

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, July 16, 2014 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Stephen Schreiber (Acting Chair), Rob Crouner, Bruce Carson, Sandra Anderson, Kathleen Ford, Richard Roznoy, and Greg Stutsman

**ABSENT:** David Webber

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

Mr. Schreiber opened the meeting at 7:03 PM.

**I. MINUTES**

Minutes not available.

**II. ZONING**

**A. Zoning Subcommittee Report & Discussion**

Mr. Crouner reported on a mini-forum on Inclusionary Zoning last week [July 9<sup>th</sup>]. He plans to ask the Planning Board to approve a proposal to hire a consultant for a limited scope of work to compile information regarding Inclusionary Zoning. The target date for receiving this information from the consultant is the end of August.

The ZSC is also interested in working on downtown parking, which is a complicated issue with many stakeholders, many interests and many approaches, both zoning and non-zoning.

The Planning Board is planning to hold another mini forum in late September or early October to talk about parking. The forum will provide an overview of the issues. The Planning Board will not have a parking amendment ready for fall.

In the meantime, the ZSC plans to meet August 6<sup>th</sup> to refresh its memory about the multi-family housing overlay district. It is not the ZSC's intent to bring the amendment to the Fall Town Meeting, but it remains a high priority. The ZSC may have an amendment ready for Spring or Fall Town Meeting [2015].

Ms. Anderson, commented on the consultant idea and stated that BID recommends getting an opinion from an attorney on Inclusionary Zoning. She recommended not rushing it and getting an outside opinion from people who do this for a living.

Mr. Crouner stated that a legal opinion regarding the nexus question was not necessary at this time. The ZSC recommends hiring a consultant to figure out the cost of providing affordable housing in the downtown area and what offsets are necessary to make that possible.

Mr. Tucker stated that staff would work with Town Counsel on the nexus statement and that the consultant would work on the tasks described by Mr. Crouner. The consultant could begin work within two weeks. He asked the Planning Board to vote to allow the ZSC to work with a consultant on Inclusionary Zoning.

Mr. Roznoy reiterated his opinion that the work should have been done "in-house", but after the forum on Inclusionary Zoning he realized the value of having an outside consultant do some of the work. If Amherst had an Office of Economic

Development it could have followed up on comments from the BID regarding Inclusionary Zoning. Mr. Roznoy agreed that Town Counsel should review the Bylaw to make sure that we do not create a “taking”.

Ms. Ford MOVED that the Zoning Subcommittee take the lead on hiring and working with a consultant on the scope of work as discussed. Ms. Anderson seconded. The vote was 7-0-0.

**B.** Public Comment Period – No public comment

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A.** Hampshire College, Portal Building – presentation of site plan for new building in the ED zoning district in accordance with Section 3.3211 of the Zoning Bylaw

Carl Weber, Project Manager and Associate Director at Hampshire College, and Jason Jewhurst, architect with Bruner/Cott in Cambridge, presented a progress report on the project known as “The Portal” that is being proposed at Hampshire College.

The college is currently working on the redirection of their campus road. They’ve begun removing the bus loop from the center of campus. This will be replaced with a new loop that will continue and connect around the east and west sides of campus.

The campus “Portal” building will be a two story building. It will serve as a welcome center at the heart of the campus. The building will be sited in the lawn area and will be visible as visitors drive up to approach the campus. The idea is to increase the pedestrian landscape and create a green space at the heart of campus, combining that with a welcome center that will house classrooms, the admissions program and act as a community space for the college.

Mr. Jewhurst displayed an aerial view of what the road looked like three months ago and presented a plan showing what it will look like after the Portal has been completed.

The building is designed to meet the “Living Building Challenge”. It will be a “net zero energy” and “net zero water use” building. The design team is in the process of working with DEP and the Town to establish a “public water supply” to serve the building. Mr. Jewhurst briefly described the system and the goals of a net zero building, including collection of water from the roof to use as the water supply for the building. The building will also contain healthy, locally sourced materials used for construction.

Chris Chamberlain of The Berkshire Design Group, explained that the Living Building Challenge has a zero net water component. For storm water, this means that all stormwater is to be treated and handled within the site. The ten-year storm will be infiltrated on site. And the water that is captured from the roof will be used as drinking water within the building. The water from the roof will be directed to a reservoir as the water supply for the building. It will have an overflow in case the reservoir is full. The overflow will flow through a vegetated swale surrounding the site which will be integrated with the landscaping on the entire site and with a series of rain gardens.

