

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 3, 2015 – 7:00 PM**  
**Town Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Stephen Schreiber, Acting Chair, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman, and Richard Roznoy

**ABSENT:** David Webber, Chair and Pari Riahi

**STAFF:** Christine Brestrup, Senior Planner

---

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

**I. MINUTES**

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to approve the Minutes of April 29, 2015. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to approve the Minutes of May 6, 2015. Mr. Carson seconded. Mr. Crowner noted that he had requested an amendment to the wording of a paragraph on page 5 regarding federal guidelines for speed limits. Ms. Brestrup stated that she would make sure that those changes were made. The vote was 5-0-0 to approve the Minutes as amended.

Mr. Schreiber stated that the Board would take one item out of order because it was scheduled to be reviewed on May 20<sup>th</sup>, but the Planning Board meeting for that night was cancelled due to lack of a quorum.

**V. OLD BUSINESS**

- A.** SPR2015-00009 – 418 North Pleasant Street – Crotty Hall – Review of submittals in accordance with Condition 1 of Site Plan Review Decision, Construction Logistics Plan

Mr. Schreiber noted that he had recused himself from consideration of the Site Plan Review for Crotty Hall because he works [at UMass] with the architect, Sigrid Miller Pollin. The Planning Board needs five members to vote on the Logistics Plan and Mr. Schreiber has no connection with the contractor who is presenting the Construction Logistics Plan, so Mr. Schreiber will not be recusing himself from consideration of the Construction Logistics Plan.

Mr. Stutsman asked about Condition 2 of the Site Plan Review decision. Ms. Brestrup stated that Condition 2 is for approval of the location of the chiller for Gordon Hall. The Planning Department, with input from the Building Commissioner, has approved the location as required by the Condition.

With regard to the Construction Logistics Plan, David Cody, Building Inspector, and Mike Roy, Fire Department Inspector, had commented on the Plan. It was revised to respond to the Fire Department's comments and the Building Inspector stated that the Plan appeared to meet all of the requirements of Condition 1.

Larry Rideout, construction manager for the project, stated that the new Construction Logistics Plan showed two 20 foot wide gates as requested by the Fire Department. The original plan had been mis-marked. The construction vehicles need the wide gates too, he said. He also stated that the parking area near the front of the site, next to

Gordon Hall, is meant for emergency vehicles and handicapped parking during construction.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to approve the Construction Logistics Plan. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

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

### **SPR2015-00016 – AutoZone Parts, Inc. – 373 Northampton Road**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Sections 3.350.0 and 3.387 of the Zoning Bylaw to demolish the existing building and construct a single-story 6,900 square foot AutoZone retail store, including approximately 44 parking spaces, landscaping and utility and stormwater improvements and other site improvements (Map 13D, Parcel 3, B-L/R&D zoning district)

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

Tim O'Neill and Nate Kirschner of Langan Engineering presented the application.

The site is 0.95 acres in size. It is located at 373 Northampton Road and abutted by the Ginger Garden restaurant, Campus Auto Parts, the Golden Nozzle Car Wash and a Mobil station.

The property has been used as a Mobil service and gas filling station. The existing site is 80% impervious and contains 29 parking spaces. A portion of the property drains to a drain manhole in the state DOT (Department of Transportation) right of way on Route 9/Northampton Road. Another portion of the property drains to the rear of the site into a drainage swale.

Mr. Kirschner stated that the Planning Board had received a packet of information containing plans for the new building. At the site visit one of the Planning Board members, Mr. Schreiber, had asked whether the building could be moved forward on the site, closer to the street, for reasons of visibility and walkability.

Mr. Kirschner had consulted with AutoZone and, along with Mr. O'Neill, had developed a compromise alternative plan. The alternative plan brings the building 20 to 25' closer to the road. The new plan reduces the number of parking spaces from the original plan, but AutoZone is still requesting an increase in parking over what is required in the Bylaw. AutoZone's business model requires at least some parking in front of the store. The new plan proposes approximately 39 parking spaces as opposed to 41 to 44 proposed for the original plan. The new plan increases the amount of green space on site. Either plan requires a permit from the DOT.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that the dimensions of the proposal correspond to the requirements of the Bylaw. The applicant is requesting a waiver from the requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement. A waiver can be supported because the traffic expected to be generated by the proposed use is likely to be less than the traffic generated by the previous use as a gas station, and the traffic from the proposed use will constitute a small fraction of the traffic already using Northampton Road/Route 9.

