

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, September 11, 2013 – 7:00 PM**  
**Community Room, Police Station**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair, Sandra Anderson, Bruce Carson, Rob Crouner, Kathleen Ford, Connie Kruger, Stephen Schreiber, Greg Stutsman, and Richard Roznoy

**ABSENT:** none

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:05 PM. He asked for a moment of silence in memory of the victims of 9/11.

**I. MINUTES**

The Board reviewed the Minutes of August 7, 2013. Mr. Roznoy asked for amendments on pages 6 and 7, regarding comments he had made about an amendment having to do with bedroom mix and a clarification as to why a Board member had recused himself.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the Minutes of August 7, 2013 be approved as amended. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-0-4 (Crouner, Kruger, Webber and Anderson abstained).

Mr. Carson MOVED that the Minutes of August 21, 2013 be approved. Ms. Kruger seconded and the vote was 9-0.

**II. ZONING**

**A.** Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crouner presented the report.

**B.** Review Potential Zoning Amendments for Fall Special Town Meeting

The ZSC made changes to the proposed Medical Marijuana zoning amendment. The ZSC also worked on the Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw, which is very complex and may not be ready for Fall Town Meeting. The ZSC asked Planning staff to contact PVPC to request assistance on housing issues, specifically Inclusionary Zoning. The ZSC intends to continue work on Inclusionary Zoning and may ask the Select Board to call a Special Town Meeting before the Annual Spring Town Meeting to deal with Inclusionary Zoning.

Two of the main issues regarding Inclusionary Zoning are 1) applying Inclusionary Zoning to residential development of any kind and 2) providing density bonuses to developers who build affordable units.

The ZSC is also proposing another amendment to promote affordable housing, to allow affordable duplexes by Site Plan Review in all zoning districts in which duplexes are allowed.

The ZSC is working on an amendment for Multi-Family Apartment Complexes, to allow an increase in density for existing apartment complexes. This may not be ready for fall.

Mr. Crouner reported that a petition article had been submitted to change the standards and conditions for mixed use buildings. It adds a provision that would undo a provision passed last spring. The Planning Board will hold a public hearing on this petition article on October 2, 2013.

Mr. Webber summarized that Town Meeting begins on November 4<sup>th</sup>. He listed the amendments that would likely go ahead for fall:

- Mixed Use Buildings (Planning Board)
- Permit Granting Authority (Planning Board)
- Dimensional Interpretation (Planning Board)
- Medical Marijuana (Planning Board)
- Mixed Use Buildings (Petition article)
- Affordable Duplexes

The Board discussed when Warrant language is due in the Select Board's Office, when the Select Board will sign the Warrant and how many Planning Board meetings remain to work on the articles prior to the signing of the Warrant. The ZSC recommended that the most difficult articles be placed first in the order of zoning amendments on the Warrant.

C. Public Comment Period – There was no public comment.

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

**VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none**

**IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS –** Ms. Brestrup reported on two upcoming Site Plan Review applications which involve Special Permits. There will be public hearings on these applications on September 18<sup>th</sup>. They are the Trolley Barn building on the north side of Cows Road in North Amherst and the Kendrick Place building at the intersection of Triangle Street and East Pleasant Street.

Mr. Schreiber stated that he might not be able to attend the meeting on September 18<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Roznoy stated that he would be late for the meeting on September 18<sup>th</sup>.

**X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS**

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson reported that the PVPC would hold a meeting in October and he plans to attend.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson reported that she plans to attend the CPAC meeting in September.

Agricultural Commission – vacant

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crouner – Mr. Roznoy reported that he would request a copy of the draft RFP and that, once he receives the draft, he would schedule a meeting with other Task Force members to discuss the draft.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – Constance Kruger reported that the ARA had not met.

Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford reported that the DRB would be meeting on the upcoming Tuesday.

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman reported that the HSC had made a recommendation on income levels for affordable housing units for the Inclusionary Zoning amendment. The next meeting of the HSC would be on September 28, but a subcommittee of the HSC would be meeting this Friday.

Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman – Mr. Webber reported that the TGSSC had not met yet.