There will be a small paved area with a few parking spaces as well as paved walkways through the site. Most of the site will be covered with meadow or prairie-mix planting as well as a group of apple trees and lawn/open space. The project, once complete, will infiltrate a majority of the storm water that falls on the site. Any overflow from these rain gardens in the very big events will leave the site via an

egress swale eventually crossing through a culvert to a wetland which is within the campus.

Mr. Jewhurst showed an image of the Portal building as one would approach it. Much of the material for the building will come from local sources.

The building will be roughly 16,000 square feet, 2 stories above grade with a partial basement below grade, and fully sprinkled.

Mr. Crowner observed that this is a very exciting project and he asked what is the extra cost for a building like this compared to a standard building.

Mr. Jewhurst noted that things that increase the initial cost of the project include photo-voltaics to cover the entire energy needs of the building and parts of the water system. However, there are local materials, such as trusses from Belchertown that are keeping the costs of construction materials lower than they might ordinarily be.

Ms. Anderson noted that there is a good south facing elevation and asked if there would be photo-voltaics on the roof. Mr. Jewhurst explained that there will be photo-voltaics on the roof, which will tip to the south. The designers are also looking at high-performance glazing strategies to block out some of the heat energy from the sun. They are considering exterior blinds to allow the daylight in but block out the heat energy.

Carl Weber mentioned that students have been involved throughout the design of the project and that the building will provide an educational opportunity for people in the community and for the State of Massachusetts. LBC is all about making people think about things differently such as net zero water, net zero energy and not using some toxic materials. It's a teaching tool from the beginning to end and Hampshire College plans to promote the educational aspects of the building.

Mr. Schreiber asked if there were a master plan for the College campus. Mr. Weber has not seen a recent master plan, but noted that the College has done several in the past. The location of the Portal building follows what the College has said in the past about building out the quad. However, the College has never before proposed the elimination of the bus loop in the middle of the campus. The rerouting of the bus route will make this a more pedestrian-friendly place.

Mr. Jewhurst mentioned that during the schematic design phase the College elected to do a "siting study" and they prepared a "mini campus plan" to understand what the best siting would be for this building and how it would position the campus for the future.

There are only five registered living buildings in the world. It will take a year to construct the building, which is expected to be completed around December 2015 with a January move-in. This building is going to be an attraction for the area. The design team visited a building in Seattle which gave weekly tours. The team anticipates that a lot of people will visit this building, not only for the purpose of admission to Hampshire College but because they are interested in how this building works.

### III. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW

#### **SPR2014-00018 – The Common School – 535 South Pleasant Street**

Request Site Plan Review approval to construct a handicapped access ramp to the front of the proposed office building [currently a residence], under Section 3.330.0 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 17A, Parcel 51, R-N zoning district)

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

Ms. Brestrup stated that the legal ad mentioned the office building but it wasn't clearly stated that there would be a change of use. She wanted to be clear that the public hearing is for the change of use and the proposed ramp. Also, Board members packets did not contain the site plan the applicant meant to give them. A new site plan was provided to Board members at the public hearing. It was emailed to Board members prior to the meeting.

The property has a wetland on it, which is north of the building. The Planning Department was not made aware of this because the applicant did not submit the correct plan. The applicant has spoken with the Wetlands Administrator and is aware that a filing with the Conservation Commission will be required.

Chris Lindeman, Director of the Common School, presented the application. She noted that Gary Powsner, Business Manager and Plant Manager, was not able to attend. The Common School would like to use this building [a former residence] as office space. Eight office employees will be moving into the building. The School is not intending to add any additional parking and does not expect any increase in traffic, except for handicapped people who need to park close to the building.

She also mentioned the School is not anticipating any major changes inside the building except for the recommendation of the architect to widen two doorways for wheelchair access. The School would like to make use of the space in the fall.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Site Visit Report. There were three Board members on site visit along with Christine Brestrup and Gary Powsner from the school. He reviewed some of the questions and observations.

- Will the driveway be repaved and/or widened?
- Will the end of the driveway be regraded?
- Will there be a walkway from the end of the ramp to the driveway?
- Where will the handicap spaces be located?