The applicant is requesting an increase in the number of parking spaces from that required in the Bylaw. Twenty-three parking spaces are required and the applicants are proposing more. The town does not set a maximum limit on the number of parking spaces that are allowed.

The lighting is proposed to be downcast. The applicant has requested a waiver from the requirement for a Sign Plan.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the applicant is also requesting a reduction in the number of handicapped spaces that would be required for a parking lot of this size, from 3 to 2 spaces.

Three handicapped spaces are required by the Amherst Zoning Bylaw for parking lots between 31 and 50 spaces. However, the state AAB regulations require only 2 handicapped spaces for parking lots between 25 and 50 spaces. The Planning Board is authorized under Section 7.9 of the Zoning Bylaw to grant a waiver from the requirement for 3 handicapped parking spaces.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Site Visit Report, including the questions asked at the visit, some of which had already been answered. The parking spaces around the building will be concrete. The roll-over concrete curbs will meet the asphalt parking surface with a hot pour asphalt sealant. There is a proposal to move the building forward on the site. The new building will be served by propane. The new signs will be designed by another consultant and presented to the Planning Board at a different time, either by Mr. Kirschner or by the other consultant.

Mr. O'Neill stated that the applicant was aware of the need to speak with Mass DOT and planned to do so once the local permitting process was concluded.

Mr. Schreiber thanked the applicants for preparing the alternative plan.

Mr. Stutsman asked about the existence of underground tanks on the property.

Mr. O'Neill stated that two underground tanks have been removed, but that the site hasn't received its full environmental approval yet.

Mr. Crouner stated that the alternative site plan is better than the original. He would recommend the alternative.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the Phase I site assessment and the vapor migration test.

Mr. Kirschner stated that the underground tanks have been removed and the Phase I and Phase II site assessments have been done. The certifications related to tank removal have been received. For either building location (the original plan or the alternative) he would propose a passive vapor intrusion system.

Mr. Roznoy noted that the alternative plan has more green space. Mr. O'Neill stated that the alternative plan has more "pervious" area than the original plan.

Mr. Kirschner stated that the plants on the Landscape Plan would be approximately in the same locations. The additional green space would occur primarily on the west side of the site.

Mr. Roznoy asked about the size of the proposed propane tank in the northwest corner of the property and whether it would be screened.

Mr. Kirschner stated that the propane tank hasn't been sized. There are national requirements regarding offsets of propane tanks from buildings. The tank will be located behind the building. The applicant will need to consult the propane company about the size of the tank.

Mr. Carson expressed support for the alternative plan. He asked about signs on the west side of the building, noting that it will face Route 9.

Mr. Kirschner stated that there was a need to reassess the signage for the building. He submitted a standard color elevation for the new building. If the regulations allow it, AutoZone would like to put signs on the west side of the building.

Mr. Crouner stated that he was inclined to grant a waiver to put a sign on the west side of the building if such a waiver were necessary.

Ms. Brestrup explained that the Board could grant an approval for this Site Plan Review with a condition that a representative of AutoZone come back, prior to the installation of signs, to obtain approval for a Sign Plan from the Board. This would not affect the ability of the

applicant to move ahead with plans to construct the building. She noted that if the sign on the west side of the building were 10% or less of the building wall, there would be no need for a waiver.

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 because detrimental or offensive actions are not planned for this site;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use;
- 11.2403 – N/A;
- 11.2410 – N/A;
- 11.2411 – Proposed methods of refuse disposal are described in the Management Plan and the Waste Management Plan submitted with the application; they are considered to be adequate;
- 11.2412 – The ability of the proposed sewage disposal and water supply systems to serve the proposed use is considered to be adequate; the property is connected to the town sewer and water systems; the Town Engineer has reviewed the project and has not expressed concerns with the proposal regarding these issues;
- 11.2413 – The ability of the proposed drainage system within and adjacent to the site to handle any runoff resulting from the development is considered to be adequate; a Stormwater Management Report has been submitted and reviewed by the Town Engineer; the Stormwater Management Report may need to be revised as a result of the revision to the site plan;
- 11.2414 – Provision of adequate landscaping is considered to be satisfactory as shown on the original site plan; a condition of the Site Plan Review approval will require that a new landscape plan be submitted which will reflect the new approved building location;
- 11.2415 – The Erosion Control Plan has been submitted; it has been reviewed by the Town Engineer has been found to be satisfactory;
- 11.2416 – Adjacent properties will be protected from the intrusion of various types of nuisances; the exterior lighting will be downcast; a vegetative buffer will be planted around the parking lot to screen it from adjacent properties; the propane tank will be enclosed by a chain link fence and the dumpsters will be screened by a wood enclosure;
- 11.2417 – Protection of adjacent properties by minimizing the intrusion of lighting has been discussed; all exterior lighting is proposed to be downcast and will also be required to be dark-sky compliant;
- 11.2418 – N/A;
- 11.2419 – N/A;
- 11.2420 – The Board determined by consensus that the design principles and standards set forth in Sections 3.2040 and 3.2041 of the Zoning Bylaw do not need to be reviewed for this proposal;
- 11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits with surrounding buildings and development; the alternative plan is preferred over the original plan; there are two driveway curb cuts onto Route 9 and one driveway curb cut connecting the property to the Big Y Shopping Plaza; these will be altered slightly and improved; the building conforms to setback requirements and requirements regarding placement of parking and landscaping; the driveway curb cut leading to the Big Y Shopping Plaza has an easement or deeded right of way for access between the properties;

