

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 19, 2013 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair, Jonathan O’Keeffe, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Sandra Anderson and Richard Roznoy

**ABSENT:** Stephen Schreiber, Kathleen Ford and Connie Kruger

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:10 PM.

**I. MINUTES**

The Minutes for June 5, 2013 were not yet available for review.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW**

**SPR2013-00009/M16948, 417 West Street – Ronald LaVerdiere** (*continued from April 17 and June 5, 2013*)

Mr. Webber noted that the public hearing had been continued from two previous dates and he reread the applicant’s request.

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

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that, in the wake of the passage of Article 32 at the Annual Town Meeting on June 10<sup>th</sup>, he would be applying for two Special Permits:

- To allow the building to be built with a front setback that is more than the 20 foot maximum now required;
- To allow two sides [north and east] of the building to be greater than 40 feet in height.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that previously the Zoning Bylaw had allowed the building to be greater than 40 feet tall on three sides, with a Special Permit, but did not allow the façade on the street side to exceed 40 feet. The new zoning amendment will allow all sides to be up to 50 feet tall with a Special Permit from the Planning Board. In addition another new zoning amendment provides for a different way of measuring the height of buildings. The height of buildings with a sloped roof will now be measured to the mid-point of the main portion of the sloped roof.

Mr. LaVerdiere will request a Special Permit to allow the north and east sides of the proposed building to vary in height from 40 feet up to 44.5 feet above surrounding grade.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he had planned to construct a mixed-use building with 7 two-bedroom apartments and 5 one-bedroom apartments, for a total of 12 apartments and 19 bedrooms. Now, in order to respond to the market and to fill a need in town, he would like to increase the number of one-bedroom apartments to 15 and decrease the number of two-bedroom apartments to 2. The one-bedroom apartments are easier to rent than two-bedroom apartments, even though they are smaller. Mr. LaVerdiere introduced the possibility of “cross-use” (sharing) of parking spaces between the office use and the residential use.

Because of the increase in the number of units, Mr. LaVerdiere will also be requesting a waiver from the requirement for two parking spaces for each dwelling unit.

Mr. LaVerdiere has been monitoring the use of parking spaces at the Phase I building on the site. Mr. LaVerdiere presented a letter to the Planning Board outlining his findings. The existing Phase I building has 11,000 square feet of office space (on two floors) and 3 apartment units. There are 44 parking spaces serving this existing building. The heaviest time of use is between 9:30 and 11:00 a.m. The parking lot is never full, he said. At least 4 parking spaces are open during the heaviest time of use.

The new building will have approximately the same square footage of office space as the existing building. At the height of use on the busiest day the applicant expects that 36 parking spaces will be needed for the office use in the new building.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that there were 63 parking spaces proposed for the new building (three spaces having been taken out for a recreational area). The office space would need 36 spaces, leaving 17 spaces available for the residences in the middle of the day. [Documents submitted with the application differ from this statement and show 60 spaces originally proposed, not 66.]

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that there are also at least 4 parking spaces at the Phase I building that are not used and that these could be used for parking to satisfy the needs of the Phase II building, if needed.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that this project provides a great opportunity to study residential uses in a mixed-use building and to establish appropriate parking requirements for mixed-use buildings. There will be more use of the residential parking spaces on weekends and nights and less during the weekdays, he explained. Office workers will need parking spaces during the weekdays but will not need them on weekends or at night, leaving them available for residential tenants.

Mr. LaVerdiere suggested that after studying this new building, the town may decide that it is able to require fewer parking spaces for mixed use buildings and therefore less paving for parking in the future. Mr. LaVerdiere offered to study the parking in the new building for a year after it is built and to share the information with the town. This will provide accurate information on parking needs for mixed-use buildings in the B-VC zoning district in South Amherst.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that the proposed building would help to fill the need for one-bedroom apartments in town while allowing the sharing of parking at the new building.

