested from the consultant had to do with zoning amendments that were already being discussed or proposed, and were not about the development of new zoning amendments.

He reviewed the history of the development of the RFP for the Housing Market Study. Last summer staff, the Planning Board and others had developed a proposal to ask Town Meeting for funds to do a Housing Study. Town Meeting had appropriated those funds and a draft RFP was developed. This draft was brought to the Planning Board and the Select Board for review and comments. After consultation with the Town Manager, the RFP was sent out in late May. Responses to the RFP are currently under review.

Ms. Kruger noted that the Housing and Sheltering Committee will hold public meetings with the consultant three times during the course of the Housing Study. While she expressed some reservations about the choice of the Housing and Sheltering Committee to be the body that will work with the consultant on this study, she noted that these meetings will provide an opportunity for public input.

Mr. Fox expressed concerns about the Housing and Sheltering Committee being chosen as the body to conduct this work since it is a new, small committee whose work is generally focused on the needs of the low income and homeless population. He stated that the Housing Study is really important and that it provides a chance to learn from everyone – businesses, officials and residents of all of the neighborhoods. He urged the town to consider incorporating a public process similar to that conducted during the Gateway Visioning process.

Mr. Webber acknowledged Mr. Fox’s concerns but noted that the RFP had already been published and could not really be changed at this point.

Mr. Schreiber disagreed with the notion that a charrette is necessary in order to receive public input. He noted that there are many ways for the public to participate in the process. He views this study as a first stage of a longer process.

Paige Wilder of Fearing Street stated that a large group of neighbors of the Gateway area had met and agreed among themselves that the Gateway process had been conducted without facts and figures. They had requested

the Housing Market Study. She objected to the way it is being carried out.

Mr. Webber noted that his vision of the study is that it will involve the gathering and analysis of information by an outside third party. He did not envision that he would have any input into that process.

There was further discussion about the nature and content of the upcoming study.

Maurianne Adams suggested that one of the three meetings of the consultant with the Housing and Sheltering Committee could be devoted to a public forum.

Ms. Kruger, the Planning Board's liaison to the Housing and Sheltering Committee, suggested that the Planning Board could offer to co-host a meeting of the Planning Board with the Housing and Sheltering Committee, outside of the regular HSC meetings.

Mr. Webber thanked Mr. Fox and others for bringing the issue of public input during the Housing Study process to the attention of the Planning Board and he noted that a proposed meeting focused on public input was probably doable within the scope of the RFP.

2. Schedule and frame discussion about housing issues

Ms. Kruger stated that she had developed a statement about how to frame the discussion on housing. It had been distributed to Board members. She questioned the way Planning Board agendas are put together and expressed disappointment that this discussion was beginning so late in the evening. She would like to figure out a role for the Planning Board on the issue of housing. She noted that there seems to be a vacuum with regard to who is taking the lead on housing. The Housing and Sheltering Committee is really focusing on affordable housing. The Planning Board has an opportunity to look at how campuses plan for housing. We need to figure out where student housing should go and we need to work with the campuses and form a partnership to resolve issues of student housing.

Mr. Tucker urged the Board to put the issue of housing on an upcoming agenda. It relates to so many other issues that the Board is grappling with. He noted that Amherst had only added 85 occupied housing units from 2000 to 2010, while the population had grown by 3,000 people during that time. Amherst has resisted allowing new housing development and as a consequence the pressure has built up and has resulted in the conversion of single family houses to student rentals.

After discussion the Board members agreed by consensus to hold a meeting in early fall with a focus on housing. The date was set for September 19<sup>th</sup> and the Board asked that housing be the first item on the agenda. Mr. Tucker suggested that the discussion should focus on what the Planning Board's role will be with respect to housing.

Mr. Carson requested that a representative from UMass be invited to talk with the Planning Board about issues related to housing.

- B. Planning Commissioners Journal – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of the Journal.
- C. Letter from PVPC regarding Certificate of Assessment for FY2013 – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of the letter from PVPC.

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

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

The Planning Board endorsed the following ANR plan:  
ANR2012-00012 – W.D. Cowls – Flat Hills Road

**VI. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS**

The Planning Board declined to review the following ZBA application:

**ZBA FY2012-00031 – John & Laura Stranlund** – For a Special Permit to create a supplemental apartment in an existing single family dwelling, under Section 5.011 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 32 Moorland Street (Map 8A, Parcel 48, R-G Zoning District)

**VII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – none**

**VIII. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS – none**

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Stephen Schreiber

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson

Agricultural Commission – David Webber

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Sandra Anderson

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – Constance Kruger

Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Constance Kruger

Other Boards and Committees

**IX. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none**

**X. REPORT OF STAFF – Mr. Tucker announced that the Glasgow Lands Scottish Festival would be held on the following Saturday.**

Mr. Roznoy reminded Planning Board members of an upcoming social event at the homes of Mr. Carson and Mr. Roznoy on Wednesday, July 15<sup>th</sup>.

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Webber, Chair

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