

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, April 22, 2015 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair, Rob Crouner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman, and Richard Roznoy

**ABSENT:** Christina Calabrese and Stephen Schreiber

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

---

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

**I. MINUTES**

Mr. Carson MOVED to approve the Minutes of the Open Session of the Planning Board meeting on April 1, 2015. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

Mr. Carson MOVED to approve the Minutes of the Executive Session of the Planning Board meeting on April 1, 2015. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

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

**SPR2015-00012 – Trustees of Amherst College – Marsh House – 81 Lessey Street**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Section 3.330.0 of the Zoning Bylaw for site improvements including resurfacing of terrace and replacement of steps, plantings, new accessible parking space, repaving and replacement of exterior lighting (Map 14B, Parcel 24, R-G zoning district)

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

Jesse Selman, of Coldham & Hartman Architects, presented the application for Amherst College. Marsh House is an Amherst College dormitory that houses 26 students. It was built in 1835 for Luke Sweetser and added to in 1903. It served as a fraternity house and became a dormitory in the 1980's. The current work consists primarily of interior renovations. The design team has met with the local access board [the Disability Access Advisory Committee], the Local Historic District Commission and the State Access Board. The applicants have a variance pending with the State Access Board the results of which are expected on April 27<sup>th</sup>.

The project involves replacing steps, resurfacing the terrace, adding a duct at the side of the building, and other site improvements. Mr. Selman presented an existing conditions plan. He noted that there is parking in the rear of the building and that there is a paved area in front.

The site lighting will be replaced with single fixture, period appropriate lights with LED fixtures. The light poles and fixtures will be the Amherst College standard.

There will be an accessible parking space built at the front of the building with an accessible route around the building to the accessible entrance. The stairs at the rear of the building will be replaced.

Mr. Selman presented elevations of the building showing the proposed repairs and showing the location of the small duct on the east façade. The duct will be screened by three Arborvitae. The duct is for the purpose of air intake for the new mechanical system which will improve the air quality in the building. The duct is called an ERV – energy recovery ventilator.

Mr. Webber reported that there had been a site visit on Tuesday, April 21<sup>st</sup>. He noted that two Board members attended and observed the site. There was one question about site furniture.

Mr. Selman stated that it was likely that there would be new furniture for the exterior of the building, but he did not have any information on the furniture.

Mr. Webber noted that the Board had received the following documents related to the application:

- Certificate of Appropriateness from the Local Historic District Commission, including the Minutes of the public hearing held on February 23, 2015, signed on March 9, 2015, and the Record of Decision, stating that the LHDC voted to approve the certificate and the project substantially as described;
- Memorandum from the Disability Access Advisory Committee to the Massachusetts Architectural Access Board, dated March 19, 2015, in support of the variance requests;
- Memorandum from the Dickinson Local Historic District Commission to the Massachusetts Historical Commission, dated March 3, 2015, in support of the AAB variance request;
- Management Plan;
- Cut sheets on the proposed lighting;
- Plans including:
  - Site Demolition Plan
  - Site Layout Plan
  - Site Details
  - Site Planting Plan
  - Proposed Site Plan showing proposed parking and access for vehicles and pedestrians
  - Existing Site Plan
  - Proposed Lighting Plan
  - Exterior Elevations
  - Photographs of the building

Mr. Roznoy observed that the Lighting Plan showed lighting going beyond the area of the building. The lights will connect the dormitory with the downtown and the main campus by providing lighting along a path going into the downtown area. This will be an improvement.

Mr. Selman noted that the lights will be Dark Sky compliant. The building will be repainted the same color as the existing color.

Mr. Stutsman stated that he had attended the site visit. This is a good plan that will improve the aesthetics and access to a prominent building. Mr. Carson and Mr. Roznoy agreed.

Mr. Roznoy noted that the pathway and terrace around the building will be improved to make it more accessible, but also that this seems like a long way around from the handicapped accessible parking space to the handicapped accessible entrance. However, this seems like the most efficient way to provide accessibility.

