



Memorandum

To: Town Council Members
From: Mandi Jo Hanneke, Chair, Community Resources Committee (CRC)
Date: September 29, 2021
Re: Report by the Chair of CRC to the Town Council – Revisions to Zoning Bylaw – ADU and Apartments Use Table

Summary:

This report focuses on the Planning Department’s proposed revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 5, Accessory Uses, Section 5.011, Supplemental Dwelling Units and Zoning Bylaw – Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments.

In short, CRC voted as follows:

- On August 17, 2021, **unanimously with one abstention (Councilor Pam) to recommend the Town Council adopt the revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 5, Accessory Uses, Section 5.011, Supplemental Dwelling Units.**
- On September 14, 2021, **CRC voted unanimously to recommend the Town Council adopt the revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments and Article 12, Definitions,** as revised at the September 14, 2021 meeting.

Discussion:

Proposed Revisions to Article 5, Accessory Uses, Section 5.011, Supplemental Dwelling Units

On July 21, 2021, the Planning Board and Community Resources Committee held a joint public hearing on the Planning Department’s proposed revisions to Article 5, Accessory Uses, Section 5.011, Supplemental Dwelling Units. This proposal came to the Council and was then referred for a public hearing.

The proposal is a proposal to rescind the current Supplemental Dwelling Unit bylaw and replace it with the attached bylaw.

The joint public hearing lasted approximately 45 minutes, and was the third in a series of four joint public hearings held that night. The Planning Department made the presentation.

After the presentation, members of CRC and the Planning Board were able to ask questions, which were then responded to by members of the Planning staff.

The questions from members of both committees concerned the section on “adequate parking” and its interplay with the proposed parking regulation changes, as well as the means of evaluating adequacy; the requirement that those who have smaller houses who want to build an ADU larger than 50% of the square footage of their house are the ones most burdened by the proposal, since they are the only ones

required with go through the permitting process, and a proposal by Planning Board Member McGowan to add a notice requirement into the bylaw.

After the members of the two committees completed asking questions, the public was invited to ask questions. Three members of the public asked questions including whether the bylaw permits ADUs to be built accessory to apartments, duplexes, triplexes (it does not – applies only to single family homes); whether an ADU larger than 1,000 sq.ft. is allowed (no); and how much land could be covered (the dimensional regulations on maximum lot and building coverage must be adhered to). In addition, the speakers generally supported a notification requirement.

Thereafter, two residents spoke in favor of adopting the revisions. Specific reasons were not generally mentioned, although the two residents speaking in favor also favored notification to abutters.

No residents spoke in opposition to the proposal.

After closing comments, the public hearing was closed by unanimous vote of both bodies (Planning Board member Chao and Councilor Schreiber were absent)

On August 17, 2021, CRC began deliberations on the proposal. At that meeting, the Planning Department provided a revised proposal, which was the proposal discussed and voted on by CRC. The main change to the language between the hearing and August 17th was to the parking section. The Planning Department modified the language surrounding parking, to ensure there would not be a conflict between the proposal, if passed, and the current parking regulations in Article 7, if the proposed parking regulations revisions don't pass. Basically, the new language refers to the Article 7 regulations, instead of creating a separate standard within the bylaw in Article 5.

The members of CRC support the simplification of the zoning bylaw by keeping all parking regulations within Article 7 (titled "Parking and Access Regulations"), instead of delineating parking regulations for different uses within the sections that detail other regulations for those uses. However, in general, CRC has concerns that the current parking requirement in Article 7 for ADUs (SDUs in the current bylaw), which require 2 spots for every ADU, no matter the size of the ADU or the number of bedrooms in the ADU, needs modified. Since there is a current proposal to modify the parking regulations for ADUs in Article 7, CRC members agree that the proposed language surrounding parking is logical. However, if the proposal to revise Article 7 parking regulations for ADUs does not succeed, CRC will likely recommend a separate revision to Article 7 or Article 5 to correct what it believes is an unnecessary requirement for parking related to ADUs. This position illustrates well the need to view all proposals in front of the Council holistically and not silo any of them from the others.

