

**AMHERST PLANNING BOARD**  
**Wednesday, June 10, 2015 – 7:00 PM**  
**First Floor Meeting Room, Town Hall**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** David Webber, Chair, Stephen Schreiber, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman, and Richard Roznoy (8:30 PM)

**ABSENT:** Pari Riahi

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

---

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:04 PM.

**I. MINUTES**

Mr. Roznoy had sent an email clarifying a statement that he had made at the meeting. This clarification was incorporated into the draft Minutes of June 3, 2015.

Mr. Carson MOVED to approve the Minutes of June 3, 2015, as amended. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 4-0-1 (Webber abstained)

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

**SPR2015-00015 – Pioneer Valley Habitat for Humanity – 235 East Pleasant Street**

Request Site Plan Review approval under Section 3.3212 of the Zoning Bylaw to construct an affordable duplex condominium at the Hawthorne Farm property (Map 11B/54, R-N zoning district)

Mr. Webber read the preamble and opened the public hearing. Mr. Roznoy had already recused himself from the hearing and was not present. Mr. Crowner stated that he is a member of the Amherst Community Land Trust and that this organization has an MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) with Pioneer Valley Habitat for Humanity to build an affordable duplex on land they are about to buy on North Pleasant Street. He has no financial interest in either transaction and has no intent to recuse himself.

Megan McDonough, Executive Director of the Pioneer Valley Habitat for Humanity, presented the application. She stated that the public hearing was being opened more than 65 days after the application was submitted, but that Pioneer Valley Habitat for Humanity had requested the hearing date of June 10, 2015, because it had a conflict with other proposed hearing dates. She introduced other members of the applicant's team, including Michael Broad, construction supervisor and home designer, Chuck Dauchy, wetlands biologist who prepared the Site Plan with Terry Reynolds, a professional engineer, Charlie Clem and Walt Kohler, volunteers on the construction team, and Brad Hutchinson, volunteer who prepared the rendering.

Ms. McDonough stated that Habitat had built 35 homes in Franklin and Hampshire Counties for low income families whose incomes ranged from 30 to 50% of the Area Median Income. These families can purchase their homes at cost at 0% interest on the mortgage. Habitat acts as the developer and the bank. The families contribute a down payment and 250 hours of sweat equity.

A duplex is proposed to be constructed at 235 East Pleasant Street on the former Hawthorne Farm property. It will be an energy efficient building with a two-story unit in front, near the

road, and a one-story unit in the rear. The units will be attached. Each will have three bedrooms and one and one-half bathrooms and will be visitable by those with mobility impairments. The one-story unit can be adapted to be handicapped accessible, if that is needed.

Ms. McDonough presented photographs of the former farmhouse that had existed on the site and has since been demolished. She showed a drawing of the proposed duplex and a site plan. There will be a driveway with a turnaround and two parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The duplex will not have a basement, but will have a slab on grade. There will be sheds attached to each unit for storage of lawnmowers, bicycles, etc. The building will be more than 20 feet from the road right-of-way, meeting the town's setback requirements. There will be no encroachment on the wetland. There will be a 10 foot pedestrian easement on the south side of the property, providing access to the rear portion of the land owned by the town.

Ms. McDonough presented floor plans of the units, noting that they are modest in size – about 1,200 square feet each. The front unit will have three bedrooms on the second floor. The rear unit will have three bedrooms on the first floor.

Ms. McDonough showed an aerial view of the property and the neighborhood and noted that the town had submitted an ANR plan that had been endorsed by the Planning Board. The front portion of the property will be deeded to Habitat prior to construction.

Ms. McDonough presented the following:

- Photographs of other houses in the neighborhood, mostly on the east side of East Pleasant Street, noting that there are larger houses on the other side of the street;
- Photographs of past Habitat projects, with simple shapes, classic designs and simple trim;
- Typical signs that are put up during the construction period, which include the Habitat logo and list of sponsors; the signs are sometimes mounted on a building and sometimes they are free-standing;
- Proposed exterior lighting which will be flood lighting, activated with motion-detectors; the lighting fixtures can be pointed down; entryway lighting will be provided on the porches;
- Photographs of TRG (trap rock gravel) driveways, noting that TRG compacts well and provides a good surface with some infiltration and less upfront cost;
- Photographs of typical doors with some glass and a traditional style;
- Photographs of typical vinyl siding and trim.

