

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, October 22, 2014 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

- PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair, Stephen Schreiber, Rob Crouner, Bruce Carson, Richard Roznoy, and Greg Stutsman
- ABSENT:** Sandra Anderson (Kathleen Ford resigned from the Board prior to October 22, 2014)
- STAFF:** Jonathan Tucker, Planning Director
Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner
Alan Snow, Tree Warden

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:05 PM.

I. MINUTES

Minutes not available.

II. PUBLIC HEARING – SCENIC ROADS

PB/TW 2015-00001 – Proposed Roadway Reconstruction – Pine Street

In accordance with the provisions of M.G.L. Chapter 40, §15C, Scenic Roads, and Chapter 87, §3, Shade Trees, the Amherst Planning Board and Tree Warden will hold a joint public hearing to review the proposed removal of the following public shade trees for the reconstruction of Pine Street:

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

22” Norway Maple at 38 Pine Street

24” Norway Maple at 58 Pine Street

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

Alan Snow, Tree Warden, presented the application. Pine Street is being reconstructed. The section of Pine Street where these trees are located is being widened to accommodate a lane divider and drainage work. The storm drainage system has already been installed and has impacted these two trees. The Department of Public Works is proposing to remove these trees to provide room for the widening.

Ms. Brestrup presented the Site Visit Report. Alan Snow, Tree Warden, Jason Skeels, Town Engineer, and Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner attended the site visit. They viewed the two trees proposed for removal. Mr. Skeels described where the “splitter island” will be located. Mr. Snow stated that at least one of the trees has old wounds, poor branching, scars and that it leans. Both Mr. Snow and Mr. Skeels stated that the DPW had worked hard to save every tree possible along Pine Street. There will be a 4’-5’ wide sidewalk in this area, which will also impact the trees. The owner of 38 Pine Street, Rudy Beyer, came out and met with the town staff members. He noted that he would prefer that his tree remain, but he understands why it needs to be removed. He spoke with the Tree Warden about having a tree or trees planted on his property by the town.

Mr. Snow recommended that these trees be removed. He stated that 3 years ago the Public Shade Tree Committee had walked the entire length of Pine Street and had identified trees to be saved and trees to be removed.

Mr. Snow noted that Norway Maples are an invasive species that can no longer be purchased in Massachusetts.

Mr. Crouner asked what would happen if the Board recommended that the trees be saved. Would they survive?

Mr. Snow stated that they could probably survive what has already been done to them.

Mr. Crouner stated that he had visited the site and had seen that there was room on the other side of the sidewalk for replacement trees. He asked whether property owners had been approached to allow new trees to be planted.

Ms. Brestrup reported on the conversation during the site visit with Rudy Beyer about replacement trees.

Mr. Snow stated that there was a nice large canopy of trees adjacent to the road and a naturalized area of nice trees nearby. He reported that the Public Shade Tree Committee had voted against removal of the trees.

Mr. Snow stated that the trees are about 50 to 60 years old.

Mr. Webber stated that it seems reasonable that the trees be removed, he was in favor of authorizing removal and he stated that there would be no fee charged to the town by the town for the tree removal, because this is a town project.

Mr. Crouner stated that the public hearing on these trees should have happened sooner. Mr. Snow responded that there were last-minute changes to the plans for Pine Street that caused the trees to be impacted.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the proposed removal of the trees. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-1-0 (Crouner opposed).

Mr. Snow left the meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW AND SPECIAL PERMIT

SPR2015-00003 & SPP2015-00001 – Joint Public Hearing – Archipelago Investments LLC – 1 East Pleasant Street (the Carriage Shops) (Continued from October 1, 2014)

Request Site Plan Review approval for a mixed-use building containing dwelling units in combination with ground floor retail/commercial uses and parking, with 78 apartments on Floors 2 through 5, and request Special Permit to modify maximum building coverage (70 to 80%) and maximum height (55' to 60') (Map 11C, Parcel 278, B-G zoning district)

SPP2015-00003 – Archipelago Investments LLC – 1 East Pleasant Street (the Carriage Shops)

Request Special Permit to modify side and rear setback requirements, under footnote “a” of Table 3 of Zoning Bylaw for mixed-use building (Map 11C, Parcel 278, B-G Zoning District)

Mr. Webber announced that a new Special Permit application had been filed to modify side and rear yard setback requirements and that the public hearing for this new Special Permit would be consolidated with the Site Plan Review and first Special Permit application into this single Joint Public Hearing.