Mr. Selman noted that the distance from the parking space to the accessible entrance is within 200 feet as required.

Mr. Webber reviewed the Development Application Report, noting that the requested waivers were for the Erosion Control Plan, Sign Plan and Traffic Impact Statement. In response to the waiver requests, there are no signs proposed, there will be minimal excavation and filling and minimal new traffic, all of which seem to support the request for the waivers.

Mr. Webber noted that the occupancy of the building will not change. The site will have 10 parking spaces, whereas it now has only 8 parking spaces.

Mr. Webber noted that Amherst College has a campus-wide parking plan. The requirement for one space per bedroom for single or double-occupancy would require that there be 13 parking spaces, with 26 beds, based on assumed double-occupancy. The Planning Board is authorized to grant a waiver from the requirement for on-site parking under Section 7.9 of the Zoning Bylaw. In this case, it appears that there is adequate student parking on campus. The Board can make a finding that there is an appropriate amount of parking for the site and waive the parking requirement under Section 7.9 of the Zoning Bylaw.

With regard to the replacement windows, the Planning Board can rely on the review and decision of the Local Historic District Commission.

The Wetlands Administrator has stated that there is no Conservation Commission review or NOI required.

Mr. Webber noted that there have been no comments from the Fire Department or the Town Engineer. There was discussion about whether the Board should expect comments from the Fire Department or the Town Engineer.

Mr. Selman stated that the driveway would not be substantially changed as a result of this project and that Fire Department access to the site would not change. There would be no substantial change in the turning radii or the curb cut. If anything the radii would be more generous.

Mr. Webber agreed that the proposed site improvements did not appear to change the emergency access to the site.

Mr. Webber stated that based on the level of documentation and the fact that there was no public comment on this project, the Board members could find that they were satisfied with the proposal and the Site Plan as submitted and that the proposal meets the Site Plan Review criteria and design guidelines outlined in Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the Site Plan as submitted, to find that the project meets the criteria of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, to find that the parking as proposed is appropriate to the site and to waive the parking requirement under Section 7.9 of the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Carson seconded and amended the motion to include the other requested waivers. Mr. Stutsman accepted the amendment. The vote was 5-0-0.

#### **SPR2015-00013 – Town of Amherst – Town Hall Parking Lot, 4 Boltwood Avenue**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Section 3.342 of the Zoning Bylaw, to install a dual head electric vehicle (EV) charging station and to reconfigure the existing parking spaces in the parking lot behind Town Hall to include 3 compact parking spaces (Map 14A, Parcel 304, B-G zoning district)

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

Stephanie Ciccarello, Sustainability Coordinator for the Town of Amherst, presented the application. The project includes an EV (electric vehicle) charging station and two parking spaces for vehicles to park while they are being charged. The town received a grant to help pay for an electric vehicle and to install a charging station through an Electric Vehicle incentive program. The parking spaces and the charging station need to be located in a public space.

Many locations were considered for the EV charging station, however there were challenges with all of them. The charging station needs to be handicapped accessible and many of the proposed locations were not graded appropriately to be accessible.

Ms. Ciccarello noted that there are 18 parking spaces existing in the Town Hall parking lot. Two of these are allocated for handicapped parking, with one van accessible space.

With the proposed plan there will still be 18 parking spaces including two handicapped parking spaces, with one van accessible space and two EV charging spaces.

Three of the 18 spaces will be reduced in size to 8 feet wide, and will be considered compact spaces.

One of the handicapped spaces [the non-van-accessible space] will be reduced in size to 8 feet wide and will have a 5 foot wide access aisle.

The two EV charging spaces will be 8.5 feet wide with a 5 foot wide access aisle between them. Ms. Ciccarello showed the location of the charging station on the Site Plan. The same bollards that are already being used in the Town Hall parking lot will be installed to protect the charging station. These bollards are steel tubes, filled with concrete, painted black with yellow tops.

People who are charging their cars will need to pay the parking meter just like those who park in other spaces in the lot, but they will not pay for the electricity to charge their vehicles. There will be signs identifying the charging spaces and indicating that the two charging spaces are only for those who are actively charging their cars. The signs will be located at the front of the spaces and will prevent people from driving into the access aisle in front of the cars.