At the August 17 CRC meeting, the Planning Department also indicated that they recommend NOT adding a notice requirement to the bylaw. Most CRC members agreed with the Planning Department recommendation, with reasons including that in a by right development, there is no hearing or public meeting to be notified of, so what would the notice accomplish from a regulatory position, there is already extensive construction a single-family homeowner can undertake without notice to neighbors, including additions, the building of outbuildings and garages, and the selling of a house, which can dramatically change the number of occupants, noise levels, general uses, and traffic patterns for that house, so lack of notice is not unprecedented in similar situations. One CRC member though notice might be a good thing, since what a homeowner does on their property can have an effect on neighboring properties.

In addition to the possible notification proposal, CRC discussed a wide range of issues, and focused on its Community Impact Review areas prior to voting a recommendation. Those areas are Historical and Cultural Assets, Economic, Transportation, Housing and Land Use, Financial, Environmental, Sustainability, and Social.

CRC identified many benefits to adopting the proposed revisions. The proposal lowers the barriers to building ADUs for nearly all ADUs, which will lower costs, streamline the process, and add predictability. Further, ADUs provide more housing, through infill, with little impact to neighborhoods, especially since there is an owner-occupancy requirement. The proposals is simpler, clearer, and more fair. It accomplishes one of the goals of the Master Plan – encouraging infill development, while not dramatically affecting the character of neighborhoods. It also provides many protections to prevent an ADU from becoming overly problematic to neighbors, including owner-occupancy of either the principal or accessory dwelling, limitations on size, limitations on the number of unrelated individuals living there, and the requirement to comply with the dimensional regulations for lot coverage and building coverage.

CRC also identified many potential impacts and concerns if the proposed revisions are adopted. These include that fact that building an outlying building in a yard likely does have some impact on the abutting neighbors, acknowledging that what is done by a homeowner on their own property does have an impact on surrounding properties.

In the end, many CRC members expressed the time is right to update our ADU bylaw and that these revisions are a good first step. CRC acknowledged that further amendments may be desired in the future, but that these needed updates should not wait. Therefore, after approximately 1 hour of total deliberation and discussion, **CRC voted unanimously with one abstention (Councilor Pam) to recommend the Town Council adopt the revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 5, Accessory Uses, Section 5.011, Supplemental Dwelling Units**, as presented at the meeting.

Proposed Revisions to Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments and Article 12, Definitions

Part I – Report on the Proposed Changes to the Permitting Requirements: R-VC from Special Permit to Site Plan Review and B-G from Site Plan Review to Special Permit

SECTION 3.3 USE CLASSIFICATION AND STANDARDS

SECTION 3.323 APARTMENTS

- N = No, the Use is not permitted in that Zoning District
- SPR = The Use is permitted with Site Plan Review (See Section 11.2)
- SP = The Use is permitted with a Special Permit, by the Zoning Board of Appeals (see Section 10.3)

Zoning Districts													
R-O R- LD	R- N	R- VC	R- G	R- F	B-G	B-L	B- VC	B-N	COM	OP	LI	PRP	FPC
N	N	SP SPR	SP	N	SPR SP	SP	SP	SP	N	N	N	N	N

Figure 1 Only Proposed Changes to Section 3.323 being brought to the Council at this time

On July 21, 2021, the Planning Board and Community Resources Committee held a joint public hearing on the Planning Department's proposed revisions to Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments and Article 12, Definitions. This proposal came to the Council and was then referred for a public hearing.

The joint public hearing lasted approximately 2 hours, and was the first in a series of four joint public hearings held that night. The Planning Department made the presentation.

After the presentation, members of CRC and the Planning Board were able to ask questions, which were then responded to by members of the Planning staff. There were no questions or concerns raised regarding the revisions proposed beyond the change from Special Permit to Site Plan Review in the R-VC, Site Plan Review to Special Permit in the B-G.

There were no resident questions specifically regarding the permitting requirement changes. Two residents spoke in opposition of the change in permitting pathway for the R-VC district.

After closing comments, a motion by the Planning Board to continue the hearing failed 3-3, with 1 absent. Thereafter, the public hearing was closed with a 4-2 vote of the Planning Board and a 3-1 vote of CRC (Councilors Bahl-Milne, Hanneke, and Ross in favor; Councilor Pam against; Councilor Schreiber absent).