Mr. LaVerdiere presented information on the proposed lighting for the new building. He is proposing colonial style Dark-Sky-compliant lighting fixtures. He stated that the lighting company is developing new styles of lighting that are Dark-Sky compliant and by the time that this building has been finished more colonial styles will be available to be mounted on this building.

He showed a modern style Dark-Sky compliant fixture, but stated that his intention would be to install a colonial style fixture that is Dark-Sky compliant. Mr. LaVerdiere has had discussions with the lighting representative about extending this Dark-Sky compliant lighting throughout the whole office park.

Mr. LaVerdiere presented elevations for the new building, which were similar to the elevations presented at previous sessions of the public hearing. He noted that the façade has been changed to include a doorway at the center of the façade with a peaked canopy above the door to mark the entry so that people will recognize it as the main entry.

Mr. Garrity presented an aerial photograph showing a plan of the area surrounding the site. The plan showed connections with the rest of the office park and showed the pathways

throughout the existing park. He showed on the plan how the new building would be connected to the rest of the office park via a walkway that would lead across the property to the main entrance of the building.

Mr. Garrity noted that a tree and some benches will be added to this open space area. There will be two picnic areas on the south side of the building and another on the north side. The northern area could consist of a 12' x 30' paved patio with tables and chairs, accessible from the entry at the west side of the building. The building will provide shade for this northern space. In the southern space shade trees will provide shade.

Mr. Garrity showed that the main entry had been modified by adding a ramp to provide access to the front door.

Mr. Webber stated that many of the questions that the Board had about the project had been answered by the presentations.

Mr. Carson inquired about the Phase I project, asking about government cars that he understood were parked on-site and the employees' cars that are also sometimes parked on-site. He asked whether the government cars would take up parking spaces needed for the building. He asked if there would be government cars parked at the Phase II building.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that government cars would not be an issue for the Phase II building explaining that he has spoken with two potential tenants (private companies) so far, one with 5-6 employees and one with 15 employees. These two companies would take up half of the office space in the building (about 5,000 square feet). About 800-900 square feet of the first floor will be taken up by bathrooms, hallways, entries, elevators, etc.

Mr. Carson asked if fewer or no government cars would make it possible to eliminate some more parking spaces for the Phase II building.

Mr. LaVerdiere was reluctant to fall below the proposed number of parking spaces to serve the proposed Phase II building.

Ms. Brestrup clarified that the primary government use is located on the property to the south of the 417 West Street building and that it is the government use with the most extra federal cars parked on the site. The Phase I building is on the west side of the property that is proposed for development and does not have a large number of government cars.

Mr. LaVerdiere clarified that the Phase I building contains a government office (APHIS which is part of the USDA) that currently has 2 or 3 trucks parked on the property. Employees will drive their own cars to work and then get into a truck and drive away, so the trucks sometimes take up 2 or 3 parking spaces on the site. In addition, APHIS stores some of its equipment in a small shed at the north side of the site.

Mr. Crouner inquired about what Mr. LaVerdiere was proposing. He asked if Mr. LaVerdiere was asking to build more parking spaces than he actually might need and then study the results and use the results to reduce the amount of parking that future developers might be able to build.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that the parking numbers established by the Planning Department and the Zoning Bylaw are fairly accurate. The Phase II building will have more residential space and residential space usually requires fewer parking spaces per square foot than office use. He is reluctant to build less or more parking than he needs. Adding parking later is very disruptive, he said.

Ms. Brestrup observed that in the past the Planning Board has been interested in working with applicants to establish the actual need for parking spaces and to build an amount of

parking that works for the proposed use. The requirements in the Zoning Bylaw could be looked at as a guide so that the Board can have some idea as to what the appropriate number (order of magnitude) for parking spaces should be. If there is an applicant who states what his actual need will be and it differs from the number prescribed in the Zoning Bylaw, the Planning Board has been open to considering fewer parking spaces in order to limit the amount of paving of a site and the resulting amount of runoff.

