

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, July 30, 2014 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: David Webber, Chair, Stephen Schreiber, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Sandra Anderson, Kathleen Ford, Richard Roznoy, and Greg Stutsman

ABSENT: none

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:00 PM.

I. MINUTES

Ms. Schreiber MOVED to approve the Minutes of July 2, 2014. Ms. Anderson seconded and the vote was 8-0-0.

II. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. Anderson MOVED to nominate the current Planning Board officers to serve for another year – Mr. Webber as Chair, Mr. Schreiber as Vice Chair and Mr. Carson as Clerk. Ms. Ford seconded.

Mr. Carson recommended that Mr. Stutsman serve as Clerk. Mr. Stutsman agreed to serve as Clerk.

Ms. Anderson MOVED to revise the motion to include Mr. Stutsman as Clerk. Mr. Carson seconded the amended motion. The vote was 8-0-0.

Mr. Webber thanked Mr. Carson for his service as Clerk.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – DEFINITIVE SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR CLUSTER SUBDIVISION

SUB2014-00002/M23945 – Retreat at Amherst LLC – Henry Street, Market Hill Road and Flat Hills Road

Request approval for a 136 lot Definitive Subdivision Plan for a Cluster Subdivision, in accordance with Section 4.3 of the Amherst Zoning Bylaw and M.G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81T (Map 6A, Parcels 84, 91, 95 and 96, R-N and R-O zoning district)

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

Mr. Webber gave an introduction to the public hearing, noting the following:

- The Retreat at Amherst is proposing to construct 175 cottage-style student housing units on this 148 acre site;
- It is being proposed as a Cluster Subdivision, pursuant to Section 4.3 of the Amherst Zoning Bylaw;
- The project first came before the Planning Board as a Preliminary Subdivision Plan, and the Board held a public hearing on that Plan last December;
- After the hearing the Board proposed 20 recommendations and changes to the Plan;
- This hearing is the next step in a long process that involves many other permits;
- The Planning Board expects to receive a Site Plan Review application in early September;

- The Conservation Commission is also conducting its own review;
- The Planning Board received this application on May 28th and must render its decision within 90 days, or by August 26th, unless the applicant agrees to an extension;
- The plan documents submitted by the applicant were posted on the town website beginning last month;
- The Planning Board and others have been reviewing the documents;
- The Planning Board also received a large number of written comments from the public which have been helpful in identifying potential issues with the proposed project.

Mr. Webber gave an outline of the night's proceedings, including a presentation by the Planning Board's consultant and a public comment period. He noted that the Planning Board did not intend to vote at this meeting. The Planning Board would be continuing the public hearing to next Wednesday, August 6th, and would receive additional public comments at that time. A consultant for the neighborhood group, Save Historic Cushman, would present its findings on August 6th.

Attorney Tom Reidy, of Bacon Wilson, attorney for the applicant, presented introductory remarks. He introduced the applicant's site engineering consultant, Tony Wonseski, of SVE Associates, and the developer, Jason Doornbos, Senior Vice President for Development for Landmark Properties, and Attorney Peter MacConnell, also of Bacon Wilson.

Mr. Reidy presented information about the background and context of the project.

About 1 ½ years ago the developer became interested in coming to Amherst because of the need for housing. The developers met with town officials and with members of the public and neighbors at the Jones Library and presented their proposal. The land was removed from its Chapter 61, Forest Use designation, to change the use to residential. A Preliminary Subdivision Plan was submitted on October 28th and a public hearing was held on December 4th. The Planning Board issued a letter of recommendations on December 10, 2013.

The subdivision plan has been redesigned in light of the recommendations issued by the Planning Board, and the following changes have been incorporated:

- The provision of the 100 foot building circle for each lot;
- Off-street parking, located on site;
- Parallel parking spaces along the road instead of perpendicular parking spaces;
- Elimination of parking lots scattered throughout the site;
- Ten percent reduction in the number of parking spaces;
- Reduction of the length of grades over 8% along the roadways.

The applicant is still requesting waivers of some requirements of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations, but not variances, to provide relief from strict compliance.