On August 17, 2021, CRC began deliberations on the proposal. CRC discussed a wide range of issues, and focused on its Community Impact Review areas prior to voting a recommendation. Those areas are Historical and Cultural Assets, Economic, Transportation, Housing and Land Use, Financial, Environmental, Sustainability, and Social.

The changing of permitting requirements has the most impact on the Land Use portion of the Community Impact Review. In general, there are four possible permitting classifications for any particular use in any particular zoning district: Y (Yes), SPR (Site Plan Review), SP (Special Permit), and N (No).

When a particular use is deemed appropriate for a zoning district, it receives a Y (Yes) permitting classification and, as long as all requirements of the zoning bylaw are met in an application, the Building Inspector can immediately issue a building permit. There is no public hearing. This permitting classification is most present for the single-family home use classification in residential districts.

When a particular use is deemed appropriate for a zoning district, but the Town would like some input into the use, building design, siting, etc., it receives an SPR (Site Plan Review) permitting classification. An applicant must appear before the Planning Board to receive Site Plan Review approval, there is a public hearing, and notice is given to abutters and published in the paper regarding the public hearing. A Site Plan Review permitting classification represents an assumption (1) that the use is suitable in that particular zoning district and allowed, and (2) that the SPR will not be denied in any case, though it recognizes that the Town would like some input into how to put that use in effect. This permitting classification is prolific throughout the bylaw and is what an owner-occupied duplex is permitted under in the R-G district.

When the Town is unsure whether a particular use is appropriate for a specific zoning district, it receives an SP (Special Permit) permitting classification. An applicant must appear before the Zoning Board of Appeals to receive the Special Permit, there is a public hearing, and notice is given to abutters and published in the paper regarding the public hearing. A Special Permit permitting classification represents

an acknowledgement (1) that the use may or may not be suitable in that particular zoning district, depending on location, size, dimensions, etc., and (2) that the a close look at the application needs conducted. This permitting classification is prolific throughout the bylaw and is what a town home is permitted under in the R-VC district.

When a particular use is deemed inappropriate for a zoning district, it receives a N (No) permitting classification. The use is not allowed in that district. This permitting classification is present for a wide variety of uses in a wide variety of zoning districts (single-family home use classification in non-residential districts; certain business uses in residential districts, etc.).

The proposed changes would change apartment permitting in the Business General zoning district from Site Plan Review to Special Permit. The CRC members support this change because they believe that a the Town’s general business district should be primarily for non-residential use, especially on the ground floors (see Part II below for more detail). Therefore, moving apartments from an assumed appropriate use in the business general district to a stricter Special Permit consideration is logical. Apartments would still be allowed, if the ZBA after review and conditions, determines the use is appropriate for that particular site.

Similarly, the proposed change would revise the permitting classification in the Residential Village Center district to Site Plan Review – an assumption that apartments are suitable for that district. The purpose of the R-VC district is defined as “provid[ing] for residential neighborhoods, within and adjacent to village centers, that are of medium densities and that allow a limited mix of residential and office uses. The R-VC is, in general, intended to provide for a transition between the Business Village Center District and surrounding residential districts.” CRC members believe that apartments are an appropriate and suitable use for the Residential Village Center zoning district but want to allow for some oversight and input into the developments and therefore, revising the permitting classification to Site Plan Review is proper.

On September 14, 2021, **CRC voted unanimously to recommend the Town Council adopt the revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments and Article 12, Definitions**, as revised at the September 14, 2021 meeting.

After the September 14 meeting, Chair Hanneke spoke with the Planning Department regarding the proposed amendments to the Apartments Section 3.323 and Definitions, given that two different proposals were voted on by the CRC and Planning Board. After discussion, a proposal to divide out and move forward on the permitting requirement changes and return the rest of the proposed changes to the Planning Department for additional consideration, recommended language, and inclusion in a future proposal that is already contemplated regarding the definition of apartments changing to not including triplexes was made. Chair Hanneke brought this proposed division to the CRC on September 28, 2021. The members of CRC reached consensus that this was a logical path forward – move forward on a portion of the revisions that was ready and not reliant on other changes in the bylaw.