The charging process will take from 2 to 4 hours. This is typical of spaces in other communities.

There was discussion about whether the charging cord would prevent a handicapped person from accessing the pay station. Ms. Ciccarello noted that people with handicapped parking placards or plates do not need to pay for parking.

Mr. Stutsman asked several questions about how the charging station would work, about the card used to operate the station and about any associated payment mechanism.

There was further discussion about how a handicapped person who was parked in parking space #6 would proceed towards Main Street if the charging cords were extended across the access aisle.

Ms. Brestrup noted that those who might park in this second handicapped spot may be traveling in the direction of Grace Church or the Lord Jeffery Inn and would not necessarily be traveling to Main Street.

Ms. Ciccarello stated that there would be signs on the street that would let people know that there are charging stations in the Town Hall parking lot. There will also be signs to indicate that three of the parking spaces are for compact cars.

The Charge Point units are the most common units and have the widest network of EV users. Each EV user gets a card to be able to use the charging station.

There was discussion about compatibility of this system with other systems.

Ms. Ciccarello noted that UMass has a “quick charge port” but not all electric vehicles have the same quick charge capability.

Ms. Ciccarello noted that Charge Point is the most widely used system and is the one favored by the Superintendent of Public Works because the cord is retractable and the cord is external so it can be replaced more easily. The cord also extends to the end of the space.

She further noted that most towns with EV charging stations give free access to the charging station, i.e. the vehicle owner does not need to pay for the electricity to charge the vehicle.

The town will purchase an electric vehicle which will use this charging station to charge overnight. The vehicle will then be moved to a different space to allow other vehicles to have access to the charging station.

The EV charging stations will be handicapped accessible.

Mr. Webber noted that there were lingering issues associated with the previous Site Plan Review application from 2013. That Site Plan Review approval was granted after the lot was paved and many site improvements had been installed. The Planning Board imposed conditions, some of which have not been met. The conditions which are remaining to be met include:

- 1) Screening of the east edge of the parking lot to keep headlights from shining into the windows of the adjacent property;
- 2) Lighting needing to be Dark Sky compliant.

There was discussion about holding up the approval of the current Site Plan Review application until after these conditions were met. The Board decided by consensus to approve the current Site Plan Review application but to include the conditions related to screening and lighting.

Mr. Roznoy asked if the grant required that the EV charging station parking spaces be in a town-owned lot or could it be on a town street. Ms. Ciccarello stated that the EV spaces cannot be parallel parking spaces since they need to be handicapped accessible. In addition it would be challenging to provide parallel parking spaces with a dual-head charging station on the street.

Mr. Webber stated that he consulted with one of his colleagues who is knowledgeable about EV charging stations. His colleague had stated that the proposed system is the “top of the line” system.

Mr. Webber listed the waivers that had been requested.

- Landscape Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Sign Plan
- Soil Erosion Plan
- Site Management Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement

Ms. Ciccarello stated that the construction period would be two weeks or less and noted that the DPW already has the EV charging station equipment. She was not sure whether the parking lot could remain partially operable during construction or whether it would need to be completely closed off.

Mr. Webber noted that the Design Review Board had recommended approval. He further noted that the town did not give parking tickets to cars parked in spaces where the parking space number is covered with snow.

Mr. Webber recommended that the Planning Board find that the application complies with all of the applicable criteria of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, grant the proposed waivers and leave the existing conditions in place.

Mr. Crouner stated that the Board should not waive the Landscape Plan or the Lighting Plan since there were issues related to both that remained from the previous Site Plan Review process.

There was discussion about whether a memo should be written to the Town Manager outlining the conditions from the previous Site Plan Review that had not been met. A particular source of concern is the existing floodlights which point out horizontally, rather than pointing downward.

Mr. Carson stated that if floodlights are needed for reasons of safety, then there may be an alternative that is somewhere in between requiring the downtown typical light fixture and retaining the glaring floodlights. There may be a compromise that can be worked out.

