

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

1 In attendance at Amherst Town Hall: Arnie Rosenblatt – Chair, Bill Stoughton – Board of
2 Selectmen Ex-Officio, Chris Yates - Secretary, Cynthia Dokmo, Tom Quinn, Tom Silvia [7:28
3 pm], Dan LeClerc (alternate), Pam Coughlin (alternate), and Tim Kachmar (alternate).
4 Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director; Nicole Stevens, Town Planner;
5 and Kristan Patenaude, Recording Secretary (via Zoom)

6
7 **PUBLIC HEARING:**
8

- 9 **1. CASE #: PZ15747-050522 – Thomas R. & Polly J. Culver (Owners & Applicants);**
10 **10 Clark Island Road, PIN #: 008-107-001 – Wetland & Watershed Conservation**
11 **District – Conditional Use Permit. To construct a 157 square foot addition with**
12 **proposed drip edges within 100' wetland buffer from Baboosic Lake. Zoned**
13 ***Residential Rural. Continued from June 1, 2022.***
14

15 Taylor Hennas, Meridian Land Services, explained that the parcel sits within the 250' Shoreland
16 zone of Baboosic Lake and within the Wetland and Watershed Conservation District. Most of the
17 existing structure sits within the 100' wetland buffer. This is a preexisting, nonconforming lot of
18 record. In 2009, a CUP was granted for this property to allow for the installation of the existing
19 single-family home, pretreatment system, and other parcel improvements. She explained that the
20 proposal is to construct a 157 s.f. addition onto the preexisting, nonconforming home. It will
21 increase the amount of impervious area of the site to 16.9%. The proposed permanent impact
22 areas include 127 s.f., and temporary impact areas include 2,193 s.f. in order to access the
23 construction areas.
24

25 Taylor Hennas explained that, after meeting with the Amherst Conservation Commission (ACC),
26 it was suggested that the plan be altered to include additional techniques to create a net
27 improvement on the property. These techniques include planting of low bush blueberries in an
28 unvegetated area, and the installation of three 50-gallon dry wells. These dry wells will directly
29 store and infiltrate stormwater from an existing 203 s.f. of the existing roof; this area is larger
30 than the proposed addition. The dry wells have been shown to remove 90% TSS, 60%
31 phosphorus, and 55% nitrogen from the stormwater. These revisions will create a net
32 improvement on the property.
33

34 Tom Quinn stated that he believes the ACC's concerns have largely been addressed. It seems
35 that reasonable attempts are being made to improve the site and the proposed addition is quite
36 small.
37

38 Bill Stoughton stated that he is prepared to support this application. He stated that the applicant
39 will need two waivers from the stormwater regulations. The Town requires 60% nitrogen
40 removal, where this project is only proposing 55%, and 30% of the existing surface for a
41 redevelopment be treated.
42

43 No other Board members had comments. There was no public comment at this time.
44

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

45 **Bill Stoughton moved to waive the provisions of Section 6 of the Stormwater**
46 **Regulations, regarding the percentage of existing impervious surface which must be**
47 **treated and the nitrogen removal requirement, and that the Board finds that**
48 **granting the waiver will not impair achieving the spirit and intent of these**
49 **regulations; that compliance with these regulations is not reasonably possible given**
50 **the specific circumstances relative to the CUP, or the conditions of the land in such**
51 **CUP; and that the proposed substitute solution is consistent with the goals of these**
52 **regulations and is in the best interest of the Town. Seconded by Cynthia Dokmo.**
53 **Motion carried unanimously 4-0-0.**

54
55 **Bill Stoughton moved that the Board finds the application satisfies the criteria of**
56 **Section 4.11 I. 1. of the Zoning Ordinance, addressing the findings required for**
57 **approval of a Conditional Use Permit in the Wetlands and Watershed Conservation**
58 **District; and, further, to approve Case # PZ15747-050522 for Thomas R. and Polly**
59 **J. Culver, for a Conditional Use Permit for site improvements in the WWCD at 10**
60 **Clark Island Road, Tax Map 8 Lot 107-1, as shown on the plan dated March**
61 **3, 2022, most recently revised May 31, 2022, with the conditions listed in the Staff**
62 **Report. Seconded by Cynthia Dokmo.**
63 **Motion carried unanimously 4-0-0.**

64
65 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF APPLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING IF**
66 **APPLICATION IS ACCEPTED AS COMPLETE**

67
68 **2. CASE #: PZ15888-060622 – Thomas Bredillet (Owner & Applicant), 10 The Flume,**
69 **PIN #: 010-030-043 – Conditional Use Permit – Site Plan for proposed backyard**
70 **improvements including a swimming pool, pool house, patio, fire pit, and landscape**
71 **plantings. Some of this proposed work is within 100’ of wetlands. *Zoned Northern***
72 ***Rural.***

73
74 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong stated that all required application
75 materials have been submitted.

