

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

1 In attendance at Amherst Town Hall: Arnie Rosenblatt – Chair, Bill Stoughton – Board of
2 Selectmen Ex-Officio, Cynthia Dokmo, Tom Silvia, Chris Yates, Tom Quinn, Tracie Adams,
3 Dan LeClerc (alternate), and Pam Coughlin (alternate).
4

5 Staff present: Nic Strong, Community Development Director; and Kristan Patenaude, Recording
6 Secretary (via Zoom)
7

8 Arnie Rosenblatt called the meeting to order at 7:00pm. He noted that the Conceptual
9 Consultation for Brook Road will be deferred to a future date.
10

11 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**
12

13 **1. CASE #: PZ16131-080422 – EIP One Bon Terrain, LLC (Owner) & New England**
14 **Facilities Solutions Corporation (Applicant); 1 Bon Terrain Drive, PIN #: 002-026-**
15 **004. Non-Residential Site Plan – Compliance Hearing. To show the as-built**
16 **conditions of the site in support of the project receiving a Certificate of Occupancy**
17 **as required by the Amherst Non-Residential Plan Regulations, Section 7.1.C. Zoned**
18 **Industrial. Continued from October 5, 2022**
19

20 Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the case.
21

22 Sam Foisie, PE, Meridian Land Services, stated that he submitted a response letter last week
23 regarding the main concerns brought up by the Board, specifically related to the as-built plan,
24 underground information, such as where the water line and drainage structures are located, and
25 critical elevations around the site. The plan has been amended to show the underground features,
26 critical elevations, and an updated drainage structure table. These elevations confirm that the
27 drainage will work appropriately and was built in accordance with the design intent. The
28 applicant has addressed previous concerns and questions on the plan and in the response letter,
29 with one exception being the light poles. There has been a supply issue for the light poles. The
30 bases are in, and the light poles are on site but have not yet been installed.
31

32 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong stated that she has no concerns with
33 this proposal.
34

35 In response to a question from Tracie Adams, Sam Foisie stated that the light poles are on site
36 and should be installed at any time.
37

38 Tom Quinn, Cynthia Dokmo, Tom Silvia, Pam Coughlin, Chris Yates, and Dan LeClerc had no
39 questions.
40

41 Bill Stoughton asked if the applicant would be okay with an additional subsequent condition, that
42 lighting shall be installed per the plan once materials are available. Sam Foisie agreed to this
43 item.
44

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

45 **Bill Stoughton moved to confirm compliance with the conditions to the approval of**
46 **the Non-Residential Site Plan Review for EIP One Bon Terrain, LLC (Owner)**
47 **and New England Facilities Solutions Corporation (Applicant) – 1 Bon**
48 **Terrain Drive, Map 2 Lot 26-4 to construct a 30,000 s.f. building addition to the**
49 **existing facility, for the purposes and use of warehousing product, with associated**
50 **truck parking yard and other ancillary improvements, subject to the conditions**
51 **listed in the Staff Report and the additional condition subsequent that lighting shall**
52 **be installed per plan when materials are available. Seconded by Tom Silvia.**
53 **Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0**

54
55 **2. CASE #: PZ16160-081022 – Vonderosa Properties LLC (Owner & Applicant),**
56 **County & Cricket Corner Roads, PIN #: 004-122-000 - Subdivision Application.**
57 **Proposed five (5) lot existing road frontage residential subdivision. Zoned**
58 **Residential/Rural. Continued from October 5, 2022**

59
60 Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the case. He noted that, subsequent to the last meeting at
61 which this item was discussed, a site walk was held. Also, certain reviews of studies requested
62 by the Board were completed and circulated to the Board.

63
64 *Cynthia Dokmo recused herself from this item.*

65
66 Chad Branon, PE, Fieldstone Land Consultants, stated that, during the site walk, the group
67 walked the frontage of the property and looked at the sight distances for each driveway. There
68 was discussion regarding revisions to the second lot in on Cricket Corner Rd, Lot 4-122. Hence,
69 that driveway location was modified, and revised plans were submitted to show the driveway
70 grading and sight line modifications, showing that an easement from the parcel across the street
71 was not needed. Third-party reviews were received from Keach Nordstrom Associates and a
72 hydrogeological review was received relative to the well reports. Two previously submitted
73 reports, one prepared by HydroSource and the other prepared by Terracon, were reviewed by the
74 Town's third-party consultant, Edgewater Strategies. Chad Branon stated that, in reviewing the
75 summary of those reports, they supported the results of the studies as originally provided.
76 Regarding Keach Nordstrom's review, the applicant has no issue with any of the 11 comments.
77 He asked that the Board consider those comments as part of a conditional approval this evening.
78 Regarding the staff memo, the applicant has no objections to any of the recommended
79 conditions.

