

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, June 5, 2013 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

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

ABSENT: none

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:05 PM. He welcomed everyone and thanked Planning Board members for attending Town Meeting. He gave special thanks to Ms. Kruger, Mr. O’Keeffe and Mr. Crouner and others who took part in Town Meeting presentations and discussions.

I. MINUTES

Mr. O’Keeffe MOVED to approve the Minutes of May 15, 2013. Mr. Schreiber seconded and the vote was 6-0-3 (Ford, Anderson and Carson abstained).

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2013-00009/M16948, 417 West Street – Ronald LaVerdiere (*continued from April 17, 2013*)

Request Site Plan Review approval for Phase 2, Amherst Office Park for construction of a mixed-use, three-story, wood-frame, office and apartment building with 10,928 s.f. on each floor with offices on the first floor and 12 apartments (6 on each of the 2nd and 3rd floors) (Map 19D/Parcel 2; B-VC/FPC Zoning District)

Ron LaVerdiere, the applicant, and Bill Garrity of Garrity and Tripp, consultants, presented the application.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that he would be presenting conceptual drawings for the building elevations because he is awaiting the results of Town Meeting on Article 32, having to do with measuring the height of buildings. Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he expects that this public hearing will be continued, pending resolution of Article 32. He noted that the footprint of the building will not change, but that Article 32 might affect the roof angles and dormers, and the look of the building. The lot line may also change depending on the outcome of Article 32.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that if Article 32 passes he will seek an opinion from the Building Commissioner, Rob Morra, on the interpretation of the new height requirements.

The base plan for the building and the site plan will remain the same no matter what happens with Article 32, he said.

The current proposal includes seven (7) 2-bedroom apartments and five (5) 1-bedroom apartments, for a total of 19 bedrooms. Mr. LaVerdiere would like the Board to consider allowing him to build more 1-bedroom apartments and fewer 2-bedroom apartments, but keep the number of bedrooms the same. These 1-bedroom apartments would appeal to young professional couples, singles and grad students.

He noted that parking for the office use and the residential use in the existing building on this property are intermingled and undesignated. The office parking occurs during the day, for the most part, and the residential parking occurs during the evening. There is an opportunity

with the new building for parking to be shared between the office use and the residential use.

Mr. Garrity presented the site plans. He stated that plans for this site, including the currently proposed building, were first presented to the Planning Board in 1997. Phase I, the existing building, was approved at that time, along with the existing detention basin. The Phase II building was shown on that site plan. Now Phase II is being proposed, but it is slightly changed, with parking and storage being proposed below grade in a basement garage. The site as a whole is about 2.94 acres. The portion of the site devoted to Phase II is about 2.4 acres. The utilities for the Phase II building will be connected with the utilities that have already been installed for the Phase I building. Mr. Garrity pointed out the location of the utility corridor on the south side of the site and showed the location of the utility spurs that will serve the new building.

Mr. Garrity presented a map showing the FEMA flood line as well as the FPC zoning district line. He noted that the FEMA flood level is at about elevation 143 feet above mean sea level. The FPC zoning district line is considerably higher by about 5 feet, at around 148-149 feet. Mr. Garrity asserted that the FPC line does not represent the real flood elevation on this property.

Mr. Garrity stated that the plans were reviewed by the Conservation Commission and the applicant has received an Order of Conditions. The plans have also been reviewed by staff at the Natural Heritage Program. The Conservation Commission has confirmed that there is no impact to the 100 year flood plain on this site.

Mr. Garrity explained that the applicant is requesting two waivers from the Site Plan Review submittal requirements:

- 1) Traffic Impact Statement – the town has done a traffic study and report on the traffic in this intersection as part of the town's plan to improve the intersection of Pomeroy Lane and West Street so a traffic study is not required and plans have been developed to improve the intersection; sight distance is 500 feet in both directions (north and south), he stated;
- 2) Sign Plan – there is an existing sign for the existing building; the applicant is considering a similar but smaller sign for the new building in a location north of the new driveway; the sign will have the same format as the existing sign, with a colonial motif; the exact location is undetermined and the exact information to be contained on the sign has also not yet been decided.

The existing detention basin will be shifted and reconstructed to accommodate the new site work.

There is a small area of Riverfront Protection Area in the northwest portion of the site. Activity in this location is restricted within 200 feet of the river bank. The trees within the Riverfront Protection Area will remain. New trees are proposed to be added along the north property line. Existing trees in the vicinity of the building will need to be removed to allow for grading and drainage on the north side of the building.