Mr. Roznoy stated that the Sign Plan should not be waived since there will be signs installed as part of this project, including sign signs out in the street.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the application be approved with the conditions as discussed, and waivers from the requirement for a Soil Erosion Plan, Site Management Plan and Traffic Impact Statement. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

#### Waivers

- Soil Erosion Plan
- Site Management Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement

#### Conditions

- 1) A Sign Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Board prior to the installation of signs. The Sign Plan shall include signs related to compact spaces, handicapped spaces, EV charging spaces and signs along the street indicating that there is an EV charging station in the parking lot behind Town Hall.
- 2) A Lighting Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Board showing how the floodlights at the east end of the parking lot can be made Dark Sky compliant, shielded and downcast.
- 3) A Landscape Plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Board showing screening of the east end of the parking lot, to prevent headlights from shining into the windows of the adjacent property.

Ms. Ciccarello announced that the Amherst Sustainability Festival would be held on Saturday, April 25<sup>th</sup>, from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

#### **SPR2015-00014 – Town of Amherst – Puffer’s Pond Conservation Area**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Section 3.335 of the Zoning Bylaw, to construct site improvements, including repair of cribbing along the pond edge, installation of steps and repair or replacement of a handrail at the South Beach, restriping parking spaces, installation of wood chips along a path, installation of a handicapped accessible path and viewing area at the North Beach, installation of a new fence and repair of an existing fence at the dam (Map 2D/8, 5B/113, 5B/16, 5B/129, 5B/130, FPC, R-N and R-O zoning districts)

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

Beth Willson, Wetlands Administrator, presented the application. The site improvements proposed for Puffer’s Pond have been reviewed by the Conservation Commission and the Design Review Board. The Conservation Commission has approved the proposal and the DRB has recommended approval. The money for the project comes from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. The work is proposed for spring and summer of 2015. Ms.

Willson presented slides showing the extent of the work and details about aspects of the project. Locations for the proposed project include the North Beach, the South Beach, the perimeter trail and the dam location.

#### North Beach

Ms. Willson showed a slide of the damaged cribbing along the North Beach and explained that a coffer dam would be built to prevent siltation of the pond during construction. New cribbing will be built into the slope, with steps, to stabilize the beach. Sediment will be pulled out of the construction area and stored on the North Beach, in the location shown on the plan.

A new kiosk will be installed on the North Beach, similar to the one on the South Beach, only smaller. She showed a photograph of the existing kiosk on the South Beach.

The existing wood chip path from the parking lot to the Beach will be made handicapped accessible by being surfaced with stone dust (TRG). There will also be a small sitting area at the end of the path with a bench.

The parking lot will be striped and a van-accessible parking space will be included.

The existing guardrail will be replaced with a split rail fence.

#### South Beach

The existing cribbing and steps will be replaced with new cribbing and steps fitted in to the pond edge and the existing railing will be repaired. Silt fence will be installed to decrease erosion.

The parking lot will be restriped. It currently has two handicapped parking spaces, which will remain. There will be one standard size space and two handicapped spaces. Two bollards will prevent people from parking in front of the access pathway to the beach. The gate at the entrance will remain. The gate is to allow for emergency access by trucks and other emergency or service vehicles.

#### Perimeter Trail

There is currently 200 feet of cribbing along the north side of the pond that will be repaired and replaced. Silt fence will be installed to control erosion. The wood will be pressure-treated and the cribbing will be 2 to 3 tiers high.

The trail will be resurfaced with wood chips.

#### Fence on Cliffs

The existing chain link fence in the cliff area near the dam is deteriorated. A portion of this fence will be removed and a portion (about 210 feet) of it will be repaired or replaced, as needed. The barbed wire on top of the existing fence will be removed.

A new section of fence (about 110 feet) will be installed, closer to the road. This new fence will be black vinyl coated chain link fence, as recommended by the Design Review Board. The new section may be visible from Mill Street, but the black vinyl coating will help it to be less visible.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the pressure-treated wood and expressed concerns about using this material in contact with water and expressed concerns about the safety of children who might come in contact with the pressure treated material. He suggested that there might be materials made from recycled plastics that might be more environmentally friendly and that wouldn't leach into the water.