80
81 Pam Coughlin, Dan LeClerc, Chris Yates, and Tom Silvia had no questions.

82
83 Bill Stoughton noted that the latest plan the Board has in front of it is Rev C, dated September 7,
84 2022. He asked if that revision contains the most recent information on the revised driveways.
85 Chad Branon stated that there was a more recent revised plan submitted. The most recently
86 revised plan uses the existing log landing and the existing curb cut there. The location of the
87 driveway was modified so that the sight lines lie entirely within the roadway. Chad Branon noted

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

88 that the most recently revised plan was not the one reviewed by Keach Nordstrom. He stated that
89 he would be happy to accept that review as a condition of approval.
90

91 Bill Stoughton stated that he previously expressed concern as to whether this lot was suitable for
92 subdivision. Based on the site walk, he no longer has that concern. He does not believe the issues
93 discussed in the ordinances and regulations regarding suitability for subdivision are an issue for
94 this subdivision, as it is currently proposed. His greatest concern during the site walk, and with
95 this application overall, was safety along Cricket Corner Road. The traffic during the site walk,
96 which occurred at 4:00 PM on a weekday, was surprisingly heavy. He appreciates the proposed
97 changes to improve sight distances but is still concerned with that road given the traffic and the
98 specific conditions.
99

100 Bill Stoughton stated that the revised driveway for proposed Lot 4-122-1 is located lower than
101 the crest of a hill to the right while exiting the driveway, and a portion of the road to the right of
102 the driveway is hidden by that crest and a corner along Cricket Corner Road. While there may
103 be the required 300' sight line visibility to a portion of Cricket Corner Road, closer portions of
104 Cricket Corner Road are partially hidden to the driveway, and therefore the driveway will be
105 hidden from certain portions of Cricket Corner Road. The driveway for Lot 4-122-2 and -3 may
106 have a similar visibility issue looking to the left because of the current terrain. He suggested that
107 Keach Nordstrom review the revised plans and do a construction inspection to ensure sight line
108 adequacy from those areas.
109

110 Bill Stoughton suggested the following conditions:

- 111 1. Compliance with all of the comments and recommendations of the town engineer are required.
- 112 2. Receipt of an estimate for construction inspections (including driveway construction details
113 and sight line adequacy and stormwater controls) from the Town's engineering firm(s) and
114 submission of the amount of the inspections to be placed in escrow. A pre-construction meeting
115 shall be held prior to the start of construction. Satisfactory construction inspections, including
116 but not limited to satisfactory sight distance verification at driveways, are a condition subsequent
117 of approval.
118

119 Bill Stoughton noted that the applicant has publicly discussed a much larger series of
120 developments; this is just one lot of six, seven, or eight adjacent properties with different lot
121 numbers, all under common ownership and control. He suggested an additional condition:
122 3. The applicant has publicly discussed a much larger development plan including adjacent
123 properties under several different lot numbers under common ownership and control. It is
124 important that the combined impacts of the potential developments not be masked by
125 applications that address subdivision of only one or some of the lots at one time. Accordingly,
126 future applications for subdivision or site development on Lots 4-116, -117, -118, -119, -121, -
127 145 and 6-102 must address the cumulative impacts on traffic, natural resources (including
128 wildlife habitat and water resources), rural character, stormwater, and town and school resources,
129 and must include the effects of this subdivision of Lot 4-122. Applicant must use a baseline for
130 assessing impacts that omits the effects of development of any of these lots.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

131 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Chad Branon explained that, typically, active and
132 substantial development for a conventional subdivision is satisfied by the recording of the
133 subdivision plan. This project is required to be phased because it is more than four lots. Each of
134 these lots stands alone, with each having its own driveway, and its own stormwater features, so
135 there is not a common feature, such as a roadway or other improvement to use for a measure of
136 completeness. The applicant is requesting that the recording of the plan be the vesting
137 component. Bill Stoughton suggested that active and substantial development be defined as the
138 completion of construction of a driveway on the first of the lots to be developed. Chad Branon
139 agreed.

140

141 Regarding substantial completion of improvements, Chad Branon suggested the construction of
142 the first home. Chad Branon stated that the applicant has had some interest in the lots, but has not
143 been able to take any offers, as there is not yet an approved plan Bill Stoughton agreed that this
144 could be defined as construction of the foundation of a lot.

145

146 Tom Quinn asked if the definition for substantial completion would also include stormwater
147 features for the lot. Chad Branon stated that he would have no problem with this, as this item will
148 be needed to secure a building permit.