Mr. Schreiber noted that the new site plan shows the location of the handicap spaces and also shows the connection from the end of the ramp to the driveway.

Ms. Lindeman stated that the School had not intended to regrade the driveway but if they have to do so then they will. It's not on the plan, but the driveway will be repaved and widened. This may mean some grading along the side of the drive area in order to add the extra two feet that is needed.

Mr. Roznoy stated there were some concerns about how the handicapped access ramp would connect with the driveway. He wasn't sure where the ramp was going at the time but the new site plan shows it better. At the end of the ramp there is a piece of grass that doesn't connect with the driveway. This was a concern at the site visit. How do you get from the parking area onto the handicap ramp?

Ms. Lindeman agreed with Mr. Roznoy that there will need to be an extension off the ramp to attach the ramp to the driveway. The handicapped parking spaces would be slightly wider than they are currently shown on the plan.

Mr. Roznoy wondered about the fact that this application is going to have to go through the Conservation Commission. He noted where the wetlands setback is now and stated that the Conservation Commission may have some concerns. He wondered if the public hearing should continue until after the Conservation Commission has acted.

Ms. Brestrup stated that the board could approve the application the way it is and have a condition that states that if the plan changes as a result of review by the Conservation Commission then the applicant must come back with a revised plan.

Mr. Schreiber stated that this seems like such a light footprint project with the ramp being built on piers. Because it is outside the wetland boundaries he did not think that this would be considered a high-impact project by the Conservation Commission.

Mr. Stutsman agreed with Ms. Brestrup's recommendation regarding a condition that will allow the Board to revisit the plan if the Conservation Commission recommends changes.

Ms. Anderson pointed out that the application material mentions that the reason for the change of use is to temporarily house the administrative offices while the school undergoes renovations. She wondered what will happen to the offices after the purpose of the use has been fulfilled. She asked the applicant to briefly explain what the plan is for the building.

Ms. Lindeman stated the construction will actually take 2 years but the School needs the office space now. Construction is not slated to take place until a year from now. It is a two year shift; they will have their offices there. At this time the board of directors has not determined what the next use of the property will be, whether it would revert back to rental or whether the School would decide to use it permanently for offices.

Mr. Crouner mentioned that they were told most of the parking for most of the users of the building will be at the parking lot off of the main school driveway. He wondered how people will get from the main driveway to the house. If there is going to be a path the Conservation Commission should be made aware of its location.

Ms. Lindeman stated that there is an existing barn along the main driveway. To the left of this barn is a former road. The School will put a crosswalk on the main driveway and direct people through the back way, around the barn, to the office building.

Mr. Schreiber stated that not everyone in a wheelchair will arrive by car. For those who arrive by bus or simply from the center of town he expressed concern about how someone in a wheelchair could make it from the town sidewalk into the property and onto the handicapped ramp in a wheelchair.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that the applicant had requested five waivers:

- Landscape Plan (not formally requested, but a landscape plan has not been submitted)
- Erosion Control Plan
- Lighting Plan

- Sign Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement

#### Lighting Plan

Ms. Anderson asked how staff will get from the parking lot to the building in the dark winter afternoons.

Ms. Lindeman stated that the main driveway has lighting that spills over onto the property with the house. The parking area is lit and there is lighting on the exterior of the house. If additional lighting is needed the School will do that.

#### Parking

Mr. Crouner noted that five parking spaces would be required based on the size of the building but only two are being proposed. The Board should consider offering a waiver from this requirement.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the people who will be working in this building are already working in the main Common School building. They are already parking in the main parking lot. The Board could consider giving a waiver from the requirement for on-site parking for five spaces because there is parking available in the main parking lot.

The Board found under Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, Site Plan Review, as follows:

- 11.2400 – The project is in conformance with all appropriate provisions of the Zoning Bylaw;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected through minimizing detrimental or offensive actions;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use;
- 11.2403 – Adequate recreational facilities, open space and amenities will be provided;
- 11.2410 – Unique or important natural, historic or scenic features will be protected;
- 11.2411 – Methods of refuse disposal will be adequate; this has been addressed in the Management Plan;
- 11.2412 – The ability of the proposed sewage disposal and water supply systems within and adjacent to the site to serve the proposed use will be adequate;
- 11.2413 – The drainage system within and adjacent to the site will be adequate to handle the increased runoff resulting from the development because there will be only a minor increase in paved area;
- 11.2414 – Adequate landscaping has been provided; the existing site is heavily vegetated; the applicant requested a waiver from the requirement for a Landscape Plan at the public hearing;
- 11.2415 – The requirement for submission of an Erosion Control Plan will be waived; there is very little excavation or filling proposed;
- 11.2416 – Adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of air and water pollution, flood, noise, odor, dust and vibration;
- 11.2417 – Adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of lighting; the existing lighting may be enhanced slightly to provide adequate lighting for those walking from the main parking lot to the office building; there have been no complaints about existing lighting;
- 11.2418 – N/A;
- 11.2419 – Wetlands will be protected because the applicant will file an application with the Conservation Commission describing the proposed work;
- 11.2420 – N/A;

11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits with surrounding buildings and development;

11.2422 – The project avoids, to the extent feasible, the impact on steep slopes, floodplains, scenic views, grade changes and wetlands;

11.2423 – There is more than one building on the site, and the buildings relate to each other in architectural style, site location and building exits and entrances;

Mr. Roznoy asked about the existing barn. Ms. Lindeman explained that the red barn on the driveway is used for storage and that it will remain. The existing garage with a collapsed roof, behind the house, will be removed.

11.2424 – N/A;

11.2430 – The site has been designed to provide for the convenience and safety of vehicular and pedestrian movement both within the site and in relation to adjoining ways and properties; the driveway will be repaved and widened;

11.2431 – N/A;

11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, drive aisles, loading areas and sidewalks has been provided in a safe and convenient manner;

11.2433 – N/A;

11.2434 – N/A;

11.2435 – N/A;

11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement will be waived;

11.2437 – N/A.

Ms. Anderson asked again about lighting, expressing concern that employees who walk up the sidewalk will have trouble in the dark. She asked if there is lighting along the path beside the barn.

Ms. Ford recommended that the path beside the barn be put on the Site Plan, that the plan note where there is existing lighting and that the new lighting fixtures, if any, be shown on the Site Plan. She also asked that the lighting be confirmed as “dark-sky compliant”.

Ms. Anderson asked that the Site Plan show where the light will be cast on the ground.

Ms. Lindeman stated that there is no existing light on the barn but that the School may install lighting on the barn.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the wetlands. Ms. Brestrup suggested that if changes are required by the Conservation Commission then a revised plan shall be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval.

Ms. Ford recommended a condition requiring that the Site Plan show a clear connection between the end of the ramp and the driveway.

Mr. Schreiber stated that a revised Site Plan should be submitted showing the path from the parking lot to the office building, that the Site Plan be explicit about lighting [existing and proposed] along the path from the parking lot to the office building, that the Site Plan show how the ramp meets the driveway, and show how a path from the sidewalk along South Pleasant Street will work for someone in a wheelchair who wishes to approach the office building. He also recommended that there be a condition about the Conservation Commission review.

Mr. Roznoy stated that many of the issues regarding the pathways relate to Site Plan Review criterion 11.2433, regarding provision for access to adjoining property. He supported the requirement for a revised Site Plan and supported continuing the public hearing to receive a revised Site Plan, before approving the application.

Mr. Schreiber explained that the Board could approve the application with conditions requiring that a revised Site Plan be submitted, or the Board could continue the public hearing and review the revised Site Plan at the continued hearing before approving the application.

Ms. Lindeman stated that the School plans to do the renovations to the house this fall and to move the office workers into the building in the winter or early spring.

Mr. Schreiber acknowledged that this is a small project, a ramp and two handicapped parking spaces. Mr. Schreiber, Ms. Ford, Ms. Anderson, Mr. Carson and Mr. Stutsman expressed support for approval of the application with conditions.

Ms. Ford MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the Site Plan Review application, including the change of use from residential to office use, with conditions and waivers as discussed. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-2-0 (Crownier and Roznoy opposed).

Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Crownier explained their opposition by stating that some aspects of the application should have been done ahead of the public hearing and that they did not have a fundamental opposition to the proposal.

