

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

1 In attendance: Doug Chabinsky – Acting Chair, Martha Chabinsky (remote), Tom Quinn, Nicole  
2 Crawford – alternate, and Bill Glenn - alternate  
3 Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director

4  
5 Doug Chabinsky, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

6  
7 **Work Session Topics:**

8  
9 **1. Updates to the HDC regulations**

10  
11 Doug Chabinsky noted that the Town attorney’s comments are highlighted in the draft document.  
12 The Commission reviewed the attorney’s comments.

13  
14 Under Article I, Purposes, the Town attorney added “as delineated by the Town of Amherst  
15 Zoning Ordinance and associated zoning map.” The Commission agreed with this wording.

16  
17 Regarding Article II, Section F now reads “...unique construction or exceptionally fine examples  
18 of their period, region, or style...shall be altered only so as to conform more closely to their  
19 original or most characteristic appearance. In such cases, the original or most characteristic  
20 appearance must be determined through documentation.” The Town attorney struck out  
21 “convincing documentation by the applicant.”

22  
23 There was discussion regarding who can submit documentation under this wording. Nic Strong  
24 noted that the applicant, or other entities/people, or Commissioners themselves, would be able to  
25 bring forward documentation. Tom Quinn asked what would happen if there were no  
26 documentation. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission would then need to make a  
27 determination on the most characteristic appearance of the house.

28  
29 Article VIII, Paragraph B, now reads that, “Garage entrances shall be placed on an  
30 inconspicuous side or rear elevation out of public view or, failing this, well set back from the  
31 house façade.” This wording change is to put the sentence in the passive voice like the rest of the  
32 regulations rather than the active voice.

33  
34 Bill Glenn noted that this is the first instance of “shall” in the regulations. Previously, Linda  
35 Kaiser raised some concerns regarding “should” versus “shall” in the regulations. He asked if the  
36 Commission would discuss this. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission can discuss this  
37 when it reviews the comments from the public hearing. Martha Chabinsky noted that the  
38 Commission previously discussed this during a work session and decided on using “shall.”  
39 Doug Chabinsky agreed that the Commission previously placed “shalls” in the document but  
40 may have been wrong. The Commission could consider changing the language before bringing  
41 the document to a public hearing. Nic Strong explained that Town Counsel noticed this item as  
42 an inconsistency using the active voice where the rest of the regulations are passive.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

44 In paragraph C, Town Counsel deleted “and lots” from the sentence, “Each housing development  
45 shall be designed and constructed to complement and harmonize with the Amherst Village  
46 Historic District, particularly with regard to size and scale of the development and its  
47 prominence and visibility to the community generally and to surrounding neighborhoods in  
48 particular. Housing developments shall include a wide variety of house sizes, a mix of styles, and  
49 open spaces, reflecting the same in the Historic District.”

50

51 Martha Chabinsky asked why the language was removed. Nic Strong stated that the Historic  
52 District Commission has no authority over lot sizes. The Zoning Ordinance contains the lot sizes  
53 for the different districts. Regardless of the wording in these regulations, the Commission cannot  
54 require a developer to make lots of different sizes in a development. Doug Chabinsky noted that  
55 this section likely only really refers to single buildings, as there is not enough land left to place a  
56 whole development.

57

58 Under Article IX, Section 9.1 D., Town Counsel changed the format of the reference to Article  
59 VI, A. for consistency.

60

61 Under Article IX, Section 9.3 C. Parking areas, Town Counsel amended the wording to read,  
62 “Parking areas shall be left unpaved or, *in the alternative*, constructed of granite pavers, gravel  
63 stone dust, or similar paving surfaces...” The Commission agreed with this language.

64

65 Regarding Article X, Windows, Town Counsel struck the end of the sentence, “and which may  
66 be considered contributing if the National Register nomination is updated.” Doug Chabinsky  
67 explained that the wording to be stricken does not matter, as the properties were identified in the  
68 survey as being noteworthy and so the window regulations apply. The Commission agreed with  
69 the change.

70

71 Under Article XIV, Administration, paragraph 7, Town Counsel struck wording that, “The  
72 applicant shall wait 30 calendar days...” before starting work. Doug Chabinsky stated that the  
73 Commission was not forcing applicants to not start work; the Commission was telling applicants  
74 that someone could appeal the decision and that work done during the 30-day period was at their  
75 risk. Nic Strong explained that the Commission could use that language but cannot tell applicants  
76 that they shall wait the 30 days.