There is a town sidewalk along West Street. The site plan proposes an entry walkway on the south side of the driveway. There will be a bike rack located near the front door.

A culvert with a natural bottom will be installed where the entry driveway crosses a wetland at the front of the site. The Army Corp of Engineers requires that the bottom of the culvert be of natural material to allow for passage of wildlife.

Mr. Webber began to review the Site Visit Report. He asked about open space on site.

Mr. Garrity stated that there would be an area of open space provided on the south side of the parking lot, in the vicinity of the existing maple trees, which will provide shade for a sitting space. There could also be a sitting space on the north side of the building, at the beginning of the swale, where the ground is relatively flat.

Mr. Webber asked if the detention basin is a wetland. Mr. Garrity explained that the detention basin is not a wetland but rather a dry-bottom basin. He showed the location of the wetland on the site plan.

Mr. Roznoy inquired about storm drainage on the property.

Mr. Garrity explained that the Conservation Commission reviewed the drainage report during its wetlands review process. He noted that a rain garden is proposed to pick up the drainage from the south side of the roof. It will act as a “mini” detention basin allowing recharge to the soil and overflow through a pipe to the larger detention basin.

Mr. Webber noted that there had been a question on the site visit about whether this building would fit in with the town’s plans for creating a village center at the Pomeroy Lane intersection.

Mr. LaVerdiere explained that this intersection area is in the process of becoming a vibrant village center. Mr. Slobody’s properties (including South Towne Common) contain retail space, as do the properties on the east side of West Street. Mr. LaVerdiere’s properties provide the office space. He referred to the restaurant (Mission Cantina) that is becoming very successful. A variety of uses help to make up the developing village center, he said.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that when a property contains a mix of uses it is possible to share parking spaces and therefore have less paving on the site.

Mr. LaVerdiere observed that the town is struggling with housing issues and that he would like to increase the number of units in the proposed building from 12 to 15, with the same total number of bedrooms. The choice is being driven by market forces, he said. This mix of uses is most appropriate for this particular site. The mix of uses on Mr. Slobody’s property is appropriate for that site because of the proximity of the building to the roadway. Mr. LaVerdiere’s proposed building is tucked back on the site and is therefore less appropriate for retail uses.

Ms. Kruger suggested that it would be more appropriate to discuss the relationship between this proposed building and the development of the village center during the Planning Board’s deliberations.

Mr. Crowner agreed that there is plenty of retail space on property of other landowners. He asked about the potential to share parking with the public and whether members of the public who attend events or patronize businesses in the area would be welcome to use the parking on Mr. LaVerdiere’s property when it is not being used by tenants.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he has an “open parking” policy and that none of his tenants has assigned parking spaces. It would be possible for members of the public to park on his property if the space is available. Sometimes parking associated with neighboring businesses and properties overflows onto Mr. LaVerdiere’s property. Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he supports a vibrant village center.

Mr. Tucker noted that the Board could think about how this project could enable a range of future uses. This building is flexible and it could accommodate retail space in the future as the village center develops.

Mr. Webber asked about the possibility of moving the building closer to the street. He noted that there is a wetland between the building location and the street that would prevent the building from being much closer.

Ms. Ford asked about the distribution of open space on the property relative to the residential use. She asked if residents could access green space or common open space.

Mr. LaVerdiere explained that he was trying to establish a “park like” setting and that he envisioned 6 or 7 picnic tables and benches around the site. The residents will want to use spots that are shady and so he has designated areas near the larger trees as places for picnic tables.

Mr. Garrity stated that the open space on site would be predominantly for passive recreation. Tenants can walk around the site and can walk on the loop road that connects this site with the adjacent property owned by the LaVerdieres.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that the property is also adjacent to Hickory Ridge Country Club and that people can ski on the golf course in the winter. Each residential unit will also be provided with a small deck to give people a place to be outdoors. There is a beautiful wetland at the front of the property, which is visually attractive although not usable as open space.

Mr. Schreiber stated that he would like to see a more campus-like look to the property. He noted that if Article 32 passes there will be a maximum setback requirement.

Mr. Tucker stated that the maximum setback requirement could be modified with a Special Permit from the Planning Board. He also noted that there are recreational areas nearby, such as the property of the Crocker Farm School and the nearby pump station with access to the Plum Brook trail system. These will be available to tenants of the new building.

There was further discussion about the maximum setback that would be required if Article 32 passes and the fact that a Special Permit would be required to allow the building to be built in its proposed location. Mr. Schreiber asked the applicant to present compelling reasons as to why the building would not be able to comply with the maximum setback requirement of 20 feet.