The joint public hearing for SPR2015-00003 & SPP2015-00001 had been opened on October 1, 2014, so this is a continued public hearing for those applications.

Mr. Webber read the preamble and opened the public hearing for the new Special Permit application to modify side and rear setback requirements SPR2015-00003.

The Town Manager, John Musante, was recognized to offer comments.

Mr. Musante thanked the Board for permitting him to address the public hearing. He expressed enthusiasm about the proposed project at One East Pleasant Street, noting that on the previous day (October 21st) Governor Patrick and Senator Rosenberg had visited Amherst to announce a \$1.5 million MassWorks infrastructure grant to bury above-ground utility wires along East Pleasant Street and Triangle Street, as far as Chestnut Court. The overhead wires recently relocated onto Pray Street will also be put underground. This work will occur in 2015. Burying the overhead wires will give more flexibility to redevelopment of adjoining commercial properties. The northern downtown area offers redevelopment opportunities to the town. It is a potential innovation district. The redevelopment of this area will help Amherst to take full advantage of its assets and will allow more people to live and work in the downtown area. The maximum height of the building will be 60 feet. Allowing this waiver will benefit development and benefit the community. It allows the first floor to be taller and allows service vehicles to enter the developed site. Service vehicles will not need to park on the street to service the building. This will be an improvement over the way service vehicles operate in the rest of downtown.

Mr. Webber asked the applicants to present the changes that were being proposed to the development and to present the new Special Permit application.

David Williams and Kyle Wilson of Archipelago Investments LLC made the presentation. They distributed a package of revised drawings, an updated Stormwater Management Report, a copy of the Traffic Impact Study and revised calculations.

Mr. Williams noted that the applicants had heard the comments from the October 1st Planning Board meeting and had gone back to the architects and now returned with a better design. The Design Review Board had also offered comments and recommendations. He noted that this project will not be under construction until next year.

Mr. Wilson presented a map of Amherst, showing the locations of UMass, Amherst College and Hampshire College, along with the center of downtown Amherst. Archipelago Investments is just working in the downtown area of Amherst to bring more residential units to the downtown.

Mr. Wilson presented three renderings of the proposed new building set in context. The efforts in revising the design focused on the window proportions, and giving a more residential scale to the upper floors. The design concept of brick planes and wood framing had been kept. The brick facades on East Pleasant Street and the south side of the building had been retained. The commercial look of the first floor had been revised and the back (southeast) corner of the building had been revised to reflect a different approach to the mural and cemetery. The windows have been stepped back into the façade and there is a different proportion on the ground floor. There will be a café space on the southwest corner of the building. The collaboration space at the corner has been brought up to the grade of the café space, to provide a better relationship with the café. The collaboration space will now be publicly accessible.

The north façade has changed, the building footprint has been reduced, there is a brick façade on each of the “bars” on the north side, but the courtyard will have an all-wood façade. There is a more detailed planting plan and the area between the new building and the Summerlin property to the north has been redesigned. Trees and groundcover will be added to the island between the Summerlin parking lot and the alleyway (“woonerf”). The green roof has been eliminated and replaced with “green roof trays” over the parking bays. The scale of the north

façade has been reduced. There is now a wooden fence with gates. Both the fence and gates will be transparent, while providing a secure garage space for tenants. The wood framing the façade on East Pleasant Street has been revised and expanded. The mural will now be painted on the building itself, which is more similar to other murals painted by David Fichter, the mural artist.

The southeast corner of the building has been changed to wrap around and be visible from East Pleasant Street. There will be signage at the corner, describing the history of the cemetery and the mural.

The site will be regraded, with the mural being raised up. The existing mural is about 4 feet below grade. The regrading will provide positive drainage and will bring the natural landscape to the mural.