76
77 **Cynthia Dokmo moved to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Chris**
78 **Yates.**
79 **Motion carried unanimously 4-0-0.**

80
81 Mike Nowicki, The MacDowell Company, and Russell Tedford, Hancock Associates, addressed
82 the Board.

83
84 Mr. Nowicki described the site, pointing out on the plans the existing house with driveway to the
85 north, the lawn area behind the house, and the tree line to the west and south. He noted that the
86 house has a walkout basement. He also explained that there is an existing water well located in
87 the lawn area, as well as a propane tank with a line running to the driveway. The proposal is to
88 plant eco-grass in a section of the lawn area, install a fire pit, steppingstones, dining terrace, and

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

89 doors leading into the house. A pool, spa, and pool house are also proposed. The pool, spa,
90 terrace areas, and pool house are located outside of the buffer area. Two boulder retaining walls,
91 each approximately 4' in height, will be used to support the pool terrace and pool house from the
92 buffer area. The applicant previously considered a saltwater pool, but this has since been revised.
93 The proposed pool equipment to treat the water includes a UV water sanitizer which will
94 deactivate 99.9% of all microorganisms and algae in the water. Thus, less chlorine is needed in
95 the pool. A Pentair pump and filters will also be used to clean the water. This will be an enclosed
96 system, so no water will need to leave the pool during the season it is used. Calcium, a
97 conditioner, and muriatic acid will also be used to regulate the water.

98
99 Russell Tedford explained that the property exists in an area with Hydrologic soil group B. This
100 consists of sandy loam, allowing for a recharge rate of 3" per hour. Proposed stormwater
101 management consists of two underground systems. These are low-profile systems used to
102 attenuate, recharge, and treat stormwater. Water is directed to these systems through yard drains
103 with deep sumps to catch yard clippings. Both systems are controlled to make sure enough water
104 is inside before discharging to storm riprap sections. Per a discussion with the ACC, the plan
105 now shows removal of 90% TSS, 60% nitrogen, and 65% phosphorus. The systems are designed
106 to handle 1" to 50-year storms. Groundwater recharge and water quality requirements are being
107 met. Maintenance logs and information on cleaning the systems are included in an O&M manual
108 for the owners.

109
110 Mr. Nowicki stated that fire pit details have been included on the plan, as requested by the Fire
111 Chief. Also, a previous plan from June 23, 2021, has been included in the packet.

112
113 Tom Quinn asked how a pump truck could access the site to clean the drains. Mr. Tedford stated
114 that the pump truck company will need to be prepared to run a line quite far from the driveway to
115 the site.

116
117 In response to a question from Tom Quinn regarding the fire pit, Mr. Nowicki explained that the
118 fire pit is proposed further from the house and closer to the driveway. This will include a natural
119 wood burning fire pit. There is also a small 3'x5' propane feature included on the plan. These
120 will be safe and are placed properly on the site.

121
122 In response to a question from Chris Yates, Mr. Nowicki stated that the central hole for the fire
123 pit is 3' in diameter.

124
125 *Tom Silvia entered the meeting at 7:28pm.*

126
127 Bill Stoughton noted that this application may not need to be before the Board. He explained that
128 the wetland area in question on the site is a stream. The plan shows three buffers, 100', 50' and
129 25'. Under the regulations, the Board picks one of those buffers based on the stream
130 characteristics. A perennial stream with always flowing water uses the 100' buffer, an
131 intermittent stream uses the 50' buffer, and an ephemeral stream uses the 25' buffer. The ACC

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

132 comments state that a 50' buffer applies to this site. The only buffer that is intruded upon through
133 this plan is the 100'.
134

135 Luke Hurley, wetland scientist for Gove Environmental Services, stated that the stream on site is
136 intermittent.
137