Ms. Brestrup noted that there are less toxic pressure-treated materials that have been developed in the last few years that might be more acceptable than those that had been used in the past.

Mr. Roznoy stated that he was in favor of seeing alternatives and noted that if recycled plastic material were used it would support the recycling industry.

Mr. Webber agreed with the concerns about using lumber that is treated with toxins. He stated that the Board would like to know the exact material that is proposed and would like to see a material safety sheet on that material. He further noted that people would be walking on and sitting on the material once it is in place.

Mr. Webber asked about the fence and expressed concerns about the aesthetics of a chain link fence. He would like to see an elevation of the fence as seen from the bridge.

Ms. Willson noted that the fence is proposed to be 6 feet high.

Mr. Webber stated that a chain link fence is not nice to look at and the Board cannot tell how the new fence will look.

Ms. Brestrup explained that a black vinyl coated fence is not very visible in the landscape. Mr. Carson suggested that vegetation in the area will obscure the view of the fence.

Mr. Webber asked if the work on the cribbing at the pond edge would result in removal of trees. Ms. Willson stated that no tree removal is planned.

Mr. Webber asked about the purpose of the kiosk. Ms. Willson stated that the kiosk will provide information for visitors, including trail maps, information about water quality, public notices, information about the history and natural resources of the pond, and regulations.

Mr. Webber stated that he had been a part of the group that developed the Puffer's Pond 2020 report. This proposed project is true to that report. However, he was not prepared to approve the application at this time because more information was needed about the use of pressure-treated materials and the proposed fence.

Mr. Webber stated that he would like the bench at the viewing area on the North Beach to be as inconspicuous as possible. The addition of site improvements will alter the look of the area.

Ms. Willson stated that the signs, garbage receptacles and dog waste bags at the North Beach will be centralized at the kiosk. She stated that the work needed to be completed before the end of June because the grant requires that the money be spent by that time.

The Board discussed whether it could approve the application or whether the public hearing should be continued. Mr. Webber noted that there had been no public comment. Ms. Willson stated that a public meeting had been held last week and that 10 people had attended. The proposal had not been changed as a result of the meeting.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the public hearing be continued to 6:00 p.m. on Wednesday, April 29<sup>th</sup>.  
Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

### **III. PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNING BOARD RULES AND REGULATIONS**

#### **PBR-1-15 Planning Board Rules & Regulations (Planning Board)**

To amend Section 3, Information Required, of Article II – Applications, in order to clarify submission requirements for residential uses, including uses containing affordable housing, and

to establish submission requirements, criteria, and other requirements related to affordable housing.

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

Mr. Crowner reported that the proposed amendments to the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations were developed as a result of the Board's work on Inclusionary Zoning. Some of the issues that needed to be addressed were how affordable units would be provided. The Zoning Subcommittee and staff developed a set of submission requirements and criteria to address these issues.

Part E of the amendments would apply to projects that are subject to Inclusionary Zoning. Part B, paragraphs 5), 7), 8) and 9) are things that developers should be aware of and address as needed. These paragraphs would apply to all applications.

Mr. Roznoy requested that the word "jersey" be capitalized when referring to "Jersey barriers".

Mr. Webber recommended that the words "if applicable" be added at the end of the first paragraph of Part B, paragraph 7).

There was discussion about whether Part B, paragraphs 8) Pollution & Hazardous materials Plan and 9) Demolition & Historic Preservation, should be included. Mr. Crowner noted that these paragraphs have been included to remind developers that they may need to address these issues and it informs applicants of the requirements.

Mr. Roznoy recommended that the word "off-site" be deleted from the first sentence of Part B, paragraph 8).

There was discussion about whether to include language related to phasing of units. How can the Board make sure that affordable units come in concert with market rate units?

