

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, June 15, 2016 – 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
MINUTES

PRESENT: Greg Stutsman, Acting Chair, Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson, Richard Roznoy, Christine Gray-Mullen, and Michael Birtwistle

ABSENT: Pari Riahi, Stephen Schreiber and Jack Jemsek

STAFF: Christine Brestrup, Planning Director

Mr. Stutsman opened the meeting at 7:00 PM and chaired the meeting in Mr. Schreiber's absence.

I. MINUTES

The Minutes were not ready for review.

Since it was not yet time for the first public hearing, the Board turned to other business.

II. ZONING

A. Zoning Subcommittee Report – Mr. Crowner reported. After Town Meeting the Zoning Subcommittee and the Planning Board has had a chance to “take stock”. The ZSC met this evening. It will be losing one member with Mr. Carson's departure and will be down to two members, Mr. Stutsman and Mr. Crowner. Mr. Crowner noted that there are a number of new Planning Board members. The Planning Board may wish to rethink the way it develops zoning amendments. The Planning Board may wish to conduct a forum to seek public input on zoning priorities and issues for the future. If a forum is scheduled, the full Planning Board should host this forum and participate in it. The forum could occur at an upcoming Planning Board meeting. The Board should begin a conversation about a better understanding about what is the downtown and about the B-L zoning district around the downtown. The Board may also wish to talk about Inclusionary Zoning or other contentious issues. The Board may wish to begin a thought process about updating the Master Plan. The state would like towns to update their Master Plans every 10 years. The Planning Board approved the current Master Plan in 2010, but the town worked on it for 5 years before that. The current Master Plan didn't resolve all the conflicts. This time the town may be able to put more specifics into the Plan. The town should lay out a vision for the next 25 years. The planning process wouldn't need to start from scratch.

The discussion was suspended in order to address scheduled public hearings and the Board decided to resume the discussion after the Site Plan Review hearings.

B. Public Comment Period – none

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2016-00022 – Ron Bohonowicz for Fort River School – 70 South East Street

Request Site Plan Review approval to replace metal/wire/shrub fence with decorative vinyl fence (Map 15A/47, R-N zoning district)

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

Ron Bohonowicz, Director of Facilities for the Town of Amherst and the school systems, presented the application.

The project involves replacing a fence at the Fort River School barn. The barn is used to store equipment for the schools. The town recently put a new roof on the building and painted it. In order to paint the building an old wire fence and shrubbery needed to be removed. Mr. Bohonowicz had spoken with the neighbors and promised to install a new fence in place of the old one and in place of the shrubbery. He has had the land surveyed so it is clear where the property line is located. The new fence will be a 6' high vinyl fence, to be installed by Hastie Fence. It will run from the property line on the north side of the barn to a point as close as possible to the driveway that comes into the school property.

Ms. Gray-Mullen gave the site visit report. Three Board members attended the site visit. They found the conditions as described by Mr. Bohonowicz. The project is straightforward.

One question that was asked at the site visit had to do with the color of the fence. Mr. Bohonowicz stated that the fence is proposed to be white but that it could be another color.

Another question was "what will happen to the existing wire fence along the north property line?" The answer is that it will stay for now.

Mr. Crowner reported that the property boundary line is about 2' - 3' from the rear wall of the barn. The fence will be on the property boundary line.

There was discussion about the height of the fence. Since the driveway is not a public way, the fence can be 6' high to a point fairly close to the driveway. Mr. Bohonowicz stated that he would install it to within 10' of the driveway edge, to keep it from being damaged by cars or plows.

Mr. Bohonowicz stated that one of the reasons for installing the fence is to keep people from cutting through the neighbors' properties on the way to the school.

There was no public comment.

Waivers

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

Conditions

- None

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to close the public hearing, to approve the application with waivers as requested and no conditions and to find that the application complies with the requirements of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

SPR2016-00023 – Elizabeth Tan – 49 Northampton Road

Request Site Plan Review approval for removal of existing driveway and curb cut off Northampton Road and construction of new driveway and new curb cut off Kendrick Place and approval of Landscape Plan in accordance with Condition #10 of SPR2014-00013 (Map 14A/243, R-G zoning district)

Mr. Stutsman read the preamble and opened the public hearing. Mr. Stutsman then recused himself and left the meeting.

Mr. Crowner chaired the public hearing.

