

AMHERST PLANNING BOARD
Wednesday, January 17, 2024 6:30 PM

Pursuant to Chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021 and extended again by Chapter 2 of the Acts of 2023, this meeting was conducted via remote means.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Board are not intended to be a transcript. The meeting recording is located here: [Planning Board Jan 17, 2024 - YouTube](#)

PRESENT: Bruce Coldham, Jesse Mager, Doug Marshall, Chair, Janet McGowan, Johanna Neumann
ABSENT: Fred Hartwell, Karin Winter
STAFF: Christine Brestrup, Planning Director
Pamela Field-Sadler, Administrative Assistant
Nate Malloy, Senior Planner
OTHER: Tree Hearing – 70 South East Street and
SPR 2024-04 & SPP 2024-03 – Town of Amherst – 70 South East Street

- Alan Snow, Amherst Tree Warden
- Tim Cooper, Senior Associate - DiNisco Design
- Rick Rice, Principal - DiNisco Design
- David Loring, Traffic Engineer – Pare Corporation
- Bill Brown, Landscape Architect – Brown Sardina Inc.
- Janet Bernardo, Civil Engineer– Horsley Witten
- Steve Stanish, Civil Engineer – Horsley Witten

6:33 p.m. Chair Doug Marshall opened the meeting and determined by Roll Call that all Planning Board (Board) members, with the exception of Ms. Winter and Mr. Hartwell, were present and participating remotely.

I. MINUTES

1. November 15, 2023

Motion: Mr. Coldham moved to approve the November 15, 2023 minutes as written. Ms. Neumann seconded the motion.

Vote: Coldham – yes; Mager – yes; Marshall – yes; McGowan - yes; Neumann – yes (5-0-0 motion passes)

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD - None

Mr. Marshall read the names of Attendee participants. There were 9 attendees at that time.

III. PUBLIC HEARING – JOINT HEARING WITH THE TREE WARDEN

6:35 PM Scenic Road tree removal – to allow relocation of site access drive to mitigate congestion due to proximity to the Main Street/East Street intersection – 70 South East Street (Map 15A, Parcel 47). Public Shade Trees impacted by this project include the following trees (Sizes indicate “diameter at breast height” – DBH): One multi stem Maple – stems 18”, 18”, 12” and 10”, One 24” Ash (if required for safety)

6:40 p.m.: Mr. Marshall read the legal ad and project description and opened the public hearing; there were no Board Disclosures.

Tim Cooper, Senior Associate - DiNisco Design explained the intent of the request is to allow for the current egress to be expanded into a 3-lane entry/egress (2 exit and 1 entrance) for the school as a means to mitigate traffic concerns related to queuing at the intersection to the north. The design proposal would require removal of 1 multi stem Maple and potentially 1 Ash tree.

During his presentation, Mr. Cooper shared the following comments:

1. Currently the parcel has a separate entrance to the south and an egress to the north.
2. Using a site plan, showed the location of the trees in question. The multi stem Maple is located just south of the existing egress drive and the Ash tree is farther to the south of the existing egress.
3. The proposed entrance/egress would be moved a little south to provide space, and in doing so, the Ash tree may be affected. For safety reasons, the condition of the Ash tree and sight lines need to be considered in order to make a determination.
4. In moving the entrance/egress to the south, the curb line would be right at the canopy edge of the Ash tree.

Site Visit Report

Ms. McGowan provided a Site Visit Report and shared the following details:

1. Observed that if the northern egress is enlarged in any way, the Maple tree would need to be removed.
2. Saw the Ash tree, but without a map it was difficult to know where the new entrance/egress would fall in relation to the Ash tree.

Board Discussion

The Board's discussion included the following comments:

1. Is the Ash tree of the species particularly vulnerable to the emerald ash borer (EAB)?
2. Makes sense to move the entrance/exit further south to create more space.
3. Suggested allowing removal of both trees with the preference to save the Ash tree.
4. Traffic management has been a concern for the Fort River site from the outset of exploring locations for a new school; the best solution is to move that driveway.
5. Constraints (sidewalk and light pole) would need to be addressed if the design were to move the driveway north.
6. A school staff member currently provides traffic management dismissing the buses at one time.
7. General support expressed for removing both trees.