149

150 Tracie Adams asked if other Board members had anything to share about the site walk, as she
151 was absent. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he was taken aback by the volume and speed of the
152 traffic along the road in this location. He stated that sight distance does matter for this project.

153

154 In response to a question from Tracie Adams, Chad Branon stated that the DPW Director
155 previously had one comment pertaining to the sight distance easement.

156

157 Howard Muscott, 48 County Road, thanked the Planning Board for its informed decision-making
158 process and efforts. He echoed Mr. Stoughton's previous comments regarding this project. He
159 stated that his concern is not about this project as a single entity, but as the first of as many as
160 seven subdivisions which the developer calls the Whitetail Meadows development. He stated that
161 he believes this subdivision proposal should be treated as part of the larger conceptual
162 development. However, if the Board chooses to grant this application, he respectfully requested
163 that any future subdivisions involving these parcels be treated as part of a whole and the
164 cumulative impacts on safety, traffic, wildlife, schools, water, and road improvements be
165 assessed and addressed in that particular way. An important question is, at what point does the
166 next subdivision trigger the larger cumulative impacts and who should bear that burden? This
167 should not be borne solely on the citizens and taxpayers of Amherst.

168

169 Tom Silvia asked about the zoning phasing requirements for this project. He asked if the five
170 units should be phased over three years and, if so, a certain number should be allowed in each
171 year. Nic Strong stated that this is a good question, as the proposal includes an odd number of
172 units. The Board should likely specify the number of units for each year instead of a percentage.

173 Tom Silvia suggested that phasing include three units in one year and two in another, or vice
174 versa.

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218

In response to a question from Tom Quinn, it was noted that the driveway easement has already been reviewed by Town Counsel.

Bill Stoughton moved to approve Case#: PZ16160-081022 for Vonderosa Properties, LLC, for the above cited Final Subdivision of Map 4 Lot 122 into five lots, with frontage on Cricket Corner and County Roads, with the conditions in the staff report, with condition #6 on phasing modified to say ‘the subdivision shall be phased over two years with not more than three of the dwelling units receiving building permits in a one year period’; and with impact fees assessed at the Residential rate; with the following additional conditions:

1. Compliance with all of the comments and recommendations of the Town Engineer are required.

2. Receipt of an estimate for construction inspections (including driveway construction details and sight line adequacy and stormwater controls) from the Town’s engineering firm(s) and submission of the amount of the inspections to be placed in escrow. A pre-construction meeting shall be held prior to the start of construction. Satisfactory construction inspections, including, but not limited to, satisfactory sight distance verification at driveways, are a condition subsequent of approval.

3. Remaining developments – The applicant has publicly discussed a much larger development plan including adjacent properties under several different lot numbers under common ownership and control. It is important that the combined impacts of the potential developments not be masked by applications that address subdivision of only one or some of the lots at one time. Accordingly, future applications for subdivision or site development on Lots 4-116, -117, -118, -119, -121, -145 and 6-102 must address the cumulative impacts on traffic, natural resources (including wildlife habitat and water resources), rural character, stormwater, and town and school resources, and must include the effects of this subdivision of Lot 4-122. Applicant must use a baseline for assessing impacts that omits the effects of development of any of these lots.

Further, defining active and substantial development as commencement of construction of the driveway on the first of the lots to be developed, and defining substantial completion of improvements as construction of the foundation and stormwater management best practices on the first of the lots to be developed.

Seconded by Tom Silvia.

Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.

Tracie Adams reviewed the Findings of Fact. It begins with a chronology of this proposal. Relative to being part of a larger development, there was conversation regarding addressing the larger scale of this project with multiple lots. Relative to regulation 203.1, this does not constitute a scattered or premature subdivision. Relative to regulation 207, that the character of the land does not pose a danger to the public health, safety, or to the environment by being developed. Relative to regulation 209, the proposal is giving proper regard to preservation of

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

219 existing features relative to stormwater management. A stormwater management review has been
220 completed by the Town Engineer and the Board is comfortable moving forward with the
221 bioretention features. There was a suggestion by the Town Engineer to monitor those features,
222 and this is included. Relative to hydrogeological concerns, well water quantity testing was
223 discussed and there were evaluations by two different companies, Terracon and HydroSource.
224 The board concluded it wanted a third-party review, which came in in support of those two
225 studies and concluded there was a sufficient quantity of water. Relative to water quality testing,
226 we have a statement that we would like to have these resources monitored and there is a
227 statement regarding quality testing for new wells. Relative to environmental impact concerns, a
228 study was completed, and the report listed some conservation measures to incorporate into the
229 design. The Board would like to see those incorporated to best preserve the natural habitat and
230 animals. Relative to the driveway and road safety, the Board finds that the elevation changes,
231 curves, and roadside topography of Cricket Corner Road in the area of the proposed development
232 pose greater than typical safety concerns. Relative to the driveway and road traffic, this warrants
233 a detailed examination of proposed and as built sight distance conditions by the Town Engineer.
234 Phasing, as addressed by the Board is also included.
235