- 11.2422 – N/A;
- 11.2423 – N/A;
- 11.2424 – Screening will be provided for the dumpster area by a 6’ high wooden screen; the Board discussed whether screening should be provided for the propane tank and determined by consensus that the propane tank does not need to be screened because the surrounding area is bordering on a car wash and there are other quasi-industrial uses in this area;
- 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; Board members requested that a path be designed to connect the building to the sidewalk on Route 9; the applicants agreed to include a path on the revised site plan;
- 11.2431 – The location and number of curb cuts is designed to minimize turning movements and hazardous exits and entrances; the curb cuts are existing and will be improved as a result of this project; the Board discussed whether there should be one entrance and one exit or whether both driveways should allow entry and exit; they determined by consensus to allow both driveways to be two way;
- 11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, bicycle racks and drive aisles will be provided in a safe manner; bike racks will be provided at the front of the existing building; they will be shown on the revised site plan;
- 11.2433 – Provision for access to adjoining properties will be provided as appropriate; there is an existing access driveway at the rear of the property, connecting to the Big Y Shopping Plaza; this driveway will be maintained and improved;
- 11.2434 – N/A;
- 11.2435 – N/A;
- 11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Report will be waived;
- 11.2437 – N/A.

Board members discussed waivers and conditions.

#### Waivers

- Traffic Impact Statement
- Waiver to allow 2 handicapped parking spaces under Section 7.90 of the Zoning Bylaw rather than 3 handicapped parking spaces as would normally be required for 39 total parking spaces

#### Conditions

1. A revised Site Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. The revised Site Plan shall show the new building location and parking layout along with a pedestrian walkway from the sidewalk along Route 9 to the building entrance and the location of a bike rack.
2. A revised Grading and Drainage Plan and Erosion Control Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
3. A revised Stormwater Management Report reflecting the revised building location shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval by the Town Engineer prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
4. A revised Landscape Plan reflecting the revised building and parking location shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.
5. A revised Lighting Plan reflecting the revised building and parking location shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval. All exterior lighting shall

be dark sky compliant. Exterior lighting shall be downcast and shall not shine onto adjacent properties or streets.

6. A Sign Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the installation of signs.
7. The property shall be managed in accordance with the Management Plan submitted as part of this application.
8. Landscaping shall be installed in accordance with the Landscape Plan and, once installed, shall be continually maintained. All disturbed areas shall be loamed and seeded, unless otherwise specified.
9. One paper copy of the final revised plans and one electronic copy shall be submitted to the Planning Department.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the Site Plan Review application with conditions and waivers as discussed. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

Mr. Schreiber thanked the applicants again for preparing the alternative plan.

**SPR2015-00017 – Spring Street Preschool (rear of First Congregational Church building)  
– 64 Spring Street**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Section 3.330.0 of the Zoning Bylaw for renovation of the existing playground and fencing around a wooded area adjacent to the playground (Map 14B, Parcel 32, R-G zoning district)

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

Lee Jennings, the Landscape Architect for this project and a parent with a child who attends the Spring Street Preschool, presented the application. She was accompanied by Dolly Pedevillano, Director of the Preschool, and Leslie Smith, Chair of the Building Committee for the Church.

The applicants propose to renovate the existing playground area. The playground is in an area behind the First Congregational Church and also includes a wooded area at the corner of the property. The play equipment is out of date and not code compliant.