Mr. Wilson described the revised Landscape Plan, with a “new approach”. There will be improvements along East Pleasant Street and in the area of the “woonerf”. The green roof trays will be elevated on a steel structure, 10 feet above the grade of the parking area and visible to the residential units above. The green roof trays will protect the parked cars in winter. The design of the “woonerf” allows pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers of automobiles to share the space equally.

Mr. Wilson described the retail spaces, and discussed the elevations of the interior and exterior spaces in relation to each other. A tree planting is proposed for the south side of the building.

The number of spaces in the parking area will be the same as in the existing condition, but the layout will be different. The turning radius for trash trucks and other services vehicles will be adequate. There will be bicycle storage at a ratio of one per unit.

The electrical transformer will be located at the end of the alley/woonerf. Pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers of automobiles will have a “key fob” for entry into the parking area.

The building will be 5 feet from the property line on the cemetery side, with the existing fence being 3 to 4 feet inside the cemetery.

The project will restore the historic grades on the cemetery side of the building.

The south side of the building will have trees and shrubs, some of which are proposed to be planted on private property and some on public property.

Along the streetscape, the existing sidewalks will be replaced with sidewalks appropriate to the Town of Amherst Streetscape Guidelines. There will be a grass strip between the sidewalk and the road to negotiate the grade change. The existing crabapple tree along the street will be removed and replaced with five (5) new street trees.

Mr. Wilson presented a cross section through the building, illustrating the pedestrian scale of the new fence on the north side. He presented a typical upper floor plan and showed an aerial perspective of the north façade, with Boston Ivy climbing on the eastern “bar” of the north façade.

Mr. Wilson described the change in the number and size of the proposed units:

- There will now be 84 residential units, rather than the originally proposed 78;
- There will now be the following configuration of units on each floor:
 - 2 Four-bedroom units
 - 15 Two-bedroom units
 - 2 Three-bedroom units
 - 2 One-bedroom units

There has been a reduction in the size of the apartments, a reduction in the number of large units and an increase in the number of smaller units.

There will be trees in the parking courtyard.

The applicants are no longer seeking a Special Permit to modify the building coverage requirements. The applicants are still seeking a Special Permit to modify the side and rear setback requirements. The requirement is for a 20 foot setback since the property is adjoining a Residence District (the cemetery). Therefore a Special Permit is needed because the proposed setbacks are as follows:

- 5' on the cemetery (east) side
- 4'-4" and 8'-4" on the south side
- 26'-6" and 5'-0" on the north side

Mr. Wilson noted that the stormwater calculations have changed. The woonerf is now paved with 2,000 square feet of permeable pavers. Runoff from the 2, 10 and 100 year storms are all reduced from the existing condition.

The building now has less than the allowed 70% maximum building coverage.

Mr. Carson asked about signage for the retail spaces. Mr. Wilson stated that although blade signs are best for retail spaces, they would protrude over the sidewalk. Therefore signage for the retail spaces will be on the glass area of the first floor.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the setbacks and building coverage.

Mr. Schreiber asked about the proposed height of the building, noting that the additional height was needed to get trucks under the wing of the building near the cemetery. Why do trucks have to go into the building? Can't the property have moveable dumpsters that can be moved outside for short distances for pick-up?

Mr. Wilson stated that there will be trash compactors in the building and they are very heavy to move. At the lowest corner of the building the first floor will be 15 ½ feet high. The enclosed location for pick-up and deliveries will prevent blocking the alleyway for others. At the highest corner of the building the first floor will be 18 feet high. There are benefits to everyone to have the service vehicles underneath the building.

Mr. Tucker noted that at the previous session of the public hearing the Board had heard testimony from a resident of Cottage Street that the building and driveway would interrupt pedestrian movement through this part of town. Now pedestrian and vehicular use of the woonerf will be expected. He also noted that blade signs can project over the sidewalk by up to 3 feet if they meet certain criteria.

Mr. Carson asked why the awnings were removed from the building façade.

Mr. Wilson stated that the building will be 3 feet back from the sidewalk along East Pleasant Street, allowing for door opening. There will be a covered area created by pushing the openings back into the building at the first floor level, allowing people to stand in the alcoves to get out of the elements.