Board members discussed the fact that the wetland separates the building from the sidewalk along West Street, that there would be a better view of the wetland if the building were set back as proposed, and that the applicant intends to build a basement garage under the building to house cars and storage areas. Because of the topography of the site, this basement garage could not be built if the building were closer to West Street. Because of the wetland, people could not walk along the public sidewalk and walk adjacent to the front of the building at the same time. People will only be able to access this building via the driveway or private sidewalk.

Mr. Webber stated that he liked the feel of the Amherst Office Park with its series of small roads. These roads appear to provide the “real frontage” he said, like a subdivision. He noted that Article 32 was intended to prevent strip malls from developing.

Ms. Kruger stated that she was convinced about the general placement of the building and that the applicant had presented a good site plan, but that it had the potential to be “excellent”. She asked that the applicant present a plan showing the area around the site, with pedestrian connections for people from this property to the adjacent properties. She noted that there is currently no pedestrian connection proposed between this property and the property to the south. She asked to see the pedestrian connections throughout the area.

Ms. Kruger noted that the Zoning Bylaw provides for the possibility of shared parking and asked if the Board would be amenable to reducing the number of parking spaces in order to have more open space. She asked about the possibility of providing a covered bike rack. She stated that the proposed open space/picnic area on the south side of the parking lot was too far from the building for tenants to walk.

There was discussion about whether this project really needed all of the parking that was shown on the site plan.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that the site plan followed the requirements of the Zoning Bylaw with regard to parking, but that he was amenable to reducing the number of parking spaces. He stated that the federal government office on the adjacent property to the south is a different situation because it has 28 official cars. This has caused the parking situation on that site to be tight, because people drive their own cars to work and may either stay in the office to work or take a federal car out on a project, leaving their own car at the site. If they stay in the office to work, both the federal car and the employee's private car will be parked on the site at the same time.

Mr. LaVerdiere said that it may be possible to share parking between residential and offices uses and reduce the number of parking spaces on the site of the new building by 4 or 5 to create a larger open space.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that tenants will be able to park their bikes in the garage, if they want covered storage, and there will be a bike rack provided on the site outdoors. He noted that the parking spaces in the garage will be available for rent by either office tenants or residential tenants. There will also be storage space in the garage. Some of the office tenants will have equipment that they need to store. Residential tenants may also have items that they would like to store.

The Board members listed questions for the applicant to address when he returns for the continued public hearing:

1. Pedestrian access to the new building, including a path to allow people who ride the bus to get to the building from West Street and walk into the site without crossing large expanses of parking;
2. A drawing that shows the area around the property, including the part of the office park that lies to the south of this site and the rest of the buildings around the intersection, and their pedestrian connections;
3. A plan showing proposed lighting for the site, including lighting for the pedestrian path and information to prove that the new lighting will be Dark Sky compliant;
4. A plan showing fewer parking spaces and more green space.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to continue the public hearing to June 19th at 7:05 p.m. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Ms. Kruger noted that she would not be able to attend the Planning Board meeting on June 19th.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – SCENIC ROAD – JOINT HEARING WITH TREE WARDEN

Proposed Driveway Construction – 666 South East Street:

Public Shade Trees potentially impacted by this project include the following trees (Sizes indicate “diameter at breast height” – DBH):

1. Five – White Pines – Sizes 21”, 16”, 15”, 14.7”, 12.3”
2. Three – Shagbark Hickories – Sizes 12.5”, 8.5”, 6”
3. One – Sugar Maple – Size 6.5”
4. One – White Oak – Size 15”

Impacts include removal or root damage

Alan Snow, Tree Warden, joined the Planning Board members at the front of the Town Room for the Joint Public Hearing.

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

Mickey Rathbun of 666 South East Street presented the application to remove the public shade trees. She has lived at this property for 3 ½ years. This is a dangerous stretch of road, she asserted. A lot of the properties along this road have hazardous driveways. The road curves as it travels over the hill. There is little sight distance and little time for drivers on the road to respond to cars exiting the driveways. Bad accidents have occurred. There is no shoulder along the road. The road is a school bus route in addition to being a busy road for passenger vehicles.

