

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, September 3, 2014 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

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

ABSENT: Richard Roznoy

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

Mr. Webber opened the meeting at 7:12 PM.

I. MINUTES

The Minutes of July 30, 2014 were not ready for review.

II. ZONING

A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crowner presented the ZSC report. The zoning amendment on Reorganization of Special Districts is ready. The amendment on Inclusionary Zoning may not be finished in time for Fall Town Meeting. The ZSC held a good meeting with the consultant, Judi Barrett, last week, but Ms. Barrett is not finished with her analysis. She offered the following preliminary recommendations:

- Make it simple
- Affordable housing cannot be created by zoning alone; tax incentives or tax breaks are also needed;
- Such tax adjustments will involve action by the Select Board and the state legislature;
- Zoning and non-zoning articles should come forward together.

A public hearing on Inclusionary Zoning is scheduled for September 17th. At that time the Planning Board can decide whether to go forward to Town Meeting or not.

Mr. Stutsman noted that in Provincetown and Truro some properties have tax exempt status because they provide year round affordability. Provincetown has a winter population of about 3,000 which swells to about 50,000 in the summer. Affordable housing in Provincetown blends in with other housing in town and is not in the historic district. Mr. Tucker reported that Provincetown has created 60 units of affordable housing as part of this program.

There was a brief discussion about a voluntary program in Manhattan that is providing affordable units.

Mr. Tucker reviewed the schedule leading up to Town Meeting.

There was discussion about the fact that the Planning Board had represented to Annual Town Meeting that it would bring Inclusionary Zoning back for Fall Town Meeting and that it would be helpful to keep Town Meeting members informed as to the progress of Inclusionary Zoning.

Mr. Webber had received an email from Aaron Hayden about a parking forum. The Planning Board has limited control of public parking and the Select Board has primary control. There will be a Joint Meeting of the Planning Board and the Select Board to

examine issues related to downtown parking. There was discussion about the Municipal Parking District. A solution to the parking issue may involve zoning, economic development, the town budget and a reconfiguration of the public way, along with involvement from the DPW.

Mr. Carson offered to obtain permission from the author of Walkable City [Jeff Speck] in order to provide copies of the chapter on parking for Board members.

The first parking forum is scheduled for Tuesday, September 23. It will introduce everyone to the subject of parking. Comments from citizens will be encouraged.

B. Public Comment Period

Melissa Perot of Summer Street would like to hear about Inclusionary Zoning and she is encouraged that it will involve more than just zoning. Inclusionary Zoning has potential to be the right thing in the end.

Mr. Crouner stated that the Select Board is aware of the need for the tax component. Select Board member, Connie Kruger, has been attending ZSC meetings at which this topic has been discussed.

Mr. Webber suggested inviting people from UMass to the parking forum.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2015-00002 – Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street

Request Site Plan Review approval to install new signs, drainage improvements at the Evergreens, mechanical system improvements at the Homestead (Map 14B, Parcels 26 & 27, R-G zoning district)

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

Jane Wald, Executive Director of the Museum, and Eric Gradoia, of Mesick Cohen Wilson Baker Architects, presented the application.

The Emily Dickinson Museum is proposing a multi-faceted project:

- 1) Signs – A new signage plan, refreshing the branding and logo of the Museum and replacing signs that were installed 10 years ago;
- 2) Drainage – Improvements to the drainage system for the foundation and basement at the Evergreens, including a trench and stone headwall to be built on the west lawn of the Evergreens;
- 3) Mechanical – An upgrade to the mechanical systems at both the Evergreens and the Homestead, involving fire suppression and HVAC, including the installation of a new chiller to be built to the north of the existing garage.

Mr. Webber reviewed the Site Visit Report, dated August 29th, noting details about the site and the buildings. The chiller would not be visible from off site. The headwall will only be visible to those approaching the Evergreens from the west and crossing the lawn to approach the house. The applicant is proposing to install 5 new signs.

Mr. Webber noted that the applicant had submitted a Management Plan form. There are apparently no changes to the Management Plan, use or access to the site since previous land use permits have been approved. He asked about the alternate locations proposed for one of the signs.

Ms. Wald stated that there are alternate locations proposed for the westernmost sign (Sign #1),

because of concerns about visibility and uncertainty about the better alternative. The view for pedestrians walking down the north side of the street is obstructed by trees. Placing the sign behind the fence and raising it up would make the sign more visible for pedestrians. However, the lower height of the original location, at the end of the fence, is more practical since it announces the end of the property, announces arrival at the Emily Dickinson Museum and is visible for vehicles driving east on Main Street.