Mr. Webber reviewed the Site Visit Report for the visit that occurred on Tuesday, June 9<sup>th</sup>, noting that Mr. Schreiber had visited the site. The site is substantially as described in the presentation. He also noted that new elevation drawings had been submitted, dated June 8, 2015.

Ms. McDonough presented the new set of building elevations. There were no major changes from the elevations previously submitted, however there was a change to four single windows on the south façade rather than four double windows. The Site Plan had also changed slightly, to allow the house to be on a single plane, with new grades across the driveway.

The old house was a little closer to the street than the new house will be. The new house will be 20.5 feet from the front property line.

There was discussion about whether there would be room for a sidewalk along the front of the property. The property line is very close to the pavement edge along the front of the property and therefore a sidewalk would have to be located on private property. However,

the roadway shoulder is wide and may provide an opportunity to put the sidewalk within the right of way.

Mr. Webber began to read a list of documents that had been submitted:

- Memorandum from the Historical Commission containing advisory recommendations to the Planning Board, such for as wider trim, corner and frieze boards, more articulation around the windows, a 4 x 4 grill pattern for windows and doors with more detail, higher quality vinyl, a circular window on the gable end to repeat the pattern of the former house, and screening for the storage shed;

Ms. McDonough noted that a window had been added on the gable end and there would be some screening for the sheds from the street. There will be shrubs along the road to provide screening for the sheds and Habitat always uses quality materials. She gave examples of typical doors that are used, with panel details.

There were questions about the width of the trim/corner boards and around the windows. Mr. Kohler stated that the trim around the windows will be 3 ½ inches and the corner boards will be 5 inches.

Ms. McDonough stated that there will be shutters on the side windows. There was discussion about whether shutters are appropriate for this house. The shutters that are proposed will be screwed onto the façade and will not be functional. They also appear to be smaller than the windows.

Mr. Schrieber suggested that there should be more, smaller windows. He preferred more windows, with the windows “ganged” together and no shutters.

Ms. McDonough presented a photograph of the original house to compare the shutter and window pattern.

Mr. Carson spoke in support of shutters, particularly black shutters, noting that they help to break up the white façade. Other Board members agreed that shutters should be kept.

Ms. McDonough noted that single windows are better for long term cost of maintenance and that they are cheaper to replace. They also provide more wall space inside for placement of furniture.

There was discussion about the proposed circular window in the gable end of the two-story unit. It is really a vent and is there for visual purposes only.

Ms. McDonough noted that recessed lights will be installed in the ceiling of the porches and that the lights will shine down onto the porches.

The Board will require that all exterior lights be dark-sky compliant and that they not shine above the horizontal plane. Ms. McDonough agreed to research dark-sky compliant lighting.

Mr. Webber continued to list documents that had been submitted:

- Email stating that the Conservation Commission had approved the project on April 8, 2015;
- Memo from Charles Dauchy regarding runoff calculations, which states that runoff will not be increased as a result of this project;

Mr. Webber noted that there was no letter from the Town Engineer on this project. Ms. McDonough stated that the project reduces the amount of impervious surface on the site from the previous condition.

- Management Plan submitted by the applicant covering the usual information.

There was further discussion about the fact that there are no sidewalks in front of this project and whether there should be one. The shoulder is potentially wide enough to accommodate a sidewalk. The strip between the house and the roadway edge is narrow and has a slope and a swale, which would make placing a sidewalk on private property somewhat problematic. Mr. Schreiber noted that it would be uncomfortable to have a sidewalk within 20 feet of the front of the building.

Mr. Tucker stated that there would be a 10 foot wide pedestrian easement to provide access to and from the street from the back property that will continue to be owned by the town. He recommended that the town make the decision about whether there should be a sidewalk in front of the house and that maybe the roadway would need to be redesigned to include a sidewalk.

Mr. Webber continued the list of submittals:

- Floor plans and elevations;
- Development Application Report prepared by staff, noting that the project complies with zoning requirements and noting that the applicant had requested a waiver of the Site Plan Review application fee of \$375.00 and a waiver of the Sign Plan and the Traffic Impact Statement.

Mr. Webber noted that the town would be selling the land to Habitat, a non-profit organization, for the nominal price of \$1.00. There were no objections to granting the following waivers:

- \$375.00 application fee;
- Traffic Impact Statement;
- Sign Plan

Other waiver requests were discussed and there was discussion about the material that had been submitted:

Landscape Plan – There was discussion about whether to allow a waiver of the Landscape Plan. The Site Plan shows the possible location of trees or shrubs, but doesn't show the species or specify the number of plants. The Board will impose a condition that requires the submission of a Landscape Plan, with appropriate native plants, to be approved by Planning Department staff.