Ms. Rathbun described the turning movements entering and exiting her driveway that are problematic. She has written memos to the DPW and the Town Manager to try to make this stretch of road safer. Ms. Rathbun, her husband and her neighbor, Janet McGowan, have met with the Town Manager and the Superintendent of Public Works to ask about speed limits and the possibility of installing flashing lights, or other traffic calming devices. The DPW agreed to install advisory speed limit signs showing a speed of 25 mph. People do not travel at 25 mph. They drive considerably faster, she said.

Ms. Rathbun explained that she has two young sons (19 and 23) and their friends, and they, along with guests and elderly relatives, regularly come and go from the property. She would like to move the driveway to create a safer condition.

Ms. Rathbun explained that she had met with a representative of the DPW on site and talked with him about moving the driveway 60 feet to the north. She had also discussed this with an engineer, Terry Reynolds, as well as with Steve Severin of Taylor Davis Landscaping. Mr. Severin drew up a plan for a new driveway location which Ms. Rathbun submitted to the Planning Board. Ms. Rathbun proposed that she be allowed to remove 4 or 5 trees in the public way to allow the new driveway to be built. There is ledge in the area and it is difficult to determine how much fill will be needed to construct the new driveway. The amount of fill will determine how many other trees will have an impact as a result of the driveway construction. The Tree Warden has stated that 10 trees will need to come down as a result of this construction because filling in the vicinity of tree roots will cause the trees to die. The Tree Warden will charge a fee of \$90 per inch for trees that will be removed. For the ten trees listed in the legal ad this will amount to about \$11,500.

Ms. Rathbun asserted that everyone is in danger as a result of the placement of the existing driveway, including bicyclists, pedestrians and automobile drivers. She noted that the town does not want to install traffic calming devices in this location and that she had met with the Public Shade Tree Committee who characterized this proposal as “a matter of convenience” for the property owner.

Mr. Snow stated that he would like to see detailed plans for the proposed driveway. He has seen hand drawings but they are not sufficient and they lack detail. The site has been marked on the ground to show the limits of the proposed driveway. If more than 25 – 30% of the tree

roots of a particular tree are damaged as a result of construction the tree should be removed, he said. That is why he marked ten trees to be removed. He believes that if the trees are left in place they will die later as a result of the construction and the town will have to pay for their removal.

Mr. Roznoy asked the applicant to provide a plan showing the location of the trees proposed for removal. He noted that the plan provided by Mr. Severin was a schematic plan lacking details.

Ms. Rathbun objected to the fact that she had not been told in advance of the public hearing that the plan was insufficient. She stated that Board members had come to the site and had seen the trees proposed for removal marked by the Tree Warden.

Mr. Snow asked that the applicant be required to submit a detailed plan showing grading and the amount of fill that is proposed to be installed.

Mr. Webber stated that he was sympathetic to the plight of Ms. Rathbun and acknowledged that the relocation of the driveway could serve the public good. However, there is missing information with regard to the tree removal. Photographs showing the trees proposed for removal should be submitted.

Mr. Schreiber stated that a survey would be useful showing the boundaries of the area to be affected, where the trees are located and where the driveway is to be located.

Ms. Kruger stated that the Board needed the information submitted in a written form.

Ms. Brestrup recommended that the applicant provide a survey of the area prepared by a registered land surveyor and an engineered plan showing where the driveway would be located, including a grading plan showing the limits of fill and cut. Ms. Brestrup also recommended that the applicant have some test pits dug to determine where the ledge is located so that the engineer would know how much fill would be needed.

Board members noted that a survey would be to the applicant's benefit because it would show which trees would be affected by the construction. The applicant might not need to take down as many trees as currently proposed if the survey shows that these trees would not experience an impact from the construction.

Mr. Severin stated that he had prepared the plan showing the location of the driveway and had laid it out in the field by painting lines on the ground. He chose an area where he thought there would be less impact. The sketch that he prepared was for purposes of submitting a cost estimate to Ms. Rathbun and not for presentation to the Planning Board.

Ms. Rathbun stated that she would like to keep the existing driveway in place for access to the house by emergency vehicles. She plans to level out the curb cut area and place pine bark mulch and posts or a barrel or planters on the existing driveway to indicate that it is not to be used for access, other than by emergency vehicles.

Mr. Severin stated that there is a 10 foot asphalt apron at the entry to the driveway and the rest of the driveway is gravel with oil and stone. The new proposed driveway will not be accessible by emergency vehicles because of its curves, which is why the old driveway should be kept in place.

Mr. Tucker noted that the DPW does not generally allow more than one active driveway to a property.