Mr. Reidy noted that the Planning Board has previously granted waivers for projects such as Amherst Hills (to allow sidewalks on only one side of the street) and South Middle Street (various waivers including waivers to exceed the maximum grade of roadways and to exceed the length of a cul-de-sac). He asserted that it is not unusual for the Planning Board to grant waivers for subdivisions. Tonight's focus will be on infrastructure.

Mr. Reidy acknowledged receipt of the Fuss & O'Neill report and offered to discuss resolutions to the issues that were brought up.

Mr. Reidy stated that the applicant would submit the Site Plan Review application soon and will present the use as a residential use, not as a commercial or industrial use. During the Site Plan

Review process the use and management of the site will be discussed along with more specific details about the design of the site.

Tony Wonseski of SVE Associates in Greenfield, presented a slide show about the proposed plans and the changes that had been made since the Preliminary Subdivision Plan application. He stated that the site is now 147.3 acres in size. A new lot has been added since the Preliminary Plan was reviewed. The property fronts on Henry Street, Market Hill Road and Flat Hills Road. There is a utility easement to the Water Treatment Plant. There are intermittent streams and wetlands throughout the site. There is an ongoing review of an ANRAD application [Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation] with the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission will be hiring a third-party reviewer. The site is wooded. It was harvested in 2010 and 2011.

The Yield Plan (showing how many lots can be built using the Standard Subdivision method of development) was submitted with the Definitive Subdivision Plan application and is the same as that submitted with the Preliminary Plan. The wetlands have been delineated by a wetlands biologist and surveyed by SVE Associates. The property is divided into an R-N zoning district along Henry Street and an R-O zoning district through the rest of the site. The R-O zoning district normally requires 30,000 square feet per lot [for a single-family dwelling in a Standard Subdivision].

Mr. Wonseski explained that there are two methods for determining “yield”. Using the first method a total of 196 lots can be accommodated. Using the second method a developer can create a total of 123 lots. The Yield Plan shows that there could be 39.3 acres of open space (20.16 acres dedicated to the town plus easements over the lots) in a standard subdivision.

The Preliminary Plan presented a “modified Cluster Development”, with 89.18 acres of open space (75.57 acres dedicated to the town plus easements over the lots). He noted that the Preliminary Plan showed a reduction in the amount of developed area from the Standard Subdivision or Yield Plan.

Submitted under the Cluster Subdivision Development Method, the Definitive Subdivision Plan now under review includes 123 lots developable for dwelling units, with 15,000 square feet for a single dwelling unit and 25,000 square feet for a duplex. Most lots have 100 feet of frontage, however waivers will be required for some lots. The 100 foot building circle is shown for each lot. This would be a standard Cluster Subdivision, he said.

With 175 dwelling units proposed, there would be a density of 1.19 dwelling units per acre on the site. The Definitive Plan would have 86.12 acres of open space (75.36 dedicated to the town plus easements of the lots). The amount of open space is slightly reduced from the Preliminary Plan, but is more than the Yield Plan. The developed area on the Definitive Plan would be 61.18 acres. The Definitive Plan shows contiguous open space and wildlife corridors. The plan avoids the “non-breeding salamander habitat area” on the east side of Henry Street.

A habitat assessment was done and will be included in the ENF [Environmental Notification Form] submitted to MEPA [Massachusetts Environmental Protection Agency]. Mr. Wonseski noted that the “non-breeding habitat” for the salamanders is west of the power lines.

Seven wetland crossings are proposed for this plan. They will be designed in accordance with the stream crossing statutes of the state and will also be designed to handle large vehicles. There will be pedestrian trails that connect to the streets. A portion of the Robert Frost Trail will be rerouted at the north end of the site. There will be “interconnectivity” for the trails and other pedestrian improvements.

Mr. Wonseski listed project features as follows:

- Large areas of contiguous, preserved open space;
- Wildlife corridors maintained;
- Minimal impact on environmentally sensitive areas;
- Trail connection to Robert Frost Trail and Cushman Market;
- On-site multi-use paved walks for bicycle and pedestrian use;
- Private trash collection;
- Privately managed roads, storm drains, lighting and landscaping;
- Design allows public water and sewer to be extended to Flat Hills Road;
- Promotes PVRTA bus use;
- Public access and utility easements;
- Wetland crossings to be designed in accordance with stream crossing guidelines and structural capacity for construction and emergency vehicles.