Peter Wells of The Berkshire Design Group presented the application. He was accompanied by Ted Parker of Kohl Construction.

Mr. Wells stated that the project had been permitted by Site Plan Review in 2014. At this time the applicant is coming back to remove the existing driveway and relocate the driveway and parking area at the front of the house. He presented a plan of the existing conditions, including the existing drainage and driveway. There is 2,151 square feet of impervious surface in the front yard.

There is a hillside along the east side of the property that drains into the backyard. The drainage goes into a low spot and some of it infiltrates into the ground. During a rain storm, some of the drainage goes into a drainage system in Kendrick Place. The proposed condition will mimic the existing condition in the back yard.

Mr. Wells presented the proposed plan to remove the existing driveway and to build a separate entrance off Kendrick Place. The new entrance would mean that cars would not need to exit onto Route 9, which is particularly difficult in the eastbound direction. The entrance drive is proposed to be 9.5' wide, with 15' radii at the curb line. The parking is designed as a turning area. There will be room for 2 to 3 cars to park in the front. The driveway is not meant for double parking. The parking area in front of the house gets little use, except for unloading. The homeowners mostly use the driveway at the rear of the house.

The plan calls for planting 3 trees along the slope along Route 9. The existing driveway and curb cut from Route 9 will be removed and a new asphalt curb will be installed along Route 9.

The driveway at the rear of the house, at the garage will be reduced to 24' wide with two 15' radii. The entire length of Kendrick Place has no curbing. The drainage around the garage area was approved in the first Site Plan Review.

At the front of the house there will be a gentle swale to carry water to a low point at the southwest corner of the property where rainwater will be held until it infiltrates.

A full-scale planting plan is proposed. It consists of foundation plantings and perennials. There will be a 6' high solid fence around the property. There is no detail of the fence at this time. It will probably be a white fence. The applicant can submit information on the fence at a later date when the owner returns home from overseas.

There will be room at the base of the fence to allow water to flow under it.

Mr. Wells presented a detail of the driveway pavement, with 3" of asphalt rather than 2".

The patio is Goshen stone and the walkways will be brick on the north side of the house.

Mr. Crowner presented the site visit report. He noted that there was no lawn in back of the house at this time.

Mr. Birtwistle expressed concern about a circular driveway off Kendrick Place. He stated that cars would need to be parked back to back in the driveway and that there was not enough room for one car to pass another to exit onto Kendrick Place. He suggested making the driveway one lane wide in one place and two lanes wide elsewhere to allow cars to pass one another.

Mr. Wells noted that the current plan has up to 39.9% lot coverage and that coverage can't be increased. He stated that the parking area would not receive too many cars.

Ms. Gray-Mullen stated that the parking area would be there for many years. She made suggestions about redesigning it to accommodate more cars, with a better turning radius.

Mr. Wells stated that there would be in-house coordination to make the parking area work. People could move their cars to allow others to pass through.

Mr. Roznoy agreed with concerns raised by previous speakers. He was also concerned about too many cars being able to park at residences. He noted that at the time of the site visit, no cars were parked in the rear driveway but two cars were parked in front of the house.

Mr. Parker stated that this is a two-family dwelling. There is a 3-car garage and an apartment on site. There is also a guest wing attached to the house. The owner has international guests who come to stay at the house. Parking will be needed for the owners of the property, the guests and the tenants in the apartment. There is no kitchen in the new wing. The owners park in front of the house when they are unloading things from their car.

Mr. Roznoy expressed concern that the center of the circular driveway would be driven over by people who visit the house.

There was further discussion about different ways to reconfigure the new driveway and the parking area. The Board members expressed concern over the narrowness of the driveway, at only 9.5'.

There was discussion about whether a circular driveway or a "hammerhead" turnaround would work better.

Ms. Gray-Mullen was concerned about 4 or 5 cars parking in the circle and no one being able to move their cars.

Mr. Parker pointed out that the existing parking area with the large rectangular asphalt pad was unattractive. He suggested installing a curb around the inner portion of the circular driveway to keep people from driving into the middle.

Mr. Roznoy expressed a preference for the driveway entrance off Kendrick Place rather than Route 9.