Ms. Anderson asked what happens if the project is built and there is not enough parking. She noted that Amherst Montessori School had made arrangements to lease parking from some of the surrounding landowners to meet its need for parking because it could not provide enough parking on-site. Ms. Anderson also noted that it appears that there are a lot of parking spaces in the area and that all of them do not appear to be used. She asked if Mr. LaVerdiere had a back-up plan if he ended up with not enough parking.

Mr. LaVerdiere responded that the Zoning Bylaw requires the same number of parking spaces for a dwelling unit no matter how many bedrooms are in the unit (2 spaces per dwelling unit). He stated that in his experience one-bedroom apartments need 1 ½ spaces per unit and office space needs 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet. He noted that some people who work at the office park will ride the bus, some people will ride a bike and some people will live on-site. This will affect the parking count. The government office at the property to the south causes increased pressure on parking on that site because of the number of government cars that they maintain. This will not be the case for the property to the north, he said.

There will always be about 5 to 8 spaces available at the Phase II site, he estimated. He is not trying to pave more or “under-pave”.

Ms. Anderson asked about snow plowing and where the snow would be stored.

Mr. LaVerdiere responded that Taylor Davis Landscaping removes the snow off-site or moves it to the green space on-site.

Ms. Anderson noted that the elevations that had been distributed to the Board did not reflect the change in the number of dwelling units and the change in the number of two-bedrooms and one-bedrooms.

Mr. LaVerdiere responded that the building would change slightly with respect to where balconies and windows would be located. He noted that the architect had not yet done the interior design for the building’s second and third floors. He was reluctant to have the architect design the interior until he knew how many one and two-bedroom apartments the Board would permit.

Ms. Anderson shared her experience about the planning for the Mullins Center at UMass. When the building was being planned people at the university thought that there would be a need for huge parking lots. However, when the traffic studies were done it was shown that students would walk to events from their dorms and some people would drive to events. The large university parking lots would be empty of employees’ cars when events at the Mullins Center happened (usually at night and on the weekends) and therefore the existing employee parking lots could serve the needs of the Mullins Center. She supported erring on the side of what the applicant was asking for with respect to parking numbers because it is the best estimate that the Board has in terms of parking that will actually be needed.

Mr. Roznoy agreed with Ms. Anderson’s assessment of parking and was satisfied that the parking was designed to meet the needs of the proposed uses.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he was proposing to build 13 fewer parking spaces than was required by the Zoning Bylaw.

The Board discussed how to handle the fact that Mr. LaVerdiere was now asking for approval of 17 dwelling units whereas the initial request and legal advertisement for the public hearing had mentioned 12 dwelling units. After discussion the Board decided by consensus that it would be satisfactory to re-advertise the public hearing and re-notify abutters of the new number at the same time that the legal ad and notices were sent out and published for the two Special Permit applications for modification of height and setback.

Mr. Webber agreed with Ms. Anderson's analysis of the parking requirements and supported the addition of green space. He asked Planning Department staff to re-advertise the public hearing for the Site Plan Review with the new number of 17 dwelling units. He stated that he had no questions or concerns about the setback issue or the increase in height.

The Board discussed whether it could approve the Site Plan now and consider the Special Permits at a future meeting. Ms. Brestrup cautioned against this approach because it was not completely certain that the Board would approve the Special Permits for setback and height. If the Special Permits were not approved then the Site Plan would need to change. It would be better to consider these applications together, at a future meeting. The three items (Site Plan Review and the two Special Permits) are inextricably linked, she said.

Mr. Webber agreed that the items should be considered together and stated that he had no questions or concerns about the setback issue or the increase in height. Mr. Carson expressed support for the underground parking because it would require less asphalt.

Ms. Anderson expressed support for Mr. LaVerdiere's lighting plan, which included downcast and Dark-Sky compliant fixtures for this site and a possible plan to retrofit the adjacent site with similar lighting fixtures. She noted that the Amherst Office Park was well-managed and well-maintained.