Mr. Wonseski showed a typical cross section of roadway, including a 50 foot right-of-way with a utility easement for the town and a tree belt between the walk and the road where there is no parallel parking. There will be parallel parking where grades are 6% or less. Secondary walks will be provided from the road to the houses. All utilities will be underground. The applicant is requesting a waiver for a 10 foot front setback.

Mr. Wonseski presented a plan for landscaping for a typical unit. Many units will have shared parking with the unit next door. There will be space for snow storage at the rear of the parking areas.

Among the revisions to the plans are the addition of streetlights, a reduction of the pavement width from 24 feet to 22 feet, a paved multi-use path, reduction in the length of cul-de-sacs, 100 foot building circles shown, a limit of about 200 feet for grades of 10%. Minor streets will be stop-sign regulated. Mr. Wonseski asserted that major streets did not need to conform to the requirement that grades be limited to 4% within 100 feet of an intersection, because the minor streets intersecting them will have stop signs. On-street perpendicular parking has been converted to parallel parking. Handicapped parking spaces have been provided in the parking lot on the amenity lot. The proposed sewer has been extended to Flat Hills Road.

Mr. Wonseski noted that the deep sewer may be a problem for the DPW and the problem can be solved with the addition of another pump station.

Mr. Wonseski showed examples of the proposed architecture.

He reviewed some recommendations from the Traffic Impact Analysis including the addition of a dedicated turn lane onto Pine Street from East Pleasant Street, northbound, new pavement markings and signage at intersections and a guardrail along Henry Street. He noted that the consultants had met with the DPW to establish a scope for the traffic study prior to beginning the study.

Mr. Webber asked to hear from third-party consultant Fuss & O'Neill.

Steve Savaria, of Fuss & O'Neill, Professional Engineer and Senior Project Manager, stated that his firm had been hired as the town's third party peer reviewer for the Definitive Subdivision Plan. He offered preliminary comments on a number of specific issues and problem areas related to dimensional requirements, parking requirements, slopes, the traffic impact statement, pedestrian and bicycle usage, the multi-use path, steep grading of roadways and intersections, the need for bus pull-offs and shelters; difficult turning movements and disturbance impacts.

Mr. Webber invited questions from the Board and staff. He began to review the Development Application Report, including the waivers requested and the questions on the roadways.

Mr. Stutsman expressed concern about the PVRTA transit service and the lack of provision of bus stops. He asked about the geometry of the intersections vis-à-vis buses being able to move through the site.

Mr. Savaria stated if the intersections were designed according to the subdivision standards they should work for buses as well as other vehicles.

There was discussion about the request for a 10' front setback rather than a 20' front setback and how this would affect the ability of cars to park within the front setback.

There was discussion about the steep grades proposed along the roadway.

Mr. Webber noted that the applicant had been asked to reduce the lengths of roadway with grades over 8%. He acknowledged that the original plan had contained more steep grades, but stated that the current plan still contained many steep roadway sections.

Mr. Wonseski asserted that the roadways would be safe as designed. He asserted that 10% is typical for a conventional subdivision and that 12% is acceptable for an "open space" subdivision. He explained that the major/through streets would have grades steeper than 4% at the intersections, but that the minor streets would not be greater than 4% because they end in stop signs. He discussed details of the roadways as designed.

Ms. Brestrup recommended that the Board seek an opinion in writing from the Town Engineer that the streets would be safe as designed.

Ms. Ford asked questions about the use and suggested that the Board seek clarification from Town Counsel about the use. She noted that the design might work on this site for a more family-oriented use but she questioned whether it would work for a development occupied by students who were all 18 to 22 years old. She expressed concern about cars driven by young people moving and parking on this site. It is a very different, very concentrated use, she said. She questioned whether this use should be located in the R-F zoning district.

Mr. Webber noted that there were two zoning districts at issue – R-N and R-O. He read the purpose of each of these districts from the Zoning Bylaw. He noted that the purpose of the R-F zoning district was to be dedicated to the specific needs of fraternities, sororities and similar uses. Mr. Webber stated that the project being proposed was meant to house students, specifically designed for the needs of students, and the amenity lot was proposed to include amenities designed for students. The project was to be marketed and managed specifically for students. There is a law suit underway to clarify questions about the use.