77

78 Under Article XIV, in paragraph 8, Nic Strong explained that language was struck by Town  
79 Counsel because two years are allowed for an applicant to complete work when a certificate of  
80 approval is issued. If the applicant submits a new application within those two years, it is unclear  
81 why the Commission would say that this was an unreasonable delay on the first application and  
82 ask for good cause in order to act on the new application. An applicant has two years for one  
83 approval, and it should not make any difference if the applicant comes in with a new application  
84 within the two years or outside of the two years. Doug Chabinsky suggested language that this  
85 would be the case unless an extension was authorized by the Commission following a written  
86 request by the applicant.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

87  
88 In the same Article, regarding Regional Impact, Town Counsel struck “local land use board” and  
89 changed this to “Historic District Commission.”

90  
91 Under Article XV, Definitions, in the definition of Abutter, Town Counsel deleted the last  
92 sentence. Nic Strong noted that this was because the wording was already in the definition  
93 further up.

94  
95 Regarding the definition for Historic District Overlay, Nic Strong explained that there were  
96 previously two definitions for Historic Overlay District. She and Town Counsel worked together  
97 to craft one complete definition. The Commission agreed with the proposed wording.

98  
99 Regarding mailboxes, Nic Strong explained that Town Counsel stated that Section IX for  
100 mailboxes, as written, does not provide enough specificity for the Town to enforce the language.  
101 “Simple in style” should be fleshed out. If the requirements are known, then the Town would be  
102 able to enforce the regulation if someone does not comply, even if there is no requirement for a  
103 permit prior to installation.

104  
105 Doug Chabinsky read the section on mailboxes in question, “Mailbox posts and supports shall be  
106 simple in style. For example, they shall be made of wood and be simple in design with nothing  
107 ornate and little or no carved details.” Doug Chabinsky asked what specificity is needed. Nic  
108 Strong stated that there is a concern if an owner does not have to get a permit for a mailbox and  
109 does not know what the requirements are before installing one, as to how the Town can later try  
110 to enforce that the mailbox does not meet the regulations. Town Counsel is suggesting that  
111 language be added so that an owner can read this paragraph and know what type of mailbox to  
112 install, so that the Town can then enforce these regulations. Doug Chabinsky stated that the  
113 language states that “mailbox posts and support shall be simple in style,” and then two examples  
114 are given for the post. There are no examples for the mailboxes themselves. Language could be  
115 added to define the mailboxes. Martha Chabinsky suggested language that the opening is on the  
116 front of the mailbox and faces the street. Doug Chabinsky suggested a couple of pictures of a  
117 wooden and a granite post and the appropriate mailbox style, along with some traditional colors.

118  
119 Martha Chabinsky asked if granite is supposed to be excluded. Doug Chabinsky stated that the  
120 language mentions that split granite posts shall be preferred over sawn or partially sawn granite  
121 posts. Nicole Crawford asked about the language “shall” in this case, as the Commission is not  
122 actually requiring applicants to do something. The Commission is simply requiring its  
123 preference. Martha Chabinsky stated that she also finds the language regarding “little to no  
124 carved details” confusing.

125  
126 Doug Chabinsky suggested language, “Mailbox posts and supports shall be simple in style. For  
127 example, they shall be made of wood and be of simple design with nothing ornate and no carved  
128 details. When using granite posts, historic split granite posts shall be used.”

129

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

130 Martha Chabinsky noted that there are several examples around the Village that do not match  
131 these regulations. She asked if this new language can be enforced on those items. Tom Quinn  
132 stated that he believes those would be grandfathered in. Martha Chabinsky noted that she is  
133 mostly speaking about colors, plastic posts, etc. Doug Chabinsky stated that the original  
134 language stated that “mailbox posts shall be simple and made of wood.” He asked if the style and  
135 color can be retroactively reinforced. Nic Strong asked how the Commission can regulate the  
136 color of a mailbox when it does not regulate the color of a house. Doug Chabinsky explained that  
137 mailboxes did not exist historically and are supposed to blend in and not be a focal point. A  
138 bright yellow mailbox does not fit in with the District. Martha Chabinsky noted that someone  
139 could paint their house that color. Doug Chabinsky agreed that the Commission does not control  
140 color, but it does control things that detract from the architectural detail, and mailboxes did not  
141 exist historically. They should fade into the background and not be a source of attention. Bill  
142 Glenn suggested language that mailboxes should be of a simple geometry, without regard to  
143 color. This may be more defensible and easier to enforce. Doug Chabinsky noted that there is an  
144 existing mailbox with simple geometry but bright pink.