MPIC – vacant

### III. PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING AMENDMENT

#### A-04-14 Medical Marijuana

To amend the Zoning Bylaw by adding a new Section 3.360.4 and amending Article 12, Definitions, in order to create zoning regulations for medical marijuana facilities established under 105 CMR 725.000.

Mr. Webber read the preamble and opened the public hearing. Mr. Crowner presented the ZSC report and described the article.

This is a new use category for medical marijuana treatment centers and off-site medical marijuana dispensaries. If the town does not adopt a zoning amendment dealing with medical marijuana, the Building Commissioner will need to fit the use into an existing use.

Mr. Crower described the changes that the ZSC had proposed to the draft amendment and listed the zones in which these facilities are proposed to be allowed. These facilities will not be allowed within a buffer zone around residential uses, except for mixed use buildings which will not have a buffer zone around them. The reason for this exception is that the Planning Board wishes to encourage the development of mixed use buildings and, if the facilities were excluded from buffer zones around mixed use buildings, the use would not be allowed anywhere. The ZSC wants to make it possible for these facilities to exist in Amherst. The use would be allowed in Business zones with a lot of regulations.

Mr. Tucker noted that the ZSC had voted to recommend this article in its current form. However, there is still a lot of ongoing discussion at the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH). One question that is still unanswered is whether cultivation of marijuana is eligible for an agricultural exemption. He noted that the deadline for submission of the first round of applications was in late August. Mr. Tucker plans to attend a meeting at PVPC and hopes to have more definitive answers to the open questions by next week.

Mr. Tucker recommended that the Planning Board hold the public hearing now and continue its public hearing on this amendment to 7:05 p.m. next week in order to allow time to get answers to open questions.

Mr. Webber observed that if Amherst does not regulate this use then the Building Commissioner will need to classify the use under an existing use. In order to exercise some control over medical marijuana treatment centers it is necessary to set rules for where and how these facilities may be operated.

There was discussion about the exemption from the buffer zone for mixed-use buildings. Mr. Stutsman noted that Medical Marijuana Treatment Facilities (MMTF) were barred from being located in mixed-use buildings by condition #5.

Mr. Webber reviewed the language of proposed Section 3.360.4, where the facilities would be located and what type of land use permit would be required. There was discussion about what would be allowed where.

Mr. Tucker explained some of the medical uses of marijuana. He talked about siting these facilities based on the impact, rate of visitation and size of the facilities. These are facilities for the delivery of medical services and some of them should be located on bus routes and associated with town centers.

Mr. Webber listed the types of activities, including cultivation, processing and dispensing, that would go on in these facilities. He noted that Massachusetts regulations regarding these facilities are complex, extensive and specific.

Mr. Tucker noted that one entity may own and operate an MMTC and have cultivation and processing in one facility and dispensing in another facility. He noted that parts of the state law relate to land use regulations and other parts relate to health regulations.

Hilda Greenbaum of 298 Montague Road asked how cultivation of marijuana fits into the Bylaw. She asked if an entity can buy land in one town and dispense the product elsewhere. She asked where in town this cultivation and dispensing could occur.

Mr. Tucker stated that cultivation falls under the category of Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers. The state use category is "Registered Medical Marijuana Dispensaries" (RMD's) which includes both Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers and Off-site Medical Marijuana Dispensaries. The town hasn't received any applications yet because the state hasn't certified anyone as of the date of this meeting.

Ms. Greenbaum stated that she is opposed to having these facilities located next to mixed-use buildings.

There was discussion about this topic. Mr. Crowner noted that there won't be any place for these facilities in the town center or in village centers if they are not allowed near mixed-use buildings. The Bylaw constrains where these facilities can be located.

Ms. Brestrup noted that all cultivation needs to take place in a locked, secure building. Cultivation will not be occurring in open fields.