Mr. Webber stated that the Dark-Sky lighting will provide more pleasant lighting with less glare and better lighting per watt.

Mr. LaVerdiere noted that the new bulbs will provide 30,000 hours of lighting with one bulb which will save money on labor.

Mr. O'Keeffe stated that the site details of this location were particularly well suited to the modification of setback requirements that were provided for in the zoning amendment that had just passed allowing the Board to grant a Special Permit for modification of setback. This site will not reasonably accommodate pushing the building up to the street as the Board is trying to encourage in the Village Centers.

Mr. O'Keeffe asked if the Board were to re-advertise this public hearing if the Board needed to close or continue this public hearing. Ms. Brestrup stated that the public hearing could be continued.

Mr. Webber noted that a portion of the site plan lies within the FPC (Flood Prone Conservancy) zoning district, which requires the Board to make specific findings under Sections 3.228 and 3.229 of the Zoning Bylaw. He listed the items that needed to be addressed. He asked if there were any questions or concerns with respect to these findings. A portion of the parking lot falls within the FPC zoning district.

Mr. Garrity stated that he had distributed a plan at a previous meeting showing the area of the parking lot that falls within the FPC zoning district and showing that the FEMA flood line does not enter onto this site. In other words the area designated as the 100-year flood zone as described by the FEMA maps is not impacted by the work proposed on this site. The FEMA 100-year flood zone is about 4 ½ to 5 feet lower than the FPC zoning district as shown on the town's zoning map. The FPC line is not highly accurate, he asserted. The amount of the site

that is within the FPC area is about 3 ½ parking spaces.

Mr. Webber noted that the criteria for the FPC zoning district were applicable only to those 3 ½ spaces that lie within its confines. He asked the applicant to provide a representation as to how these 3 ½ parking spaces would affect the items listed in Section 3.228 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Brestrup pointed out that there are reasons why the FPC zoning district was created other than its strict adherence to the 100-year flood line and that these reasons are described in the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Webber asked if the Board had received a letter from the Town Engineer with regard to these issues. Ms. Brestrup stated that the Board had received a letter from the Town Engineer outlining his review of the project, but that his letter may not have mentioned the FPC zoning district. In terms of engineering it's not necessarily applicable; but in terms of zoning it is applicable.

There was further discussion about the fact that a small area of the parking lot is located in the FPC zoning district. Mr. Webber noted that it appears to be a "de minimus crossing of the [FPC] line". However, he reiterated that the Planning Board needed to make findings about the impact of the crossing.

Mr. O'Keeffe stated that the Board and the applicant were talking about two different things. He noted that the applicant was stating that the FPC line may be in error and that the 100 year flood would not come up to the parking lot and that even if the 500 year flood came up it would only come up a few inches into the parking lot. Mr. O'Keeffe noted that the Board needed to address the issues outlined in the Bylaw.

Mr. Webber stated that the answer may be that the project does already have drainage provisions set up for this parking lot, including a catchment basin that will handle the runoff and will keep it from affecting the surrounding area.

Mr. Garrity stated that the Conservation Commission had already addressed the issue of flooding. After further discussion Ms. Brestrup offered to help the applicant draft a response regarding the list of potential impacts in the FPC zoning district.

The Board agreed by consensus that increasing the number of one-bedroom apartments in the proposed building would be satisfactory. Board members noted that the market is asking for the type of units that Mr. LaVerdiere is proposing to provide. Mr. Webber and other members referred to the information that had been presented by the consultants, RKG Associates, at a joint meeting with the Housing and Sheltering Committee on June 18<sup>th</sup> in which the consultants stated that there is a demand for small, one and two-bedroom apartments in multi-unit developments. The town had hired RKG to look at the demand for housing in Amherst.

Mr. Roznoy asked if Mr. LaVerdiere rented to students.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that he has rented to students in the past. His development has rules regarding behavior and he requires residential tenants to sign a contract that outlines the rules with regard to behavior in a mixed-use building with offices below.