138 Bill Stoughton stated that there is a small corner of the project that nicks the 50' buffer. He asked
139 if the plan could be amended to move that small corner outside of the buffer. Normally, the
140 stormwater management system would be reviewed under a CUP application, and he believes the
141 proposal is an appropriate one. A redevelopment generally requires that 30% of the existing
142 impervious area be treated, as well as all of the new impervious area.
143

144 Mr. Tedford stated that roof drains are being used to capture runoff from the rear roof of the
145 existing structure. He is unclear if this is 30% of the existing impervious area.
146

147 Bill Stoughton stated that he is unsure if this application needs to be before the Board for a vote.
148

149 Nic Strong stated that the application still proposes to disturb over 20,000 s.f. for the stormwater
150 management plan, which requires approval. Mr. Tedford agreed that the plan calls for a
151 disturbance of approximately 27,000 s.f.
152

153 Bill Stoughton stated that he would like to confirm the 30% requirement for existing impervious
154 area. This could be conditioned as part of approval of the project.
155

156 Tom Quinn noted that there appears to be a significant amount of driveway being removed as
157 part of the proposal. Mr. Tedford agreed that this equates to approximately 10,000 s.f.
158

159 There was no public comment at this time.
160

161 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton regarding if the Board could approve the
162 application not as a CUP but as a stormwater management plan application, Nic Strong
163 explained that the Board can do so, she pointed out that she is still waiting on Keach
164 Nordstrom's review of the engineering plan and the drainage calculations.
165

166 **Bill Stoughton moved that the Board finds this application satisfies all of the**
167 **requirements of the Stormwater Regulations and that it be approved under CASE#:**
168 **PZ15888-060622 – Thomas Bredillet for a Stormwater Management Plan for**
169 **improvements at 10 The Flume, Tax Map 10 Lot 30-43, as shown on the plans dated**
170 **May 31, 2022, and June 2, 2022, with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report and**
171 **the following additional condition precedent: that the applicant shall demonstrate to**
172 **the Community Development Office that at least 30% of the existing impervious**
173 **area is treated with the stormwater management practice. Seconded by Chris Yates.**
174 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.**
175

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

- 176 **3. CASE #: PZ15907-060722 – Walnut Hollow Realty LLC (Owner) & Ashley and**
177 **Jarron Dunnick (Applicants) – Walnut Hill Road, PIN #: 006-081-003 – Subdivision**
178 **Application. Depict a subdivision of Tax Map Lot 006-081-003 to create one new**
179 **2.66-acre residential lot with a +/-6.2-acre remainder lot. Zoned Residential Rural.**
180

181 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong stated that the applicant is
182 requesting waivers from all of the required studies.

183
184 Arnie Rosenblatt explained that the Board can choose to either defer deciding on the requested
185 waivers until it first hears the applicant’s proposal, with the understanding that it can later choose
186 to require any/all of the studies, or the Board can determine that the application is incomplete
187 until the waiver issue can be resolved.

188
189 **Bill Stoughton moved to waive the requirements for the requested studies for**
190 **purposes of completeness only, with the understanding that the Board may request**
191 **one or all of the studies in the future as it reviews the application. Seconded by**
192 **Chris Yates.**
193 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.**
194

195 Arnie Rosenblatt explained that the Board will accept the application as complete, but it may
196 require one or more studies in the future, as it deems necessary.

197
198 **Bill Stoughton moved to accept the application as complete. Seconded by Chris**
199 **Yates.**
200 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.**
201

202 Spencer Tate, Meridian Land Services, addressed the Board. He explained that this request is for
203 subdivision of land from an 8.9-acre piece on Walnut Hill Road. The northwestern edge of the
204 property is approximately 7/10 of a mile from Route 101. The northeasternmost corner is the
205 Embankment Road right of way. The proposal is to break off 2.66 acres with 2.01 net acres,
206 leaving a remainder piece of 6.3 acres. The special circumstances of the parcel include that the
207 owner/applicant currently resides at 40 Walnut Hill Road. The owner also owns a property
208 across the street and would like to break off a piece to construct a structure for their children to
209 live in. There is a 0.8-acre wetland located in the easternmost corner of the piece, with only 0.6
210 acres as part of the proposal. There are no 25% slopes on the lot. In regard to the ACC concerns
211 about the developable area, there is a suitable site and soils on the site. There is a 4,000 s.f. area
212 for a septic system that would support a single-family residence and complies with all local and
213 State setback areas. This area is currently being managed as a pasture, so no trees will need to be
214 removed to create a structure. A septic design has been created. The speed limit was recently
215 lowered in this area to 25 mph, leading to a 200’ sight distance requirement, which is met
216 through this proposal. The DPW Director signed off on this item and included a comment that
217 brush needs to be trimmed back at the sight distance location. One lot will meet all regulations
218 and the remainder lot will be conforming. A waiver is being sought from traffic and other impact
219 studies, due to no additional impact from traffic trips as part of the proposal.