Andrea Nuciforo, an attorney from Pittsfield, stated that he is the Clerk of Kind Medical Inc., one of five applicants in Hampshire County. He was accompanied by Dr. Joseph Keenan, an ENT Surgeon from the Pioneer Valley, Chris Crane, an adviser, and J. Heineke, a technical adviser. He observed that the Amherst zoning amendment being proposed was a good, thorough effort. The use is heavily regulated by DPH already. He supports the use of the Special Permit because it is a new concept. He stated that the physical requirements for the facilities make the limitation of 2,500 square feet too restrictive. Most dispensaries will want to offer other alternative medical services within the same place. The limitation of 2,500 square feet should be defined so as not to include alternative therapies and back office operations, processing and storage, etc. The related therapies are things like yoga and chiropractic. Alternatively the entire facility could be made larger to accommodate the related therapies.

Mr. Nuciforo noted that these are non-profit corporations operated under M.G.L. Chapter 180. They need to be operated under Chapter 180 and do not have owners or shareholders and there is equity in the corporation. A representative of the corporation rather than an owner or shareholder should be the person who is referred to in the Bylaw. He asked that the Bylaw include the ability for the entity to operate alternative medical services such as chiropractic and yoga. He supported the reporting requirements and reminded the Board that DPH can enter any licensed facility any time to inspect and enforce the state regulations.

Chris Crane of Phoenix, Arizona, referred to Section 3.b.4) of the Standards and Conditions and noted that medical marijuana facilities focus on broader aspects of "wellness" including massage, yoga and acupuncture. These facilities also need office space. It is impossible to provide these alternative wellness services in a space that is 2,500 square feet in size. If there is a large patient base the facility can become crowded and unwelcoming. He recommended expanding the square footage or applying the limit of 2,500 square feet to the public areas of the facility but not to the associated services.

Dr. Joseph Keenan of Westfield stated that he treats MS patients and children with seizures. He stated that some people become criminals in order to obtain medical marijuana.

Mr. Crane spoke about "collocation" wherein one dispensary is allowed (but not required) to have two facilities – a cultivation facility and a dispensing facility. The processing can occur at either place, he said. He noted that it would be possible to grow the substance in Western Massachusetts

and to dispense it elsewhere. Proximity is not an issue.

Mr. Nuciforo explained that state law allows two approaches:

- 1) One facility that is “seed to sale”, including cultivation, processing and dispensing;  
Or
- 2) A facility that has cultivation and processing in one location and dispensing in another location.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Off-site Medical Marijuana Dispensary is just a dispensary and does not involve cultivation. The distance between the treatment center and the off-site dispensary is generally supposed to be a regional distance.

Mr. Webber read the definitions for both types of facilities and noted that the current language of the zoning amendment does not allow for ancillary services.

There was discussion about the state’s limitations placed on these facilities. Currently each county must have at least 1 facility but no more than 5 facilities, with a total of no more than 35 in the entire state. There are 14 counties in the state.

The state is not as concerned with the location of cultivation facilities as with the location of dispensaries because the state wants to make sure that everyone who needs the material will have access to it.

Mr. Nuciforo stated that he anticipates that Hampshire County will end up with one dispensary, or maybe as many as two.

There was further discussion about the 2,500 square foot limit on the dispensaries and the desire to allow ancillary, alternative medical services.

Board members noted that there would be no consumption of marijuana on the premises of these facilities and that the ancillary services would also not include the use of marijuana. They noted that there is a benefit to allowing other medical services close to the dispensaries in the same way that pharmacies are often located next to medical facilities. Ms. Kruger noted that many patients will take public transportation to these facilities and that the convenience of having services close to one another will help these patients. Ms. Kruger said that she sees this use as a humanitarian use.

Mr. Tucker agreed to draft language for the Board’s consideration at a continued public hearing.

Janet Keller of 120 Pulpit Hill Road offered comments and recommendations as follows:

- These facilities should be regulated as treatment facilities and should be regulated based on their potential impacts on the surrounding areas, similarly to the way that medical facilities are regulated;
- The 500 foot buffer should be maintained;
- The buffer should apply to mixed-use buildings, because they are residential uses;
- Churches and the National Historic District properties should also have buffers around them.

Board members asked that maps be provided showing where these facilities can go, with and without the buffers from the mixed-use buildings.

Board members asked that negative or pejorative language be eliminated from the text so that patients do not feel as if they are being stigmatized.

