

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, June 21, 2017, 7:00 PM
Town Room, Town Hall
Minutes

PRESENT: Greg Stutsman, Acting Chair, Robert Crowner, Michael Birtwistle, Jack Jemsek, Christine Gray-Mullen, Richard Roznoy and Maria Chao

ABSENT: Pari Riahi and Steven Schreiber

STAFF: Christine Brestrup, Planning Director
Steven McCarthy, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Stutsman opened the meeting at 7:02 PM.

I. MINUTES – April 19, 2017 & May 3, 2017

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED that the Board approve the minutes of April 19, 2017. Mr. Crowner seconded. The vote was 4-0-2 (Ms. Gray-Mullen and Ms. Chao abstained).

The Minutes of May 3, 2017 were not ready for review.

II. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING WITH TREE WARDEN – SCENIC ROADS

Scenic Road tree removal – 95 East Pleasant Street

Public Shade Trees impacted by this project include the following trees (Sizes indicate “diameter at breast height” – DBH):

13 Arborvitae

For construction of a bus pull off which is being moved to align the road for the roundabout project at the intersection with Triangle Street

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

Mr. Snow gave the presentation. There are 13 relatively mature and healthy Arborvitae that must be taken down so the bus stop can be moved and the curb can be pushed further north, as part of the construction of the roundabout at the intersection of Triangle Street and East Pleasant Street.

Mr. Crowner reported on the site visit. He noted that the right of way is very wide there, and there are some arborvitae to the south that will remain, as well as a Silver Maple.

Ms. Brestrup noted that plans of the expanded bus stop are available for the Planning Board’s viewing.

Mr. Snow reported that the Public Shade Tree Committee (PSTC) had held a site visit and a meeting and had voted to recommend retaining the trees if possible.

Henry Lappen, Chair of the PSTC, said that it is frustrating that many trees are being lost to the rotary project. He asked if there is any way that the center island or the street could be narrowed and stated that the trees should be retained. These trees mark the transition from the urban downtown to a more rural scenic road, he said.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if there was any way to relocate the proposed sidewalk and narrow the roadway to preserve the trees.

Guilford Mooring, Superintendent of Public Works, said it was not easy to move the road. On the other side of the road, there are many underground utilities that restrict the road’s placement. Also, re-aligning the road before the roundabout could reduce traffic safety. The current design is set up to deflect and direct traffic. The bus stop is not big enough for a double bus. It needs to be placed to

the north of Triangle Street, as the bus stop services buses that come from campus and turn left on East Pleasant St. The DPW plans to replace the Arborvitaes that are removed. Arborvitaes are fast growers and within ten years trees of equivalent size could be in existence there.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted there was not much space there, and the trees might have to be placed on private property. Mr. Snow said that there was probably enough room in the public right of way for a row of trees.

Mr. Stutsman asked if there would be an equivalent number of trees planted. Mr. Snow said there would likely be fewer, so as not to crowd the Silver Maple.

Ms. Gray-Mullen noted that the Silver Maple was stressed, and asked if it would be healthy for the new trees to go in. Mr. Snow said it would be fine.

Mr. Snow recommended removal and replacement of the trees.

Mr. Crowner MOVED that the Planning Board agree with the recommendation of the Tree Warden. Mr. Birtwistle seconded and the vote was 6-0-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS – SITE PLAN REVIEW

SPR2017-00015 – Mindi Sahner – 16-18 & 20 Dickinson Street

Public hearing to request Site Plan Review approval for a mixed-use building, to amend the use of the ground floor to allow residential use, in addition to the current office use permit ZBA 91-06 & ZBA 93-56, under Section 3.325 of the Zoning Bylaw (Map 14B, Parcel 57, B-VC zoning district)

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

Mindi Sahner, property owner, presented the application. The building, White Barn Studios, opened in 1993 when Dickinson Street was in the Commercial zoning district. The building was mixed use, commercial on the first floor and residential on the second floor. She had amended the permit to let the ground floor be used as a small office space.

Mr. Roznoy arrived (7:20 PM).

The second floor became a dance studio, and the small office on the ground floor was used by the tenant. The tenant got divorced and moved into the ground floor office in 1994. Since then, 98% of the time it has been used as an apartment, not a small office. Ms. Sahner would like to maintain this use despite its currently inadequate permitting.