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

220

221 In response to a question from Dan LeClerc, Mr. Tate explained that the B&M Trail is shown on
222 the septic plan. There is a wood line shown and the septic is proposed well beyond that. There is
223 no need to encroach on the 25' buffer as part of this proposal.

224

225 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Mr. Tate stated that the driveway will be able to
226 achieve the 8% slope requirement.

227

228 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton regarding if the project will require stormwater
229 management features, Mr. Tate stated that this is not triggered for the subdivision of land
230 proposal. He is unclear what the intended buildout timeline is. The proposal is also under 20,000
231 s.f. of disturbance.

232

233 Bill Stoughton noted that the parcel is adjacent to wetlands. If stormwater management features
234 are needed, they will need to be placed outside of the wetlands buffer. Mr. Tate noted that this
235 approval could be conditioned on there being no future impacts to the buffer.

236

237 In response to a question from Tom Silvia regarding how the equestrian farm on the remainder
238 lot would be impacted if the proposed lot was sold to someone else, Mr. Tate explained that the
239 applicant is the manager of the equestrian farm located on the property. It will be up to her to
240 decide how best to make sure this proposal does not impact her business. The property will still
241 be zoned for this use.

242

243 Cynthia Dokmo and Chris Yates had no comments or questions.

244

245 In response to a question from Tom Quinn, Mr. Tate explained that the proposal is for a 2.661-
246 acre lot, with 2.01-acre net, leaving 0.5 acres of wetlands. The wetlands are larger than a half-
247 acre, but there is only a half-acre of wetlands on the site itself.

248

249 There was no public comment at this time.

250

251 Tom Quinn stated that he is okay with approving waivers for a smaller subdivision of this type.

252

253 **Tom Quinn moved to waive the fiscal impact, environmental impact, traffic impact,**
254 **water supply, drainage reports, and hydrological reports, being that this is a minor**
255 **subdivision and not worthy of the time and expense to complete these items.**

256

257 **Seconded by Tom Silvia.**

258

259 Bill Stoughton stated that the proposed use is residential, however there could be other uses on
260 the property, such as agricultural if a barn is built instead. Impact fees could be assessed at the
261 residential rate for now and ultimately, a different use would lead to assessment of different fees.

262

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

263 The Board discussed the items for active and substantial development. Bill Stoughton suggested
264 this be the construction of a well. For substantial completion of the improvements for final
265 vesting, Bill Stoughton suggested completion of the foundation of the structure on site. Spencer
266 Tate agreed with these suggestions.

267
268 **Bill Stoughton moved to approve Case #: PZ15907-060722 for Walnut Hollow**
269 **Realty, LLC, and Ashley & Jarron Dunnick, for the above-**
270 **cited Final Minor Subdivision of Map 6 Lot 81-3, with frontage on Walnut**
271 **Hill Road, with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report and the following**
272 **additional subsequent condition #4: this subdivision approval is conditioned upon**
273 **no encroachments to wetland buffers being necessary to accommodate residential**
274 **construction; further with impact fees being assessed at the residential rate; and**
275 **further with active and substantial development or building being defined as**
276 **construction of a suitable potable water well, and substantial completion of**
277 **improvements being defined as completion of the residential foundation. Seconded**
278 **by Chris Yates.**
279 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.**

280
281 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

282
283 **4. Discussion re: Planning Board requirements for Traffic and Hydrogeological**
284 **studies**

285 Arnie Rosenblatt explained that the Board currently follows a procedure when various studies
286 are required that the applicant, at his/her own expense, will retain an expert and submit a report
287 to the Board. Sometimes the Board will have that report reviewed by a third-party expert. This is
288 also paid for by the applicant, even though it is a report to the Board/Community Development
289 Office. Bill Stoughton has suggested that the Board have a neutral expert on hand to immediately
290 make a report on traffic and hydrogeological items; this will be paid for by the applicant. Arnie
291 Rosenblatt stated that he does not agree with this idea because he believes the current process is
292 the most thorough way to handle things.