#### Waivers

- Landscape Plan
- Erosion Control Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Sign Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement
- Waiver of the requirement for 5 on-site parking spaces

#### Conditions

1. A revised Site Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Board. The revised Plan shall show:
  - a. the existing path around the barn from the main parking lot to the proposed office building,
  - b. the any existing lighting and any new proposed lighting fixtures and the spread of the light on the ground,
  - c. the paving for the existing driveway and the connection of the driveway to the end of the ramp.
2. Exterior lighting shall be downcast and/or shielded and shall be dark-sky compliant.
3. The change of use from residential to office use is approved contingent on these conditions.
4. If changes are required as a result of the Conservation Commission review, the applicant shall submit a revised plan for review and approval by the Planning Board.

#### **SPR2014-00019 – Archipelago Investments LLC – 57 Olympia Drive (Olympia Place)**

Request amendment to Conditions #2, 6 and 7 of SPR2014-00001, to allow more time to submit information regarding revised Management Plan and handicapped access, under Section 3.326 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 8D, Parcel 17, R-F zoning district)

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

Kyle Wilson and David Williams of Archipelago Investments presented the application. When they came to the Planning Board last fall they had projected an opening date of fall 2015 for both Kendrick Place and Olympia Place. Now the schedule for Olympia Place has shifted by six months. The building is expected to be completed in the spring of 2016 and to be leased in September 2016. Currently the requirements of Conditions 2, 6 and 7 of the

decision on SPR2014-00001 are required to be completed “prior to the issuance of a Building Permit”. The applicants are requesting that these conditions be changed so that they are required to be met “prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy”. At that time the applicants feel that they will be able to provide a comprehensive and thorough response to the requirements of the conditions.

Mr. Wilson recommended that in allowing a change in the conditions the Board may wish to require the applicant to return in September 2015 to report on progress in meeting the conditions.

There was no site visit for this application since Board members had already visited the site for the initial application.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Development Application Report. He summarized why the Board took the initial action that it did with respect to conditions. He noted that the Building Commissioner was in agreement with the proposal to change the conditions and with the timeline being proposed, particularly with regard to handicapped parking and the handicapped drop-off area. An update prior to September 2015 would be acceptable.

Board members agreed in principle to change the three conditions to be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy and to require that the applicant return to the Board to present an update on progress prior to September 30, 2015. Mr. Wilson noted that this date would be six months prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Wilson noted that the information required by the three conditions requires additional effort to resolve the issues. The applicant would like to provide adequate drop-off and parking areas and needs more time to negotiate with UMass.

Mr. Williams noted that there is a new Parking Director at UMass. He and Mr. Wilson have met with her and want to make sure that she is fully engaged in the process.

Ms. Ford noted that the applicant would not receive a Certificate of Occupancy until the conditions are met.

Ms. Anderson MOVED to close the public hearing, to approve the change in the completion date for Conditions 2, 6 and 7, and to require the applicant to report to the Planning Board on progress prior to the end of September 2015. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 7-0-0.

#### Waivers

Since this is a request to amend conditions of the Site Plan Review approval (SPR2014-00001) and no new physical changes are being proposed for the property a request for waivers is not applicable.

#### Conditions

The conditions of Site Plan Review approval SPR2014-00001 shall be amended to read as follows:

2. Development shall be managed substantially in accordance with the Management Plan submitted to the Planning Board. A revised Management Plan, addressing all issues listed in the conditions, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Board prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy with the applicant required to submit to the Planning Board an update on progress in meeting this condition before September 30, 2015, to ensure that the applicant is making progress on the requirements of Condition 2.

6. The applicant shall submit a plan to provide appropriate handicapped parking adjacent to the site either within the Town of Amherst Right-of-Way on Olympia Drive, or on town-owned land adjacent to the property, or on University-owned property adjacent to the development site, or on private property. The applicant shall submit a proposal for handicapped parking to the Planning Board for its review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy with the applicant required to submit to the Planning Board an update on progress in meeting this condition before September 30, 2015, to ensure that the applicant is making progress on the requirements of Condition 6.
7. A handicapped drop-off area shall be provided for the front entrance and in compliance with the Massachusetts AAB regulations. A plan showing the drop-off area shall be submitted to the Planning Board for its review and approval prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy with the applicant required to submit to the Planning Board an update on progress in meeting this condition before September 30, 2015, to ensure that applicant is making progress on requirements of Condition 7.