Richard and Erick Lewison of 20 Kendrick Place (residents since 1968) reported that the intersection of Kendrick Place and Route 9 has been prone to accidents, especially when there was a tall hedgerow along the front of the property at 49 Northampton Road. They noted that people sometimes park their cars on the west side of Kendrick Place, making exiting from a driveway on Kendrick Place a challenge. They talked about problems with having a driveway so close to the intersection. There are 40 to 50 cars per day that use Kendrick Place, mostly as a turnaround or to access the body shop at the end of the street.

Mr. Parker reminded the Board that the tall hedgerow has been removed. The sight lines have been improved and that the new driveway location will be less hazardous than backing out onto Route 9 from the existing driveway.

Ms. Brestrup reported that the Planning Board had received an email from the Town Engineer expressing support for the new driveway location. No comments had been received from the Fire Department.

Mr. Wells noted that the original house had two curb cuts, with a standard driveway at the north end of the site that went around to the rear of the house.

Mr. Parker stated that the old driveway at the garage was two cars wide.

Ms. Brestrup read an email from the Town Engineer, Jason Skeels, dated July 13, 2016, stating that “the plans are acceptable and improve safety over the existing curb cut off Northampton Road.”

Mr. Lewison expressed concern about potential visibility problems that might be caused by the trees proposed to be planted along Northampton Road. He suggested a very low hedge.

Mr. Wells stated that the trees will be pulled back from the intersection of Northampton Road and Kendrick Place.

There was further discussion about access to the front door of the house, whether a circular turnaround was necessary and whether cars could back out onto Kendrick Place. There was also discussion about the need for a turnaround on site.

Mr. Parker stated that during the previous Site Plan Review the Planning Board had expressed a desire for a better driveway configuration in front of the house. He spoke in favor of the circular configuration.

Mr. Crouner reviewed the Development Application Report. He noted that there was a need for a waiver from the requirement that a driveway be placed 75’ from an intersection. [Section 7.106 of the Zoning Bylaw]

Mr. Wells stated that the center of the proposed driveway would be about 60 feet from the intersection.

Mr. Carson stated that he was in favor of granting the waiver for safety reasons.

There was a question about a catalog cut for the proposed fence and the Board made this a condition of the approval.

Ms. Gray-Mullen acknowledged that it would be safer to have the curb cut off Kendrick Place rather than Northampton Road, and the circle is more elegant than the existing parking lot, but that the design needs to be examined further. In addition, the driveway is too narrow, at 9.5’.

Mr. Parker noted that the homeowners would like to configure the driveway to accommodate parking for a holiday party, but they don’t want a lot of paving. They would like to design it for 90% of the time, when it is used by the two people who live in the house, plus their teenage sons. 90% of the time there are only two people moving cars in the driveway. They still have parking in the garage and in the driveway at the rear of the site.

Mr. Roznoy stated that the driveway would also need to accommodate people using the guest house.

There was further discussion about how many cars can be parked on the site.

Ms. Gray-Mullen expressed concern about future owners and how they would use the site. The circle appears to be able to handle up to 8 cars parked end to end. It could become like a parking lot.

Mr. Crouner noted that people attending a party could park on the street.

The Board discussed soil erosion control. Presently soil erosion has been controlled by hay bales, silt fences and silt sacks in the catch basins.

Mr. Crouner suggested that a condition be imposed requiring the applicant to talk to the Town Engineer about erosion control.

There was discussion about whether a retaining wall would be needed at the front of the site. The slope from Northampton Road to the circular turnaround has been redesigned and no retaining wall will be needed.

Mr. Wells stated that he had talked to the Town Engineer, Jason Skeels, about drainage. Mr. Skeels had stated that drainage was not a problem. The existing and proposed runoff was essentially the same.

Mr. Roznoy suggested that a condition be imposed requiring the applicant to talk to the Town Engineer about drainage. He noted that drainage comes from an adjacent site and washes across this site.

There was discussion about having the Town Engineer review the revised plans.

Mr. Parker noted that the house to the east had recently been sold. The new homeowners are collaborating with the Tan's on plantings and erosion control.

The Board agreed that the Town Engineer's report could come back to Planning Department staff.

The Board asked to see a catalog cut on the proposed fence.

The Board asked about snow storage and how a snow plow would move around the circular driveway. Mr. Wells explained how snow would be plowed and where it would be stored.