Part II – Report on other aspects of the original Proposal not being brought forward at this time

I am including a report on the proposed revisions to the Apartments bylaw and Article 12 Definition of Apartments in this report for informational purposes. As indicated above, these revisions are not being brought to the Council at this time and would require the CRC to conduct a new public hearing prior to the Council vote on them.

The July 12, 2021 public hearing was on the entire proposal. See Part I for an explanation of that hearing. The questions from members of both committees focused on the density of buildings in all the

zones if the cap were lifted, the level of open space that would be required on the lots, and whether the changes would result in the building of apartments in the B-G zone instead of mixed-use buildings. The lifting of the 24 units per building cap in zones other than B-G was not mentioned as a concern.

The Planning Department responded that because of the minimum lot area requirements and additional lot area requirements of the residential zones, lifting of the 24-unit cap in those zones would have no real impact, since most of the parcels in those zones are not large enough to accommodate more than 24 units under the current dimensional table regulations. For example, in the R-G zone, per dimensional table regulations, a lot must be larger than approximately 2.5 acres before more than 24 units can be built. The only two zones where there are land parcels large enough to build a building with more than 24 units and still comply with the minimum lot size, additional lot size per unit, and maximum building coverage requirements are the B-G and B-VC zones.

In addition, since there are maximum lot coverage requirements in all the zones, green space would be required, even if the unit cap is lifted. This is particularly true in the residential zones, where a building can cover no more than 25% of the parcel in the R-G and R-VC zones and 20% of the parcel in the R-N zones (and even less in the R-O and R-LD zones). Further, hardscaping (building and parking, driveways, etc.) can cover no more than 40% of the parcel in the R-G and R-VC zones, thereby effectively requiring 60% of the parcel to be greenspace. In the B-VC zone, 30% of the parcel must remain greenspace.

After the members of the two committees completed asking questions, the public was invited to ask questions. Five members of the public asked questions regarding how these revisions would affect the incentives for building mixed-use buildings in the business zones, what the change means if lots are combined, how the change would interact with the municipal parking overlay district and the proposed B-L overlay district, whether it is wise to lift the cap at all, especially if the only impacts are to the business districts.

Thereafter, no residents spoke in favor of adopting the revisions. Three residents spoke in opposition, mainly opposing the lifting of the cap.

After closing comments, a motion by the Planning Board to continue the hearing failed 3-3, with 1 absent. Thereafter, the public hearing was closed with a 4-2 vote of the Planning Board and a 3-1 vote of CRC (Councilors Bahl-Milne, Hanneke, and Ross in favor; Councilor Pam against; Councilor Schreiber absent).

On August 17, 2021, CRC began deliberations on the proposal. CRC discussed a wide range of issues, and focused on its Community Impact Review areas prior to voting a recommendation. Those areas are Historical and Cultural Assets, Economic, Transportation, Housing and Land Use, Financial, Environmental, Sustainability, and Social.

CRC identified many benefits to adopting the proposed revisions. These include the more efficient use of land from a sustainability perspective. A 24-unit cap restricts the size of buildings, requiring more buildings for the same number of units, thereby covering more land with buildings, leaving less open space, and potentially creating a development that is less energy efficient than if those same units were built in one building.

CRC also identified many potential impacts and concerns if the proposed revisions are adopted. One of the largest economic concerns is that the changes would result in apartment buildings being the primary new construction in the B-G, resulting in a B-G streetscape that has no commercial or public facing uses. The Planning Department presented a proposal that would limit this from happen, one Councilor

suggested the possibility of not allowing apartments in B-G at all, and another suggested the possibility of lifting the cap in the residential zones, but not the business zones.

There is also concern that larger buildings are less neighborly, and therefore the 24 units cap promotes more live-able small-scale apartments. CRC has struggled with determining what the right size for an apartment building in Amherst is, especially throughout the many different zones. Many of these concerns touch on multiple aspects of the community impact review.