236 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt regarding the bonding item in the Findings of
237 Fact, Tracie Adams suggested it be stricken.
238

239 **Tracie Adams moved to accept the proposed Findings of Fact for Vonderosa**
240 **Properties, as presented. Seconded by Tom Silvia.**
241 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0**
242

243 **CONCEPTUAL DISCUSSION:**
244

245 **3. CASE #: PZ16279-090722 – 24 BR Partners, LLC c/o Ron Decola (Owner &**
246 **Applicant); 24 Brook Road, PIN #: 010-026-000 – Subdivision Application.**
247 **Proposed 38-unit elderly housing development with a community water supply and**
248 **private septic systems. Zoned Northern Rural.**
249

250 The Board discussed timing and agenda for upcoming meetings. They agreed to hold a public
251 hearing on the proposed ordinance changes on December 7, 2022.
252

253 **Bill Stoughton moved to continue this application to December 21, 2022, at 7pm at**
254 **Town Hall, at the request of the applicant. Seconded by Chris Yates.**
255 **Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0.**
256

257 **4. CASE #: PZ16440-101222 – P & P Commercial Properties LLC (Owners) & Apex**
258 **Fireworks LLC (Applicants) – 68 Route 101A, PIN #: 002-080-001 – Non-**
259 **Residential Site Plan Application – Change of Use site plan approval for the**
260 **operation of a retail fireworks location. Zoned Commercial.**
261

262 *This item was withdrawn by the applicant.*

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306

DESIGN REVIEW

5. CASE #PZ16438-101222 – Kevin Curran & Claudine Curran (Owners) & Meridian Land Services, Inc. (Applicants); Williamsburg Drive, PIN #: 008-094-000 – Subdivision Application – To depict a subdivision of lot 008-094-000 to create one new 2.17-acre lot with a 203+/-acre remainder lot. Zoned Residential/Rural.

Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the case.

Cynthia Dokmo recused herself from this item.

Bill Stoughton moved that there is no regional impact from this application. Seconded by Tracie Adams. Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0.

Ken Clinton, LLS, Meridian Land Services, stated that Lot 8-94 is approximately 205 acres, with Baboosic Lake wrapping along the east side of the property. To the north, via Red Gate Lane, is Route 101, to the west are various subdivisions and residences, and in the southwesterly corner is Walnut Hill Road. The proposal is for a small, single lot subdivision, for a single-family residential lot, based on the reduced frontage lot requirements. As a design review, this not a final application at this time. There are three points of discussion the applicant would like to hear from the Board on. These include delineating the full boundary of the entire 205-acre lot, studies that might be required, and the interpretation of reduced frontage lots.

Ken Clinton stated that, as suggested in the Staff Report, the applicant anticipates requesting a waiver of the requirements to show each boundary line with bearings and distances. The reference plan relied upon for this information was far more detailed and did annotate quite a bit of the boundary for this parcel. This is a unique parcel as it has one Tax Map Lot number yet spans both sides of numerous roads. The reference plan did not fully define the right of ways for each one of those roads. The current proposal concentrates on one small corner on the northwesterly side of the property, as opposed to having detail or any proposals along any of the roads that are not fully defined in the reference plan. In the vicinity of proposed Lot 8-94-1, bearings and distances are fully defined on the boundary adjacent to the proposed lot, as well as the proposed lot itself. A waiver request for providing bearings and distances for the remainder, which is approximately 203 acres, will be proposed.

Ken Clinton stated that, secondly, the applicant would like an indication if the Board felt this single lot would require any of the studies that are listed in the checklist, such as traffic, fiscal impact, environmental, water supply, etc.

Ken Clinton stated that the final point of discussion is the reduced frontage lot area and the Board's interpretation. An acreage of 2.17 acres is proposed for this lot, which complies with the consistent and long-accepted interpretation of the ordinance and regulations for this matter.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

307 However, it seems that the Board has a new interpretation of this, as of January/February of this
308 year. Ken Clinton stated that he has been presenting plans and doing this work in Amherst for
309 over 25 years. In that time, it has been consistent that a back lot is required to have the minimum
310 acreage of its zone, not 10 acres minimum. A lot is proposed that complies with the regulations.
311 He noted that Attorney Brad Westgate, Winer & Bennett, LLP, will provide some written and
312 verbal testimony to this point, which can then hopefully be considered by Town Counsel. The
313 full content of Attorney Westgate's opinion should be reviewed and responded to further. The
314 applicant is proposing to provide \$2,500 to be put in an escrow to allow for the back-and-forth
315 detailed review and Town Counsel's opinion.