Public Comment – None

Tree Warden Alan Snow offered the following comments:

1. All Ash trees are susceptible to EAB; unless the town wants to fund injections to protect it from EAB, the tree will eventually die. The tree in question is surrounded by about 6 other Ash trees that are well in decline and dying from EAB. Although the tree is healthy now, if left untreated, it too will be in decline and need to be cut down in two years.
2. The Maple tree is healthy and growing fine. Silver Maple trees do historically grow very large very fast. They are known as a weak wooded tree and will self-destruct if they are not cared for properly.

3. Has discussed this proposal with the Public Shade Tree Committee (PSTC). The PSTC is in favor of removing the Ash tree; however, they would like other designs considered that would allow the Silver Maple tree to be retained.
4. Of the opinion that widening the driveway in either direction would impact the root zone of the Maple tree significantly.
5. Willing to work with the design team to select a location in the public way where 1 or 2 new trees, depending upon space and species, could be planted to replace the those that are removed.

Applicant Response to Questions

Responses to the Board’s questions and comments included:

1. Yes, this Ash tree is susceptible to the EAB. Currently, the Ash tree seems in pretty good condition and we have upgraded the site so we could save the tree as part of the plan if appropriate. The concern is for the future and any potential impact from EAB and/or construction.
2. The original impetus for removing the Silver Maple tree was the goal to move the north driveway curb cut as far south as a site plan would allow in order to get as much distance from the intersection as possible. There is not enough frontage to move the northern driveway entirely past the Silver Maple tree to the south.
3. Roughly 100 trees will be planted onsite. If the Ash tree is removed, a new tree can be planted along the public way.

Motion: Mr. Marshall made the motion to approve removal of the multi-stem Maple tree and the Ash tree as requested for property at 70 South East with the condition that the applicant work with the town Tree Warden to provide at least 1, but probably 2, suitable replacement trees within the public way, and to close the public hearing. Mr. Mager seconded the motion.

Tree Warden Alan Snow stated he was in support of the motion.

Vote: Coldham – yes; Mager– yes; Marshall – yes; McGowan – yes; Neumann – yes
(5-0-0 motion approved)

IV. PUBLIC HEARING – SITE PLAN REVIEW AND SPECIAL PERMIT

6:45 PM SPR 2024-04 & SPP 2024-03 – Town of Amherst – 70 South East Street
Joint public hearing to request Site Plan Review approval, under Section 3.330 of the Zoning Bylaw to construct a 3-story, 105,750 GSF elementary school building with associated site improvements including parking and athletic fields & to request a Special Permit in accordance with Section 6, Table 3, Footnote “a” of the Zoning Bylaw to modify maximum building height requirements and Section 5.10 of the Zoning Bylaw to allow for the filling of land to raise the first floor elevation due to the high water table. (Map 15A, Parcel 47, R-VC and FPC zoning district)

7:06 p.m.: Mr. Marshall read the preamble and opened the joint public hearing for SPR 2024-04 & SPP 2024-03 – Town of Amherst – 70 South East Street; there were no Board Disclosures.

Tim Cooper, Senior Associate - DiNisco Design introduced the members of the Design team and began the presentation and included the following comments:

1. Described the existing school and said that the buildings sprawling nature is not well suited for a 21st century education. The conditions of the building are not aligned with Amherst’s goals for an elementary school.

2. Reiterated the issues with the current traffic flow and parking on the site. Described the athletic fields and play structures. Noted the athletic fields surrounding the building are not well drained and are subject to flooding for a lot of the year.
3. To the east of the site is the Fort River and to the south is Fearing Brook. There are wetlands and some habitat areas, all of which are outside of the project work limits. There is some compensatory storage and some minor regrading would be done where the floodplain extends onto the site.
4. New construction would be focused on the southern half of the site so that the existing school can operate as close to normal as possible with enough staff parking and play space for children.

Mr. Cooper continued by describing the Proposed Site Plan:

1. Reiterated that the north entrance/exit would be widened to 3 lanes (2 exit and 1 entrance).
2. Described the traffic flow for drop-off and parking. Staff control/monitoring would continue during drop-off and pick-up.
3. The south entrance would be dedicated to buses and service vehicles.
4. There would be structured play areas directly north of the building and the cafeteria.
5. There would be basketball courts to the east of the building on asphalt.
6. Focused on the southern half of the site would be programmed outdoor educational spaces, a forest floor garden, a planter garden, a pollinator garden and a pavilion.
7. The new school is intended to be net zero supported by PV panels located on the roof and parking canopies. The solar canopy proposed to be over the southern portion of the parking lot is within the 30' (15' requirement doubled due to use) side setback requirement. A SP may be required, but noted it would probably be possible to meet the 15' requirement.
8. A SP is needed to allow for the filling of land to mitigate the high ground water on site. The 1st floor of the new school would be elevated 2' above the existing school's elevation. Also would include under slab drainage to aid the mitigation of high ground water.
9. Seek a SP from the ZBA to allow the east end of the proposed building and the outdoor learning structure to be located in the FPC.
10. Focused building amenities to the southern portion of the site in order to have all programs operating on day one and encourage a seamless transition from the existing to the new building.
11. Provided views of the proposed building and amenities.