Dr. Keenan encouraged Board members to think of the dispensaries in the same way that they do about a drug store.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the B-G district is made up predominantly of mixed-use buildings. These facilities would be effectively shut out of the B-G district if a 500 foot buffer were maintained around mixed-use buildings.

Mr. Crowner recommended adding the OP (Office Park) district since it already allows medical facilities. Board members agreed.

Mr. Webber asked about the hours of operation excluding hours from 8 p.m. to 8 a.m. and was informed that this limitation came from the PVPC draft of the medical marijuana bylaw.

Mr. Webber stated his support for the draft bylaw as it has been presented, without the addition of churches, mixed-use buildings or National Historic Register District properties to the list of buildings to which the buffers would apply. He agreed that the OP district should be added, he agreed with changes that were suggested by the ZSC and he asked to see changes related to Section 3 with regard to the 2,500 square foot limitation.

There was further discussion about the 2,500 square foot limitation. Board members suggested that this limitation apply to the area where patients wait and allow the facilities to be larger overall to allow for ancillary uses.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to continue the public hearing to 7:05 PM on September 18<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Kruger seconded and the vote was 9-0.

#### **IV. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW**

##### **SPR2014-00002 – Ron Bohonowicz, Director of Facilities, Town of Amherst – Amherst Regional Middle School, 170 Chestnut Street** *(continued from August 21, 2013)*

Request Site Plan Review approval for refurbishing existing tennis courts on existing footprint under Section 3.330.0 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 11B, Parcel 124, R-N Zoning District)

Mr. Webber read the preamble, noting that he had already read it on August 21<sup>st</sup> and had opened the public hearing on that date as well. Due to the applicant's absence from the Planning Board meeting on August 21<sup>st</sup>, the Board had continued the public hearing to September 11<sup>th</sup> without taking any testimony.

Ron Bohonowicz, Director of Facilities for the Town of Amherst, presented the application. He stated that the project involves refurbishing the existing tennis courts. The tennis courts were in disrepair and the town was not able to hold matches on the courts. Mr. Bohonowicz had viewed this project as a repair and had already begun work. However, the Building Commissioner told him that the project needed to go through the Site Plan Review process, so he had filed the application.

The project involves lifting the old pavement, regrading the area to improve drainage and putting the pavement back in the same location. The existing fence was also removed and new fencing will be installed. The refurbished tennis courts will conform to the same standards as other US Open courts. The courts will be able to be used for USTA (United States Tennis Association) matches. Massachusetts Interscholastic Tournaments will be able to be held here.

Mr. Bohonowicz noted that the courts are used by LSSE for teaching camps. They are also used for intramural tennis and for health and wellness activities among staff at the school.

The tennis courts will be in exactly the same location as they were prior to the reconstruction. The town had examined the possibility of moving the courts, which are located between the baseball and softball fields and had concluded that this would be too expensive. The town is applying for a grant of \$25,000 from the USTA to help to pay for the refurbishing of the courts. The total cost will be approximately \$250,000. At the time of this public hearing the courts are

80% complete. The drainage system was not changed, but it was rebuilt. Tan Brook runs underneath the Middle School property.

Mr. Roznoy asked why this project needs Site Plan Review. The project requires Site Plan Review because it involves an exterior change to a public recreation facility, a use that requires Site Plan Review in the R-N zoning district.

Ms. Kruger noted that the town is out of compliance with a previous Site Plan Review approval for the parking lot at the rear of Town Hall. Several of the conditions that were imposed have not been accomplished. She expressed concern that the Planning Board only finds out about these town projects after they are partially done.

Mr. Bohonowicz stated that he would address the issues of compliance regarding the Town Hall parking lot. He noted that, in his opinion, this tennis court project is really a repair.

Mr. Roznoy asked if there is any intention of limiting the use of the tennis courts to school students and personnel once the courts have been completed.

Mr. Bohonowicz stated that the limitations on use would include locking the courts during the winter to prevent people from playing street hockey on the courts and that the courts are not permitted to be used during school hours. He did not mention any other limitations on use.