293
294 Bill Stoughton stated that a traffic study was submitted by the applicants for the Jacobson and
295 Clearview developments. The Planning Board sought an independent third-party review of that
296 report. Later, the Planning Board asked the Board of Selectmen to examine that third party
297 review, because it noted that an intersection in Town was set to fail, with or without additional
298 developments in place. NRPC completed this study, and its traffic analyst took issue with the
299 original traffic study completed by the Jacobson/Clearview development. The NRPC analyst
300 found that there were two items completed by the original traffic analyst that understated the
301 traffic impact of the two developments. One being that a no-development growth rate was used
302 which hasn't been experienced in this area in 20 years. The second being that a peak month
303 requirement was misused. These made the existing traffic in Town look worse than it was,
304 allowing the argument to be made that the developments would not add to an already bad
305 situation. This was not pointed out by the Clearview analyst and was not caught by the third-
306 party analyst the Board retained. This shows an error in the process. The Board cannot determine

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

307 who the developer will choose as an analyst. It also has not retained a third-party traffic analyst
308 often enough to have one it can rely on all of the time. Bill Stoughton stated that he believes it is
309 important to have this.

310
311 Bill Stoughton explained that there was a similar occurrence for a hydrogeological report, in
312 which case the third-party analyst hired by the Town is no longer local and went 180 degrees
313 between the recommendation he made to the Board for a particular development and what he
314 later told the applicant's agent. If the Board had someone it routinely engaged there would be a
315 level of trust and engagement. He suggested this mostly for traffic studies, but also potentially
316 for hydrogeological. The applicant would be required to pay for and use whichever party the
317 Board selects for these reports. If the applicant disagrees with the findings of the study, s/he
318 could then seek an additional analyst for additional reports at his/her expense.

319
320 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that the concern seems to be with the analysts that the Board has chosen
321 for third party review in the past. He asked if a more regular relationship with one or two third
322 parties that can be relied on would solve this issue. Bill Stoughton stated that he does not believe
323 the Board would generate enough business for a firm to create that kind of relationship. He
324 would like a more trusted, neutral evaluation. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes the Board
325 already receives trusted, neutral evaluations. Bill Stoughton stated that the two cases he
326 mentioned previously were inadequate. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes the current
327 process leads to more review, which is what he is in favor of.

328
329 Tom Quinn stated that he sees both sides of the issue. He believes that it makes sense for
330 applications for certain sized developments that these two items be addressed right off the bat by
331 a Town-engaged expert. The applicant will likely want their own expert involved as well. The
332 applicant is required to pay for both of these experts, so the Board might as well make it clear
333 that these two items will be required in this process.

334
335 Chris Yates asked if this intention could be fulfilled by including more exact, neutral language in
336 the RFP from the developer to the analyst. As the applicant is paying for these studies, the Board
337 is at its mercy as to what language is included in the RFP. Sample or required language may help
338 with this issue. Bill Stoughton stated that he does not believe this is likely workable.

339
340 Cynthia Dokmo stated that there used to be a Town Engineer contracted to review all plans and
341 developer's reports. The Board previously chose two companies to review plans that ended up
342 being questionable. She prefers the current system but believes there should be one company
343 used by the Board in a reliable manner for each review.

344
345 Bill Stoughton stated that the issue is that the Board does not regularly go out for a third-party
346 review and, when it has, it has scrambled to find someone to perform it.

347
348 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes the proposed approach will create problems. He believes
349 developers will not like the approach and it will leave the Town open to potential lawsuits. He
350 wants to give developers every chance to make their positions. He believes developers should

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

351 have the chance to hire their own experts, with the Board's understanding that these are hired by
352 the applicant to advocate for their clients. The Town can then retain someone, paid for by the
353 developer, to scrutinize the applicant's position. This is a more effective process. He suggested
354 asking Nic Strong to identify three companies in each area that can be reviewed by a small
355 subsection of the Board. This accomplishes the goal of having certain experts on standby,
356 without limiting the applicant.