316
317 Attorney Brad Westgate explained that the Currans previously submitted a design review
318 application for a property on Baboosic Lake Rd/ Pond Parish Road, which contemplated 44 lots
319 on 156 acres, ten of which were reduced frontage lots. During the hearing for this item, on
320 September 7, 2022, Attorney Westgate stated that he addressed the Board with respect to the
321 reduced frontage lot regulations and zoning ordinance provisions. He has submitted a letter to the
322 Board in anticipation of this evening's meeting and reviewed the Staff Report, relative to the one
323 lot application as previously described. The gist of the presentation regarding reduced frontage
324 lots, was to the effect that the long-standing analysis and interpretation this Board has made with
325 respect to lot acreage should still carry. There is a good rationale for that when analyzing the
326 zoning ordinance and subdivision provisions. The minimum acreage requirement is two acres,
327 not 10. The Staff Report references the same comment regarding reduced frontage lots that was
328 set forth in the Staff Report for the September 7th hearing. The Staff Report makes reference to
329 the subdivision regulation component of the reduced frontage lot analysis, but not the zoning
330 ordinance provisions. Attorney Westgate stated that he would like to focus on the zoning
331 ordinance provisions and how they dovetail and interact with the subdivision regulations. Since
332 the September 7th meeting, the Board has formed working groups to deal with a variety of
333 proposed zoning amendment changes and subdivision regulation changes, including those that
334 deal with reduced frontage lot provisions. The rationale behind the Board's apparent new
335 interpretation of a 10 acres minimum lot requirement has not been given, although a number of
336 Board members have expressed their opinion. Attorney Westgate stated that Mr. Curran is
337 willing to place \$2,500 in escrow with the Town to cover Town Counsel expenses to discuss his
338 analysis of the provisions and why there is a rational basis for the interpretation to stand as it has
339 since at least 1986. He asked that the Board give him the opportunity to address this with Town
340 Counsel.

341
342 Attorney Westgate stated that, Section 4.3.C. of the zoning ordinance, states that each new lot
343 shall have a minimum frontage of 200' on a publicly maintained road, unless frontage has been
344 approved and recorded as a reduced frontage lot, in which event 35' shall be sufficient. The
345 minimum lot area section in the Residential Zoning District sets forth a two-acre minimum lot
346 requirement. Nowhere in the zoning ordinance is there any mention of reduced frontage lots
347 having to be greater than two acres. Section 4.3.C. of the zoning ordinance and its subsections
348 mention a two-acre requirement in one subsection and the frontage requirements in another.
349 These two items are locked together. The reduced frontage lot section is not found elsewhere in
350 the zoning ordinance.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

351
352 Per the Staff Report, Section 213.2.E. of the Subdivision Regulations, states that no subdivision
353 plan providing for reduced frontage lots shall be approved unless the total acreage of such plan is
354 a minimum of ten acres for each reduced frontage lot. Thus, 20 acres could produce two frontage
355 lots. If the intent of the Subdivision Regulations was that each lot be ten acres minimum, it
356 would have simply said, no reduced frontage lot should be less than ten acres, but its focus is the
357 acreage of the plan. This provision in the Subdivision Regulations has not changed since 1986. It
358 has been interpreted sensibly and in accordance with the zoning requirements. The acreage
359 requirement of two acres and the frontage requirement of 35' are in the zoning ordinance, right
360 next to each other, as subsections of the same section. This board has recognized the consistency
361 between the zoning ordinance and the regulations by allowing reduced frontage lots to be to at
362 least two acres and not requiring them to be ten acres. This traditional interpretation does not
363 violate the core objectives of the zoning ordinance or the rational way in which the interplay of
364 these regulations is to be read. On the other hand, to interpret it as to require a ten-acre minimum
365 for each lot, would contradict the zoning ordinance, effectively allowing the subdivision
366 regulations to override the zoning ordinance.

367
368 Ken Clinton stated that the requested items for discussion are the potential waiver for full
369 bearings and distances, and boundary annotations on the 203 acre remainder lot; an indication of
370 what studies the Board might feel reasonable for this particular application; and a response to the
371 request to have further communication with Town Counsel and to have him write a formal
372 opinion after conversations with Attorney Westgate, with a deposit of \$2,500 proposed in an
373 escrow account for that matter.