Ms. Brestrup explained that in the R-G zoning district, for a use that is other than a dwelling unit, up to two signs are allowed, with a total square footage of 12 square feet. In this case, the applicant is asking for five signs and there is already an existing sign that is interior to the site that will be retained. The Board would need to grant a waiver to allow five signs exceeding a total of 12 square feet.

Ms. Brestrup noted that there is a section of the Zoning Bylaw, Section 8.5, which allows the following:

“Any section or subsection of Article 8, Sign Regulations, may be waived or modified by the Permit Granting Board or Special Permit Granting Authority authorized to act under the applicable section of the Bylaw for compelling reasons of public convenience, public safety, aesthetics or site design.”

She explained that these waivers or modifications are allowed when the Board is considering the signs under Site Plan Review. The Board is considering the chiller, the drainage improvements and the signs under Site Plan Review. She explained how each sign met or did not meet the requirements of the Bylaw, so that the Board would understand what they are asked to waive or modify:

- The first thing would be to waive the number of signs and to allow the applicant to install more than two signs for the property.
- The second thing is that the Board is asked to waive the total square footage for the signs. The allowed square footage is 12 square feet. The total proposed square footage is around 47 square feet.
- There are several signs in this proposal that exceed 4 feet in height and Section 8.103 of the Zoning Bylaw states that “No sign allowed under this section shall exceed four feet (4’) in height above grade, except that projecting signs with a total area of three square feet or less may be up to six feet (6’) in height above grade.”
- Section 8.104 of the Zoning Bylaw states that “There shall be no front setback requirement for signs allowed on private property under this section, except that no sign shall be set closer to any public sidewalk than 30 inches (30”).” The fence is probably within 30 inches of the sidewalk and therefore signs mounted on the fence would be closer than 30” to the public sidewalk.

Based on the Development Application Report, page 3, Ms. Brestrup reviewed how each of the five proposed signs met or did not meet the requirements of the Bylaw:

- Sign #1, Branding sign, west end, is 15 square feet in area and is proposed to be either 8’ high or 6’-8” high, depending on which alternative is chosen; it may be closer to the public sidewalk than 30” if the alternative location is chosen;
- Sign #2, Identification sign, is 1.46 square feet in area; it may be closer to the public sidewalk than 30” because it is proposed to be mounted on the fence;
- Sign #3, Identification sign, is 1.6 square feet in area; it may be closer to the public sidewalk than 30”, because it is proposed to be mounted on the fence;
- Sign #4, Welcome sign, is 11.45 square feet in area and is proposed to be 7’-6” high;
- Sign #5, Branding sign, east end, is 18 square feet in area and is proposed to be 4’-6”

high.

In summary, at least three of the signs exceed the height limit, the signs taken as a whole exceed the square footage limit and at least three of the signs are closer to the public sidewalk than 30". The total area of new signs for the property is about 47.5 square feet.

The Board may wish to waive or modify the dimensional requirements of Section 8 to allow the proposed signs "for compelling reasons of public convenience, public safety, aesthetics or site design" because the proposed signs will allow visitors to more easily find the Emily Dickinson Museum, identify the Evergreens and the Homestead buildings and determine how to enter the site.

Mr. Crowner stated his opinion that the signs require a Special Permit based on his reading of Section 8.101 of the Zoning Bylaw. If the language of Section 8.101 were not in the Bylaw, he would be supportive of waiving the requirements under Section 8.5. But, given the language of Section 8.101, he would not be able to vote for the signs without a Special Permit. There was discussion about Mr. Crowner's interpretation and whether a Special Permit should be required.

Mr. Webber read Section 8.101 and Section 8.5 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Ms. Brestrup explained that in staff's opinion, Section 8.101 relates to a situation where the Board is not considering a Site Plan Review for a property but is only considering a sign that exceeds the dimensions and number of signs allowed in the Bylaw.

Section 8.5 of the Bylaw is interpreted by staff to mean that a Board, either the Special Permit Granting Board or the Permit Granting Authority "authorized to act under the applicable section of the Zoning Bylaw", i.e. for whatever use is being considered, may waive or modify any section or subsection of Article 8, Signs, for "compelling reasons of public convenience, public safety, aesthetics or site design", under the particular land use permit that is being sought. In this case the Planning Board is considering a Site Plan Review for the use, under Section 3.330.0, non-profit educational use, and therefore may consider waiver or modification of sign requirements under Section 8.5 of the Bylaw.