Mr. Webber read from some questions in letters received from citizens. Some spaces on the second floor could be used for offices or other uses. Did the developers consider allowing more flexible use of the second floor spaces?

Mr. Wilson stated that a primary goal of the developers was to bring more residential uses downtown. Residential leads retail, he said. Also, there is a separation between the uses built into the fact that the first floor will be steel and the upper floors will be wood construction.

There is a problem mixing mercantile and offices with residential uses. This is an optimal lot for retail use on the ground floor, he said.

Mr. Webber asked about the concept of collaborative space. He asked about “live/work” space, where people live upstairs and come down to work in the collaborative space.

Mr. Williams stated that the collaborative space on the ground floor is also called “computational space”. It will be joined to the café to provide an “innovation environment”.

Mr. Crouner asked if the collaborative space was only being provided on the ground floor. Mr. Williams stated that the collaborative space was only on the ground floor, but it had been expanded.

Mr. Crouner asked about the possibility of access to bike parking from the stairwell. Mr. Wilson acknowledged that the back stairwell should open onto the bike storage area. He noted the location of the elevators, stated that the entry desk in the lobby would be manned (“personned”) and that the lobby was “key fob” accessible.

Mr. Crouner asked about the possibility of solar panels on the roof. Mr. Wilson said that this is possible. The building’s energy needs are minimal. It will use “all-electric, air source heat pumps” which are small and 13 hot water tanks. The engineering of the roof depends on how to install PV panels, since it affects the roof framing. He stated that the developers would look at multiple options. Massachusetts has good incentives for solar energy because of the high cost of electricity. The solar panels may be able to be flat and cover the whole roof. He noted that the electricity for the building would be “sub-metered”.

Mr. Webber expressed his hope that the demographics of the tenants in the proposed building would be the same as that in Boltwood Place.

Ms. Brestrup asked if the Board members would like to hear from the developer about parking for the tenants who have cars but will not be able to park on-site.

Mr. Williams stated that for Boltwood Place, the developers arranged to rent 12 parking space in the Boltwood Garage, but only needed 6 of the spaces. Amherst is a “walkable town”, he said. Soon there will be Zip Cars in the downtown area. The building will provide 36 [37] parking spaces. People will find other means of transit, he asserted.

Mr. Wilson stated that the main demographic that the developers hope to attract are millennials for whom mobility is different. The developers have not approached neighboring property owners. Tenants can purchase a downtown parking permit.

Ms. Brestrup noted that parking along the streets in the downtown area is not permitted over night during the winter months.

Mr. Wilson stated that the town needs to deal with the issue of cars if it wants to bring residential uses back to the downtown area. We need to look at the permit parking system. The proposed building is located in the Municipal Parking District. It will provide parking on the first floor. The developer has looked at the possibility of using the parking area of the building for other uses, but “this is not a viable approach” he said.

Mr. Carson suggested that the developers consider Zip Cars as part of the parking proposal. Mr. Wilson agreed with the idea of Zip Cars but acknowledged that the developers have not yet allocated space for Zip Cars on-site. He noted that the parking lot includes three (3) handicapped spaces.

Public comment

Susan Phillips, a member of the Public Shade Tree Committee, noted that she had sent a letter to Archipelago, requesting that the developers reconsider a plan to save existing trees.

Mr. Wilson stated that the developers have tried to pull the building back from the property line, to a line close to that of the existing building. The artist David Fichter, likes the idea of trees in front of the mural. However, the developers can try to save trees during construction, only to see them die 4 to 5 years later. The developers can look at preserving and also replanting trees that are removed. They can also plant trees on the south side of the building. They will try to save what they can save and plant new ones where needed.

Ms. Phillips noted that some of the trees are at a lower elevation and changing the grade on the cemetery side will cause problems for them.

Mr. Wilson acknowledged that the construction of the new building will cause an impact to the roots of the trees. He noted that the planting of trees along the cemetery edge will need to be balanced with the need to see the mural.