374
375 Pam Coughlin stated that she had no questions at this time.

376
377 In response to a question from Dan LeClerc regarding what will be done with the remainder of
378 the lot, Ken Clinton stated that there are no plans for it at this time.

379
380 In response to a question from Chris Yates regarding if other properties in Williamsburg Drive
381 are two-acre lots, Ken Clinton stated that lot size varies in this neighborhood.

382
383 Tom Silvia asked for more of an explanation regarding the proposed waiver for total boundaries
384 of the site. Ken Clinton explained that the current plan does define the boundaries of the entire
385 property with bearings and distances, and sight distances along Baboosic Lake Road, however it
386 does not fully define all of the right of ways within. There are town roads and likely private
387 roads within the overall boundary of the property, not defined by the reference plan. If another
388 application was submitted for this lot in the future, it would likely have to fully define these, but
389 in the context of a single 2.17-acre lot, it should be reasonable to waive that requirement for the
390 remainder of the 203 acre.

391
392 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, regarding that the cul-de-sac the proposed lot is
393 located off on the plan is shown as a temporary cul-de-sac, Ken Clinton stated that this means the
394 subdivision plan which created the lots in the right of way for Williamsburg Drive noted it was a

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

395 temporary cul-de-sac. The right of way itself is 50' wide and continues to the common boundary
396 line as a right of way. Thus, the temporary cul-de-sac could be considered an easement.

397

398 Bill Stoughton stated that he has a concern, given the Town's driveway standards, and the fact
399 that this temporary cul-de-sac does not meet those requirements. If the owner was to subdivide
400 this lot, he would like to see an extension of Williamsburg Drive, and the construction of a
401 compliant cul-de-sac.

402

403 In response to a question from Bill Stoughton regarding compliant frontage for the 203-acre
404 remainder lot, Ken Clinton stated that this could likely be considered Embankment Road, which
405 is publicly maintained. There are other roads and ways to select from, but not all are publicly
406 maintained.

407

408 Bill Stoughton stated that he would be in favor of a waiver of the full delineation of boundaries
409 for the entire parcel. He would also be in favor of not requiring a full set of studies, as he does
410 not believe this small site has circumstances that require it. Bill Stoughton noted that Section
411 213.2.G., stated that the use of reduced frontage lots shall be restricted when in the opinion of the
412 Planning Board, such use is in conflict with the long-range plan for the Town or creates unusual
413 traffic problems or conditions. He stated that, if the applicant disagrees with the Board's
414 interpretation of that item, it will need to be addressed in the context of an application.

415

416 Bill Stoughton stated that the Board is contemplating certain zoning changes and noted that, if
417 those changes were to be finalized and accepted by the voters, this could solve some of the issues
418 at hand. Ken Clinton stated that he is not in agreement with most of the proposed changes. He
419 does not believe they are based in science, but instead driven by a desire to reduce development.
420 Ken Clinton stated that he does not see how these would be of any benefit to his client.

421

422 Arnie Rosenblatt asked if it is Attorney Westgate's view that this Board has the authority to
423 interpret the ordinance. Attorney Westgate stated that the Board does, but that does not mean the
424 interpretation is correct. The Board interprets the ordinances all the time with all applications.

425

426 Arnie Rosenblatt asked if it is Attorney Westgate's view that this Board has the authority to
427 promulgate regulations pursuant to the ordinances. Attorney Westgate stated that the Board has
428 the authority to promulgate subdivision regulations, pursuant to the statutes. In regard to the
429 Town's ordinances, he has not had time to thoroughly study them.

430

431 Arnie Rosenblatt asked if it is Attorney Westgate's view that this Board has the authority to
432 interpret and to make decisions based on the regulations. Attorney Westgate stated that, based on
433 duly adopted subdivision regulations, yes it can, and it does all the time.

434

435 Arnie Rosenblatt asked why, recognizing this Board routinely and properly interprets the
436 ordinances, interprets, and makes determinations based on the promulgated regulations and
437 based on the statutory authority, in this instance Attorney Westgate believes the Board should
438 ask Town Counsel to opine and provide his interpretation. Attorney Westgate stated that he does

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

439 not believe Town Counsel's opinion replaces the Board's determination. In this particular case,
440 the Board's seeming interpretation of this ordinance is simply incorrect, fundamentally wrong,
441 and contrary to the way it has been dealt with for over 30 years. Attorney Westgate stated that he
442 believes if he has an open discussion with Town Counsel regarding his analysis of the interplay
443 of the regulations, including the zoning ordinances, a reasonable judgment could be made. Then
444 the Board has the benefit of a thoughtful and detailed analysis of this regulation. Attorney
445 Westgate stated that he has not heard anything from the Board regarding any indication as to
446 why two acres has suddenly become ten. He believes the Board could make a fatal error if it
447 makes that judgment and without receiving Town Counsel's advice.