Mr. Crowner disagreed with this interpretation.

Mr. Schreiber asked why the drainage and the chiller unit need Site Plan Review.

Ms. Brestrup explained that the Building Commissioner is requiring Site Plan Review for any site change, such as a generator or smaller site changes such as a headwall or a chiller. In this case the headwall and chiller are fairly large. Therefore the Building Commissioner sent this project to the Planning Board for Site Plan Review for all three items.

Ms. Wald stated that the drainage improvements and the improvements to the HVAC system are the top priority for the Museum and that the Museum was willing to continue to use the existing signs if the new signs would hold up approval of the rest of the project.

Mr. Carson asked if the Planning Board could consider the mechanical and drainage aspects of the project tonight and postpone consideration of the signs. Ms. Brestrup stated that the Board could approve the proposals for the chiller and the drainage improvements under this Site Plan Review application, and not approve the signs, and ask the applicant to apply to the Planning Board for a Special Permit for the signs.

Mr. Webber noted that there are two ZBA Special Permits for signs on this site. Ms. Brestrup pointed out that those decisions were made prior to Section 8.5 being incorporated into the Zoning Bylaw. At that time there wasn't an option to waive or modify the requirements of Section 8.

Ms. Brestrup noted that it was the intention of those who drafted Section 8.5 to allow whichever Board was considering a land use permit for a project [Site Plan Review or Special Permit] to waive or modify the sign requirements for signs related to the project that was being considered, under the umbrella of whichever permit was being reviewed. This would be different from a review that was solely about a sign that was larger than would normally be allowed. A sign that was all by itself would be considered under Section 8.101 and a sign that was part of a land use permit application would be considered as part of the land use permit application, under Section 8.5. That is staff's understanding of the intent of Section 8.5.

Mr. Stutsman reminded the Board that they had recently worked on unifying the sign regulations. In doing so, members of the Zoning Subcommittee had met with the ZBA to discuss changes to Section 8.41 of the Zoning Bylaw, which dealt with non-conforming directional or identification signs. In changing this section, the ZBA had been concerned that the ZBA would lose its ability to waive or modify sign requirements for certain signs. Therefore Section 8.5 was developed to maintain the ability of the ZBA and the Planning Board to waive or modify sign requirements within the context of a land use permit application.

Mr. Webber remembered this discussion with the ZBA and supported going ahead with the Site Plan Review process for the signs, under Section 8.5. He noted that the Board's decision tonight might set a precedent. However, if it was determined at a later date that the applicant needed to apply for a Special Permit, the signs could be removed and the applicant would then need to apply for a Special Permit to re-install them.

Mr. Schreiber stated that the signs could be considered on their merits and anyone who disagreed in the future could challenge the decision. The Board would act under what it considered to be its authority.

The Board discussed the merits of the signs being proposed. Several Board members agreed to continue to review and vote on the proposed signs as part of this Site Plan Review application.

Mr. Crouner recommended that the applicant be required to submit an application for a Special Permit from the Planning Board for the signs.

Mr. Stutsman supported the interpretation that the signs could be approved under Site Plan Review, under Section 8.5 of the Bylaw "for compelling reasons of public convenience, public safety, aesthetics or site design" and he supported the waivers and modifications related to the number of signs, the size of the signs and the distance from the public sidewalk.

Ms. Anderson agreed with this interpretation. She supported the sign proposal explaining that there are two main structures on the property and people need to know where to go when approaching this unique, landmark destination. The signs are a matter of public convenience. She also noted that this is not a commercial property.

Ms. Anderson reported that those who attended the site visit preferred the alternative location for Sign #1.

The Board discussed the alternative locations proposed for Sign #1. Several Board members expressed support for the alternative location, at the end of the fence, rather than the location behind the fence which would require a higher sign.

Ms. Ford suggested that the applicant try out both locations to see which one worked the best for the purpose of visibility. The question is where the sign is mounted and how high it is mounted. Otherwise the size of the sign is the same.

Ms. Wald explained why the Emily Dickinson Museum would like to revised its signage. The existing signs were put in place before the Museum changed the size and location of the fence.