The Board began to make findings 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; the Board agreed to waive the requirement for the 75' distance from the driveway to the intersection and the width of the driveway from 10' to 9.5';
- 11.2401 – Town amenities and abutting properties will be protected through minimizing detrimental or offensive actions;

Ms. Gray-Mullen again objected to the proposed 9.5' width of the driveway. Mr. Wells explained that the driveway would have an excellent pavement design with 3" of asphalt and 12" of gravel base. The gravel base could be extended 12" to 18" on each side. An average car width is only 6.5' to 7'.

Mr. Roznoy noted that there were still a lot of questions about the driveway width and the circular design. He recommended that the applicant return with a wider driveway and a redesigned parking and turnaround area, but still have the curb cut coming off Kendrick Place.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to continue the public hearing to July 13, 2016, to address the width of the driveway and the parking of cars. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded.

Mr. Birtwistle recommended dropping the eastern half of the circle (eliminating about 40% of the circle) allowing the driveway to be widened.

The vote was 3-1-1 (Crownor opposed; Carson abstained) to continue the public hearing to July 13th.

The Board agreed to finish review of the Site Plan Review criteria on July 13th.

Mr. Stutsman returned the meeting and resumed the role of Acting Chair.

SPR2016-00024 – Town of Amherst – 1200 North Pleasant Street (North Amherst School)

Request Site Plan Review approval for improvements to North Amherst Field, including fence repair, installation of TRG parking lot and picnic area, wooden fence around parking area, 6' tall decorative metal fence along road, requesting waiver under Section 6.29 of Zoning Bylaw for fence height of 6' within front yard setback (Map 5A/22, B-VC zoning district)

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

Ms. Brestrup presented the application on behalf of the Town of Amherst, in the absence of Dave Ziomek, Director of Conservation and Development, and Nate Malloy, Senior Planner, who prepared the site plan.

The town would like to create a more welcoming place at the North Amherst School field. It is a popular area for pick-up games for Lacrosse and for Cricket. The plan includes the creation of a parking area towards the northern edge of the field. The parking area would use the existing asphalt apron that comes down from Sunderland Road. The parking area would be trap rock gravel and stone dust. At the far western end of the parking lot there would be a handicapped parking space with an access aisle. The handicapped spot is not required by the state handicapped regulations, but is required by the Amherst Zoning Bylaw. For parking areas of over 10 spaces, 1 handicapped space is required. In this case the handicapped parking space would not be completely handicapped accessible because of the surface not being paved with asphalt. To the west of the parking lot a small, 10' x 15' picnic area would be installed with a picnic table. This would be directly accessible from the parking lot. Along the west and south sides of the parking lot there would be a low wooden fence, similar to the fence at Plum Brook Recreation Area on Potwine Lane. There will also be a 6' high, decorative metal fence that will run along the entire Sunderland Road edge. This fence would require a waiver from the height requirement for fences. Fences within the front setback of a property may not exceed 4' in height without permission from the Board. In addition, the existing backstop would be removed. The field will be levelled out and loamed and seeded. A trash can and a bike rack are also proposed.

Mr. Stutsman reviewed the Site Visit Report and read the questions that had been asked at the site visit and the answers that had been given.

1. Will lighting be installed as part of this project? No lighting is proposed at this time. There is a street light across the road from the driveway entrance which may help to light this area.
2. Will the site be secure or will it become an attractive area for people to congregate at night, away from surveillance? A suggestion was made to install a solar-operated light to make surveillance easier.
3. Will there be any signage as part of this project? No signage is being proposed at this time.
4. Will there be a Porta-potty? There is no plan to install a Porta-potty at this time.

Mr. Carson asked about access to the field if the intersection of Sunderland Road and Montague Road is redesigned. Ms. Brestrup explained that there will still be a need for a driveway to access the ballfield.

Mr. Birtwistle noted that the sight distance is difficult when exiting the driveway onto Sunderland Road at the north end of the field. He stated that removal of vegetation at the driveway would solve this problem if that is allowed by the Conservation Commission.