357
358 Bill Stoughton noted that this might not be effective because the second review has always, in
359 his time, been a paper review. It has not involved site work or gathering data in the first instance.
360 He would like a firm to routinely do all of that in the first instance, and then allow the applicant's
361 chosen analyst to perform a desk review. This is about trusting the work product. He wants the
362 Board and the public to be able to trust the work product.

363
364 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that Bill Stoughton's opinion seems to be that it is not adequate to
365 receive a rebuttal report that is relying on the applicant's chosen analyst's underlying data, as
366 that data cannot necessarily be trusted. An alternative could be to require that the second, third-
367 party review also use underlying data. This will likely lead to complaints by applicants.

368
369 Bill Stoughton stated that he is not interested in making applicants pay more through the process.

370
371 Tim Kachmar stated that he has never seen a report from a developer that does not state that
372 there will not be an impact from the proposal. He agreed with having a set firm on the books that
373 could be requested to either complete a full review with underlying data or a simple paper
374 review, depending on what the Board finds necessary. He agreed with interviewing a few firms
375 to have certain ones to rely on.

376
377 Pam Coughlin asked if a developer could sue the Town if it does not like the analyst the Town
378 has chosen to complete the review. Arnie Rosenblatt explained that, to the extent that an
379 applicant loses control over the process, there is a specific State policy in place that encourages
380 applicants to seek litigation based on failed applications. He would prefer to give as little
381 opportunity as possible to complain about the process.

382
383 Bill Stoughton stated that, if the Board is doing the right thing, he believes the Town will defend
384 itself against a lawsuit.

385
386 Cynthia Dokmo stated that she believes the applicant needs to be able to present the whole
387 application, including their own experts.

388
389 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that no one is truly a neutral expert. He does not want to create additional
390 exposure for the Town. The legislature has created a court that is specifically intended to rule
391 against municipalities. The playing field is not equal.

392

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

393 Chris Yates asked how the Board can be sure that the second third-party review is truly looking
394 at the best overall interest of the Town, as it is also being paid for by the applicant. Arnie
395 Rosenblatt stated that the Board currently chooses this expert.

396
397 Bill Stoughton stated that the Board recently has started discussing the scope of the third-party
398 review. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that this was not previously done and only came about due to
399 discussions with an applicant's engineer.

400
401 Dan LeClerc stated that his concern is charging the applicant twice if it is not part of the
402 application fees. Many developers have on-staff experts in these fields. These can easily be
403 skewed one way or another, but how can it be proven that their findings are incorrect if the
404 studies are carried out correctly. This does not mean the Board shouldn't have backup. He
405 suggested that the Town partner with other nearby towns to share certain experts in the field if
406 the Town itself does not have enough of a workload to find one on its own.

407
408 Tom Quinn stated that he believes Bill Stoughton's suggestion would make the process more
409 efficient. Allowing the developer's expert and the Town's own expert to work separately using
410 the same data instead of simply reviewing completed studies, may ensure that items are not
411 missed or skewed along the way.

412
413 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt regarding if there are any other towns that use
414 the process as suggested by Bill Stoughton, Nic Strong stated that she is unaware of any. She
415 believes that two or three different companies would need to be interviewed if the Board does
416 wish to move to this process.

417
418 Bill Stoughton stated that he believes a regulation would need to be drafted in order to move to
419 this new process. Arnie Rosenblatt asked if Bill Stoughton would draft this item for review.

420
421 Bill Stoughton suggested that NRPC might be able to complete the traffic studies routinely or
422 may know of firms that may be helpful.

423
424 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that the threshold question is if the Board will approve of the proposed
425 regulation.

426
427 Nic Strong suggested asking this question on the Planning Board listserv site to see if other
428 towns have suggestions. Arnie Rosenblatt agreed.

429 **5. Minutes: June 15, 2022**

430 **Chris Yates moved to approve the meeting minutes of June 15, 2022, as submitted.**
431 **Seconded by Tom Silvia.**
432 **Motion carried 4-0-1 [C. Dokmo abstaining].**
433

434 **6. Any other business to come before the Board**

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

July 6, 2022

APPROVED

435 **Cynthia Dokmo moved to adjourn at 8:31pm. Seconded by Bill Stoughton.**
436 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.**

437
438

439 Respectfully submitted,
440 Kristan Patenaude

441
442 Minutes approved: July 20, 2022
443