The sizes and locations of those signs relate to a previous condition that no longer prevails. The signs were also an attempt to make the site “findable”. With the landscape restoration complete, and with the new fence and maturing hedge in place, it was necessary to consider a new sign plan. The fence and hedge help to identify the site. But visitors are still unsure about when they have arrived at the site and where they are supposed to enter. The Museum needs a public announcement to clarify when people have arrived at the site. The Museum plans to remove the existing signs. The largest sign that sits next to the Homestead driveway will be removed. The two large “branding” signs at either end will help people to know when they have arrived at the site. The new signs will also help people to figure out which house is which. The small signs to be mounted on the fence will help people to figure out where they are.

The new sign at the driveway will be closer to the street, for vehicles and pedestrians, and will help people to figure out how to get into the site.

The Museum has 15,000 visitors per year from around the world. The guests of the Museum are also the guests of the Town of Amherst. The signs will be in keeping with a public service.

Ms. Ford spoke in support of the “branding” signs.

Ms. Anderson spoke in support of the “branding” and suggested that Signs #1 and #5 include arrows to help people to know which direction to walk or drive to the entrance. Perhaps the arrow could be accompanied by the word “Entrance”. Other Board members concurred with the suggestion to include arrows on the signs.

Mr. Webber noted that the Local Historic District Commission had already reviewed the proposal and had issued a Certificate of Non-Applicability and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work, including the drainage, signing and chiller, and made findings in support.

Mr. Webber noted that waivers had been requested:

- Landscape Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement
- Soil Erosion Plan

The Board discussed the waiver requests.

Mr. Webber asked if people might come upon the headwall and trip over it.

Mr. Gradoia stated that the stone headwall would be built of dry-laid stone. The grade at the back of the headwall could be lowered to create a curb on the uphill side so that people would notice the wall not fall over the edge. The headwall is proposed to be 18 inches high and 8 feet long and is a fairly substantial structure. It is in a remote part of the site at the southwest corner and is set amongst vegetation. It is not on a walking path through the gardens.

Board members discussed the fact that people might be tempted to approach the site from the end of the fence because of the proposed sign being located there and that they might come into contact with the headwall. Board members suggested that plantings around the uphill side of the headwall might prevent people from getting too close to it.

Ms. Brestrup noted as a point of reference that state law requires that walls adjacent to a walking path with a drop of 30” or more are required to have a railing. In this case the drop is only 18” and would not require a railing.

Mr. Schreiber asked if a drywell were considered for the drainage. Mr. Gradoia stated that the amount of drainage that will flow from the headwall is minimal. The drainage system is being installed to mitigate rising groundwater in and around the basement of the Evergreens. A

drywell would be a much larger approach. The drop of the land suggests daylighting the pipes at a headwall.

Ms. Anderson suggested that the Board approve the wall as proposed and that it require that the top of the wall be raised so that it is more visible. A condition could be imposed that requires the Board to review the condition at the top of the wall once it is installed and to require a Landscape Plan for the area around the wall if it is then deemed necessary.

Mr. Webber stated that in his opinion a 6" curb at the top of the wall will be sufficient to warn people and the applicant should not be required to come back with a Landscape Plan.

He noted that there were no changes proposed to site lighting, there is a description of the existing lighting and therefore a waiver of the Lighting Plan was reasonable.

There would be minimal excavation and filling and therefore a waiver of the Soil Erosion Plan was reasonable.

There will be no increase in traffic as a result of this project and there is no parking on site other than handicapped parking and therefore a waiver of the Traffic Impact Statement is reasonable.

The Fire Department and Town Engineer had no comments on this application.

Mr. Webber acknowledged receipt of the architectural restoration details for the Evergreens but stated that they were not in the scope of this Site Plan Review.

Barbara Ford of Flat Hills Road stated that she had served on the ZBA when previous land use permits were considered for the signs. She supports the alternative location for Sign #1, because the Hemlocks may continue to grow and the location behind the fence will become a problem in the future. She also supports moving the entrance sign at the driveway further towards the street, as is being proposed.

Larry Kelly of South Pleasant Street asked about the budget for the project.

Ms. Wald stated that the project, except for the signs, was submitted to the Massachusetts Cultural Facilities Fund for a grant. The Museum received \$380,000 in grant funds and needs to find matching funds. The total cost of the project is \$1.5 million for exterior renovation of the Evergreens, the drainage, fire suppression and HVAC improvements for both houses.