Mr. Tucker noted that this is a worthwhile idea, but that it, and the calculations for affordability, had not been included in the public hearing notice and so could not be discussed at this public hearing.

There was discussion about whether the proposed changes should be approved contingent upon Town Meeting voting to approve Article 22.

Mr. Webber recommended voting for the changes to the Rules and Regulations now and noted that the changes could be rescinded later if necessary.

Mr. Roznoy suggested including different language in place of Part B, paragraph 8). The new language could refer to Phase I Site Assessments.

There was discussion about this suggestion.

Mr. Tucker stated that the intent of the language was to remind developers that there are existing state and federal regulations that developers need to abide by.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

Mr. Webber thanked the Zoning Subcommittee and staff for their work on the Rules and Regulations.

#### IV. ZONING

- A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crouner presented the ZSC report. The ZSC and Planning Board members have already done a lot of outreach on Inclusionary Zoning. A few concerns have arisen. One of these concerns is the interpretation of Footnote “m” (Section 15.32 of the amended Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw). The effect of eliminating Footnote “m” would significantly increase the density in the R-G zoning district. In addition, some of the automatic changes might not be necessary for residential zones. The maximum height and number of floors may not need to be increased. It may not be necessary to have the ability to add additional height and floors in the residential zoning districts. The result of these discussions is an amended version of Article 22. The proposal is to delete Section 15.32 and to replace it with the word “Reserved” and to delete reference to the residential zoning districts in the sections that allow increased height and floors.

Mr. Webber noted that the deletion of Section 15.32 would reduce the potential for affordable developments in the R-G zoning district.

Mr. Crouner stated that after staff did some calculations it became clear that complete removal of Footnote “m” would have the effect of considerably increasing the density in the R-G zoning district.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Board could commit to having a conversation with residents of the R-G zoning district to find a more balanced and equitable number that would not overwhelm the neighborhoods in the R-G zoning district.

Mr. Webber noted that the change in the section on height and floors would still allow increased height in the Business Village Center and Commercial districts. He further noted that there had been a lot of opposition to allowing an extra floor and an extra 10 feet in height in the residential districts.

Mr. Tucker noted that this change reinforces the primacy of the centers as places where the town wants development to occur. The R-G zoning district includes many different densities and we need to analyze it carefully.

Mr. Webber noted that if the Inclusionary Zoning Bylaw as proposed were in place, Kendrick Place, the Carriage Shops and The Retreat would have been required to provide affordable units. Even without Article 21, the current proposal is better than what exists now.

Mr. Crouner noted that if Article 21 passes there will be another avenue for incentives and it is conceivable that a proposed development in the R-G zoning district could apply for tax incentives.

Mr. Tucker reminded people that without Inclusionary Zoning as it is proposed, we don't have a requirement for affordability. Without Article 22 there will be nothing for tax incentives to work on. Article 22 is essential for Article 21 to work.

Mr. Crouner reported that the ZSC had recommended making an amended motion at Town Meeting.

Mr. Crouner MOVED that the Planning Board make a revised motion on Article 22 as discussed. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0 (with two members absent).

Mr. Crouner stated that there was a possibility that Article 23 may be moved to refer. Article 23 is a petition article that seeks to rezone four parcels of land on Butterfield

Terrace from R-N to R-G. The petitioner may move to refer it to the Planning Board for further study.

There was discussion about the Planning Board's recommendation if the petitioner moves to refer or if a third party moves to refer.

Mr. Crouner MOVED that if the petitioner moves to refer Article 23 that the Planning Board will support the move to refer. Mr. Stutsman seconded.

Mr. Roznoy asked what would happen if a third party moved to refer. There was general agreement that the Planning Board should take a neutral position in that case.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED an amended motion, that the Planning Board would be neutral if a third party moved to refer. Mr. Crouner accepted the amended motion and the vote was 5-0-0 (with two members absent).

Mr. Carson, who is scheduled to speak on Article 23, stated that he will be out of town after May 6<sup>th</sup> and would like to arrange to have a substitute to speak if Article 23 comes up after May 6<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Roznoy volunteered to speak to Article 23.