Ms. Gray-Mullen reported that three Planning Board members had been at the site visit. They walked around the perimeter of the property, the driveway, and went into the dance studio. They viewed the outside of the apartment since the tenants were there and they did not want to go in and disturb the tenants. The building and landscaping are well maintained.

Mr. Crowner noted that there is no frontage on the street for the apartment; it is accessed by a stone staircase and an internal staircase in the barn. Someone walking by would not see the apartment.

The Board discuss the issue of parking.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the building commissioner had had any feedback. Ms. Brestrup said his comment was that this property used to be governed by a ZBA Special Permit due to its being a mixed use building in the COM zone. Since then, zoning and the criteria for a mixed use building have changed. A mixed-use building now requires Site Plan Review in the Commercial zoning district. The Building Commissioner thought this was the best way to have the use approved. He had no comments about exterior changes; an inspector has been working with Ms. Sahner to make sure the building is up to Building Code. One condition of a previous permit included a clause for use of the first floor as an office space; that could be changed by the Board. It is alright if Ms. Sahner was allowed to change between the office and residence use, although it would have to be an office that is not open to the public since it is not handicapped accessible.

Mr. Stutsman noted that in the Development Application Report there was a suggestion to modify the parking requirements to allow the current parking plan to prevail. Ms. Brestrup said the parking is working as is, and Ms. Sahner reported during the site visit that each apartment has only one car; many dance studio patrons walk, and there is street parking available in the area.

Mr. Stutsman said that two possible conditions had to do with parking and the flexible use.

Ms. Sahner noted the existence of Bill Gillen's neighboring parking lot, she had been required in 1993 to rent spaces from him; they were never used, so she eventually stopped renting them.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked if the apartment was up to Code. Ms. Sahner said that Code requirements have been met. Mr. Cody, a Building Inspector, has inspected the apartment.

Mr. Crowner said he would prefer that the permit include office use. He said he would not impose any parking requirements.

Mr. Crowner MOVED to close the public hearing, that all relevant Site Plan Review criteria have been met, that the waivers requested are granted, including parking, and that if the ground floor unit is used as an office it shall not be open to the public, and it may be used for residential use. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 7-0-0.

SPR-C2017-00014 – Paul Cole – 1194 West Street – Apple Brook Cluster Subdivision

Public hearing to request Site Plan Review approval for an 8 lot Cluster Subdivision, under Section 4.3 of the Zoning Bylaw, with 8 single family homes, with slight modifications from previously approved Cluster Subdivision SPR-C2007-00009 (Map 25B, Parcel 29, R-O & R-LD zoning district)

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

Tom Reidy, of Bacon-Wilson, and Carlos Nieto-Mattei of the Berkshire Design Group presented the application on behalf of Apple Brook West. Paul Cole, property owner, and David Berson, of Bacon-Wilson, were also present. This development has been under consideration since 2007. A Preliminary Subdivision Plan was proposed in 2007; it was approved in April 2007. A Definitive Subdivision Plan was approved in June 2007. It originally proposed 8 lots with 11 units. The Site Plan Review for Cluster was approved in June 2007. The Conservation Commission approved a Request for Determination of the wetland resource areas in 2006 and determined that the streams on the property were intermittent. The Conservation Commission also issued an Order of Conditions for the project. All of the approvals were appealed. Mr. Reidy gave a detailed explanation of the approvals and appeal sequence.

After 2008, the project lay dormant due to the appeals. The appeals were resolved in 2011.

By now the Conservation Commission's decisions have expired. However, the Definitive Subdivision Plan approval is still good – it doesn't expire. However, the approval of the Site Plan Review for Cluster from 2007 has expired.

Today the applicant seeks approval again for the Site Plan Review for Cluster.

Mr. Crowner asked where the applicant stood with Conservation Commission process. Mr. Reidy explained that they are midway through the review process.

Mr. Nieto presented the revised Site Plan. He was the original landscape architect who worked on the development. Since 2007, there have been revisions to the plan.

The site in total is about 11 or 12 acres. The site slopes down from Route 116, where there is a curb cut.

There are currently two barns on the site, which are proposed to be removed. Some trees in the vicinity will be removed and some will remain. The site is surrounded by streams on two sides; on the north, the slope keeps the wetlands close to the stream. There is a large hay field in the middle of the site, with a tree line to the south. The house near Route 116 will be retained.