David Sloviter of 194 Lincoln Avenue spoke in opposition to the project. He made the following comments:

- This is an “undergrad dorm in the center of town”;
- The proposed building is an unsightly monolith;
- The representation that such a mixed-use development will attract young professionals and retired people is unrealistic;
- There are too many 3 and 4 bedroom units;
- A 4 bedroom unit is like a dorm;
- Older retired people who are downsizing may not be satisfied with an 800 square foot apartment;
- Boltwood Place is not like this building;
- There is general concern about the Kendrick Place building, with 102 bedrooms, minimal setbacks and no Traffic Impact Statement;
- There is a general concern about inappropriate student behavior;
- This building and Kendrick Place will be like dorms;
- Government should represent the interests of the community.

Louis Greenbaum of Precinct 1 read from a prepared letter that had been previously distributed to the Planning Board. The letter expressed concern about density in the downtown area, particularly the effects of such density on Kendrick Park, which was a gift to the town from George Kendrick.

Niels la Cour of 124 North Whitney spoke in support of the project. He noted his credentials as a planner in Amherst for 17 years. He referred to the 1973 SCOG (Select Committee on Goals) plan which encouraged development in the downtown area and in the Village Centers. He noted that there is a nationwide housing problem because the right product is not being offered to young people, whose numbers will be peaking in the next decade. Amherst shut down the development of multi-family housing in the 1970’s, he said. We need a supply of housing. Downtown is way too small. There is lots of open space in town. We need more residential units.

Hilda Greenbaum of Precinct 1 stated that she is not opposed to the project but has problems with the combination of cedar and brick on the façade. The materials will age at different rates and the cedar will weather unevenly. She asked who will install the curtains.

Mr. Wilson stated that the developer will install the curtains.

Ms. Greenbaum stated that Footnote “e” in Table 3 of the Zoning Bylaw states that a 20 foot setback is required when a property adjoins a Residential District. She questioned the ability of the Planning Board to waive this requirement under a Special Permit, under Footnote “a”. She asked about the dimensions of the units.

Mary Wentworth of 22 Lessey Street expressed concern that the Town Manger would explicitly express support for this project to the Planning Board. She questioned the \$1.5 million grant from MassWorks and asserted that the application for this grant indicated that staff in Town Hall was moving ahead with changes in town that were not supported by the citizens. She stated that Town Meeting, if asked, might have chosen to use the money for sidewalks and other infrastructure, rather than to support this project. Town Hall is going ahead without proper planning, she asserted. She noted two issues:

1. Student behavior is out of control. The town is paying a consultant to try to help the town and UMass. The town is under pressure to increase its police force.
2. Parking is an issue. The problem is made worse by allowing huge structures. The Master Plan did not foresee five-story structures. The town is now under pressure to vote for a new parking garage.

Vince O’Connor of Summer Street noted that his previous letter to the Planning Board had referenced the original application, with the original number of proposed units and likely number of tenants. He plans to revise and resubmit his letter based on the new numbers. He noted that the amount of retail space has been reduced from 7,500 square feet to 6,040 square feet. He questioned the use of the term “mixed-use” for this building. He stated that a Management Plan is needed and expressed concern that the units might be rented by the bed and not by the unit. He expressed support for placing the utilities underground, but asserted that the use of this money doesn’t depend on the actions of the Planning Board. He expressed concern about pedestrians and the fact that there were too few parking spaces, and that all of the bike parking was in one place. He noted that it is becoming hard to find bicycle parking at UMass.

Mr. O’Connor further noted that this building does not seem to provide the necessary amenities required by the Site Plan Review criteria, such as recreational space and automobile parking. A building like this will have a different level of use than the Ann Whalen Apartments and the Clark House, he said. He recommended that the Planning Board seek an opinion from Town Counsel on the issue raised by Ms. Greenbaum [Footnotes “a” and “e”]. He asserted that for 84 residential units the developer should be required to provide 10 affordable units. He urged the Board to re-read the letters from citizens.

Sarah la Cour, Executive Director of the BID and a resident and Town Meeting member of Precinct 9, offered the following comments:

- On the setback issue, the existing building on the site is within 5 to 8 feet of the property line;
- The concept of a 20 foot setback when adjoining a Residential District has to do with living residents of the district; in this case the property abuts a cemetery;
- The issue of Inclusionary Zoning will be resolved by Town Meeting;
- She expressed support for the proposed project and noted that mixed-use development in the downtown area is supported by the BID.