Lighting Plan – There was discussion about the Lighting Plan. Board members noted that the lights under the porch ceiling would be recessed. The Board will impose a condition regarding lighting. Motion activated floodlights will be acceptable if they are aimed low, but it may be better to use a type of light fixture that has a shield. Lighting shall be downcast and shall not shine onto adjacent properties or streets.

Soil Erosion Plan – This plan was submitted and there were no concerns expressed about it. It had also been submitted for the Conservation Commission review and the Town Engineer had not expressed concerns about the plan at that time.

Management Plan – This plan was submitted and appears to cover the necessary information. The Board will require that condominium documents be submitted to be placed in the file for this project. Ms. McDonough stated that there needs to be a structure to manage the property and condominium documents are the simplest method to accomplish this goal. She agreed to submit condominium documents when they have been prepared and signed.

Ms. McDonough stated that the affordability of the units will be maintained in perpetuity, with the standard deed restriction. The units will be listed on the SHI and the sale of the units

will be restricted. The price of the units will be maintained so as to be affordable for the next homeowner. The condominium documents need to be in place before the sale of the units to the first homeowner. The Board will impose a condition requiring that signed condominium documents be submitted to Planning Department staff prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Parking and Driveway – Board members discussed and agreed with the proposed parking arrangement. They discussed whether TRG (trap rock gravel) was an appropriate surface for the driveway and parking area. TRG is more permeable than asphalt, but less durable than asphalt or concrete. Board members agreed that TRG could be used for the driveway but the Board will impose a condition requiring that the first 20 feet of the driveway be paved with asphalt.

Mr. Webber noted that neither the Town Engineer nor the Fire Department had submitted comments on this application, but they had been provided with the information and had elected not to respond.

#### Public Comment

Lynda Faye, 232 East Pleasant Street, owner of the Purple Gables Bed & Breakfast, offered the following comments:

- She and her neighbors are pleased that Habitat will build this project and that it will be occupied by two families and not be a student rental;
- The Historical Commission had asked for an oculus window at the gable end; the one that is proposed is out of proportion with the house and needs to be larger;
- The house looks like a tract house; it needs wider trim, corner and frieze boards;
- Windows should have a 4 x 4 grill pattern.

The Board discussed the oculus window. Mr. Broad stated that it would be better to put in a window in place of the oculus. There was further discussion about the idea of “ganged windows”. Mr. Broad stated that large windows interfered with the bracing of the corners of the building and placement of furniture. He proposed maintaining the look of the original farmhouse.

There was further discussion about adding mullions or muntins to the windows, perhaps using removable grills inside the house. The cost of the grills was noted as an added expense given that there are 25 windows in the building.

The house will have rain gutters.

There was general agreement that a small window in the gable end would be acceptable in place of the oculus.

There was discussion about the use of hardi-board instead of vinyl siding. Mr. Broad stated that hardi-board is more difficult to work with, requires painting and is more expensive.

Ron Bohonowicz, Facilities Director for the Town of Amherst, recommended that Habitat install a ridge vent along the roof. Mr. Broad stated that the house will have a ridge vent.

David Bosse of Strong Street asked about the number of vehicles that will be on site during construction and the length of construction.

Mr. Webber recommended that the Board require that a Logistics Plan be submitted, which would cover issues like staging of materials and parking for volunteer laborers. The Logistics Plan should be prepared and submitted to the Planning Department for review by town staff including the Fire Department, Police Department.

The Board discussed further conditions, including a requirement for windows with 4 x 4 grills, a small window in the gable end in place of the oculus.

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

- 11.2400 – The project is in conformance with all appropriate provisions of the Zoning Bylaw;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected through minimizing detrimental or offensive actions; the proposed duplex will be owner-occupied;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use because lights will not shine onto adjacent properties; lighting will be addressed through the conditions;
- 11.2403 – Adequate recreational facilities, open space and amenities will be provided because each of the families will have its own area of the yard and there will be an easement to the town to provide access to the rest of the Hawthorne Farm property;
- 11.2410 – Unique or important natural, historic or scenic features will be protected because the original house had shutters and this house will have shutters and the new building design goes to great lengths to replicate the appearance of the historical property in terms of massing and detail;
- 11.2411 – Methods of refuse disposal will be adequate; the Management Plan addresses this issue and a condition of the Site Plan Review approval will require that the applicant submit a plan for how to deal with storage of garbage and recyclables between pick up or modify the site plan to show how to get from the sheds to the driveway with the trash, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

The Board discussed where trash should be stored between pick-ups. Ms. McDonough proposed that trash would be stored in the attached sheds, which will be attached to the units via a covered walkway. The Board noted that the sheds are a long way from the driveway where the trucks will pick it up and they expressed concern that homeowners would leave their trash and recycling containers at the road instead of putting them in the sheds.