145

146 Nicole Crawford stated that the Commission requires certain attachments on houses to blend in  
147 with the house. She asked if the Commission could apply that thinking to mailboxes. Doug  
148 Chabinsky stated that mailboxes sit on the streetscape and are not attached to the house. He  
149 would like them to fade into the background so that one does not see multicolored mailboxes  
150 down a street, detracting from the historic structures and character.

151

152 Martha Chabinsky asked why the Commission did not previously decide to regulate house color.  
153 Doug Chabinsky stated that this is unclear. Many historic districts regulate colors for houses.  
154 Historically, houses were mustard yellow, plum, red, etc. The purpose of not regulating the color  
155 was likely to allow people to go pick a color that might very well be of a historic nature.  
156 Previous Commissioners may not have thought it appropriate to micromanage the District, as this  
157 would have limited the character and dimension. The variation is nice. He stated that he is more  
158 than happy to regulate mailbox color as these did not historically exist and he does not want  
159 them to detract. He is also happy to regulate roof color as roofs are a structural element that sets  
160 the character of the house. It is also important to shield the mechanicals, as they also did not exist  
161 back then and should not be in the line of sight.

162

163 Tom Quinn asked about making any particularly strong comments on the mailboxes, given that  
164 these are federally regulated in certain ways. Nic Strong stated that she believes the Post Office  
165 is interested in the height and distance from the edge of the road. Doug Chabinsky noted that the  
166 U.S. Postal Service is a private entity. It is not federally regulated anymore. Carriers are  
167 concerned with height and distance from the road. He would like to see mailboxes made as  
168 unobtrusive as possible in the Village. They should not be a source of attraction. Tom Quinn  
169 suggested including a picture of a standard mailbox in either black or white. Doug Chabinsky  
170 agreed to a photograph of a wooden post, granite post, an appropriate style mailbox, and neutral  
171 colors to blend in with the surroundings. Nicole Crawford suggested removing the language

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

172 about blending in, as this is open to subjectivity. Doug Chabinsky agreed. He stated that he  
173 would draft language and compile pictures to send to Nic Strong.

174

175 The Commission discussed the comments that came from the last public hearing on the  
176 regulations, using the minutes of the meeting as their guide.

177

178 The Commission reviewed comments regarding the word ‘shall’ in Article III, Preservation  
179 Guidelines Section B. 2. Nicole Crawford suggested that this could be because the language  
180 states “when possible” but does not define what “possible” means. She suggested language that,  
181 “Any historical material or distinctive architectural features shall not be removed or altered.”  
182 This leaves no room for subjectivity and allows the applicant to bring additional requests before  
183 the Commission. The Commission agreed.

184

185 Doug Chabinsky reviewed the final paragraph in that section which stated that, “. . .the new  
186 material shall match the material being replaced. . . Repair or replacement of missing  
187 architectural features shall be based on accurate duplications of features substantiated by  
188 historical, physical, or pictorial evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of  
189 different architectural elements from other buildings or structures.” Bill Glenn stated that the  
190 intention of this section of the paragraph is to replace something when it is unclear what was  
191 originally there. Doug Chabinsky agreed that this is about recreating something based on  
192 evidence of what previously existed. The Commission agreed to remove the end of the sentence  
193 after the word “evidence”.

194

195 Regarding page D-9, paragraph E., the Commission agreed to amend the language “shall not  
196 have false “historical” hardware” to read, “shall have hardware appropriate to the period.”

197

198 In Article IX, Streetscape, Section 9.1, C., the Commission discussed the language that  
199 “Reasonable efforts to preserve historical and traditional markings for property boundaries and  
200 grounds, such as stonewalls, fences, and tree borders, shall be undertaken.” Nicole Crawford  
201 suggested rewording this to read that historical and traditional markings, etc., shall be preserved.  
202 Nic Strong noted that fences, trees, and stonewalls can legally be removed. The property  
203 boundary is defined in the deed and should not be based on fences, trees, or stonewalls. She is  
204 not sure if the Commission can require someone to maintain a fence or trees if someone wants to  
205 cut them down. Doug Chabinsky stated that he thought the State wanted to preserve stonewalls.  
206 Nic Strong stated that this is true, but the law states that these can be removed, if the people on  
207 either side agree to it. Nicole Crawford suggested removing the reference to property boundaries  
208 and talking about these items as historical features. The Commission could state that it wants to  
209 preserve them, not necessarily as property boundaries, but as historical features. Nic Strong  
210 stated that this section seems to deal specifically with property boundaries. Doug Chabinsky  
211 suggested changing the language from “shall” to “should.” It would thus read, “Historical and  
212 traditional markings for property boundaries and grounds, such as stonewalls, fences, and tree  
213 borders, should be preserved.” The Commission agreed.