The Board found under Section 8.5 of the Zoning Bylaw, as follows:

The requirements of Article 8 of the Zoning Bylaw with respect to the number, size and location of signs are waived for compelling reasons of public convenience, public safety, aesthetics and site design.

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; waivers from the requirements for signs have been requested and will be granted under Section 8.5 of the Zoning Bylaw; these waivers are related to number of proposed signs, size of proposed signs and location of signs adjacent to the public sidewalk;
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected through minimizing detrimental or offensive actions;
- 11.2402 – Abutting properties will be protected from detrimental site characteristics resulting from the proposed use; the drainage improvements, HVAC equipment and signs will not cause detrimental site characteristics;
- 11.2403 – Adequate recreational facilities, open space and amenities will be provided; this site is one of the most important attractions in the Town of Amherst for recreation;

- 11.2410 – Unique or important natural, historic or scenic features will be protected;
- 11.2411 – N/A;
- 11.2412 – N/A;
- 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 drainage system for the Evergreens will be improved;
- 11.2414 – Provision of adequate landscaping has been addressed; the requirement for submission of a Landscape Plan will be waived; there is adequate landscaping existing on the site;
- 11.2415 – N/A; the requirement for submission of a Soil Erosion Plan will be waived;
- 11.2416 – The adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of air and water pollution, flood, noise, odor, dust and vibration through appropriate site and structure design and the use of appropriate design and materials for containment, ventilation, filtering, screening, sound-proofing, sound-dampening and other similar solutions;
- 11.2417 – Adjacent properties will be protected by minimizing the intrusion of lighting; there are no changes proposed to the existing site lighting; the requirement for submission of a Lighting Plan will be waived;
- 11.2418 – N/A;
- 11.2419 – N/A;
- 11.2420 – The Board chose not to refer to the design principles and standards set forth in Sections 3.2040 and 3.2041 of the Zoning Bylaw;
- 11.2421 – N/A;
- 11.2422 – N/A;
- 11.2423 – The buildings relate harmoniously to each other in architectural style, site location and building exits and entrances; no changes are proposed;
- 11.2424 – Screening will be provided for storage areas, loading docks, dumpsters, rooftop equipment, utility buildings and similar features; the proposed chiller will be located behind the existing garage and will therefore be screened from view;
- 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; the proposed signage will improve the convenience and safety of vehicles and pedestrians approaching and entering the site;
- 11.2431 – N/A;
- 11.2432 – N/A;
- 11.2433 – N/A;
- 11.2434 – N/A;
- 11.2435 – N/A;
- 11.2436 – The requirement for a Traffic Impact Statement will be waived;
- 11.2437 – N/A.

Ms. Anderson MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the Site Plan Review application with waivers and conditions as discussed. Mr. Stutsman seconded and the vote was 6-1-0 (Crownor opposed).

Waivers

- Landscape Plan
- Lighting Plan
- Traffic Impact Statement
- Soil Erosion Plan

Conditions

- 1) The Board authorizes the applicant to experiment with two different locations for Sign #1 to determine which one best fulfills the applicant's needs for visibility of the sign. However, the Board's preferred first placement for Sign #1 is the one shown as the alternative location in the application. That is, the preferred placement for Sign #1 is at the end of the fence, next to the end post, on the west side of the Evergreens property. The applicant may choose to move Sign #1 to the location behind the fence, with a height up to 96" if the first location does not fulfill the applicant's needs for visibility of the sign.
- 2) There shall be a 6" curb/reveal at the top of the headwall, so that the headwall is visible from the uphill side to those coming down the hill, toward the street, across the lawn.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

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

SPR2014-18 – Common School – 521 South Pleasant Street

SPR2015-01 – Elm Electric – 32 Northampton Road (Newport Hall, Amherst College)

- B.** The Retreat – Definitive Subdivision Plan and Site Plan Review – discussion of process and schedule – Ms. Brestrup reported that there has been no news since the last meeting. A continued public hearing is scheduled for September 17th. At the last meeting the Board and the applicant agreed to extend the period for action on the Definitive Subdivision Plan until October 26th.

The Conservation Commission continues to work on the application for an ANRAD [Abbreviated Notice of Resource Area Delineation]. There was discussion about the schedule for the completion of the third party review consultant's work.

Mr. Carson requested that the Board be provided with a small, 11 x 17 plan showing the streets, the slopes of the streets, the heights of the walls and other pertinent information, color coded and labeled.