Waivers

- Traffic Impact Statement
- Landscape Plan
- Soil Erosion Plan

- Construction Logistics Plan
- Pollution & Hazardous Materials Plan
- Height of fence of 6' within the front setback
- Handicapped parking space pave with trap rock gravel and not with asphalt

Conditions

1. The applicant shall selectively prune vegetation at the north end of the field at the end of the driveway to improve sight distance on Sunderland Road if the Conservation Commission will permit such pruning.
2. The applicant shall install a solar light at the picnic area at the end of the parking lot.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to close the public hearing and to approve the application with waivers and conditions as discussed, including a waiver of the requirement for a paved surface for the handicapped parking space, and a waiver for the height of the fence within the front setback and to find that the application meets all relevant criteria of Section 11.24 of the Zoning Bylaw. Mr. Birtwistle seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

IV. ZONING

- A. Zoning Subcommittee Report (*continued*) – Mr. Crouner resumed presentation of the ZSC report. The ZSC membership is down to two members. The Planning Board may wish to begin working on an update of the Master Plan which was approved by the Board in February of 2010. The Master Plan was developed under state law [M.G.L. Chapter 41, Section 81D].

Mr. Roznoy offered comments about the current Master Plan. It exists under state statute. It is not a master plan of development but rather it is an expression of what the town believed in 2010 about everything. It would be in the best interest of the town to have the Planning Board prepare the Master Plan update and not assign that responsibility to other board and committees. The Planning Board should accept this responsibility. He recommended holding a public hearing to receive input and begin to work on an update of the Master Plan. An update of the Master Plan should be done every 10 years.

Mr. Roznoy stated that the Zoning Subcommittee should not continue as the “Zoning” Subcommittee, because as that title implies it only addresses zoning. He recommended that the Planning Board should work on more comprehensive projects, noting that work on the Form Based Code for North Amherst was an example of such a comprehensive project. The Board should proceed with a public forum or forums. A questionnaire is a good idea. If issues are identified that need to be addressed, subcommittees should be formed to address specific issues. He referred to the Transportation Task Force and the Downtown Parking Working Group as examples of subcommittees with specific tasks.

Mr. Crouner expressed support for Mr. Roznoy’s comments on the Master Plan and on zoning.

Mr. Roznoy reiterated that the town would be better served by having an issue identified first, rather than having the ZSC identify the issues.

There was further discussion about the future of the Zoning Subcommittee.

Mr. Stutsman stated that the ZSC has looked at the idea of working groups. He noted that the ZSC already has a number of articles in draft form that are worth pursuing.

The Board should make this an agenda item for an upcoming meeting. The status of the ZSC should be addressed soon.

Mr. Crowner noted that one of the issues that could be worked on by another type of subcommittee is the issue of downtown zoning and the B-L districts abutting the downtown. This could be tackled by a larger group. He recommended changing the focus of this downtown/B-L issue from “zoning” to “planning”.

Mr. Crowner and Mr. Stutsman will continue to meet for the time being as the Zoning Subcommittee. Mr. Stutsman recommended that the ZSC begin to plan for the upcoming forum(s).

- B. Public Comment Period – none

IV. TOWN MEETING

- A. Review of Annual Town Meeting Actions – no discussion
- B. Zoning Amendment Process for Upcoming Town meetings – previously discussed
- C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting

Signing of Attorney General Forms – The Planning Board signed forms for the Town Clerk in support of documentation that must be submitted to the Attorney General on zoning amendments adopted by the 2016 Annual Town Meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS

Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – Mr. Roznoy noted that recently he had been stopped in a long line of traffic by a family of chickens crossing the road on North East Street. He reminded the Board that there had been a promise of an inventory of places in town where there are chickens. He recommended that the Board of Health and the Animal Welfare Officer present a report to the Planning Board on an inventory of poultry in residential areas.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Planning Board Summer Schedule – the Planning Board is scheduled to meet as follows:

Wednesday, July 13th – continued public hearing for Elizabeth Tan

Tuesday, July 19th – public meeting for presentation by AECOM on Floodplain Mapping (joint meeting with Conservation Commission)

Wednesday, July 20th

Wednesday, August 3rd

Wednesday, August 17th

Wednesday, August 31st

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

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – none

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS

The Board declined to review the following ZBA applications:

June 9th, continued to July 21st

ZBA FY2016-00022 – GTI-Massachusetts NP Corp. – For a Special Permit to establish and operate an Off-Site Medical Marijuana Dispensary (OMMD) under Section 3.360.41 of the Zoning Bylaw. Said proposal involves the interior renovation of an existing building, with some exterior changes, and all associated site work including but not limited to construction of a new parking area, landscaping, and lighting, at 169 Meadow Street (Map 4B, Parcel 6, Light Industrial (LI) Zoning District) – June 9th and July 21st