214

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

215 Regarding page D-13., Nic Strong suggested adding a couple of sentences that reflected Doug  
216 Chabinsky's previous comments regarding mailboxes being certain styles and colors, not  
217 detracting from the neighborhood, and so on. Doug Chabinsky agreed.

218  
219 Nicole Crawford noted that there is a section regarding public infrastructure. She asked if this  
220 applies to the Town and schools. Doug Chabinsky noted that the Commission cannot force the  
221 Town or the School District to abide by the regulations. The Commission encourages them to  
222 abide, and, in most cases, they do, but they are exempt overall. He noted that Town Counsel did  
223 not object to the language proposed in that section. Nicole Crawford asked why the Town is  
224 exempt from the section on public infrastructure. She asked what the definition is for public  
225 infrastructure. Doug Chabinsky stated that this would include roadways, sidewalks, Town Hall,  
226 etc. Nicole Crawford noted that Town buildings are exempt. Tom Quinn stated that he reads this  
227 section as suggestions. Doug Chabinsky stated that this should remain as "shalls" for public  
228 infrastructure and certainly "shalls" for private roads.

229  
230 Nicole Crawford stated that a member of the public commented on the driveways section. The  
231 person stated that she may want to pave her driveway in the future. The regulations seem to be  
232 ambiguous on that item. In Article IX, Section 9.3.A., "...asphalt shall be limited to areas of  
233 necessity and shall not be expanded or applied to auxiliary spaces, such as supplemental parking  
234 areas." She asked what the definition of "areas of necessity" is. Doug Chabinsky stated that this  
235 is the driveway. Nicole Crawford stated that this may be ambiguous. This could be better  
236 defined. The person could pave her driveway if she wants to, based on these regulations. Doug  
237 Chabinsky agreed. He noted that areas of necessity could be rewritten to include the primary  
238 driveway, from roadway to garage and auxiliary parking spaces. For example, the DPW asked to  
239 pave the parking lot in front of Town Hall. The Commission said this would be inappropriate as  
240 it would create a large expanse of pavement. Other materials such as permeable brick pavers  
241 could be possible. Nicole Crawford noted that the DPW could have completed the project  
242 anyway. Doug Chabinsky agreed. Tom Quinn noted that the section references a preference to  
243 start with paving using natural materials and then moving toward pavement.

244  
245 In Article X, Section 10.2., Replacement Windows, the member of the public suggested language  
246 that windows should be replaced as is. The Commission noted confusion on this suggestion, as  
247 the language already mentions in-kind replacement. Nicole Crawford explained that the member  
248 of the public does not like that the Commission allows for metal clad windows in areas that are  
249 susceptible to significant and rapid deterioration from moisture due to rain and snow. Nicole  
250 Crawford noted that this change was made due to the architecture of the building with windows  
251 that are low to the ground. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission prefers all-wood  
252 windows, but on rare occurrences would consider a different material on non-contributing  
253 properties. Tom Quinn asked about contributing buildings in an area of heavy moisture. Doug  
254 Chabinsky stated that the regulations, as written, would not allow anything other than all-wood  
255 windows in this case. Nicole Crawford stated that she would suggest removing the potential for  
256 aluminum clad windows altogether if this is the case. Doug Chabinsky suggested language that  
257 aluminum clad windows will be addressed on a case-by-case basis, generally applied to non-

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

258 contributing properties and architectural styles where there are significant rot issues. Nicole  
259 Crawford noted that this will open up the door for discussion from applicants. Martha Chabinsky  
260 noted that one property owner went to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to change the  
261 Commission's decision on windows. Doug Chabinsky stated that this was because the  
262 Commission's regulations did not mention all-wood windows at that point in time. He would like  
263 the Commission to have the ability to review this on a case-by-case basis to determine if other  
264 materials are appropriate. He noted that in previous cases, such as at the Country Mansions, clad  
265 windows were approved because maintenance of all-wood windows would be difficult and  
266 dangerous, and the windows were susceptible to a lot of rot.