Mr. Roznoy stated that it is his belief that there is a strong market for non-students.

Mr. LaVerdiere stated that for the most part his tenants are grad students and young professionals. They like the quiet atmosphere with a business below.

Mr. Webber thanked Mr. LaVerdiere for offering to do the parking study for a mixed-use building and provide the information to the Planning Board. It would provide the Board with valuable empirical data with regard to parking requirements for a mixed-use building.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to continue the public hearing to July 17<sup>th</sup> at 7:05 p.m. with a re-publication of the public notice [because of the change in the number of dwelling units]. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 6-0.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

- A. SPR2005-00001 – Amherst (Big Y) Shopping Center – 165 University Drive – Review of proposed signs in accordance with Condition #2 of Site Plan Review

Stephanie Smith of Viewpoint Sign & Awning presented the proposed signs. Her company will be installing the signs and doing the retrofitting for the signs. Ms. Smith described the proposed signs.

Ms. Brestrup said that all of the signs comply with the sign requirements of the Zoning Bylaw in that they cover 10% or less of the building façade, except the existing sign on the front façade (sign #6). Sign #6 [the large “CVS Pharmacy”] already covers over 10% of the front façade. It covers 11.86% of the façade. This exceeds the 10% limitation allowed by the Zoning Bylaw. Any signs that are added to the front façade would need to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a Special Permit to exceed the 10% limitation. Other than that the signs all meet the dimensional requirements, she said.

If the applicant wants to install the other proposed signs on the front facade, the applicant would need to reduce the size of the signs so that the total square footage of signs on the front façade would equal 10% or less of the building wall. Otherwise a Special Permit would be required. The applicant could also leave the oversized sign on the front façade in place because it is a pre-existing non-conforming sign, but couldn't add signs to the front façade without a Special Permit.

There was discussion about the proposed signs and the existing non-conforming sign.

Mr. Webber asked whether any of the signs (#7, 8 or 9) were new signs. Ms. Smith stated that sign #7 would be new. It would be a window sign mounted on the inside of the window. Sign #9 would be temporary and #8 would just have a change of color.

Ms. Brestrup explained that the existing signs on the front façade were over 10% of the building wall. The addition of sign #7 [the “Minute Clinic” inside sign] would put them even more over the 10% threshold.

Mr. Roznoy stated that the coverage issue was paramount.

Ms. Brestrup suggested that the Board could consider approving all of the signs except sign #7. The applicant is proposing only to change the color on the existing non-conforming sign and to change the illumination, going from neon to LED.

Mr. Webber stated that he is satisfied that the work on the existing sign on the front façade is maintenance rather than anything new. Ms. Smith stated that color of the sign would be changed to “the new CVS red”, a brighter red than the existing color.

Ms. Brestrup stated that the Building Commissioner will often allow an existing non-conforming sign to be repaired, as long as it's not getting bigger or changing substantially.

There was further discussion.

Mr. Crowner asked how sign #6 became non-conforming. He stated that CVS should have gotten a Special Permit for sign #6. Ms. Brestrup stated that the issue of the size may have been an oversight on the part of whoever was reviewing the application for installation of the CVS signs. The building was put up in the last five to ten years.

Ms. Brestrup proposed two options for the Board to consider:

Option A – approve all of the signs except sign #7, because it would add to the square footage;

Option B – approve the signs on all sides of the building except on the University Drive side.

Mr. Roznoy observed that if the Board approves everything except sign #7 then the applicant would not be expanding a pre-existing non-conforming use. He noted that the new LED lighting would be more energy efficient than the existing illumination.

Ms. Smith stated that the Minute Clinic was a big issue for CVS and having nothing on the front façade to acknowledge the Minute Clinic would be a problem for them. The Minute Clinic sign would be important to CVS, she said.