The focus of the conversation at CRC was on balancing the apparent usefulness of eliminating a cap in most of the town either because it is not necessary to keep buildings reasonably sized (residential zones) or because it arbitrarily causes the use of a mixed-use buildings to create more housing when an apartment building was possibly the more logical choice (the University Drive mixed use building near the Hangar that has 2% of the first floor “mixed-use” because an apartment building would have had to abide by the 24-unit cap), but the potential need for the cap in the B-G and possible B-VC zones in order to direct building in the business areas to mixed-use buildings and away from apartments. The other proposed revisions are generally agreed to be good revisions to the bylaw and did not garner much, if any discussion.

Due to all the concerns regarding ensuring the right language to get the right balance, and the Planning Department's new proposals to address them, CRC continued its deliberations on September 14, 2021.

The discussion throughout this process also touched on the realization that the issues surrounding apartment buildings in Amherst are bigger than this proposal. Most of the places where apartments have been built in Amherst are in the R-N zone, which under the use table does not allow apartments (Pufton Village, Brandywine, The Brook, Southpoint, Britany Manor, Alpine Commons, Colonial Village, and Rolling Green are all in R-N zones). Future discussion will be needed regarding our zoning map with regards to apartment locations.

At the September 14, 2021 meeting, CRC members were able to discuss the Planning Department's proposed language to address the concerns regarding the B-G district. The language presented was the language recommended by the Planning Board and included a 500-foot “no-build” zone surrounding an apartment building – i.e. once 1 apartment building is built in the B-G (and there is already one), no other apartment building that fronts a main thoroughfare could be built within 500 feet. A number of CRC members were not supportive of the proposal, because the actions of one land-owner had a direct impact on the ability of a different landowner to use their land. Discussion centered completely around addressing these concerns. In the end, a proposal was made to delete the Planning Board recommended language regarding the “no-build” zone and replace it with a 24-unit cap in the B-G district, in order to temporarily address the concerns without holding up the other proposed revisions.

CRC acknowledged that further amendments will be needed in the future to address the B-G zone as it relates to apartment buildings, but CRC did not want to delay the consideration of the rest of the bylaw any further. Therefore, the revision of the proposed language to add back in a 24-unit cap to the B-G was believed to be a good interim solution to the issue. In the end, **CRC voted unanimously to recommend the Town Council adopt the revisions to Zoning Bylaw – Article 3, Use Regulations, Section 3.323, Apartments and Article 12, Definitions**, as revised at the September 14, 2021 meeting.

Update: Additional Zoning Priorities Recommendation

The Planning Department continues to present proposed revisions to the zoning bylaw. CRC has been offering feedback to the Planning Department on these proposals.

The Planning Department has created a website for these zoning revisions:
<https://www.amherstma.gov/3603/2021-Zoning-Amendments>. Please spread the word.

Here is the tentative Public Hearing Schedule for amendments that have been or are expected to be referred for hearing at the next few Council meetings:

- Rezone Parcel 14A-33 – Town Parking lot behind CVS (referred on May 24th) (hearing deadline - July 28th)
 - October 6: PB continued public hearing
 - October 26: CRC new public hearing in accordance with MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5 due to no Council vote within 90 days of close of CRC hearing
- Mixed-Use Building Revisions
 - October 26: CRC new public hearing in accordance with MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5 due to no Council vote within 90 days of close of CRC hearing
- Parking and Access Regulations Revisions
 - November 9: CRC new public hearing in accordance with MGL Ch. 40A, Sec. 5 due to no Council vote within 90 days of close of CRC hearing

Committee Members:

Shalini Bahl-Milne, Vice Chair

Mandi Jo Hanneke, Chair

Dorothy Pam

Evan Ross

Stephen Schreiber

Attachments: ADU Proposed Bylaw

5.011 Accessory Dwelling Units

Accessory dwelling units, as defined under this section, are intended to meet the changing housing needs of owner-occupied households, including housing for relatives and others associated with the household, and the provision of small, individual rental units. As accessory uses, accessory dwelling units are exempt from the additional lot area/family requirements of Table 3. Only one (1) accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted as accessory to a one-family detached dwelling.