The proposed driveway is offset from the existing curb cut by 10 or 15 feet. The existing building will be Lot 1 of the subdivision. Lot 2 will be behind it; to the right of the driveway. Further up will be a side drive with two lots. There are then two open space areas, connecting to a large open area to the south. Further back, there will be four single family residences; they will have driveways to garages, including a hammerhead turnaround for emergency vehicles.

The main paved drive will be 16 feet wide, with Cape Cod berms; there will be 20 feet of reinforced area along the drive, due to 2 foot reinforced shoulders on either side.

Drainage structures, including planted depressions, will be present along the main drive. The southern drive spur will have a planted swale to the east. A final drainage area will be a rain garden and vegetated swale to the east.

There will be a row of evergreens to screen the nearest abutter to the south of Lot 1.

There is a proposed revision to the plan that shows the deletion of a building from Lot 7 so that it may be sold to the Town for use as a parking area and trailhead. Lot 8 will then be converted to a duplex so that the applicant does not lose a unit. This duplex was part of the original plan. The applicant would no longer propose a vegetated screen to the east of the nearest abutter; instead they would propose a 6 foot stockade fence. The open space to the south would be donated to the Town and the trail would connect to existing Holyoke Range trails to the east. The town would purchase Lot 7.

The site is bisected by zoning districts – to the east, it is R-LD, to the west it is R-O. The project meets all zoning requirements. As a result of the approval of the Definitive Subdivision Plan in 2007 the zoning in place in 2007 is frozen on the site until 2019.

Paul Cole said that ten years ago, there were a total of 11 units with two more duplexes to the back. The applicant is pleased that last week they finally reached an agreement with the Conservation Department regarding the open space.

Mr. Nieto said that there has been a reduction in lot coverage since the original 2007 plan, as well as fewer units and less paved area.

Mr. Stutsman reviewed the written Site Visit Report. Ms. Brestrup noted that the Board had seen the steepness of the existing and proposed driveways. This existing driveway will serve as the driveways to Lots 1 and 2, and it is on top of the existing driveway which is over 10% grade.

Mr. Roznoy asked what land exactly would be given to the Town. Mr. Nieto showed on the plan what would be given, and noted the open space to the North of the roadway would likely be retained by the Apple Brook Homeowners' Association as it contains the drainage infrastructure that the Town would not have an interest in owning and maintaining.

Mr. Birtwistle asked about the drainage infrastructure to the east. Mr. Nieto said that would be part of Lot 4, with an easement.

Ms. Chao asked about the determination between perennial and intermittent streams. Mr. Reidy said that under local bylaw, the streams are determined to be perennial – the Conservation Commission is in the process of evaluating whether the project meets performance standards.

Ms. Chao asked about the fence at the border with the Rod and Gun Club to the south. Mr. Nieto-Mattei stated that there is a fence along the southern property line but no fence along the eastern property line.

Mr. Reidy stated that the town will purchase Lot 7 for \$75,000 which is below the market rate for a lot. The Purchase and Sale Agreement is being prepared. The town will receive an easement over the private roadway for access to Lot 7. The driveway to Lot 7 and the parking lot will be gravel. The Town will not be part of the Homeowners' Association.

Mr. Roznoy asked how close the trail is to firing ranges. Mr. Nieto said that there was a slope up and down in between the range and the subdivision. There is no connection between the two that could allow a shot to enter the property.

Mr. Roznoy noted there should be signs on the fence noting that the property was part of the Gun Club; he asked if there was consideration of more detailed signage, and asked how high the fence would be. Mr. Nieto said that he believes that the existing fence is 6 feet high, and he feels the signage is sufficient.

Mr. Jemsek asked about a crosswalk across Route 116 to give access to Atkins Farms.

Mr. Reidy said it would be the Town's responsibility to do so most likely, as the trailhead will be owned by the town, and the town is getting a "good deal" on the property; also, no other developments off West Street in the area have crosswalks.

Mr. Jemsek asked about signage for the trailhead; Mr. Cole said he believed the Conservation Department was planning to install signage.

Mr. Birtwistle asked about the architecture of the units, and whether they would be designed as a block or individually.