Mr. Crouner observed that the Board had started to talk about the use of the property but didn't finish this conversation. The Board needs to talk again about the use and the Board needs to make some decisions sooner rather than later about the application and not try to make all the decisions at the last meeting.

Mr. Webber stated that there needs to be a sufficient period of time at the next meeting for public comment. The time for public comment at the previous meeting had been taken up by comments from the consultant for Save Historic Cushman and members of the public did not have much time to comment.

There was no information as to when the Site Plan Review application would be submitted.

Mr. Schreiber expressed concern about the vacancy on the Board. The Board should have a full complement of 9 members to open the public hearing to discuss the Site

Plan Review application. Mr. Webber reported that the Town Manager was actively trying to fill the vacancy.

Jack Hirsch of Flat Hills Road stated that people were disappointed that there was no chance for the public to speak at the last meeting. Mr. Webber stated that he would try to allow at least an hour for public comment at the next session of the public hearing.

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 – Ms. Brestrup reported that the Planning Board had received a letter from PVPC regarding the project entitled “Our Next Future: An Action Plan for Building a Smart, Sustainable and Resilient Pioneer Valley”. The Plan comes in several parts, in the form of pamphlets that address individual topics. It is available for members of the Planning Board and the public to review. Mr. Webber stated that he would write a thank you letter to PVPC and noted that the Plan is probably available for review on the PVPC website.

VI. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

VII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – The Planning Board declined to review the following ZBA applications:

ZBA FY2014-00038 – Margaret Riley – For a Variance, and/or any other relief necessary, to allow the enlargement of a non-compliant lot by adding area and frontage and to structurally alter and enlarge a non-compliant, existing, single family dwelling, under Section 10.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 908 South East Street, Map 20D, Parcel 47 and Map 21C, Parcel 3, R-LD Zoning District)

ZBA FY2014-00039 – W.D. Cows – For a Special Permit to extend and/or alter a pre-existing non-conforming lot by subdividing it into two lots resulting in an increase in an existing non-conforming lot coverage and to alter an additional non-conforming lot, under Section 9.22 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 125, 134, and 149 Montague Road (Map 5A, Parcels 29, 153, 139, COMM Zoning District)

ZBA FY2015-00009 – Andrea Tulenko & Jeffrey Catlin – For a Special Permit to structurally alter and enlarge a pre-existing non-conforming (as to rear yard setback) detached garage by adding a second floor, at 124 High Street (Map 11D, Parcel 124, R-G Zoning District)

ZBA FY2015-00010 – Ryan Karb – To appeal a Notice of Violation dated July 16, 2014, that the dwelling is occupied by more than four unrelated individuals, under Section 10.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, at 110 Logtown Road (Map 18D, Parcel 63, R-N Zoning District)

VIII. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – Ms. Brestrup reported that applications had been submitted for the following:

Site Plan Review application to allow a mixed-use building at the Carriage Shops at One East Pleasant Street;

Site Plan Review application for Amherst College, The Bunker, to allow climate control equipment;

Site Plan Review application for the First Baptist Church, to allow a trailer in the parking lot to serve meals to guests who will be staying at Craig's Doors shelter, to allow them to keep warm and have dinner while waiting to get into the shelter.

Mr. Webber asked that the application materials on the Carriage Shops (One East Pleasant Street) be posted online for everyone to review.

IX. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson – no report

Community Preservation Act Committee – Sandra Anderson reported that CPAC would be holding a public forum soon to hear about priorities for projects to be considered by CPAC.

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – no report

Transportation Plan Task Force – Richard Roznoy and Rob Crowner – Ms. Brestrup reported that the TPTF would be meeting on September 15th with the consultant to get started on preparing the Transportation Plan.

Amherst Redevelopment Authority – vacant – no report

Design Review Board – Kathleen Ford – no report

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman – no report

Town Gown Study Steering Committee – David Webber and Greg Stutsman – Mr. Webber reported that the TGSSC would be meeting on Thursday, September 4, at 4:00 p.m. in the Town Room.

Master Plan Implementation Committee – vacant – no report

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Greg Stutsman and Stephen Schreiber – report already presented.

X. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – Mr. Webber noted that the Planning Board meeting on September 17th would begin at 6:00 p.m.

XI. REPORT OF STAFF – none

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Approved:

Christine M. Brestrup
Senior Planner

David Webber, Chair

DATE: _____