Board members recommended that the trash be kept in a screened garbage area or lean-to off to the side of the driveway, perhaps in the turnaround area. The Board will impose a condition requiring that the applicant submit a plan explaining how homeowners will store garbage and recyclables between pick up or modify the site plan to show how to get from the sheds to the driveway with the trash, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.

- 11.2412 – The ability of the proposed sewage disposal and water supply systems within and adjacent to the site to serve the proposed use will be adequate; the units will be connected to the town sewer and water systems in East Pleasant Street;

There was discussion about the location of the connection to the town sewer line. Mr. Dauchy stated that the proposed grading plan should give enough leeway to reach the sanitary sewer in the street at a good pitch.

- 11.2413 – The proposed drainage system within and adjacent to the site will be adequate to handle the increased runoff resulting from the development; the runoff will be decreased from the previous existing condition;
- 11.2414 – Provision of adequate landscaping has been addressed; a condition of the Site Plan Review approval will require that a Landscape Plan be submitted for review and approval by Planning Department staff;
- 11.2415 – The soil erosion control methods shown on the Site Plan are considered adequate to control soil erosion both during and after construction;

- 11.2416 – N/A;
- 11.2417 – Adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of lighting, because a condition of the Site Plan Review approval will require that the proposed lighting will be downcast and will not shine onto adjacent properties or streets;
- 11.2418 – N/A;
- 11.2419 – Wetlands will be protected in accordance with the provisions of the Wetlands Protection Act, Chapter 131, Section 40, and the Amherst Wetlands Bylaw because the project has been approved by the Conservation Commission;
- 11.2420 – N/A;
- 11.2421 – The development is reasonably consistent with respect to setbacks, placement of parking, landscaping and entrances and exits with surrounding buildings and development;
- 11.2422 – N/A;
- 11.2423 – N/A;
- 11.2424 – Screening will be provided for trash storage areas; a condition of the Site Plan Review approval will require that a plan be submitted for how to deal with storage of garbage and recyclables between pick up or modify the site plan to show how to get from the sheds to the driveway with the trash, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit;
- 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;
- 11.2431 – The location and number of curb cuts will not change substantially; the existing condition with respect to curb cuts minimizes turning movements and hazardous exits and entrances;
- 11.2432 – The location and design of parking spaces, bicycle racks, drive aisles, loading areas and sidewalks will be provided in a safe and convenient manner; bicycles will be stored in the sheds;
- 11.2433 – Access to adjoining properties will be provided by the 10' wide easement on the south side of the property leading to the town-owned land of the Hawthorne Farm;
- 11.2434 – N/A;
- 11.2435 – N/A;
- 11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement will be waived;
- 11.2437 – N/A.

The Board discussed waivers and conditions.

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

Waivers

- Site Plan Review application fee (\$375)
- Sign Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement

Conditions

1. Landscape Plan

- a. A Landscape Plan showing proposed trees and shrubs shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval by Planning Department staff. The plant list shall include appropriate native plants.

- b. 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.
  2. Lighting Plan
    - a. All exterior lighting shall be dark sky compliant. Exterior lighting shall be downcast, shielded and shall not shine onto adjacent properties or streets.
    - b. There shall be recessed lights installed in the porch ceilings to light the entryways.
  3. Management
    - a. The property shall be managed in accordance with the Management Plan submitted as part of this application.
    - b. Signed Condominium Documents shall be submitted to the Planning Department prior to the Certificate of Occupancy being issued.
    - c. The applicant shall submit a plan for storing garbage and recyclables between pick-ups, which may include construction of a lean-to or screened area in the vicinity of the driveway turnaround. Alternatively, if the applicant proposes to store garbage and recyclables in the storage sheds connected to the units, the applicant shall submit a modified Site Plan showing a pathway from the storage shed for each unit to the driveway and a plan for keeping the pathway clear of snow. The plan for storage of garbage or the plan to construct a pathway shall be submitted to the Board for review and approval prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
  4. Driveway

The first 20 feet of the driveway (the driveway apron) shall be paved with asphalt.
  5. Construction Logistics Plan

A Construction Logistics Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review by town staff prior to the beginning of construction. The Logistics Plan shall include information about parking for construction volunteers and contractors, location of on-site staging, location of fencing around construction site, emergency contact information such as name and cell phone number of Habitat for Humanity project manager and location of construction sign.
  6. Windows
    - a. The windows shall include 4 x 4 grills.
    - b. A small window or oculus shall be installed in the gable end of the front unit. If an oculus is chosen it shall be in proper proportion to the building massing and larger than that shown on the elevations submitted with the Site Plan Review application.