267  
268 Nicole Crawford noted that the applicant can request waivers from the regulations. Tom Quinn  
269 stated that he is inclined to leave the wording the way it is. He noted that any applicant can ask  
270 for a waiver. The Commission is already making these decisions on a case-by-case basis all the  
271 time. This language was to help in the process. Doug Chabinsky agreed that the Commission  
272 would prefer all-wood windows, but there are some unique situations in which the Commission  
273 could consider otherwise. None of the Commission's decisions set precedent.

274  
275 The next public comment was regarding the section for fencing. The section states that enclosure  
276 of a yard is allowed for the safety of children and pets. Doug Chabinsky noted that the person  
277 commenting has an issue with her neighbors. The person commenting wanted to add reasoning  
278 to install a fence. Bill Glenn noted that the regulations do mention that someone cannot use  
279 dislike of their neighbors as justification for putting up a fence: "Privacy, per se, shall not be  
280 considered sufficient cause for relief." Tom Quinn noted that trash blowing across a yard could  
281 be a reason for a fence, as stated by the member of the public. Doug Chabinsky explained that  
282 this dealt with construction debris. He does not want to get in the middle of a feud between  
283 neighbors.

284  
285 Nicole Crawford asked about owners who watch their grandchildren on a semi-regular basis who  
286 may want a fence. She stated that the Commission is trying to be very specific about when  
287 someone can and cannot put up a fence. Doug Chabinsky explained that this is because a lot of  
288 people just want to put up a privacy fence. Nicole Crawford stated that the regulations state that  
289 those people with kids can. Doug Chabinsky disagreed. He explained that those with children  
290 can put up a fence but will not necessarily be approved for a privacy fence. The Commission  
291 allows for privacy fences in certain circumstances. If an applicant wants to install any type of  
292 fence because they hate the neighbors, that is not reason enough. There are certain circumstances  
293 that allow for relief. Other reasons could be considered under a waiver process, in considering  
294 that justice would be done, the proposal would be keeping with the intent of the neighborhood,  
295 and is not detrimental to the historic character, etc.

296  
297 Martha Chabinsky noted that the regulations state that if there is a dispute between parties, the  
298 Commission cannot rule on that item.  
299

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

300 Tom Quinn asked if the fencing reasoning regarding children could somehow cross into Fair  
301 Housing Laws. Nicole Crawford explained that proposals for fences that keep in line with the  
302 rest of the neighborhood will be granted, but large privacy fences will not. Doug Chabinsky  
303 noted that there could be exceptions for privacy fences. Tom Quinn explained that he was  
304 questioning the use of the word “children” instead of “people.” Nic Strong suggested language  
305 regarding enclosing the yard for occupant safety. Doug Chabinsky noted that he would like to  
306 include wording regarding pets. Nic Strong suggested language regarding safety of residents and  
307 pets. Nicole Crawford stated that it seems to be strange to call out these specific reasons at all, as  
308 opposed to stating that someone can install a fence as long as it keeps in style with the  
309 neighborhood. Doug Chabinsky explained that this has not always been the case, as people have  
310 wanted to put up fences that keep with the style, but this depends upon the people sitting on the  
311 Commission at the time. Safety is an important thing to include as a reason to make sure that an  
312 application would not be refused if this was the reasoning. Nicole Crawford stated that her  
313 parents installed a fence at their property for her dog. There seems to be a gray area for those  
314 instances. Doug Chabinsky explained that this could be explained by an applicant and then  
315 considered by the Commission. Nic Strong explained that the introductory paragraph for this  
316 Section previously specifically said that, “...to enclose children or pets is not an acceptable  
317 reason of itself.” She explained that Doug Chabinsky previously stated that he wanted these  
318 included as acceptable reasons, so they got added to the end of the list. Doug Chabinsky  
319 explained that he believes these are important concerns due to traffic in the Village.

320  
321 Doug Chabinsky explained that the next public comment deals with requiring site plans to be  
322 submitted with every application, even if an applicant is reconstructing on an existing footprint.  
323 He explained that he believes this falls to the Building Inspector. For these regulations, if an  
324 applicant is not changing the footprint, there is nothing to look at. The Commission agreed.

325  
326 Doug Chabinsky noted that the public comment mentioned a question as to how to know if  
327 someone is located in the Historic District or not. He suggested including a link in the  
328 regulations to the Historic District map. Nic Strong agreed that the map could be placed in an  
329 Appendix.

330  
331 Based on public comment submitted, Doug Chabinsky noted that the Town and schools do not  
332 have to comply with the regulations. Nic Strong explained that this is per State law.