There was further discussion about the Town Hall parking lot.

Mr. Tucker noted that, in his opinion, the tennis court project is a simple repair. Mr. Webber stated that he did not think that this project should require Site Plan Review and would be in favor of changing the Bylaw to allow such projects without Site Plan Review.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 9-0.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the application because it meets all of the criteria of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Ford seconded and the vote was 9-0.

## V. OLD BUSINESS

### A. **SPR2014-00001 and SPP2014-00002 – Archipelago Investments LLC – 57 Olympia Drive (Olympia Place)**

Continued discussion and deliberation regarding a request for Site Plan Review approval for a private apartment-style dormitory building with 75 units and associated interior and exterior spaces under Section 3.326 of the Zoning Bylaw and a Special Permit to modify front yard setback, maximum lot coverage, maximum building coverage, maximum floors and maximum height under Section 6, Table 3 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 8D, Parcel 17, R-F Zoning District)

Mr. Webber re-read the description of the application. He announced that there would be no new testimony taken because the public hearing on this application had been closed on August 21<sup>st</sup>. The Board would be considering whether to grant the Site Plan Review and Special Permit approvals.

Mr. Webber noted that parking is an issue that needs to be resolved. The applicant is proposing to use the UMass parking adjacent to the property to meet the needs of this project. Handicapped parking is needed close to the building. The applicant has requested a waiver of the Sign Plan. The Board needs to find that the building is not an apartment but falls into the category of “social dormitory or similar use”.

Mr. Crouner noted that the building cannot be an apartment because an apartment is not allowed in the R-F zoning district. Mr. Tucker noted that the proposed building

contains more than 24 units (the maximum number of units allowed in an apartment building).

Mr. Webber listed issues that need to be resolved:

- Restrictions that can be placed on the category of people who can live in the building.
- What might happen in the future with the building?
- The dimensional regulations – the building is larger than what would normally be permitted.

Mr. Webber noted that the Board had received documents including the following:

- A Traffic Impact Study that found that there would be no significant impact as a result of this project;
- Drainage information;
- Information on the Conservation Commission review;
- Proposed lighting;
- Connection to the town water and sewer systems;
- Fire Department verbal comments;
- Town Engineer's comments on drainage and utilities;
- Conceptual Landscape Plan;
- Information on bike racks, sidewalks, benches and open space;
- Site Visit Report;
- Letters from the public;
- Elevations of the building;
- Examples of similar housing in other towns that have universities;
- Management Plan;
- Sample lease;
- Maps;
- Excerpts from the UMass Campus-wide Parking Vision Plan.

Board members discussed the need for a revised lease with more information about parking of tenants' vehicles and a statement that tenants are responsible to make their own parking arrangements and requirements that the owner keep records on tenants' cars, such as registration and parking permit information. Board members determined that the lease should also describe who would be eligible to live in the building.

Mr. Crowner read a statement about his opposition to using Footnote "a" to justify modifications of the dimensional requirements to the extent being proposed. He recalled the proceedings at Spring Town Meeting at which the R-F Dimensional Requirements had been made more flexible by adding Footnote "a" and stated that the project being proposed might fit in on North Pleasant Street the way it is designed, but did not fit in on Olympia Drive. He asserted that the Planning Board was being asked to change the zoning of this property outside of the legal process. He would like to be able to permit this project without resort to the Special Permit for dimensional modifications. He recommended that the application be delayed for two months to allow time for Town Meeting to change the zoning for this property. He asserted that the proposed height and lot coverage were not compatible with this neighborhood. He stated that he would vote against the Site Plan Review and the Special Permit applications.

Ms. Anderson acknowledged Mr. Crowner's values and ethics regarding this project, but expressed her support for the project.

Mr. Schreiber also expressed support for the project and noted that his recollection of the Annual Spring Town Meeting proceedings was different from Mr. Crowner's. Mr. Schreiber stated that he presented the zoning amendment article on the R-F Dimensional Regulations at Spring Town Meeting. He remembered the discussion differently, noting that the modifications of dimensional requirements would relate not just to North Pleasant Street but also to the Olympia Drive area. Mr. Schreiber stated that the proposed project aligns with his expectations. Mr. Roznoy agreed with Mr. Schreiber's interpretation.