Mr. Webber read from relevant sections of the Planning Board's Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land, with particular attention to the purpose of the Subdivision Rules and Regulations.

Mr. Tucker noted that, in this case, categorizing the use is a complex question. There is no use category defined in the Zoning Bylaw that exactly matches this use, so the Board needs to fit it into the category that most closely matches it.

There was further discussion about the use and the fact that Town Counsel has been involved in discussions about what use category this proposal falls into.

Mr. Schreiber noted that the Board had made a determination in the case of Olympia Place that the use was an apartment-style dormitory.

Tom Reidy reported that the lawsuit is in the summary judgment phase and he asserted that the use is a residential use of single and two-family dwellings. The project is marketed towards students but would not be limited to students. Discussion of the use was not germane to the discussion of the Subdivision Plan, he said.

Ms. Ford asked about parking and the number of cars that would be accommodated on the site, noting that over 700 cars could be parked on site. There would be a large number of curb cuts and parking spaces along the road, which would complicate the movement of vehicles.

There was further discussion about the use. Mr. Webber stated that it is within the jurisdiction of the Planning Board to make a determination about the use. The Planning Board is responsible for interpreting the Zoning Bylaw. A Planning Board's decision will only be overturned if the Board abuses its discretion.

Mr. Roznoy noted that the Planning Board may consider the use when reviewing a Subdivision Plan. He stated that the Fair Housing Law would bar the managers of the property from keeping people other than students out. He asked the consultant, Fuss and O'Neill, to help the Board to sort out which issues the Planning Board can address and which issues are based on legal questions that need the advice of Town Counsel.

Mr. Webber referred to letters that had been received regarding this case. Some of these letters asserted that this project is a social dormitory and that the internal design of the units is like that of a social dormitory. The units have four bedrooms, each with its own bathroom. There is almost one parking space per bedroom. The management scheme, the advertising and the accessory building with amenities should be considered when determining the use category.

Ms. Ford noted that the project is being considered as a whole under the Cluster Subdivision Development Method.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Cluster Subdivision Development Method is a "development method" and not a "use category". Land uses and development methods are separate issues.

There was discussion about whether the Board should look at each property to determine if it is a dormitory or look at the whole, and not lot by lot. There was discussion about whether the amenity lot is a different use category or a common space for all the lots.

There was discussion about the PURD development method, which allows different types of uses within the same development.

Mr. Tucker stated that it would be complicated to make the argument that this is a dormitory. The buildings have four bedrooms each with its own bathroom and the units are marketed principally to students. But he noted that Amherst has various types of units all over town that are occupied by students that may fit that description.

Mr. Webber stated that the Board would hold off on its decision about the use. He referred to Section 4.3 of the Zoning Bylaw, and read the purpose of the Cluster Subdivision Development Method in Section 4.31. Mr. Webber stated that it was not clear that the amenity uses are included in the allowed uses listed for a residential cluster subdivision.

Mr. Schreiber recommended that the Board members consider the design of the access road to the high school parking lot which serves young people and note the fact that this development will be occupied by 18 to 22 year olds, each with his/her own car. He saw the requested waivers as safety issues. He noted that the Board might consider that this project is similar to a project being marketed to the elderly.

Mr. Webber reviewed the list of waivers that were requested or required. He referred to page 5 of the Development Application Report. The Board discussed the requirement in the Subdivision Rules and Regulations that no cul-de-sac be longer than 800 linear feet.

The Board discussed Road B, which was portrayed as a loop road, but was functionally the same as a cul-de-sac. The Board discussed the proposed gated emergency access road that would connect Road B with Road C. It was noted that the proposed access road crossed a wetland.

The Board discussed issues where waivers had been requested and asked Fuss and O'Neill to give an opinion on the requested waivers.

Mr. Savaria commented on the waivers requested for roadway design, as follows:

- The maximum grade in Amherst is 8%; a lot of towns have a maximum grade of 10 or 12%;
- The grades through the intersections should be reduced;
- The radius of proposed horizontal curves needs to be studied further;
- The length of the cul-de-sacs is not arbitrary but relates to the number of houses served;
- The provision of an emergency access road mitigates against concerns about the length of the cul-de-sacs;
- There is a need to maintain the emergency access roads in winter;
- The emergency services [Fire and Police Departments] should be consulted on whether they would be satisfied with the provision of an emergency access road.