448

449 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Attorney Westgate agreed that his interest is in
450 trying to persuade Town Counsel, if he cannot persuade the Board.

451

452 In response to a question from Tom Quinn regarding the fact that this proposal looks to build a
453 driveway in the public way to access the lot, Ken Clinton stated that this is correct and is exactly
454 what happens everywhere else. Attorney Westgate noted that this is the typical way in which
455 every lot accesses the public right of way from the lot.

456

457 Tom Quinn asked on the proposed plan, which lot was considered the backlot, the 200+ acre lot
458 or the proposed lot. Ken Clinton stated that the reduced frontage lot, Map 8 Lot 94-1, was the
459 backlot. Tom Quinn stated that he envisioned this being behind another lot on the property. Ken
460 Clinton stated that this is not consistent with what he has seen for the past 25 years practicing
461 with the Board. Tom Quinn noted that the regulations state that the driveway portion of the
462 reduced frontage lot or lots shall be integral and attached to the back lot. Ken Clinton stated that
463 the remainder lot is a standard vacant lot and the reduced frontage lot, as proposed, has 35' of
464 frontage on a public right of way and has full access to the public pavement this is maintained.

465

466 Tracie Adams agreed that she would support both of the proposed waivers.

467

468 Arnie Rosenblatt noted that, as this is a design review, the Board normally does not make any
469 decisions, and nothing stated is binding. He stated that he does not favor allowing Attorney
470 Westgate to speak with Town Counsel as proposed, as he believes it is the Board's job to
471 interpret the regulations and ordinances. He stated that all Board members need to review the
472 submitted memorandum very carefully and consider the arguments within. He stated that Board
473 members are very capable of interpreting the ordinances and regulations. He stated that he is
474 uncomfortable with asking Town Counsel to advise the Board as to how to do its job, and
475 possibly reaching conclusions with Attorney Westgate outside a public meeting.

476

477 Bill Stoughton stated that his biggest concern with the suggestion is that it takes a very important
478 discussion about this property out of the eyes of the public. The Board is not supposed to do that.
479 It is supposed to have deliberations in public. The public would not have any access to these
480 discussions, except second hand. He does not want this to raise privilege issues.

481

482 The other Board members supported Arnie Rosenblatt and Bill Stoughton's views of this item.

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

483
484 Ken Clinton asked if the Board would allow the applicant to ask for a continuation of the design
485 review hearing to give the Board members time to read and digest Attorney Westgate's letter. A
486 follow up design review hearing could then be held on that matter.

487
488 Tracie Adams asked if the Board has ever done a secondary design review before for a single lot
489 subdivision. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he is unclear on this.

490
491 Tom Silvia stated that he was okay with this proposal.

492
493 Bill Stoughton asked if the follow up hearing could also review the information he requested
494 regarding the cul-de-sac and if there is an appropriate termination. Ken Clinton stated that he
495 would respond to those items as well.

496
497 Bill Stoughton and Tom Quinn stated that they were also okay with the proposal.

498
499 Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes, in this instance, the proposal is a good one.

500
501 The Board discussed timing and agenda for future meetings, in order to accommodate this
502 request. The Board agreed to move the Master Plan review to its first meeting in January.

503
504 **Bill Stoughton moved to continue this design review to December 21, 2022, at 7pm**
505 **at Town Hall. Seconded by Tom Silvia.**
506 **Motion carried unanimously 5-0-0**

507
508 **Tracie Adams moved to move the Master Plan hearing to January 4, 2023.**
509 **Seconded by Chris Yates.**
510 **Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0**

511
512 **COMPLIANCE HEARING**

513
514 **6. CASE #: PZ16439-101222 – Howe Warehouse Q1, LLC (Owner) & Ashoke**
515 **Rampuria (Applicant) 2 Howe Drive; PIN #: 002-034-001 – Non-Residential Site**
516 **Plan Application – Compliance Hearing -To show as-built information for Phase 2**
517 **of the 253,914 square foot warehouse building with associated parking and site**
518 **improvements. Zoned Industrial.**

519
520 Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the hearing.

521
522 Matt Routhier, PLA, TF Moran, addressed the Board, noting that an as-built plan had been
523 submitted and asking for any comments.

524
525 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong stated that there were no issues with
526 this application.

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

527
528 The Board had no questions or comments at this time.