The applicants plan to remove the existing playground equipment and replace it with a new metal play structure and a new swing set. The surface of the play area will also be removed and replaced with 12” of engineered wood fiber. There is an existing retaining wall that will be replaced with a new pressure-treated timber wall. The existing chain link fence and metal gate will be replaced with a new ornamental aluminum fence and gate. The existing wood picket fence near the Parsonage will be replaced in kind. A black vinyl coated chain link fence is proposed to be installed around the natural wooded play area. Ms. Jennings showed examples of the proposed play equipment for the playground and the types of equipment that is proposed to be installed in the natural play area. The equipment in the natural play area will not be climbable and will be added to over time. The area will not be completed all at once.

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that the applicants had applied for waivers as follows:

- Landscape Plan – no plantings are proposed
- Lighting Plan – no lighting is proposed
- Erosion Control Plan – excavation and filling are minimal
- Sign Plan – no signs are proposed
- Traffic Impact Statement – no increase in traffic will result from this project

Mr. Schreiber reviewed the Site Visit Report. He noted that most of the area to be improved is a little courtyard behind the concrete block addition to the church. There is also a small forested outdoor play area which is proposed to be cleaned out and enclosed with a chain link fence. He noted that the Dickinson Local Historic District Commission will also be reviewing the proposed site improvements.

Ms. Brestrup stated that the Board had some options with respect to timing and coordination with the LHDC review:

- 1) Keep the public hearing open until the LHDC had reviewed the project and made its recommendations;
- 2) Close the public hearing and place a condition on the approval that any substantial changes resulting from the LHDC approval would need to be submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval;
- 3) Close the public hearing and place a condition on the approval that any substantial changes resulting from the LHDC approval would need to be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval.

Mr. Carson asked if there would be plants in front of the chain link fence along Spring Street. Ms. Jennings stated that there are currently Hemlocks in front of the area where the chain link fence would be installed. Not all of the Hemlocks on the property have the blight yet.

Mr. Smith noted that some of the Hemlocks on the church property are affected by the blight [wooly adelgid] but over time these trees will be watched and removed as necessary.

Mr. Carson recommended that the Board impose a condition that if the Hemlocks are removed, they would be replaced with a vegetative border to screen the chain link fence.

Mr. Roznoy asked why this project needs Site Plan Review. The answer is that both the church and the preschool are allowed in the R-G zoning district under Site Plan Review as “non-profit educational or religious uses”. Changes to the site for either of these uses also requires Site Plan Review.

Board members discussed waivers and conditions. There was discussion about what would happen if the Local Historic District Commission were to require changes to the plan. Ms. Brestrup suggested that the Board approve the plan with the condition that any substantive changes to the plan would need to be submitted to the Board for review and approval.

#### Waivers

- Landscape Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Erosion Control Plan
- Sign Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement

#### Conditions

- 1) If the Hemlocks along the road are removed and are no longer present to screen the new fence, the applicant shall submit to the Planning Board a Landscape Plan showing replacement plantings that will screen the fence, for review and approval.
- 2) If substantial changes to the approved plan or the proposed equipment or fencing are required by the Local Historic District Commission, the applicant shall submit these changes to the Planning Board for review and approval.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to close the public hearing, to find that this project meets the relevant criteria of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw, and to approve the application with waivers and conditions as discussed. Mr. Roznoy seconded. The vote was 5-0-0.

## V. OLD BUSINESS

### B. SPR2015-00006 – 134 Montague Road – Atkins North – Review changes to loading dock

Chris Farley of Kuhn Riddle Architects presented the change to the loading dock. He was accompanied by Jeff Pickering of W. S. Pickering & Son, the HVAC installers, and Evan Jones of Cows Building Supply. Mr. Farley presented a drawing showing loading dock as it was approved by the Planning Board. The original configuration showed an open loading dock, 4' off the ground, with a shed roof.

He also presented a revised drawing showing the new configuration, with a flat roof and HVAC equipment on top of the roof, with a painted steel fence surrounding it. The footprint of the loading dock is the same as in the original configuration. Mr. Farley showed photographs of the new loading dock with the HVAC equipment on top. He stated that there was no other good location for the equipment. The ductwork requires that the equipment be in this location. Otherwise ductwork would need to be run along the outside of the building.

There was discussion about screening the HVAC equipment. The applicant's representatives stated that the fence was for safety, to keep workers who are working on the equipment from falling. It is not really for screening. It is available in sizes up to 42 inches high. There are clearances that have to be met around the equipment. A 4 foot clearance is required over the top of the equipment.

There was discussion about painting the HVAC equipment the same color as the building to camouflage it. Mr. Farley stated that the other barn now partially conceals the loading dock. However, it was noted that the other barn is under a demolition delay order and may not be in place after July.