Mr. Schreiber stated that cul-de-sacs and loop roads are bad for connectivity. He would encourage roads with better connectivity.

Mr. Webber stated that the Board could find that the loop road is a cul-de-sac and the Board could decline to grant the waiver on the length of cul-de-sacs.

Mr. Webber stated that one of the purposes of a Cluster Subdivision is to provide large contiguous areas of open spaces. He stated that the largest area on the property that would be considered open space may be an area of wetlands and steep slopes. That would prevent getting a road through these areas.

Mr. Wonseski stated that the applicant had taken the previous comments of the Board seriously and had tried to provide connectivity in terms of pedestrian traffic. The emergency access could be used by bicyclists and pedestrians. The designers were trying to maintain wildlife corridors. He spoke in support of the emergency access connection to Road C.

Mr. Roznoy requested that the applicant provide a list of roadway grades and that this list be posted on the website.

Public Comment

Jack Hirsch of 400 Flat Hills Road spoke in opposition to the application and read from Section 4.3 of the Zoning Bylaw which governs Cluster Subdivisions. Mr. Hirsch offered many arguments as to why this proposed subdivision would not provide these benefits, including the assertion that it is not economical, not efficient, not harmonious with natural features, not compatible with the character of surrounding residential areas. People who chose to live in the R-O zoning district want a lower density experience. This development would not be in the style of the existing neighborhood. It would not protect natural resources, it doesn't meet the standards of the Zoning Bylaw, and it does not meet the objectives set forth in the Master Plan. This is a unique piece of land that will not be preserved by this development. He implored the Planning Board to minimize the impact on the Town of Amherst open space and small town

character, honor the historic character and beauty of the neighborhoods. He recommended that the Board require the applicant to reduce the size of the proposal, that the Board hold the applicant to the letter of the Zoning Bylaw requirements, not grant any waivers and maintain the safety of the roads.

Ellen Pile of 110 Bridge Street questioned written comments that had been received from Town Counsel about the issue of land use. She asked the Board to look at the pattern of use and not just the physical structure. She asked if material from the Preliminary Subdivision Plan process could be introduced into the Definitive Subdivision Plan process. She noted that Landmark, the applicant, had filed a countersuit against the town.

Ann Hollingworth of Henry Street spoke in opposition to the proposed development. She spoke primarily about the historical character of the Cushman neighborhood and asserted that the proposed architecture is out of place. Ms. Hollingworth presented information about the history of the Cushman neighborhood. She recommended that the Historical Commission be asked for its comments on the proposed project.

Mr. Webber invited the Historical Commission to comment on the application.

Alton Acker of 53 Henry Street spoke in opposition to the proposed development. Landmark came to Amherst 1 ½ years ago and presented a project for student housing. It was advertised as student housing and never presented as housing for everyone. He asserted that it may be “flipped” to another owner and that this project could be viewed as a precedent for other developers who want to build dorms in Amherst.

Mr. Acker noted that Henry Street has been designated as a Scenic Road. A previous proposal to widen Henry Street to 40 feet was defeated at Town Meeting. He cautioned that taxes will be decreased in this part of town because land values will go down. More buses will come through the area. Students will park on lawns and on emergency roads.

Nancy Gittleman of 410 Old Montague Road spoke in opposition to the development. She cautioned against putting students in a place with such steep roads, which would become especially dangerous in winter.

Vince O’Connor of Summer Street spoke in opposition to the development. He encouraged the Board to:

- Listen to the public about issues related to steepness of roads and length of cul-de-sacs;
- Require the applicant to reduce the number of lots;
- Designate all entry roads as secondary roads;
- Require that all trees over 8” be shown on the plan;
- Require that all trees over 12” be preserved if possible;
- Require that the applicant get feedback from the Conservation Commission before proceeding with the Planning Board process;
- Examine the Yield Plan;
- Require that the site be assessed for a storm greater than the 100 year storm;
- Limit roadways to 8% maximum slopes.