Mr. Stanish provided an overview of the Stormwater Management System and shared the following comments:

1. The general stormwater management plan consists of a number of components to manage the stormwater on the site including water quality units, deep-sump catch basins, sand filters, rain gardens, bioretention areas and aggressive swale. The components would vary across the site due to varying soils and groundwater depths.
2. Used a site plan to show the locations of the system components, briefly described each component and how the stormwater would move through the system and off the site.
3. Peak runoff rate will match the existing conditions.
4. Pointed out the bio- retention area in the bus drop off loop.
5. The athletic fields and playground areas have subsurface infrastructure as well.
6. Raingarden, athletic field and play area runoff would all drain into the Fort River.
7. Confirmed there is an agreement between the DPW and the school as to the operation and maintenance for the different components and control measures of the site system. There is an Operation and Maintenance Manual (OMM) which provides detailing about what is needed for each of these different control measures and there is an understanding of who is responsible for maintenance and when it needs to be done.

Mr. Loring discussed Traffic Control and shared the following comments:

1. Prepared a traffic impact analysis that reviewed both the Wildwood Elementary School and the Fort River sites.
2. In regards specifically to the Fort River site, considered the on- and off-site traffic at the conceptual level when completing the traffic impact analysis.
3. The bus drop-off loop to the south designed to accommodate drop-off procedures. Considered queuing information provided from the school department regarding the number of buses and vans that would be used for drop-off. Ensured that dual bus lanes could be accommodated
4. Bike and pedestrian walkways enter from South East Street and would cross at the entrance to the bus loop and enter the school at the main entrance.
5. Reiterated that the northern entrance would have three lanes (1 in and 2 out). Parents dropping off students would loop through the parking lot and queue up along the east lanes that head in the north/south orientation.
6. Parking lot speed would be controlled with raised pedestrian crosswalk speed tables. Directional signage would be used.

Site Visit- Brestrup, Coldham, McGowan

Ms. McGowan shared the following comments regarding the site visit:

1. Was shown the location of the front door of the proposed building.
2. Noted the location of the Fort River behind the site to the right [east] and Fearing Brook to the south.
3. Observed the chain link fence which keeps students located on the north side of the property.
4. Noted there is a small wetland on the north side of the site.
5. Observed White Pine trees in the current parking lot used by parents to drop-off students that would need to come down to locate the new building.
6. Learned that standard asphalt material would be used for parking areas and drives on the site. Had asked if curbing would be used in the parking areas as a safety measure.
7. Being that the Fort River site has been identified as a site that could have large scale solar, asked why not install PV panels over all the parking. Learned that the proposed PV panels were required to meet the Net Zero standards for the school from day one and also remain within the budget.
8. Discussed the proposed play areas, outdoor classroom and landscaping including forested area, no mow area to the south and pollinator plantings.
9. Observed proposed locations for the Stormwater Management System components responsible to hold, filter and ultimately release stormwater into the Fearing Brook.
10. Discussed the need to raise the site up to avoid dampness.
11. Learned that the athletic fields to the north would be improved as part of Phase II. New playground equipment would be installed.
12. Discussed lighting and learned the tallest lighting would be around the building. Discussed the timing of illumination and whether the existing wooden light poles on the softball field could be reused.
13. Learned the protected habitat area is located in the tree area and would not be impacted by this project.
14. Discussed the entrance/exits and the safety goals managed by separating buses and parents doing drop-off and pick-up.
15. Noted a crossing guard is currently located at the north exit and discussed the potential need for a crossing guard at the south entrance/exit.

Mr. Coldham said the group did not look at the existing murals during the site visit. He noted that the DRB has requested that those murals be retained. Mr. Cooper explained that the mural is essentially painted plywood fastened to the exterior of the building. If it were to be saved, it

would probably need to be an interior mural because it is not meant to last the lifetime of a generational building. He suggested that scanning and reprinting of the artwork could be considered. Areas within the proposed building have been identified for locating art; however, it is uncertain if the existing mural or some other commissioned art would be located in those areas.