The Board discussed the possibility of using another point of access at the southern end of the property, an old farm road. Ms. Rathbun stated that this old farm road is not accessible by

her vehicle [a pick-up truck] and would not provide a safer point of access to the property. It would also be very expensive since it would be a longer run of driveway than the driveway that she is proposing, and it would involve removal of more trees. She noted that the house was built in 1953. Mr. Snow reported that he had looked at old aerial photographs of the site and there had not been a lot of trees at that time that the house was built.

Board members discussed the trees proposed to be removed to build the proposed driveway.

Mr. Roznoy asked if there were any standards which the Tree Warden and the Planning Board could use to determine whether to preserve the trees or allow their removal on a Scenic Road.

Mr. Tucker noted that there are no written standards associated with the Scenic Roads legislation. However the Board and the Tree Warden typically consider age and health of the trees, their historical significance and the part they play in the streetscape and the consistent pattern of tree growth along the road.

In response to a question, Mr. Snow stated that utility companies have the right to come in and prune trees within the town right of way to accommodate the power lines that they maintain.

Janet McGowan of 706 South East Street expressed her support for Ms. Rathbun's request to remove the trees. South East Street is beautiful because of the vistas and the vistas would be improved by the removal of the trees. People will slow down to see the views of the farmland, she predicted.

Mr. Schreiber asked if the applicant had discussed with the DPW the issue of the extensive new driveway construction proposed on town land. Mr. Severin stated that they had not discussed the plan with the DPW.

Board members requested that Planning staff ask the DPW about the driveway design, whether the path of the driveway should take the shortest path across public land and whether the applicant would be permitted to have more than one driveway access into her property.

The Board discussed alternative designs and alternative locations. Board members determined that they needed to respond to the request that was before them and not speculate about alternative locations.

Kathleen Auble of 651 South East Street acknowledged that the driveway at 666 South East Street is dangerous. She lives across the street. She stated that the previous owners had used the southern driveway for access. There have been accidents in the location of the proposed driveway. However, she spoke in opposition to the tree removal and the proposed driveway relocation. She does not want to look at cars entering and exiting the property and does not want to be bothered by headlights.

Ms. Rathbun stated that she had attempted, somewhat unsuccessfully to drive her pick-up truck down the southern access drive. There is ledge and vegetation that would need to be removed to allow this access drive to be used on a regular basis.

The Board and the Tree Warden discussed the request to waive the fee charged by the Tree Warden for tree removal.

Mr. Snow stated that he wants to see plans and construction techniques for the driveway construction. It may be possible to remove fewer trees with certain techniques but more information is needed to determine how many trees need to be removed.

Mr. Webber asked that the applicant provide the best possible plan with the most precise information, including where the trees are located and how much impact they will receive from the driveway construction.

Ms. Brestrup recommended that the applicant obtain a survey prepared by a Registered Land Surveyor, showing the location of the trees and property line and other physical objects in the vicinity of the proposed driveway and dig some test holes to determine the location of the ledge. This will help to determine how much fill will be needed to construct the driveway in this location. It may be possible to use the GIS topography to determine the amount of fill.

Mr. Tucker noted that the Planning Board's jurisdiction, in this case, is focused on the request to remove public shade trees in the public way.

The Board and the Tree Warden discussed the fee schedule and whether financial hardship is considered in determining the fee. Mr. Snow stated that the determination is partially based on whether someone has the financial means to pay the fee and whether the project is urgent and needs to be done. He gave an example of a financial hardship. A low income homeowner needs to replace a utility line and in order to replace the utility line a public shade tree needs to be removed. Mr. Snow would consider that example a valid case of financial hardship. He reminded everyone that the Tree Warden has discretion over the fee.

Mr. Webber stated that the Board was not recommending waiving the fee. He noted that in one case in the past the Board had added a surcharge to the fee. The applicant needs to make a case for a waiver of the fee, he said.

Mr. Snow noted that the town had done a traffic study of the area after the applicant met with the Town Manager. The result was the installation of 25 mph signs. However, there has been no difference in the speed traveled before or after the installation of the new signs. He stated that 40 mph is a typical speed for traffic along this road. The only way that the new driveway location would be safer is if drivers actually drive at 25 mph.

Mr. O'Keeffe asked to see the traffic and speed report from the DPW.

Mr. Webber summarized that the Planning Board would like to have a detailed site plan of the area proposed for construction, a copy of the DPW report, and would like Planning staff to talk to the DPW and work with the applicant. He recommended that the hearing be continued.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the public hearing be continued to June 19th at 8:00 p.m. Mr. Carson seconded.