- 5.0110 **Contained Accessory Dwelling Unit** - An accessory dwelling unit which is contained entirely within an existing or new one family detached dwelling and requires no significant external changes to the dwelling or site beyond entrances and windows required by the building code.
- a. A Contained Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be permitted in the R-G, R-VC, R-N, R-O, and R-LD Districts, following review of the proposed accessory use by the Building Commissioner and verification that it meets the requirements of this Bylaw and the General Requirements found below in Section 5.0113.
- 5.0111 **Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit** – An accessory dwelling unit which is attached to and involves significant changes to the existing one-family detached dwelling, including but not limited to, external fire escape structures, exterior additions, and other similar changes which result in a significant alteration to the appearance and function of the building or site.
- a. An Attached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be permitted in the R-G, R-VC, R-N, R-O, and R-LD Districts, following review of the proposed accessory use by the Building Commissioner and verification that it meets the requirements of this Bylaw and the General Requirements found below in Section 5.0113.
- 5.0112 **Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit** - A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit shall be a small, freestanding, accessory, one-family, detached dwelling permitted to occur on a residential property as accessory and incidental to a one family detached dwelling. An accessory detached dwelling unit may be the result of new construction or rehabilitation of an existing structure resulting in a unit meeting the general requirements of this section.
- a. A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit resulting from new construction with Habitable Space greater than 50% of the Habitable Space of the primary one-family dwelling, is allowed by a Special Permit from the Zoning Board of Appeals in the R-G, R-VC, R-N, R-O, and R-LD Districts.
 - b. A Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit with Habitable Space less than 50% of the Habitable Space of the primary one-family dwelling, shall be permitted in the R-G, R-VC, R-N, R-O, and R-LD Districts, following review of the proposed accessory use by the Building Commissioner and verification that it meets the requirements of this Bylaw and the General Requirements found below in Section 5.0113.
- 5.0113 **General Requirements.** The following standards shall apply:
- a. Only one (1) accessory dwelling unit shall be permitted as accessory to a single-family detached dwelling.
 - b. There shall be not more than 1,000 square feet of Habitable Space in any accessory dwelling unit.
 - c. One of the dwelling units on the property shall be occupied by the owner(s) of the principal one family residence, which requirement shall be made a condition of any Special Permit or approval by the Building Commissioner issued under this section



- d. No one family detached dwelling may be used simultaneously for accessory lodging under any provision of Section 5.010, nor shall any accessory dwelling unit be so used.
- e. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12, an accessory dwelling unit shall be occupied by a total of no more than three (3) unrelated residents.
- f. The accessory dwelling unit shall meet the definition of a Dwelling Unit as defined in Section 12.
- g. The accessory dwelling unit and property shall be operated in accordance with a Management Plan submitted to and approved by the Building Commissioner. Upon any change in ownership, a new Management Plan shall be filed in a timely manner with the Building Commissioner for review and approval.
- h. Any dwelling unit on the property being rented shall be registered and permitted in accordance with the Residential Rental Property Bylaw.
- i. To the extent feasible, newly constructed Detached Accessory Dwelling Units shall be located behind the front building line of the primary structure.
- j. Parking shall be provided in accordance with Article 7.
- k. All exterior lighting shall be designed and installed so as to be shielded, downcast, and dark-sky compliant to avoid light trespass onto adjacent properties.
- l. On-site storage and management of waste and recycling shall occur on the interior of the dwelling, within an attached garage or other accessory outbuilding, or screened appropriately from public view. There shall be no freestanding dumpster or storage unit associated with a property regulated under this section, except on a temporary basis in association with construction or similar temporary purposes.
- m. A reflective street address sign for each unit shall be installed at the street in a manner ensuring their visibility for public safety personnel from any approach.
- n. The accessory dwelling unit shall be designed so that the appearance and scale of the building is compatible with the primary single-family dwelling unit. Detached Accessory Dwelling Units shall be clearly accessory to the primary dwelling unit.
- o. The Building Commissioner or Permit Granting Authority shall determine the applicability of any provision of Section 10.38 when reviewing accessory dwelling unit applications.
- p. For Contained and Attached Accessory Dwelling Units, to the extent feasible, any new entrances shall be located on the side or rear of the building and any exterior changes must conform to the character of the neighborhood.
- q. The design review principles and standards established under Section 3.204 shall be applied to all accessory uses under this section, and the review and recommendation of the Design Review Board may be sought by the Building Commissioner, Permit Granting Board, or Special Permit Granting Authority.