Mr. Webber outlined the choices for the Board:

- 1) The Board can decide that the whole sign plan requires ZBA approval;
- 2) The Board can decide to approve the signs proposed for three sides of the building but not the front façade facing University Drive;
- 3) The Board can decide to approve all of the signs except sign #7.

There was further discussion.

Mr. Carson MOVED to approve all of the proposed signs except sign #7. Mr. O’Keeffe seconded and the vote was 5-1 (Crowner opposed).

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

### **III. TOWN MEETING**

**A.** Update on Town Meeting actions – Mr. Webber thanked all of the Board members who attended Town Meeting sessions, noting that he had not been able to attend the session on June 10<sup>th</sup>. He reported that Articles 32 through 35 had passed for the most part and he complimented the Planning Board members on the good job they had done in presenting the articles.

**B.** Signing of Attorney General’s Forms – Board members signed the Attorney General’s Forms.

**C.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of a letter from Christopher and Ellen Pyle, the original of which had been sent to the Select Board. He reported that the Planning Board had held a joint meeting with the Housing & Sheltering Committee on June 18<sup>th</sup> to hear a presentation by the consultants on the Housing Market Study.

### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A.** Letter from PVPC regarding offer of DLTA (Direct Local Technical Assistance) – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of a letter from PVPC offering Direct Local Technical Assistance to towns. Ms. Brestrup reported that Mr. Tucker had observed

that the Planning Board had many things to work on for Fall Town Meeting and that requesting help from PVPC for another project would potentially overload the Board.

Ms. Brestrup explained that the Planning Board had already submitted a request to PVPC via a letter from Mr. Webber, requesting assistance in developing a medical marijuana bylaw. The town is now working with PVPC and other towns in the region on developing such a bylaw. She noted that there would be a limit of 35 dispensaries throughout the state and that there would be at least one in each county. There was further discussion on the topic of zoning for medical marijuana.

Mr. Webber stated that he was not inclined to ask for further assistance from PVPC until the town had resolved (pursued or dropped) the issue of Transfer of Development Rights, which the Planning Board was already working on with PVPC.

- B.** Email, dated June 11, 2013, from Tom McBride to Stephanie O’Keeffe re zoning – Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of the email.

Mr. O’Keeffe and Mr. Webber asked that items not be put on the Planning Board’s agenda unless they were intended to be discussed. Letters and emails can be included in the Planning Board packets and the Planning Board can then decide at a meeting if they wish to have these items put on an agenda for a future meeting.

- C.** Planning Board summer schedule:

- July 17<sup>th</sup>
- August 7<sup>th</sup>
- August 21<sup>st</sup>

The Zoning Subcommittee will hold a Zoning Forum on June 26<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Webber gave a synopsis of what would be expected at the Zoning Forum.

The Board discussed scheduling a joint meeting of the Housing & Sheltering Committee and the Planning Board on August 7<sup>th</sup> or August 21<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Crowner and Ms. Anderson will not be able to attend a meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup>.

- D.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Mr. Webber announced that this was Mr. O’Keeffe’s last Planning Board meeting. He stated that Mr. O’Keeffe had been a leader among Board members and he thanked Mr. O’Keeffe for his service on the Planning Board. Mr. O’Keeffe has been of great value to the town and to the Board.

**VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none**

**VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – The Board declined to review the following ZBA application:**

ZBA2013-00028 – Katrin Verclas – 62 Taylor Street – To change the use of an existing owner occupied two family dwelling to a non-owner occupied two family dwelling, under Section 3.3211 of the Zoning Bylaw.

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

SPR2013-00013 – Wheatberry – 321 Main Street – Request approval for seasonal outdoor dining

**IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS** – no reports

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Stephen Schreiber

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson

Agricultural Commission – David Webber

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crouner

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – Constance Kruger

Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Constance Kruger

Safe and Healthy Neighborhoods Working Group – Sandra Anderson

**X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – no report

**XI. REPORT OF STAFF** – no report

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

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

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

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