Ms. Brestrup explained why this project is subject to the proposed petition article on Inclusionary Zoning that will be voted on by Town Meeting at the Fall Special Town Meeting if it passes.

John Fox of 90 Fearing Street spoke about the issue of Inclusionary Zoning. He noted that the Planning Board had taken the position that the existing Article 15 in the Zoning Bylaw doesn't apply to this project. He asserted that it should apply. If a developer requests a Special Permit, he shall provide affordable units. The Planning Board based its opinion on a letter from Town Counsel that the Special Permit should be for the "use". However, there is nothing in the history of Article 15 that suggests that it only applies to "use" and not to dimensional requirements. He encouraged the Board to look at the "plain meaning" of the Bylaw. Even if Town Meeting rejects the current Warrant article, the existing Article 15 requires provision of affordable housing. The town has said that it cares about affordable housing and it has obligations to provide affordable housing. He encouraged the Board to reject the prior interpretation of the Bylaw.

Joel Greenbaum, abutter/owner of 274 North Pleasant Street and 15 Hallock Street, spoke in opposition to the project. He agreed with Mr. Sloviter's comments, but agreed with some of Mr. la Cour's comments as well. He stated that the project is too big and is inappropriate for the space. It has displaced small businesses. It will detract from the downtown, which needs nice retail shops like were in the Carriage Shops. The town needs professional office space downtown with elevators. He would support a project that is three (3) stories tall, with two (2) stories of apartments. The building should be smaller and not so overwhelming.

Paige Wilder of Fearing Street read a letter submitted by Steve Bloom that was then submitted to the Planning Board. The letter was in opposition to the project, and expressed concern about the following issues:

- The size and design of the proposed building;
- The likelihood that the building would be inhabited by students;
- The lack of amenities proposed for the building;
- The parking shortage.

Jane Wald, Executive Director of the Emily Dickinson Museum, spoke in support of the project. She noted that this is a discussion about change versus no change. In the 1940's there were 4 or 5 Village Centers. The Master Plan recommends preserving and enhancing the Village Centers. Much of the town has gone off the tax rolls as open space. We now have almost 40,000 citizens. This project is consistent with the town's history and consistent with the Master Plan. She noted that some citizens have endorsed a public Transportation Plan, but now decry the lack of parking spaces in this project. She expressed doubt that this project would turn into dormitories. The population of the town is now ten (10) times larger than when the Village Centers were first acknowledged. A school has closed because of a lack of school age children. She supports this project as an improvement to the largest Village Center – the Downtown.

Mr. Wilson stated that Archipelago Investments wants to bring residential uses to downtown. Housing in Amherst is left without a product type that is needed. There is a lack of high-quality downtown rental units and not a lot of "new product". He encouraged the Board to look ten (10) years into the future. This project is not providing big master bedrooms and not providing large units. There is a two-bedroom unit that is 840 square feet. He encouraged the Board to recognize the realities of housing in Amherst. He appreciated Mr. O'Connor's comments regarding a balance of retail, bike parking, collaboration space, noting that all of these uses compete for ground floor space. He stated that the buildings at Phoenix Row and

Merchants Row are on the property line. He noted that the Business District extends to Triangle Street, but that there are only one-story buildings there now, with surface parking.

Mr. Wilson gave the sizes of the proposed apartment units, as follows:

- One-bedroom 500 to 600 square feet
- Two-bedroom 800 square feet
- Three-bedroom 1,000 square feet
- Four-bedroom 1,200 square feet

In the revised plan there will only be a total of 8 four-bedroom units in the building. There are no 1,300 to 1,500 square foot two-bedroom units.

The demographic will be the 25 to 44 year old group. Archipelago still receives a lot of inquiries on Boltwood Place.

Mr. Williams noted that the developers receive two inquiries a day for Boltwood Place and it is leased out through 2016. They plan to lease Kendrick Place with the same mix of people. It will not be a dormitory.

Mr. Roznoy asked that Planning staff obtain an opinion on the applicability of Footnote “a” to Footnote “e”.