Mr. Carson noted that the decision for Atkins North requires that a revised Landscape Plan be submitted if the other barn is removed, so there would be an opportunity to screen the loading dock at that time if necessary.

Mr. Stutsman asked about a fuel source for the building, in light of the gas company moratorium. The applicant's representatives stated that there will be propane tanks, buried on the site. They will have no noticeable physical presence on the surface.

Mr. Schreiber noted that barns are usually full of mechanical equipment. Barns are essentially industrial buildings for agriculture.

Board members agreed with the recommendation to paint the HVAC equipment to match the building. Board members acknowledged that the fence was unlikely to hide the HVAC equipment and they agreed that a 42" fence was acceptable around the HVAC equipment.

Mr. Crouner MOVED to approve the revised loading dock with the condition that the HVAC unit be painted to match the barn. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

## III. TOWN MEETING

A. Review of Annual Town Meeting Actions – Mr. Crouner stated that the political landscape has changed in light of some controversial developments. Many more people are paying attention to Planning Board actions. He noted that there is a degree

of hostility and suspicion on the part of some citizens. The ZSC and Planning Board had worked on Inclusionary Zoning for two years, working with other bodies in town to develop a package, but Inclusionary Zoning failed, which was surprising. The tone and content of the opposition was also surprising. There was no middle ground. In Mr. Crowner's opinion, the Planning Board cannot fix Inclusionary Zoning so that it will pass in the future. Two of the petition articles received strong support, although they didn't pass. There was strong opposition to the other petition article [regarding rezoning of parcels on Butterfield Terrace]. He recommended that the Planning Board not spend any more time on Inclusionary Zoning.

Mr. Stutsman agreed with this assessment. He noted that the ZSC had discussed proposals from staff which included a comprehensive system for dealing with zoning amendments, including a spreadsheet and a timeline. These are useful tools, however he thought the issue was "what, how and who". He noted that Northampton has used ad hoc committees to address zoning issues. There was some discussion of using smaller groups to work on different zoning amendments.

Mr. Schreiber stated that there was a desire on the part of the Planning Board Chair to shorten the Zoning Bylaw. In Mr. Schreiber's opinion Inclusionary Zoning was too big to succeed. Zoning bylaws from other towns are much thinner, he said. We should make our Bylaw shorter and more readable.

Mr. Roznoy agreed that the Zoning Bylaw is too big. He noted that after the Master Plan was completed the town was going to hire a consultant to rewrite the Zoning Bylaw. He recommended that the ZSC and Planning Board not take up any zoning amendments without "a major cry from the public". He supported the idea of an ad hoc task force or committee to work on particular zoning amendments as they may arise. Right now the only issue that people will be concerned about is parking and there may be a need for zoning amendments related to parking. Also, the Transportation Plan will have recommendations for changes to the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Roznoy stated that the Planning Board sits at the fulcrum of zoning and constitutional rights. Some rights can't be taken away by the democratic system. Property rights are constitutionally protected and people need to understand this. He recommended that the ZSC not meet anymore. The Planning Board should focus on shortening or cutting down on the Zoning Bylaw.

Mr. Crowner asked "What should we pay attention to? What should we cut from the Zoning Bylaw?" He suggested rethinking how the ZSC works. But he said that the Planning Board should be involved with "planning" and should not be reactive. The Planning Board should try to make changes to bring about "a better place".

Mr. Schreiber stated that the Zoning Bylaw is about "generations" or planning for the future. He also suggested that when we add something to the Zoning Bylaw, we should take some things away.

Mr. Roznoy suggested making the Bylaw more simple, especially streamlining the tables and footnotes.

Ms. Brestrup noted that the town had planned to spend \$150,000 over a three year period to rewrite the Bylaw, but only the first \$50,000 was appropriated by Town Meeting. That money was used to hire a consultant to develop the Form-based Code zoning amendments.

Mr. Schreiber agreed that the populace wants the Planning Board to focus on parking.

Mr. Stutsman reiterated his proposal that the town set up an ad hoc committee to deal with issues related to parking, noting that parking will require input from others. He suggested putting together a larger group to address issues related to parking.

Mr. Crouner noted that issues having to do with the downtown and parking are inter-related.

Mr. Schreiber stated that the primary issues are change and uncontrolled student behavior. There is a level of discomfort in living in a community with unpredictable student behavior. People are also concerned about the way things look.