Ira Addes of Shutesbury Road submitted a written document, spoke in opposition to the project and made comments and assertions as follows:

- The Retreat is not legal according to the Zoning Bylaw;
- It is masquerading as a Cluster Subdivision;
- The Retreat is not in keeping with the Master Plan;

- It is an idea driven by special interests which will have disastrous consequences for the town;
- It is a huge “rent-by-the-room” collegiate complex, asking for permission to be built in the R-O zoning district;
- He questioned how the project had gotten this far without more public input.

Mr. Reidy requested that the time to render an opinion about the Definitive Subdivision Plan be extended from August 26 to September 26, 2015. He submitted a letter to the Board requesting the extension of time. The Board agreed by consensus to the request to extend the time.

The Board also discussed the issue of the return of the inspection fee. The fee had been paid at the time of application, but would not be needed until the project was under construction. Since the application was submitted in May, the Board had amended the Rules and Regulations Governing the Subdivision of Land to no longer require that the inspection fee be submitted at the time of application. It is now required to be submitted prior to the endorsement of the Definitive Subdivision Plan.

Mr. Schreiber MOVED to return the roadway inspection fee to the applicant. Mr. Roznoy seconded and the vote was 8-0-0.

Mr. Webber encouraged Board members to submit questions about the project to staff. Mr. Roznoy praised the consultant, Fuss and O’Neill, for doing a good job on short notice.

Ms. Brestrup directed the Board members’ attention to the issues of grading, cutting and filling.

Ms. Anderson noted that there were issues related to site preparation. She asked about the depth of excavations and their impact. She asked how long the construction process would last, from beginning to end, and how it might impact the neighborhood.

Mr. Carson asked for information from the applicant or consultant about where the retaining walls would be located and how high they were.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Development Application Report had recommended that “crow’s eye views” be prepared to show a sense of what the area would look like as a result of the proposed cutting and filling.

Mr. Roznoy requested that staff get an opinion as to the viability of the proposed emergency access road. He also asked whether it would be subject to the grading limits of the other roads.

Mr. Stutsman asked for a statement about trip generation regarding Pufton Village.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to continue the public hearing to 7:45 p.m. on August 6, 2015. Mr. Carson seconded and the vote was 8-0-0.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Signing of Decisions – the Board signed the following decisions:

SPR2014-00016 – Tea Musketaquid for Fire & Water Yoga Studio & Juice Bar – 37-39 Boltwood Walk

SPR2014-00017 – KM Operations LLC for Subway – 308 College Street

B. Zoning – Mr. Crowner reported that the ZSC had begun to discuss a Multi-family Housing Overlay zoning amendment, while waiting for consultants to help with work on Inclusionary Zoning. The ZSC would also like to work on renumbering and cleaning up the Special Districts section of the Bylaw because the Multi-family Housing Overlay district would need a new section. Mr. Tucker reported that the ZSC

also reviewed the Scope of Services for the Inclusionary Zoning consultant. There would be an emphasis on non-zoning options and a look at a financial analysis of fees-in-lieu. Mr. Webber expressed concern that fees-in-lieu would push affordable housing into the future. Ms. Ford stated that affordable housing was not really inclusionary if it is not on the same site as market rate housing.

Mr. Crowner stated that parking downtown is complicated. There will be a public forum in late September to obtain input about downtown parking.

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

V. NEW BUSINESS

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

VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – none

VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – Ms. Brestrup reported that the Planning Department had received Site Plan Review applications from the Emily Dickinson Museum and Elm Electric and expected to receive an application for the Carriage Shops shortly. Mr. Tucker stated that there were questions regarding the existing mural that needed to be resolved with respect to the Carriage Shops, located at One East Pleasant Street.

IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS – no reports

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson
Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson
Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber
Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crowner
Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant
Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford
Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman
Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman
Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant
Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman and Stephen Schreiber

X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – Mr. Webber thanked Mr. Schreiber for chairing the meeting last time.

XI. REPORT OF STAFF – Mr. Tucker announced that the annual Queechee Scottish Festival would take place in Queechee, Vermont, on August 21st, 2014.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:27 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

Christine M. Brestrup
Senior Planner

David Webber, Chair

DATE: _____