Mr. Carson asked how the wood façade treatment would age and how it will be maintained.

Mr. Wilson stated that the developers like the warmth of wood and will keep the building in good repair. Maintenance of the wood façade treatment will be part of the maintenance budget.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to continue the public hearing to November 12th at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

Mr. Roznoy left the meeting.

IV. ZONING

A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crowner stated that the ZSC had expected to receive the report from the consultant on Inclusionary Zoning, but it had not arrived. Therefore there was no significant progress on Inclusionary Zoning. The ZSC had continued working on the Multi-Family Apartment Overlay district, which will involve at least two Warrant articles: 1) to make the apartment complexes conform to the Zoning Bylaw as to use and dimensions and 2) to provide for redevelopment or expansion of these complexes. There may also be articles related to Form-based Code, changes in dimensional table requirements and possibly an allowance for supplemental or accessory uses.

Mr. Webber noted that he would be giving a report to Town Meeting on the Planning Board’s work on Inclusionary Zoning and that Mr. Crowner would be speaking to the IZ petition article. They plan to coordinate their remarks.

Mr. Tucker noted that the two Planning Board reports to Town Meeting on zoning amendments had been sent out. The Select Board voted to support Article 4 and to support referral of Article 5.

Mr. Webber clarified that the Planning Board would cancel its scheduled meeting on October 29th and that the next full meeting of the Board would be November 12th with another meeting on November 19th.

- B.** Public Comment Period – none
- V. OLD BUSINESS**
 - A. SPR2015-00004 – First Baptist Church – 434 North Pleasant Street**

Review of proposal to install two temporary outdoor portable toilets at the southwest corner of the parking lot to be used by clients of Craig’s Place shelter, during hours of operation of trailer, approved under SPR2015-00004 (Map 11A, Parcel 29, R-G zoning district)

Ms. Brestrup reported that the applicants for First Baptist Church were exploring options regarding toilets and were not ready to speak to the Planning Board at this time.
 - B.** Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none
- VI. NEW BUSINESS**

Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting

Mr. Webber announced the appointment of a new Planning Board member, Christina Calabrese. She was recently appointed by the Town Manager and her appointment had received approval by the Select Board. She is highly recommended by the Town Manager.
- VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none**
- VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none**
- IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS**

SPR2015-00008 – 190 University Drive – Proposed ramp, stairs and landscaping
- X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS**

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson – no report

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson – no report

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – no report

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crouner – Ms. Brestrup reported that the Transportation Plan Task Force had held a successful event in mid-October (October 17 and 18) – “Transportation Days”. Consultants from Nelson\Nygaard came to Amherst for 2 days and spent many hours interviewing stakeholders, meeting with staff and meeting with many citizens at the Farmers’ Market. They gathered a lot of material and would be returning soon with the results of their information gathering. The TPTF meets every Monday afternoon.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant – no report

Design Review Board – vacant – no report

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman – no report

Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman – Mr. Webber reported that the TGSSC would hold its next meeting on Monday, November 3rd at which time the Committee would receive a final presentation from the consultants, U3, on the topics of housing and economic development.

Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant – no report

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

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none

XII. REPORT OF STAFF – Mr. Tucker reported that, although the Save Our Stop group hadn't met recently, he had attended a presentation in Palmer by Mass DOT representatives and their consultants regarding train service to this area. They use different technologies to estimate passenger trips. They use "air sage" which maps locations and travel of people's cell phones. The preliminary results of a passenger rail study show that there will not be enough passenger traffic on the Central Corridor line and the Inland Route from Boston to Springfield to justify investment in service at this time. However, the report provided new information and a set of things to build on. The connection between UMass and UConn was a repeated theme. Service might be justified at a lower level with public/private effort. There is a potential ridership of 140,000 per year for the Central Corridor. The "Down Easter" service to Vermont is now being operated as a "volunteer effort" he said. Further exploration may be justified.

Mr. Tucker noted that Springfield is receiving a grant from the state of \$1.5 Billion to renovate a factory complex for a Chinese firm to manufacture state-of-the-art passenger rail cars.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

Christine M. Brestrup
Senior Planner

David Webber, Chair

DATE: _____