Mr. Webber summarized the Board's position. The Planning Board recommends passage of Article 23 if the petitioner proceeds with a motion to adopt Article 23.

Mr. Tucker stated that the petitioners for Articles 24 and 25 have not yet met with the Moderator to discuss their motions.

Mr. Roznoy asked whether the Planning Board had recommended dismissal of Article 24. Mr. Tucker clarified that the Planning Board had recommended referral of Article 24 and dismissal of Article 25.

Mr. Webber stated that the Planning Board saw some merit in Article 24 but saw no merit in Article 25.

Mr. Webber opened discussion about Article 27, the Mill Street Bridge. He stated that he thought this article has some merit. The Transportation Plan consultant has stated that narrow rural roads slow down traffic. When the bridge was open people had to drive slowly and there were no accidents on that stretch of road. The bridge was known to be used by pedestrians, bikes and cars. The current proposal is to make the bridge one way. Mr. Webber would prefer that the layout remain as it had been, with two way traffic. A one-way bridge will encourage speeding. This bridge provides the only way to get to the center of town, other than taking Pulpit Hill Road or going through the UMass campus, which is very difficult. It is a mistake to make the bridge one way and a mistake to close it. Mr. Webber would like Town Meeting to approve Article 27. The bridge is a critical link that has been closed. The town should make it a priority to reopen the bridge.

Mr. Carson expressed disagreement. He referred to the memorandum from the Public Works Committee. He noted that there is a plan to reopen the bridge in two years.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Planning Board had an interest in ensuring that whenever the work is done that the design and safety implications be carefully looked at. He supported the process of examining what should be done.

Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Stutsman concurred that the bridge should be two way.

There was further discussion about the Mill Street Bridge, including a suggestion that the Planning Board should move to refer Article 27 back to the Select Board and Public Works Committee for further study.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the Planning Board recommended that Article 27 be referred to the Select Board and the Public Works Committee for further study. Mr. Carson seconded. The vote was 5-0-0 (with two members absent).

Mr. Roznoy will make the motion and Mr. Webber will speak to the motion to refer.

**B.** Public Comment Period – none

**V. TOWN MEETING**

**A.** Zoning Amendment Issues

Mr. Tucker reported that it appears that Articles 21 and 22 will probably come up on May 6<sup>th</sup> or May 13<sup>th</sup>. He stated that he is trying to arrange to have Town Counsel, Joel Bard, and consultant, Judi Barrett, at the Town Meeting session when these articles are discussed.

**B.** Warrant Review – Article 27, Mill Street Bridge – already discussed

**C.** Movers and Speakers – no discussion

**D.** Public Outreach & Schedule – no discussion

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

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**

Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting

Mr. Roznoy reported that the Transportation Plan Task Force was still awaiting the arrival of the final Transportation Plan. The final draft was presented to the public on April 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Roznoy will be making a report to Town Meeting on the Plan and it will be presented to the Select Board for acceptance. Then there will be discussion on how to implement the Plan. Mr. Roznoy asked if the Planning Board would like an opportunity to accept the Plan and to incorporate it into the Master Plan. Mr. Tucker agreed that it would be useful for the Planning Board to vote to incorporate the Transportation Plan into the Master Plan.

Mr. Roznoy stated that there needs to be a discussion about what entity will address things like the bridge closure. The town needs a centralized entity to address and coordinate these issues.

Mr. Webber agreed that consideration of the Transportation Plan should be placed on the Planning Board's agenda. He suggested the date of May 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Webber stated that he was impressed with the work of the consultants, Nelson\Nygaard, on the Transportation Plan. Mr. Roznoy expressed appreciation for the support of the Planning Board and the Select Board at the April 8<sup>th</sup> public forum.