BREAK: Amidst the discussion period, the Board took a break at 8:06 PM and resumed the meeting at 8:14 PM.

Board Discussion

1. Confirmed the side setback in this district is 15', but because this is an educational use, the setback needs to be 30'. The applicant could choose to pull back from the property line or apply for a SP to modify the setback requirement. Approving the SP would allow the school to have more PV panels.
2. Described SPs that are needed:
 - A. Planning Board SP to modify the height of the building. Proposing a 43' high building and 35' is allowed in the RVC.
 - B. Planning Board SP to allow the filling of land under Section 5.10.
 - C. Planning Board SP to modify the side setback requirement to allow the proposed PV canopy.
 - D. ZBA SP to allow two structures (east end of the proposed building and the outdoor classroom structure) to be located in the FPC, and locate a structure that's taller than one floor in the FPC and taller than 20' under Footnote a.
3. Clarified the ZBA public hearing for the aforementioned ZBA SPs, would open on January 25, 2024; however, it may need to be continued to a date certain if a quorum of the ZBA is not available.
4. Agreed to postpone discussions regarding the PV canopy until a SP is received for consideration.
5. Is there a bicycle traffic plan designed and are there bike racks on site?
6. Can you ensure the existing moisture problems in the current school won't occur in the new building?
7. Does the Management Plan for the athletic fields include use of pesticides? If so, what steps would be taken to reduce the impact on the Fort River?
8. Would like the Town Engineer's recommendation regarding the stormwater plan. Staff has sent the transmittal to the Town Engineer; waiting to hear back from him. The Wetlands Administrator, who is very knowledgeable about drainage systems, has reviewed this system extensively.
9. Are the invert elevations of the control mechanisms high enough to be out of the water table?
10. How would student drop-off be prevented at the southeast end of the loop which is closer to the main entrance?
11. A member expressed concern for having cyclists/pedestrians crossing the lane where buses come in and said that covered bike racks would support the town's overall goal to encourage non-car traffic.
12. Suggested that the area where cyclists/pedestrians need to cross the lane from the south entrance could be raised.
13. Traffic queueing is a problem at every school; however, it seems exacerbated here because the drive does not follow along the main frontage of the building. It was noted that currently if you enter from the South, you go into the side parking lot and never go to the front of the building. They have a staff person at that side entrance waiting for children to be dropped-off or picked-up.

14. Noted that queuing is a problem in the morning because children can't be dropped off until a certain time. Suggested that design team members visit the site at a morning drop-off if they have not had the opportunity yet.
15. A member expressed strong dislike for the cyclists and pedestrians using the same infrastructure. It seems like a mixed message because cyclists are encouraged to share the road with cars and avoid sidewalks.
16. The solar panels over a portion of parking create a sheltered parking feature that seemingly would be taken advantage of.
17. The number of bike racks seems insufficient. How was the number of provided bike racks determined? There is room to include more. Support for double or triple the number of proposed bike racks and covered bike racks.
18. Support expressed for interior showers in the future.
19. Staff reminded Board members that they can come into the Planning Department to view the large set of plans.
20. A Board member expressed support for the thoughtful traffic plan design. Asked what is the traffic plan for the interim period when the new school is operational, but the old school is still standing.
21. A Board member expressed concern for the non-fossil fuel generator located near the abutters.
22. A Board member suggested that the existing wood light poles are valuable and the Board could consider a condition to repurpose/reuse them. The Board member will reach out to someone who might be interested in the poles.
23. A Board member expressed strong concern for the north parking lot design. This is a larger school which will accommodate many children and families. Consider the addition of features, maybe trees and/or islands, to slow the traffic and control various aged children running through the parking area. Suggested that use of trees could prevent a heat island effect and maybe additional solar canopy in the future. Need to remember the parking area would be used for events outside of normal school hours.
24. It was noted that the proposed parking area is similar in size to the Mill River parking area. It is longer, but the width and the pedestrian traffic route to the fields is the same.
25. Why request a waiver from screening from the abutters' property? An evergreen screen would provide year-round screening for the parking area.
26. Could the solar canopy located near the abutters be moved to over the parking area connector to avoid the SP requirement? What about extending the solar canopy over the parking lot to the north? Net-zero status allows for buying green energy to fill any gap allowing for the solar to be installed in phases and prevents everything from being condensed to the southern portion of the site.
27. A Board member expressed concern about setting any precedent regarding the parking waiver requests for town projects.
28. Noted that the swale acts as a barrier for people trying to get to the athletic fields. Consider adding a crosswalk in the middle.