**SPR2014-00020 – Survival Centers, Inc. dba Amherst Survival Center –  
138 Sunderland Road**

Request Site Plan Review approval to amend Site Plan SPR2011-00009 to reconfigure and pave TRG parking lot (constructed in 2011), to improve circulation and add parking spaces, and to add a walkway to a new bus shelter (Map 5A, Parcel 26, COM zoning district)

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

Ted Parker of Kohl Construction presented the application. Mr. Parker is on the Board of Directors of the Survival Center. He explained that the building was approved under a previous Site Plan Review approval and was occupied in December of 2012. It became apparent that the parking lot, as originally designed, was not configured properly. There were fender benders and scrapes and people had a difficult time turning around in the parking lot.

Mr. Parker joined the Board of Directors in 2012 and has been working with Mark Darnold of The Berkshire Design Group to reconfigure the parking lot to make it flow better so that it would be more convenient for people coming to the Center. The resulting design has generated more parking spaces. However, the applicant is requesting a waiver from the requirement to increase the number of handicapped spaces. There are enough handicapped spaces to meet the requirements of the existing number of parking spaces.

The parking lot will be re-graded as a single grade. The rain garden that was originally designed to handle stormwater runoff was never constructed. All of the runoff now flows to the detention basin. The new configuration stays within the same net impervious area as the existing parking lot. There is no new impervious area being added to the site and therefore no increase in runoff as a result of this reconfiguration.

The southernmost curb cut will move further to the north.

Mr. Parker introduced Mindy Domb, Executive Director of the Survival Center, who has been successful in getting bus service to the building. The Center would like to add a bus shelter on this side of Sunderland Road. UMass Transit is donating a bus shelter. The proposed location of the bus shelter was reviewed and approved by Jason Skeels.

Mr. Parker noted that the original stormwater management system was designed to handle runoff from a paved parking lot.

Mr. Crowner asked about a bike rack. He noted that there is a good existing bike rack on-site. It is appropriately located and well-designed and is part of the parking lot. He asked that a bike rack be installed in a similar location.

Mr. Parker stated that the Survival Center hasn't yet determined a good location for a bike rack, given the new parking lot configuration. But they intend to have a bike rack. The existing bike rack does get used by visitors to the site. The applicant will consider an appropriate location for the bike rack.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that the following waivers had been requested:

- Traffic Impact Study
- Management Plan (a Management Plan was submitted with the first Site Plan Review application in 2011)
- Waiver from the requirement to provide 3 handicapped parking spaces and instead provide only 2 (Section 7.6 of the Zoning Bylaw; Federal ADA regulations and Massachusetts AAB regulations require only 2 handicapped parking spaces)

Mr. Roznoy asked to hear from the applicant about the number of handicapped spaces and he stated that this facility may need more handicapped parking spaces rather than less.

Ms. Domb stated that the existing 2 handicapped spaces are used, but she has not heard anyone complain that more handicapped parking spaces are needed. She noted that many disabled people arrive at the site by PVRTA bus or van rather than driving.

Mr. Parker noted that there is a lot of turn-over in the parking lot. He stated that the applicant could eliminate some of the parking spaces and go back to the original number if the Board would prefer. The main purpose of the reconfiguration is improving the circulation.

Mr. Schreiber noted that two aspects of the previous plan had not been carried out – ground cover was proposed throughout the site but it had not been planted. Groundcover was replaced with grass. In addition, the rain garden had not been constructed or planted.

Chris Chamberlain of The Berkshire Design Group stated that Jason Skeels, Town Engineer, was satisfied with the drainage plan because the designers were able to maintain the site with a net decrease in impervious area.

Mr. Parker stated that the plants shown on the Landscape Plan were planted. These are going to be removed and heeled in and replanted when the construction is completed.

There were three light poles shown on the original plan and only two were installed. The light poles are proposed to be relocated as part of the reconfiguration of the parking lot. Mr. Parker noted that the pole in the middle of the parking lot has two lights on it and therefore the number of lamps in the parking lot is the same, even though there are fewer poles.

Ms. Anderson stated that if there hadn't been a problem with the lighting that it could be left as is. Ms. Domb remarked that there were no lighting problems last winter and that there are lights on the building that shine into the parking lot and provide lighting for people approaching and leaving the building. The lights are on timers and turn on when it is dark.

In support of a waiver of the Traffic Impact Study, the Board noted that the Survival Center is now on the PVRTA bus route and that there is a stop at the Center now.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Site Visit Report.