Mr. Webber also thanked Mr. Roznoy and Mr. Crouner for their work on the Plan. Mr. Roznoy thanked Charlie Moran, who had assumed the position of Co-chair when Mr. Roznoy was on medical leave. Mr. Tucker thanked Mr. Roznoy and Ms. Brestrup for their work on the Transportation Plan.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

**A.** PVPC Top Ten Resolves for 2015 and PVPC Minutes of February 12, 2015

Mr. Carson reviewed the Top Ten Resolves for 2015 and noted that the appeals for train service for Amherst were not included in the Resolves. PVPC had explained that the current efforts were focused on finishing the work that is required for the

Knowledge Corridor rail line and continuing the work on the train station in Springfield. PVPC believes that analysis has been done for the Inland Corridor and the numbers do not warrant service at this time.

PVPC is also continuing to work on a regional bike share program, which includes Amherst.

Mr. Carson also stated that the gas pipeline had been discussed at the PVPC meeting. Most of the route parallels the existing utility lines, passing through wetlands, large forest blocks and under rivers. The utility right-of-ways need to be widened. Planning for the pipeline is in the public “finding” phase, which will last until September. Kinder Morgan will then request a certificate from a federal agency to do the work. Then the federal agency will take up to a year to grant the certificate. If the federal agency grants the certificate then Kinder Morgan will be given the power of eminent domain. If the certificate is granted it would most likely be in October of 2016. Construction is expected to begin in April 2017 with service available in November 2018. Kinder Morgan will have to follow state laws. The PVPC cannot take a position on this issue, but merely provide information. Even if the pipeline is built, the moratorium is likely to go on for at least 3 years.

There was also a report about a recently updated population study, with updates based on the latest census information. The Donahue Institute at UMass, which follows population trends in Massachusetts, states that Massachusetts is the only state that is growing in population in New England. The growth rate in Massachusetts is the same as for the U.S. as a whole for the first time since 1968. Growth is occurring around Boston, Metro West and the Central Region around Worcester and Fitchburg. Our area has slower growth than eastern Massachusetts. International migration offsets the outflow of population from Massachusetts to other parts of the U.S. The report estimates that, in 2030, deaths in Massachusetts will exceed births.

Mr. Stutsman noted that the last time there was a report given to the Planning Board about population growth, Massachusetts was experiencing a decline in population. He asked what period the prior report was referencing.

Mr. Carson stated that the new report is a result of recalculations and covers the period from 2015 to 2035.

Mr. Tucker noted that the study that was done regarding the rail question was a Mass DOT study that was based on car travel. The study tracked people’s cell phone locations as they traveled in their cars. On that basis they projected who might change their travel patterns and use the train. Mr. Tucker expressed skepticism about the report. He noted that Mass DOT had a strong desire not to have projects competing with the ones they are working on at this time. Mr. Tucker stated that if Amherst and Storrs wish to have access to passenger rail service they will need to do something different and may need to seek non-public funding.

There was further discussion on passenger rail service.

**B.** North Amherst Intersection – Scheduling of public forum

Board members stated that they would be available to meet on June 10 or June 24 for a public forum dealing with the North Amherst Intersection. Ms. Brestrup reported that the Survival Center in North Amherst was graciously willing to host the meeting.

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

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

**IX. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS** – no report

**X. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS** – no report

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

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson – report previously given

Community Preservation Act Committee – vacant – Mr. Roznoy stated that he was interested in being the Planning Board’s representative on CPAC. Mr. Stutsman observed that there may be an additional round of applications to CPAC in the fall. There was universal acclaim over Mr. Roznoy’s offer to serve on CPAC.

Mr. Carson MOVED to nominate Mr. Roznoy as the Planning Board’s representative on CPAC. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – no report

Transportation Plan Task Force – Rob Crowner and Richard Roznoy – Mr. Roznoy reported that the Transportation Plan Task Force would probably continue in some form to work to implement the Transportation Plan.

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 – no report

Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant – no report

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman, Stephen Schreiber and Christina Calabrese – report previously given

**XII. REPORT OF THE CHAIR** – Mr. Webber reported that he had recently received two letters from Kevin Collins. One of the letters had been previously distributed. He requested that Mr. Collins letter of April 13, 2015, be distributed to the Planning Board members.

**XIII. REPORT OF STAFF** – no report

**XIV. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

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

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

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