Applicant Team Responses to Questions

Responses to the Board's questions and comments included:

1. From the beginning, applicants have known that the project would require review by the Board and the ZBA, but not to what extent. Have known from the beginning about the FPC and issues associated with the floodplain and the setbacks from the Fort River and the Fearing Brook on the site. The location of the PV canopy had not been determined when the site was chosen. In order to meet the Net Zero standard, the energy production system needs to be operating from day one which limits the location choices.
2. Clarified there would be under slab drainage that would connect to the retaining system.

3. Steps taken to avoid the current building moisture problems include lifting the building up out of the natural groundwater elevation and breaking capillary action with porous fill. The new building floor elevation is higher than the existing building's floor elevation.
4. The OMM defines what types of fertilizers and pesticides would be appropriate for the athletic fields and emphasizes minimal use to the greatest extent possible. Noted the water would work its way through a system prior to draining into the Fort River. Confirmed that Con Com has placed conditions regarding fertilizer use in their order.
5. Some control measures would be lined with a liner to prevent any intrusion of the groundwater table. Some of the control measures are a bit shallower than typical; some have been designed in a way that they would be closer to the surface. The large twin culvert that crosses through the site is the control; the goal is to have the top of the pipes be at the same elevation as the top of the culvert.
6. The proposed conditions would reduce the peak flow from what is currently flowing towards the Fort River. The mechanisms hold the stormwater so that the flow is reduced; mechanisms would be placed 2' below the surface.
7. In discussions with the town in terms of traffic, our purview sort of ends at the property line. The town has retained a different consultant to consider traffic control measures related from the project off site; that report is due to the town in February.
8. Currently staff/faculty play a large role in managing traffic on the site. It is expected that staff/faculty would continue this role and encourage queueing and drop-off along the east side of the loop. It is expected that the east/west connection between the two sections of the parking lot would be unavailable for cars during peak drop-off and pick-up times.
9. At the south end of the loop, a pull off, sort of a flush curb, provides an area for 4 cars specifically for students that require additional time to transition into school.
10. Queueing up tends to be more of a problem at pick-up versus drop-off. Want to avoid any crossing of the traffic flow.
11. 10' wide sidewalks at both the north and south entrances would accommodate cyclists and walkers. Reiterated if using the south entrance, a cyclist/pedestrian would need to cross the vehicle lane and continue to the main entrance. One bike rack would be located at the front entrance area, and more located to the west of the playground.
12. There is not a shower available in the building, and the bike racks would be uncovered.
13. Discussed raising the crossing at the south entrance; however, that is designed to be for buses only. You can put a traffic calming device there, however, it would be something the buses would need to traverse. Also, adding a raised table would require installing a catch basin to mitigate the stormwater runoff.
14. Kept the sidewalk on the southern side of the south entrance because the existing trees on the north side create a nice buffer for the existing house on that side.
15. School staff provided the number for the bike racks and consultant agreed there is room for more.
16. Confirmed that the square area on the site plan between the two sidewalks south of the building is a dedicated service area where the transformer and dumpsters will be located and would be paved. A screen wall and planting would protect the area from the entrance.
17. Recognize that parking during demolition of the old school and construction of the northernmost portion of the parking area will be problematic. Accommodations would be made to allow parking on the southern portion of the north parking; however, a deficit in parking would occur for several months (approximately September 2026 – December 2026) and consultants are working with the district to manage this problem.
18. Confirmed the north parking lot would have 4 rows to accommodate 175 cars.
19. The generator located near the abutters would be exercised once per week. Do not have an exact dB measurement, but an acoustic consultant is looking at this. The sound is that of a diesel engine and sufficiently quiet. Exercising the generator would not be timed