There was further discussion. The applicant stated that she would have liked more assistance and guidance during the process leading up to the public hearing.

Mr. Snow asked for a copy of the report from the engineer that Ms. Rathbun had contacted. Ms. Rathbun stated that there was no written report.

There was further discussion about what would be needed on the survey and discussion about the possibility of replacing the trees on-site.

Ms. Brestrup explained that a survey prepared by a registered land surveyor and an engineered plan for the proposed driveway prepared by an engineer or landscape architect would be needed to fully understand the impact of the proposed driveway.

Mr. Snow noted that the removal of trees in this area would result in increased stormwater runoff.

Mr. Roznoy AMENDED his motion and MOVED that the public hearing be continued to July 17th at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 9-0.

IV. TOWN MEETING

- A.** Update on Town Meeting actions – Mr. Crowner reported that Town Meeting had passed Articles 30 and 31. Town Meeting still needed to deal with Articles 32, 33, 34 and 35.

Board members discussed who would give the introduction and who would speak for articles on June 10th if Mr. Webber were late or absent. Mr. Tucker noted that there were three more nights scheduled for Town Meeting – 6/10, 6/17 and 6/19.

Board members discussed a scribner's error in the Warrant Article 32, part A.2. which should refer to Footnote "g" rather than Footnote "n". Melissa Perot noted that Footnote "g" was not included in the Warrant.

Mr. Tucker stated that if Article 32 does not pass then Article 35 does not make sense

There was discussion about the possibility of dividing Article 32. The Planning Board decided not to divide Article 32 but acknowledged that someone else may move to divide it at Town Meeting.

Ms. Perot observed that Articles 31, 32 and 35 are "a package" and should be considered together. There was discussion about the order of Warrant Articles.

Ms. Kruger asked that Planning Board members have input on the order of Warrant Articles in the future.

Janet Keller of Pulpit Hill Road asked for examples of something built under the current Zoning Bylaw in the B-VC zoning district that reflects Footnote "b" having been used. Some examples were offered by Mr. Tucker.

- B.** Zoning Amendments – Last minute issues for possible Town Meeting sessions scheduled for June 10 and June 19 – see above
- C.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Ms. Kruger offered to host a Planning Board potluck dinner at her home during the summer.

V. OLD BUSINESS

- A.** Signing of Decisions – Board members signed the following decisions:

SPR2013-00011/M17940, 62 Boltwood Avenue (Garman House) – Trustees of Amherst College

SPR2013-00012/M17941, 155 South Pleasant Street (College Hall and Morgan Hall) – Trustees of Amherst College

- B.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting

Mr. Tucker reported that the Zoning Subcommittee had not met for a while but that a Zoning Forum had been tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, June 26th. He stated that there would be no ZSC meeting on June 19th.

Mr. Tucker reported that the Glasgow Lands Scottish Festival will be held at Look Park on July 20th. He invited everyone to attend.

Mr. Crowner noted that Article 31 as voted on by Town Meeting had not matched exactly what the Planning Board had recommended. There was discussion about this topic and a suggestion that people who are making motions be given a hard copy of the motions. There was discussion about whether it would be helpful to have a general motion sheet, but it was decided not to recommend this because motions change up until they are moved at Town Meeting.

- C. Letter to PVPC requesting Technical Assistance on Model Medical Marijuana Bylaw – The Board acknowledged receipt of a copy of the letter signed by Mr. Webber.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Letter from PVPC regarding offer of DLTA (Direct Local Technical Assistance) – The Board acknowledged receipt of this letter and asked that staff put a discussion of this letter on the agenda for the next meeting.

- B. Planning Board summer schedule – The Board decided to dispense with the July 3rd meeting and to meet on July 17th. The Board plans to meet as follows, in June:

- June 18th – Joint Meeting of Planning Board and Housing & Sheltering Committee
- June 19th – Planning Board meeting
- June 26th – Zoning Subcommittee – Zoning Forum

Board members discussed the summer schedule further and decided to leave the schedule for August open until they know what applications have been submitted.

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

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

The Board endorsed plans for ANR2013-00014 – Jean K. Canon – 348 Henry Street

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – none

X. 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 Rob Crowner
Amherst Redevelopment Authority – Constance Kruger
Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford
Housing and Sheltering Committee – Constance Kruger
Safe and Healthy Neighborhoods Working Group – Sandra Anderson

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none

XII. REPORT OF STAFF – none

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

Christine M. Brestrup
Senior Planner

_____ DATE: _____
David Webber, Chair