Ms. Anderson stated that, with regard to the waiver of the requirement for three handicapped parking spaces, there had been no complaints or problems, some disabled people arrive by other means than private cars, so she recommended waiver of the third handicapped parking space and go with two spaces.

Mr. Parker noted that the number of parking spaces required is based on the square footage of the building. Only 22 parking spaces are required, so the applicant is providing extra parking spaces beyond what is required.

There was further discussion of the parking issue. Mr. Schreiber stated that the people who operate the building are the ones who are best equipped to decide how many handicapped spaces are needed.

Ms. Domb noted that there is a lack of parking spaces in general and that some people park elsewhere and walk into the site.

Mr. Chamberlain noted that the applicant is not asking for a waiver from the federal or state regulations with regard to handicapped parking spaces.

The Board found under Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, Site Plan Review, that the project complied with all of the relevant criteria of Section 11.24, since the proposal was merely changing the orientation of the parking lot.

#### Waivers

- Traffic Impact Study
- Management Plan (a Management Plan was submitted with the first Site Plan Review application in 2011)
- Waiver from the requirement to provide 3 handicapped parking spaces and instead provide only 2 (Section 7.6 of the Zoning Bylaw; Federal ADA regulations and Massachusetts AAB regulations require only 2 handicapped parking spaces)

#### Conditions

1. The applicant shall submit a revised Site Plan showing the location of a bike rack for review and approval by the Planning Board.

Ms. Anderson MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the application with the waivers and conditions as requested. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 7-0-0.

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

- A. Signing of Decisions – The Board did not sign any decision since they were not yet ready for signature.
- B. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

- B. The Retreat – Definitive Subdivision Plan and Site Plan Review – discussion of process  
Ms. Brestrup reported that the Planning Board's third-party review consultant, Fuss and O'Neill, would be present at the upcoming public hearing on The Retreat, on July 30<sup>th</sup>. She stated that the public and Board members were welcome to look at the materials in the Planning Department office. She also distributed packets on the application to Board members who were present.

There was further discussion about process and schedule.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the applicant had not yet submitted the Site Plan Review application, although the Definitive Subdivision Plans show some of the information that would be expected to be submitted for Site Plan Review.

Ms. Brestrup reported that the Conservation Commission had received an ANRAD (Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation) and they are also involved in reviewing enforcement orders related to disturbance of wetlands. They will be choosing a third party consultant soon. The Conservation Commission process is expected to lag the Planning Board process.

**C. Planning Board – Committee and Liaison Nominations and Appointments**

The Planning Board scheduled Election of Officers for July 30<sup>th</sup>.

**D. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Ms. Brestrup reported that the Planning Department had received two copies of a book published by Massachusetts Audubon Society called Losing Ground: Planning for Resilience. It is available to be read or borrowed from the Planning Department.**

Mr. Schreiber noted that the Planning Board was going to hold a potluck supper at the homes of Bruce Carson and Richard Roznoy. The event will be held on July 22<sup>nd</sup>.

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

**VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS**

The Planning Board declined to review the following applications:

**ZBA FY2014-00039 – W.D. Cows** – For a Special Permit for 125, 134, and 149 Montague Road

**ZBA FY2014-00040 – Fletcher Clark & Mattea Kramer** – For a Special Permit for 676 East Pleasant Street

**ZBA FY2015-00001 – Peter Seterdahl** – For a Special Permit for 561 Flat Hills Road

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

Ms. Brestrup reported that, in addition to the Definitive Subdivision Plan for The Retreat (SUB2014-00002) the Planning Board would be reviewing the following Site Plan Review applications at upcoming Planning Board meetings:

SPR2015-00001 – Elm Electric – 32 Northampton Road (Newport Hall – Amherst College)

SPR2015-00002 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street

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

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson volunteered to serve on the PVPC again.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson volunteered to serve on CPAC again.

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber volunteered to serve as the Planning Board's representative on the Agricultural Commission.

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crowner

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant

Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford has been appointed to serve on the DRB until November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman

Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman

Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Stephen Schreiber, Greg Stutsman and Bruce Carson

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to approve the slate of Planning Board Committee Liaisons. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 7-0-0.

**X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – none

**XI. REPORT OF STAFF** – none

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted:                      Approved:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen Schreiber  
Acting Chair

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