- automatically and can work through any abutter concerns to determine the most unobtrusive time. Confirmed the acoustic enclosure itself is a mitigating factor for the engine noise.
20. Confirmed the design team has seen the memo from the Fire Dept. which is the result of many meetings between the design team engineers and the Fire Dept. Discussed the locations of hydrants, lock boxes and adjustable panels. Although not perfunctory, design team is doing all they can to meet the requirements put forth, including a final stamped Turning Movement Analysis. Discussed requiring a condition that all of the Fire Department's comments in the memo dated January 10, 2024, be addressed.
 21. Confirmed that the geothermal well system would be located in an area southeast of the building. There would 84 wells located 500' deep with a steel casing and polyethylene loop in them which will bring all that piping back to a vault which is south of the building and all of which is completely underground. This system will be connected to a heat pump in the mechanical room on the 3rd floor of the building. The system, a balanced annual load, would function as a heat sink in the summer, pumping heat into the ground which would be extracted in the winter months. The heat would also fuel the water heater exchanger.
 22. Detectable warning panel refers to the tactile surface at any crosswalk and areas of flush curbing such as along the Van Drop-off Zone.
 23. Confirmed that the lights and controllers from the athletic field pole lights would be saved for future reuse; however, the town is not looking to save the wood poles.
 24. The swale area between the parking area and the drive aisle is depressed slightly to hold water and, although they could, it would not be easily traversed by pedestrians. The upper sand filter is about 2' deep and the side slopes around 3:1 and should only have water in it after a heavy rain event.
 25. There is a sidewalk that runs the entire length of that sand filter and swale from the north end of the parking lot to the crosswalk leading to the entrance. Confirmed, although not showing on the site plan, there is a crosswalk proposed at the northeast end of the north parking lot leading to the athletic fields area.
 26. When designing the parking lot, took great care not to disturb the buffer between the parking lot and the property line. The trees in this area would remain. We can consider it, but adding an evergreen screen in that area would disturb the existing vegetation. There is an existing berm from the south end of the parking lot to at least the middle and maybe a little north too.
 27. Pointed out that it seems like there is a lot of space in the area of the athletic fields, but every bit of it is necessary to meet game field regulations. Moving things around is not a simple solution.
 28. Consultants were asked to submit a revised site plan showing locations for future additional bike racks.

Motion: Mr. Coldham made the motion to continue the joint public hearings for **SPR 2024-04 & SPP 2024-03 – Town of Amherst – 70 South East Street** to February 7, 2024 at 6:35 p.m. Mr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Vote: Coldham – yes; Mager– yes; Marshall – yes; McGowan – yes; Neumann – yes (5-0-0 motion approved)

V. OLD BUSINESS

Topics not reasonably anticipated 48 hours prior to the meeting:

1. In answering a question from Mr. Coldham regarding the Olympia Drive project, Mr. Malloy shared that the developer is currently very busy finishing up the Spring Street and 11 to 13 East Pleasant Street projects. He said he has not heard that the Olympia Drive project is not happening. It is possible the developer has an order of priority which could be delaying the start of the Olympia Drive project.

2. In answering a question from Ms. McGowan, Mr. Malloy reported that Dodson and Flinker have been hired to work with the town on the Downtown Design Standards project. They are currently studying existing conditions. The town will establish a working group or a stakeholder group to work with the consultants. Outreach meetings will be scheduled, along with a visual preference survey. Information about this project will be put on the town website. The project has about a 1- month timeline. Ms. McGowan requested that the project be linked to the Planning Board and Planning Department webpages.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Request for Determination of Applicability – Pelham Road

The Planning Board was notified that a Request for Determination of Applicability has been filed with the Conservation Commission for property located at 89 North East Street (15A-29) and Pelham Road (15A – 39 and 56). This is the remnants of an old coal gasification plant and the Eversource has been removing contaminants and monitoring the area for years. To continue the remediation work, soil borings and monitoring wells are necessary; however, the work is in an area subject to wetlands protection.

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

VII. FORM A (ANR) SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS – None

VIII. UPCOMING ZBA APPLICATIONS – None

IX. UPCOMING SPP/SPR/SUB APPLICATIONS – None

X. PLANNING BOARD COMMITTEE & LIAISON REPORTS

Pioneer Valley Planning Commission – Bruce Coldham and Alternate (Jack Jemsek) – No Report
Community Preservation Act Committee – Mr. Marshall reported that CPAC has approved most of the projects seeking funding. He noted that some of the requests from the town needed trimming, but that overall, the CPA review and recommendation process has been smooth this year.

Design Review Board – Karin Winter – No Report

Community Resources Committee – Ms. Brestrup reported that the CRC membership changed minimally; four of the five CRC members remain on the committee and 1 new member has joined. They will pick up the Rental Registration review. They also have the Solar Bylaw in their hands, and although they have not worked on it to date, they were given a deadline of June 2024 to finish.

XI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR – No Report

XII. REPORT OF THE STAFF – Ms. Brestrup said the posting for the vacant Planner position has been sent to HR, but she does not believe it has been advertised yet.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Pamela Field-Sadler
Administrative Assistant

Doug Marshall – Chair

DATE: _____

Document Packet: <https://www.amherstma.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/6119>