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

- A. SPR2014-00015 – Crocker Farm School – Parking Lot – Review of Landscape Plan in accordance with Condition #1 of Site Plan Review approval

Ron Bohonowicz, Director of Facilities for the Town of Amherst, presented the Landscape Plan required by Condition #1 of the Site Plan Review decision. Money has been authorized by Town Meeting for construction of the parking lot project so it will be going ahead. Many of the plants shown on the Landscape Plan are existing. Two maples will be removed and they cannot be relocated. The town will relocate two fruit trees away from the area where children congregate because of bees.

The Public Shade Tree Committee has planted 20 trees on the Crocker Farm property with students from the school.

Mr. Roznoy joined the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

Two maple trees will remain on the south side of the driveway.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to approve the Landscape Plan. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

Mr. Bohonowicz noted that the town is building raised-bed gardens and planting plants for resting places for monarch butterflies.

**C. SPR2014-00010 – South Congregational Church – Review of enclosure for mechanical equipment**

Steven Jones presented the proposal. He stated that there is mechanical equipment located in the alcove on the north side of the church. The church would like to install a 6' x 25' white fence to screen the alcove from view, to reduce noise and to prevent damage to the equipment from vermin or humans. They would also like to build a cover over the equipment to reduce icing and noise. Mr. Jones presented plans for a similar installation at the Parsonage. The white fence will be visible and it will match the existing building.

Mr. Stutsman MOVED to approval the proposal to screen and cover the mechanical equipment. Mr. Schreiber seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

**III. ZONING**

**A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crowner reported that last week (June 3) the ZSC had started to tackle zoning issues. A number of ideas had been proposed. Staff had done research into how zoning amendments were developed in communities across the Commonwealth.**

In many communities a standing committee does this work. Some involve very large groups. Generally all standing committees are connected with the Planning Board. Some communities use task forces or working groups for short term projects. This method gets stakeholders involved. Mr. Tucker described how several towns in the Commonwealth develop zoning amendments.

Mr. Carson suggested that Amherst keep its current system, except that it may occasionally form a task force for a specific purpose.

Mr. Schreiber reported that the ZSC had discussed the size of the Planning Board. Other communities have Planning Boards that range in size from five to nine members. He noted that the ZSC is a subset of the Planning Board and may not be representative of the town. There may be a need to activate it with others.

Mr. Webber agreed that activating the ZSC with more members might be worthwhile.

Mr. Schreiber stated that a larger group could include some Planning Board members, some Select Board members, some ZBA members, a developer, and someone representing those with more “provocative” views.

Mr. Roznoy agreed that Amherst could keep its current method of developing zoning amendments but engage a task force to work on individual issues. Parking might be one of them.

Mr. Tucker reported that the Planning Department was anticipating completion of a summary report on parking. There are several projects that will involve discussion of

parking such as the proposed expansion of the library, the cinema and historical museum, the proposed cultural district. Coordination of parking issues should come out of conversations between the Planning Board and the Select Board.

Mr. Roznoy recommended reconstituting the Parking Commission.

There was discussion about this suggestion which would take action by the Select Board or the Town Manager. Mr. Webber suggested that someone from the Planning Board could be a “senior parking liaison to other boards” and Mr. Roznoy was proposed for this role because he has been so articulate about parking issues on television and because of his ties to the Transportation Task Force.

Mr. Roznoy noted that there had been discussion at the last Planning Board meeting about streamlining the Zoning Bylaw. He recommended that Section 11.24 could be consolidated and streamlined. There was discussion about this recommendation with some members doubtful that this could pass Town Meeting.

Mr. Tucker suggested taking Sections 10.38 and 11.24 and developing one set of criteria that would apply to every application and simplify a set of findings for a Special Permit.

Mr. Roznoy reminded the Board of a recent effort to appropriate \$150,000 to redo the Bylaw. He suggested a similar effort now because the Bylaw is cumbersome, whereas it should be simpler and more approachable.