Mr. Cole said the design is that of a contemporary cape, with houses between ranging from 1800 to 2400 square feet, with the master bedroom on the first floor for accessibility. Some units will have shingles, some will have other types of siding; some will have a porch and some won't for variety's sake. Two car garages are proposed for most units. The units will be designed for solar access. The applicant will be doing the design, but some homeowners may make modifications.

Mr. Birtwistle asked if all units would be built at the same time; Mr. Cole said they would be done sequentially, and hopefully Lots 2 and 8 could be done this fall; the four in the back next spring.

Ms. Chao asked why the house on Lot 2 is so small and different from the others. Mr. Nieto said that the homes will be of different sizes and that the current plan does not show the final footprints. Mr. Birtwistle asked that the applicant return with a plan showing the real proposed footprints. He would also like to know the number of bedrooms per unit and how the units are laid out.

Ron Jacques of 1260 West Street, an abutter, said he thinks the conservation lot (Lot 7) should be closed from dusk to dawn, and should have no more than 6 parking spaces. He suggested that the town should build a crosswalk there. Other than that he thinks the plan is a big improvement from the older plan, and he likes it.

Mr. Stutsman asked if the Board could condition that the trailhead and parking lot be open only from dawn to dusk. Ms. Brestrup said other conservation areas are managed in that manner.

Ms. Freda Peters of 1240 West Street asked if the fence and trees abutting her property would be contractually obligated to be created. Mr. Stutsman assured her that they would. She asked if the units would be owner occupied or could be converted to student housing.

Mr. Reidy said the intention is for them to be owner occupied, but once they are sold the occupancy of the units is up to the owner. Amherst has a rental registration system that Inspections Services is doing a good job monitoring. The duplex would require a Zoning Board of Appeals Special Permit to be converted to a non-owner occupied duplex, if they were owned by the same person and they wished to convert.

Ms. Gray-Mullen asked how many bedrooms would be in the duplex units. Mr. Cole said that the larger homes would have 3 bedrooms and 2.5 baths; the duplex is likely to have 2 bedrooms in each unit but he is not sure.

Mr. Reidy said they would appreciate an approval this evening, even if it is contingent on Town Engineer's review.

Mr. Stutsman said that he is concerned about the lack of input from Town Engineer and Fire Dept at this point. Ms. Brestrup recommended that the Board wait for review by the Conservation Commission and the Town Engineer.

The Board discussed the waivers that had been requested.

Mr. Birtwistle noted that the new roadway will be long and it would be good to have some lights. The Definitive Subdivision Plan decision contains a condition that there be a streetlight installed at the intersection of the new roadway with West Street.

Mr. Nieto-Mattei stated that the new roadway is 500 to 600 feet long, and it will have a sidewalk on one side. He contended that a light would be needed if there were no sidewalk.

Ms. Gray-Mullen suggested that given the purchase of Lot 7 by the Town, a streetlight be installed at the intersection of the driveway to Lot 7 and the main roadway. Mr. Nieto said he would discuss this with the applicant.

The Board discussed the waiver requests as follows:

- Lighting Plan – no street lights are proposed for the subdivision
- Sign Plan – no entrance signs are proposed for the subdivision
- Traffic Impact Statement – The traffic generated by this development is minimal. The development will not significantly affect the level of service of West Street.
- Yield Plan (formerly called “Sketch Plan”) – The number of lots are determined from the Town’s Cluster Subdivision density formula; the applicant did not submit a Sketch Plan with the previous application.
- A modification of the requirement in Section 7.715 for driveway steepness over 10% (requested in email from The Berkshire Design Group, dated June 16, 2017)

Mr. Stutsman asked if anyone had concerns about the steepness of the driveway as noted in the waiver request. Mr. Crowner said he had no concerns – it is a short distance.

The Board agreed that there is no need for a Yield Plan. The Board discussed the side setback on Lot 8. Mr. Reidy contended that the proposed setback would be allowed because the project is still controlled by the Zoning Bylaw of 2007.

Mr. Stutsman said that the open space is in negotiations, and there will be a condition on this transfer.

The Board discussed possible conditions.

Mr. Reidy listed items that needed to be addressed at the next session of the public hearing:

1. Building footprints;
2. Streetlight at the intersection of the new roadway and the driveway to Lot 8 (trailhead);
3. Side setback for Lot 7;
4. Radii at the entry drive;
5. Height of the fence at the Rod and Gun Club.