333  
334 Based on public comment submitted, Doug Chabinsky noted that the Commission cannot control  
335 temporary fences. This is controlled by the Building Inspector.

336  
337 Nicole Crawford asked how the Commission would like to view solar systems. She asked if  
338 these will be viewed similar to other mechanical appurtenances, and if these will be considered a  
339 necessity or luxury. She noted that the most common Tesla roofs do not currently look anything  
340 like shingles. Tesla roofs do have different options for low profile panels or shingles, but these  
341 remove the existing roof down to the decking, which she does not believe the Commission would  
342 want. She stated that the solar roofs she has seen do not have seamless integration and do not

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Historic District Commission

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

343 look like a traditional roof. She asked if the Commission would consider these if they can be  
344 completely out of sight from all angles or shielded. Doug Chabinsky stated that if there is a way  
345 to implement solar on a house that does not detract from the character and the nature of the  
346 Village, that would be great. He stated that he believes there will be some Tesla panels that look  
347 like slate. Technology will likely continue to mature. Tom Quinn noted that this option is also  
348 very expensive. Doug Chabinsky stated that the Commission could consider this on a case-by-  
349 case basis. At some point this will likely become written into the regulations, as technology  
350 continues to mature. If someone could place a solar array on their house or in the backyard that is  
351 totally shielded from any public view, there may be a case for this. Most roofs in the Village can  
352 be easily seen from the public view.

353  
354 Doug Chabinsky thought that at some point the Commission will likely also have to consider  
355 wood composite siding, as this technology matures, and other building materials become scarcer.  
356 The challenge for this Commission is how to maintain the character of the Village and preserve  
357 the crucial historic elements that make the Village unique, in the face of dwindling natural  
358 resources and the demand for more technology, and more energy efficiency. This continues to be  
359 harder and harder to do. This is why it was important to update and better define the regulations.  
360 There needs to be a well-defined baseline to adapt and make changes from.

361  
362 Tom Quinn suggested researching State laws on solar applications to see what the Commission  
363 can/cannot regulate in the first place. This may be similar to accessory dwelling units (ADUs),  
364 which the Planning Board has found it cannot regulate. Doug Chabinsky asked if he could put an  
365 ADU on his property in the Village, as long as it blended into the historic character of the  
366 Village, regardless of lot size limitations. Nic Strong explained that anywhere residential is  
367 allowed, attached ADUs have to be allowed. Detached ADUs can have extra conditions placed  
368 on them, for which there is a Conditional Use Permit process through the Planning Board.

369  
370 Doug Chabinsky requested that the Commission read the draft document before the next  
371 meeting, as there will be a public hearing at the beginning of the meeting on the proposed  
372 regulations. He will take questions and comments from the Commission and then comments  
373 from the public at large. The Commission can then close the public hearing and enter into  
374 deliberations. The Commission can then decide to move to adjourn the hearing to a future date,  
375 move to adopt the amendments as presented, or move to adopt the regulations as amended at the  
376 public hearing. Once the regulations are finalized, the Commission can update its application  
377 form to make sure it follows the regulations. People often fill out the application form without  
378 reading the regulations and do not provide all the necessary information. Once this is all  
379 complete, there will be no excuse for applications coming before the Commission without a  
380 complete application.

381  
382 Tom Quinn stated that he has heard a couple comments recently regarding dumpsters in the  
383 Village, specifically commercial dumpsters such as the ones at Moulton's Market or behind the  
384 rental property. He asked if the Commission would consider the visibility of those. Doug  
385 Chabinsky stated that it would be nice to shield the dumpsters, but there becomes an issue with

May 30, 2023

**APPROVED**

386 accessibility. This is not currently in the regulations. Martha Chabinsky noted that the  
387 regulations mention trash receptacles not being outside of people's garages. Doug Chabinsky  
388 stated that it is unclear who controls large dumpsters in the Village. Nic Strong stated that this is  
389 unclear. She does not believe this is currently controlled. She explained that page D.13. does  
390 mention that for trash receptacles "Public visibility of any of the following may be ordered to be  
391 minimized or concealed..." Nicole Crawford noted that commercial properties enclose their  
392 dumpsters all the time. Doug Chabinsky stated that this should be considered.

393

394 **2. Discussion of Rules of Procedure**

395

396 *This item was not directly addressed at this time.*

397

398 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

399

400 **3. Any other business:**

401

402 **Doug Chabinsky adjourned the meeting at 8:18pm.**

403

404 Respectfully submitted,

405 Kristan Patenaude

406

407 Minutes approved: June 15, 2023