There was further discussion about redoing the Bylaw, with some members agreeing that this would make a substantive difference. Applicants should take the responsibility for showing how they meet the criteria set forth in the Bylaw. The Rules and Regulations could be changed to require this type of submittal.

Mr. Stutsman agreed with the previous suggestions that the process for developing zoning amendments needs to be revised. He would like to use a broader group to bring zoning amendments forward. Development of zoning amendments needs a larger “buy in” from the community. There is a need for more outreach and a more deliberative process. He suggested having alternative groups work on proposals to make things more clear and remove language. The town should pursue an overall zoning revamp.

Mr. Tucker suggested that the Planning Board choose one or two topics and invite members of the community to join in the discussion and see how it works.

There was discussion about whether the Planning Board had the authority to form an ad hoc group to work on zoning amendments.

Mr. Webber summarized the discussion and concluded that the Planning Board authorized the ZSC to work with citizens and to report back on progress. The ZSC can figure out what they want to do and decide which amendments they want to work on.

Mr. Crowner stated that the likely topics were 1) Parking in the downtown; 2) Definitions of housing categories; 3) Mixed use buildings.

Mr. Webber observed that there was not enough time and enough meetings to bring all of these things to fall Town Meeting.

Mr. Stutsman recommended outreach to the Select Board and others.

Mr. Webber observed that parking is important but it is bigger than what the ZSC can handle.

Mr. Schreiber noted that there were use categories in the Bylaw that referred to public and commercial parking lots. He suggested that the town could allow commercial parking lots by Site Plan Review in the downtown area.

Mr. Stutsman stated that the Planning Board should recommend to the Select Board and the Town Manager that the Parking Commission be reconvened.

Mr. Carson would like to look at fees-in-lieu to meet parking requirements in the downtown.

Mr. Tucker suggested that the Planning Board go forward with zoning amendments and that members of the Board should do their own research on zoning issues. He noted that staff, the parking forum process and the Transportation Plan had already identified many things that zoning could do with parking.

Mr. Webber suggested coming back to this discussion at a later date.

- B. Zoning Amendment Process – see above
- C. Public Comment Period – no comment

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS

- B. Amherst Master Plan – discussion and vote on incorporating documents into Master Plan

- 1. Amherst Transportation Plan (2015)

Mr. Roznoy reported that the Select Board had accepted the Transportation Plan at a meeting in April.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED that the Planning Board incorporate the Transportation Plan into the Master Plan by reference. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

- 2. Valley Vision 4 (PVPC - 2014), Pioneer Valley Housing Plan (PVPC - 2014), Housing Production Plan (2103), Open Space and Recreation Plan (2009), Amherst Preservation Plan (2005)

Mr. Tucker recommended that the Board consider adopting these plans by reference into the Master Plan at a future meeting.

- C. Greenbaum v. Archipelago Investments, Amherst Planning Board et al. – acknowledge receipt of new court documents and schedule an Executive Session if necessary

Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of new court documents and noted that these court documents were public documents. He explained that the Board would need to go into Executive Session to discuss these documents. The Board agreed that there was no need to schedule an Executive Session at this time but requested that staff keep the Board posted about further developments. Mr. Webber stated that the Minutes of the previous Executive Session had been approved.

- D. North Amherst Intersection – Public Forum in June – sponsored by Planning Board and Public Works Committee – preparation

Mr. Crowner and Mr. Roznoy agreed to participate and lead groups during the Public Forum scheduled for June 24<sup>th</sup>.

- E. Signing of Decisions – the Board signed the following Site Plan Review decisions:

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

SPR2015-00017 – Spring Street Preschool – 64 Spring Street

- F. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none
- V. NEW BUSINESS**
- Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Board members acknowledged receipt of a request for withdrawal from Chapter 61A for property on West Street. The town has 120 days to respond to the request. Board members will discuss this request at a future meeting.
- Board members agreed to meet on July 15<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> but not to meet on July 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Roznoy will not attend the meeting on July 15<sup>th</sup>.
- VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none**
- VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none**
- VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – none**
- IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS – no reports**
- Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson  
Community Preservation Act Committee – Richard Roznoy  
Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber  
Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant  
Design Review Board – vacant  
Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman  
Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crouner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman and Stephen Schreiber
- X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none**
- XI. REPORT OF STAFF – none**
- XII. ADJOURNMENT**
- The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 PM.
- Respectfully submitted:                      Approved:

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

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

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