June 30th

ZBA FY2016-00023 – Linda S. Muerle – For a Special Permit to construct a new, approximately 4,700 square foot, two story building containing four new condominium Town House units, under Section 3.322 of the Zoning Bylaw, and to convert an existing single family dwelling into two condominium units as a Converted Dwelling, under Section 3.3241, with associated site work including but not limited to grading and drainage, new driveway, parking areas, and landscaping, at 32 North Prospect Street (Map 14A, Parcel 32, General Residence (R-G) Zoning District)

ZBA FY2016-00024 – Mass Alternative Care, Inc. – For a Special Permit to establish and operate an Off-Site Medical Marijuana Dispensary (OMMD) under Section 3.360.41 of the Zoning Bylaw. Said proposal involves the interior renovation of an existing building, with some exterior changes, and associated site work including but not limited to re-stripping of parking spaces, construction new fencing, and parking lot lighting at 55 University Drive (Map 13B, Parcel 21, Limited Business (B-L) and Research and Development (R & D) overlay district)

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS

SPR2016-00025 – Jane Wald for Emily Dickinson Museum – 280 Main Street

Request Site Plan Review approval to reconstruct historic architectural feature, a conservatory originally constructed in 1855 and removed circa 1916 (Map 14B/27, R-G zoning district)

SPR2016-00026 and SPP2016-00002 – Archipelago Investments – One East Pleasant Street

Joint public hearing to request Site Plan Review approval for modifications to currently permitted project (mixed-use building) to reconfigure the floor plans for floors 2 through 5 to increase number of dwelling units from 84 units (with 184 tenants) to 135 units (with 143 tenants), to reconfigure the ground floor plan, to revise the site plan and to revise the elevations and to request a Special Permit to modify side & rear yard setbacks and height requirements (Map 11C/278, B-G zoning district)

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Carson – Mr. Carson reported the he and Ms. Brestrup and Ms. Kruger had attended the annual PVPC dinner last week. The subject was Innovation Districts. The meeting was held in an old mill building that is being repurposed for different uses. The speaker was from the Brookings Institution. An interesting discussion followed. Mr. Carson will be leaving the Planning Board and his position on the PVPC will need to be filled.

Mr. Stutsman reported that an example of innovation is the reuse of the former First National Bank building to house an office sharing use – Amherst Works – a co-working space.

Community Preservation Act Committee – Pari Riahi

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber

Transportation Task Force – Christine Gray-Mullen, Rob Crowner & Richard Roznoy – Ms. Gray-Mullen reported that the Town Manager is preparing a charge for a Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) that will be presented to the Select Board for its consideration.

Design Review Board – Michael Birtwistle reported that he has recently been sworn in as a member of the DRB but has not yet attended a meeting.

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman reported that the HSC would be meeting again next month to discuss some of the issues related to homelessness. They are trying to bring together stakeholders to discuss issues around homelessness.

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Bruce Carson and Greg Stutsman – report previously given UTAC (University and Town of Amherst Collaborative) – Greg Stutsman and Christine Gray-Mullen

Mr. Stutsman reported that the Housing Subcommittee hoped to meet soon with a consultant from the UMass system regarding public private partnerships. There will be a hiatus over the summer but a focus of their upcoming work is likely to be housing for faculty and staff associated with the university. They are looking at models from other universities around the country.

Ms. Gray-Mullen reported that the Economic Development Subcommittee has five working groups associated with it. The Subcommittee would be having a hiatus over the summer, but the group that she is on (Entrepreneurship and Start-ups) plans to meet soon to continue work.

Downtown Parking Working Group – Christine Gray-Mullen and Richard Roznoy – Mr. Roznoy reported that the DPWG has been formed and Sandra Anderson is the Chair and Christine Gray-Mullen is the Vice-chair. Next week the consultants, Nelson\Nygaard, (who worked on the Transportation Plan) will present an inventory of parking in the downtown area. The DPWG will be starting a series of regular meetings.

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – Mr. Stutsman reported that Mr. Carson’s last meeting would be July 13th. He thanked Mr. Carson and stated that the Board appreciated his service and that Board members would be sad to see Mr. Carson leave the Board.

XII. REPORT OF STAFF – Ms. Brestrup reported that she would miss Mr. Carson very much. He has been a thoughtful and careful member of the Planning Board.

There was a round of applause for Mr. Carson.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Approved:

Christine M. Brestrup
Planning Director

Greg Stutsman, Acting Chair

DATE: _____