Mr. Birtwistle MOVED to continue the public hearing to July 19, 2017. Ms. Gray-Mullen seconded and the vote was 7-0-0.

IV. PLANNING & ZONING

A. ZSC Report

Mr. Crowner presented the ZSC report. He explained that the ZSC was working on another amendment to Table 3, involving Footnotes “j” and “k”, removing them from the list of footnotes and putting them into the text of Section 6 of the Zoning Bylaw. This amendment will be ready for fall.

The ZSC is also looking at amending Footnotes “a” and “b”. It was noted Footnote “b” could be deleted, and its language moved to Section 6 of the Bylaw. However the language should be revised since it is unclear. This amendment may benefit from waiting until after the Downtown Forums as it affects the B-L zoning district. Footnote “a” should not be removed as it is integral to the Bylaw, but it could be limited in scope. The amendment could limit the ability of permitting boards to modify dimensional requirements; or the amendment could limit the size of the neighborhood that can be used for comparison. Either or both could be done,

but it could have a big impact on town center planning so it may need to wait. The ZSC also looked at modifying the PRP zone on Route 9, to make it more in keeping with the project currently proposed at the Amherst Motel site.

The ZSC is anticipating having something ready for recreational marijuana by Fall Town Meeting, but that is tabled for now, awaiting state legislation. Recreational Marijuana could be made into a new use category or a temporary moratorium could be enacted.

Mr. Crowner is ready to move Footnote “b”, acknowledging that the language could be simpler. Regarding Footnote “a”, he proposed modifying Footnote “a”; he proposed 20% as a limit on modification. A further modification could be done by a variance.

Mr. Stutsman said he is concerned about opening the conversation on those footnotes, as they are closely related to the downtown planning process already in motion. He would rather complete the forum process and address the issues raised by the forums. He agreed with Mr. Crowner’s proposed changes to Footnote “b”.

- B.** Planning for Community Forum – Downtown/Town Center – Planning for the forums includes a steering committee made up of the members of the Zoning Subcommittee, plus two Select Board members, plus the Economic Development Director and the Town Manager.
- C.** Public Comment Period – none
- D.** Other – none

V. OLD BUSINESS

- A.** ZBA2017-00024 – Todd Gaines/Breck Group – Aspen Heights – 408 Northampton Road – Discussion and recommendations to the ZBA

The ZBA is opening its hearing on July 19th. The ZBA is planning to have 3 or 4 sessions of public hearing, so there is no rush for comment.

Mr. Crowner said he preferred to discuss the issue tonight. Mr. Jemsek recused himself.

Mr. Crowner said he took issue with the project in the abstract. While he supports it and thinks it’s an appropriate use for the site, the applicants must contradict the existing zoning and find a loophole to allow the use that is requested – an apartment building of more than 24 units in the PRP zoning district. For that reason the proposal is hard to recommend as complying with zoning. However the Planning Board should find a way to make the project possible, as it is a good use for that site.

At the ZSC meeting tonight they discussed ways to make it possible. There are two related approaches – one is to create a new use category of Class II apartments, which could allow more than 24 units. The second is they would have to allow that use (Class II apartments) in this zone (PRP), or add an overlay zone that allows the Permit Granting Authority the ability to waive and modify the zoning requirements to allow for such use. They were not able to reach consensus on the approach today. There are two pieces of the PRP zone in the vicinity – three or four lots to the west owned by Greenleaves Apartments and the Amherst Motel, and some lots to the east with no frontage and/or owned by Amherst College. Mr. Crowner proposed rezoning the west portion of the PRP zone, as well as Hawkins Meadow, either with an overlay or a new zoning district.

Ms. Brestrup asked about the time frame, and asked whether Mr. Crowner was proposing that this rezoning happen before the ZBA considers the case.

Mr. Crowner said he wants the Planning Board to consider starting now, independent of the ZBA process, and not get involved in the ZBA process, or the Planning Board could limit its review to site plans, and not review the use.

Mr. Crowner said he doesn't want to make a recommendation allowing this use in this zone, but could make recommendations about the Site Plan and state that Planning Board is pursuing rezoning.

Mr. Roznoy liked the suggestion to pursue rezoning and keep it separate from a recommendation on the proposed development. He suggested that the Board say that it liked the use and make recommendations about the site plan.