Mr. Stutsman stated that there is a continued need to connect with the public. The Planning Board needs to do more outreach, through alternative channels. He recommended exploring alternative avenues of communication, perhaps using social media.

Mr. Crouner concluded that the process is not settled regarding who will be responsible for zoning amendments. And there is no consensus on the Planning Board on choosing the next zoning article.

Mr. Stutsman suggested continuing this discussion on June 10<sup>th</sup>. Both the ZSC and the Planning Board will meet next week.

- B. Zoning Amendment Process for Upcoming Town meetings – covered by previous discussion
- C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

#### **IV. ZONING**

- A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – covered by previous discussion
- B. Public Comment Period – none

#### **V. OLD BUSINESS**

- C. SPR2015-00013 – Town Hall Parking Lot – 4 Boltwood Avenue – Review of EV Charging Station Signs in accordance with Condition #1 of Site Plan Review approval

Ms. Brestrup presented the signs for the EV charging station. She noted that the signs for compact parking spaces and handicapped parking spaces would be the same as those used elsewhere in town. In consultation with the Superintendent of Public Works, Ms. Ciccarello, Sustainability Coordinator, had decided that there was no need for multiple signs along the street indicating where the charging station is located. One sign at the entry to the Town Hall parking lot on Main Street is enough. People with electric vehicles will all have an “app” on their phones to help them find charging stations.

Mr. Crouner MOVED to approve the signs for the EV charging stations as presented. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 5-0-0.

- D. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Ms. Brestrup noted that the Board members had received in their packets copies of the Planning Board’s letter to the Select Board regarding the width of crosswalks on Pine Street.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. North Amherst Intersection – Public Forum on June 24<sup>th</sup> – sponsored by Planning Board, Public Works Committee and Select Board – The Board members acknowledged receiving notice of this meeting.
- B. Chapter 61A Withdrawal Request – Jean K. Cannon & John W. Wysocki – Property on Henry Street – Lot C

Ms. Brestrup explained that Lot C is the last lot shown on the ANR plan for the lots along Henry Street owned by Ms. Cannon and Mr. Wysocki. The other lots (Lots A, B and W) had previously been reviewed by the Planning Board and the Board had recommended that the town not exercise its right of first refusal. Now the Board is being asked to make a recommendation about Lot C.

Mr. Roznoy **MOVED** to recommend to the Select Board that the town not exercise its right of first refusal to purchase Lot C. Mr. Stutsman seconded. The vote was 4-1-0 (Crownor opposed).

Mr. Crownor stated that his opposition was based on the same reasoning as was described in the Minutes of December 17, 2014, when Lots A, B and W came before the Board for a recommendation.

- C. Site Visit and Attendance at Community Meeting – Tuesday, June 9<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. – SPR2015-00015 – Pioneer Valley Habitat for Humanity – 235 East Pleasant Street – regarding construction of an affordable duplex at Hawthorne Farm

Mr. Roznoy stated that he would recuse himself from the Site Plan Review process. However, he will attend the community meeting as an abutter and interested citizen. Mr. Carson, who lives across the street from Mr. Roznoy, is not an abutter because his property is more than 300 feet from Hawthorne Farm. Mr. Roznoy will arrive late to the Planning Board meeting on June 10<sup>th</sup>, so as not to participate in the public hearing for the Habitat project.

- D. Planning Board's Summer Schedule – The Board briefly discussed the Planning Board's summer schedule. Ms. Brestrup requested that Board members send her their plans for attending scheduled Planning Board meetings in the summer.
- E. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

**VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS**

The Board endorsed the ANR plan for ANR2015-00010 – Kestrel Land Trust – 37 Bay Road

**VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none**

**IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – no new applications other than Habitat project at Hawthorne Farm have been submitted to date**

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

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson reported that the annual dinner for the PVPC was scheduled for next week. The topic is automated cars. Mr. Carson plans to attend.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Richard Roznoy reported that CPAC has begun its planning process.

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – no report

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crowner – There was no report and the TPTF is currently dormant, waiting for reappointment of its members.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant

Design Review Board – vacant

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman reported that the HSC has met and discussed the results of Town Meeting. The HSC members are inclined not to pursue another Inclusionary Zoning article, but rather to look at other methods of providing affordable housing.

Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman – Mr. Schreiber recommended taking this committee off the roster because it has completed its work.

Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant - Mr. Schreiber recommended taking this committee off the roster because it does not have any members and is not active.

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

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

**XII. REPORT OF STAFF** – no report

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted:                      Approved:

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

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

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