529
530 **Chris Yates moved to confirm compliance with the conditions to the approval of**
531 **the Amended Non-Residential Site Plan Review for Howe Warehouse QI, LLC, at 2**
532 **Howe Drive, Map 2 Lot 34 Sublot 1 for the operation of Phase 2 of the**
533 **existing warehouse, subject to the conditions subsequent as noted in the staff report.**
534 **Seconded by Tom Silvia.**
535 **Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0**

536
537 **7. CASE #: PZ16449-101422 – Napior Rentals LLC (Owners) & NH Custom**
538 **Builder (Applicants); 104 Route 101A, PIN #: 002-047-002 – Non-Residential Site**
539 **Plan Application – Compliance Hearing -To confirm compliance with the Planning**
540 **Board’s approval of April 21, 2021,for a proposed commercial change of use from**
541 **retail to office on Tax Map Lot 2-47-2. Zoned Commercial.**

542
543 Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the case.

544
545 *Cynthia Dokmo recused herself.*

546
547 Chad Branon, PE, Fieldstone Land Consultants, stated that, the application for this project
548 presented a couple of concepts for the building. The site has since been built out, paved, striped,
549 and graded. He believes the site is in full compliance and there are no issues with staff’s
550 recommendations.

551
552 In response to a question from Arnie Rosenblatt, Nic Strong stated that there were no issues with
553 this application.

554
555 Chris Yates stated that the improvements to the property look great.

556
557 Tom Quinn asked if landscaping needed to be compliant at this step. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that
558 the Board can make this a condition subsequent. Chad Branon stated that one tree was supposed
559 to be planted in the front, but this has not yet been done. This will be addressed.

560
561 **Tom Silvia moved to confirm compliance with the conditions to the approval of**
562 **the Non-Residential Site Plan Review for NH Custom Builder (Applicant) and**
563 **Napior Rentals, LLC (Owner) at 104 Route 101A, Map 2 Lot 47 Sublot 2 for**
564 **the operation of an office building, subject to the conditions subsequent outlined in**
565 **the Staff Report. Seconded by Chris Yates.**
566 **Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0**

567
568 Cynthia Dokmo apologized for recusing herself on the first two items on the agenda. She noted
569 that she sits on the Amherst Land Trust that has interest in land that those two items. She will be
570 off the land trust at the end of December and will no longer need to recuse herself. Arnie

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

571 Rosenblatt thanked Cynthia Dokmo but noted that Board members do not generally have to
572 mention why they are recusing themselves.

573

574 **OTHER BUSINESS:**

575

576 **8. Minutes: September 21, 2022; September 27, 2022; and October 5, 2022**

577

578 **Tracie Adams moved to approve the meeting minutes of September 21, 2022, as**
579 **presented. Seconded by Chris Yates**

580

Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0.

581

582 **Tracie Adams moved to approve the meeting minutes of September 27, 2022, as**
583 **amended [Line 144: change the comma to a period]. Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

584

Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0.

585

586 **Tracie Adams moved to approve the meeting minutes of October 5, 2022, as**
587 **presented. Seconded by Tom Quinn.**

588

Motion carried unanimously 5-0-1 [C. Dokmo – abstaining].

589

590 **9. Any other business that may come before the Board**

591

592 Tom Silvia asked about the Findings of Fact, in terms of the Board being able to vote on four
593 pages of verbiage without reviewing it first. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that an alternative could be
594 for a Board member to write up the document ahead of time and read it out loud. State statute
595 requires this new step. He stated that he does not believe the Findings of Fact can be circulated
596 ahead of time because it may give the perception that Board members have prejudged the
597 application.

598

599 Bill Stoughton suggested that one Board member could be assigned in advance to draft the
600 document, for it to be reviewed at the meeting after being circulated by staff. Arnie Rosenblatt
601 stated that he believes it would be a mistake to do that, as there's still the possibility for
602 prejudgment or influence.

603

604 Cynthia Dokmo agreed that this document should not be circulated ahead of time, but the Chair
605 could take a consensus of Board members after each finding, instead of giving a blanket
606 approval. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes this would take a long time and be a huge
607 effort. He will better articulate that Board members should speak up during the reading of the
608 Findings of Fact if there are questions or concerns.

609

610 Bill Stoughton suggested a nonpublic session before the next design review hearing, for the
611 Board to review and discuss the advice already given by Town Counsel.

612

613 **Bill Stoughton moved to adjourn at 8:50pm. Seconded by Tom Silvia.**

614

Motion carried unanimously 6-0-0.

TOWN OF AMHERST
Planning Board

November 2, 2022

APPROVED

615
616 Respectfully submitted,
617 Kristan Patenaude
618
619
620 Minutes approved: November 16, 2022