There was further discussion on this topic, including public comment supporting Mr. Crowner's interpretation.

Mr. Webber expressed his respect for Mr. Crowner's opinion but stated that the language of the Bylaw gives the Planning Board authorization to grant a Special Permit to allow dimensional changes. The R-F zoning district is a logical place to put student housing. This project is exactly the type of project that he hoped would come to the Planning Board as a result of the zoning amendment in the spring. He noted that the increased scale of the building allows an entry security desk to be open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and allows on-site management. He supported granting the Special Permit and suggested that the Planning Board could introduce a zoning amendment to Fall Special Town Meeting regarding dimensional requirements in the R-F zoning district.

Mr. Tucker noted that the current Bylaw requires that the Special Permit Granting Authority "shall consider the proposed modified dimensional requirements in the context of the pattern(s) of the same dimensional established by existing buildings and landscape features in the surrounding neighborhood" but is not required to be bound by these patterns. He noted that there are projects on the UMass campus of the size being proposed here and that Clark House in the center of downtown Amherst is also a five story building.

Ms. Kruger expressed her respect for Mr. Crowner's opinion, but stated that she had "never embraced his assumptions". She stated that the size and scale of the building being proposed is not out of scale with this area.

Mr. Crowner expressed concern about future projects in the R-F zoning district.

There was discussion about parking requirements. Ms. Brestrup explained that, according to the Building Code, this building would be required to have one handicapped parking space or one handicapped drop-off area.

There was discussion about where the handicapped parking space and/or drop-off area could be accommodated. Ms. Kruger, Ms. Anderson and Mr. Stutsman expressed support for requiring both a handicapped parking space and a drop-off area. This is especially important because there will be handicapped accessible apartments in the building and the project will not be required to have on-site parking.

Mr. Webber recommended that the applicant be required to return to the Board with a plan showing handicapped parking and a drop-off area that is acceptable to the Board.

He explained that as part of its deliberations, the Board would craft draft conditions addressing the issues identified to date, to aid in the review and assessment of the criteria and findings for the Site Plan Review and Special Permit applications. Staff

had provided a draft list of possible conditions for the Board's consideration.

The Board noted that more clarity was needed in the Management Plan regarding how parking for tenants would be handled. There was discussion about whether to include a condition requiring certain action to be taken upon change of ownership of the property. There was discussion about who should be allowed to live in the building, whether family members should be included, and whether members of the Five-College community should be included. There was discussion about whether faculty and staff should be included. There was discussion about the need for a revised lease, including limitations on who can live in the building and a rider to the lease including information about car ownership and parking permits.

Mr. Wilson stated that the Traffic Impact Statement had been prepared in July 2013, but it was based on data that had been collected when school was in session.

There was discussion about whether covered bike racks should be required.

Mr. Webber asked staff to revise the conditions as discussed for the next Planning Board meeting.

- B.** Signing of Decisions – The following decisions were not ready for signature.

SPR2013-00013 and SPP2014-00001, 321 Main Street, Unit 2 – Wheatberry (Adrie & Ben Lester)

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

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

- A.** Town Meeting Coordinating Committee (TMCC) – Comments on Draft Zoning Primer and discussion about possible “Question and Answer Forum” for Town Meeting members and residents regarding zoning and zoning amendments

Peg Roberts, Chair of the TMCC, had left the meeting and therefore there was little discussion about the Zoning Primer or the upcoming TMCC and Planning Board “Question and Answer Forum”. Ms. Brestrup called the Board's attention to a document (“Public Participation in Zoning Amendments”) that Mr. Tucker had compiled listing opportunities that citizens have to find out about and to be involved in the zoning amendment process. Mr. Webber noted that the document also contained the Zoning Amendment Cycle.

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

**XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none**

**XII. REPORT OF STAFF – Mr. Tucker announced that on the last weekend of September the New Hampshire Highland Games would be held at Loon Mountain in Lincoln, New Hampshire. He encouraged people to attend.**

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

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

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

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