Mr. Stutsman referred to an email dated June 16, 2017, from Mr. Schreiber which was forwarded to Board members and made available at the public meeting. He agreed with everything that Mr. Schreiber said in his email.

To the rezoning idea, it reminds him of an apartment overlay zone, looked at by the ZSC in years past. It could be applied here and on other nonconforming apartment complexes around town, giving them more flexibility for minor alterations.

Mr. Birtwistle agreed that zoning was the issue, and that if there is a Zoning Bylaw it should be adhered to. This project violates the Zoning Bylaw in two deeply significant ways – a modification of the 1968 permit is absurd on its face, as demolishing a small one story building and replacing it with a four story much larger building is really a re-use, not a modification. However this is a reasonable use for the site, and the Zoning Bylaw should reflect that. He wondered if the simplest remedy was to allow for larger apartment developments in the Zoning Bylaw, and rezone the site to allow for that use. He suggested staying out of the ZBA's process, but to move ahead swiftly on the zoning issue for that area and areas like it, and define more appropriately what the Board would like the definition of apartment to be.

- B. Signing of Decisions – none
- C. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Planning Board Summer Schedule – The July 5th Planning Board meeting is cancelled.
- B. Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting – none

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS

The Board endorsed ANR2017-00013 – Rolling Hill Properties – 214 Pomeroy Lane

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS

Mr. McCarthy listed upcoming ZBA applications which the Planning Board declined to review:

15 Cranberry Lane, 334 Lincoln Avenue, Amethyst Farm

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS

Ms. Brestrup listed upcoming Planning Board applications:

Sandri Belchertown Sunoco, Amherst College Plimpton House and Marsh House

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Jack Jemsek and Christine Gray-Mullen

Community Preservation Act Committee – Pari Riahi – no report

Agricultural Commission – Stephen Schreiber – no report

Design Review Board – Michael Birtwistle

Mr. Roznoy MOVED to nominate Mr. Birtwistle as the Planning Board's representative on the DRB. Mr. Crowner seconded and the vote was 6-0-1 (Birtwistle abstained).

Housing and Sheltering Committee – Greg Stutsman

Zoning Subcommittee – Rob Crowner, Greg Stutsman and Maria Chao

UTAC (University and Town of Amherst Collaborative) – Greg Stutsman and Christine Gray-Mullen

Downtown Parking Working Group – Richard Roznoy reported that the DPWG has scheduled a forum for June 22, Thursday, at 5:00 in the Woodbury Room of the Jones Library. They will present recommendations that the group is making to Select Board, in draft form. The recommendations are available on the Town website and will be presented at this forum. The DPWG would like to hear input from the public. The recommendations include modifying the price of parking, standardizing hours of parking, and changes to the annual permit fee.

Transportation Advisory Committee – Richard Roznoy reported that the TAC is looking at things on a macro level to standardize forms of transportation and looking at the micro level when citizens bring issues. The West Street crosswalk will likely come up. This could be a great way to set a precedent for how the Planning Board and TAC could work together. The Planning Board could recommend a crosswalk for projects and impose a condition that requires applicant to meet with the TAC for consultation. That way Planning Board doesn't have to worry about details of crosswalks. He noted that Ms. Gray-Mullen is taking charge of the Complete Streets program.

Mr. Crowner stated that the Applicant for the West Street potential crosswalk suggested that if foot traffic is predominantly going east to west, from subdivision to sidewalk, then it might be appropriate for the developer to install crosswalk, but if vice versa, it might be the town's responsibility.

There was discussion about how to determine whose responsibility such a crosswalk might be and where to locate it.

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – none

XII. REPORT OF STAFF – Ms. Brestrup noted that the Board may wish to hold elections and vote on assignments for committees at the July 19th meeting. Traditionally elections and assignments are made in July after appointments and reappointments to the Board occur in June.

She reported that she had participated in "Cuppa Joe with Paul" at the North Amherst Bread and Butter Restaurant. It was very interesting; they had people from all spectrums of the local political arena make comments. Former Town Moderator Francesca Maltese came to talk about sidewalks. She wanted to bring the idea of a sidewalk on Shays Street to the TAC, but wanted the Planning Director and Town Manager to know about it first and she wanted to explain why it was needed.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 9:32 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Approved:

Steven McCarthy
Administrative Assistant

Greg Stutsman, Acting Chair

DATE: _____