

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

In attendance: Arnie Rosenblatt, Dwight Brew, Bill Stoughton, Christy Houpis, Mike Akillian (alternate), Tracie Adams, Chris Yates, Tom Quinn (remote), and Tom Silvia (alternate).  
Staff present: Natasha Kypfer, Town Planner; and Kristan Patenaude, Recording Secretary (remote).

Arnie Rosenblatt, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00pm at Town Hall and via Zoom concurrently. He explained the Board is requesting all present in-person to wear masks over nose and mouth, as a courtesy. The Board is masked and there are extras available.

Arnie Rosenblatt noted that he would be taking agenda item 3 out of order, as the applicant has requested a continuance.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 1. CASE #: PZ14590-080321 – EAM Amherst Holdings, LLC (Owners & Applicants) – 317 Route 101, PIN # 008-072-000 – Non-Residential Site Plan Application. To depict proposed site improvements to utilize the subject property for a proposed Agricultural Farming and Supply Operation. Zoned Residential Rural. Continued from October 20, 2021.**

Natasha Kypfer, Town Planner, noted that the applicant is requesting a continuance to December 15, 2021, and will allow for an extension of the 65-day deadline.

**Tracie Adams moved to continue the Non-Residential Site Plan Application, CASE#: PZ14590-080321, to December 15, 2021, at 7pm at Town Hall. Seconded by Bill Stoughton.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - aye, Tom Quinn - aye, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; motion carried unanimously.**

A member of the public noted that he flew up from Florida to be present for this case and stated that it was difficult to hear it being cancelled at the last minute. It was noted that the request for continuance was sent to the Town on Tuesday.

**COMPLETENESS REVIEW OF APPLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING IF APPLICATION IS ACCEPTED AS COMPLETE:**

- 2. CASE # - PZ14922-101321 – David & Laura Wang (Owners) & Bennett Chandler (Applicant); 4 Gatchel Way, PIN #: 005-059-021 – Conditional Use Permit Application. To add a 998 square foot apartment within the footprint of a 40'x42' pool house and garage already permitted for construction under PO13151-092220. Zoned Residential/Rural. Continued from November 3, 2021.**

Arnie Rosenblatt read and opened the case.

Natasha Kypfer noted that all required items have been submitted for this application.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

**Tracie Adams moved to accept this application as complete. Seconded by Bill Stoughton.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - aye, Tom Quinn - aye, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; motion carried unanimously.**

Bennett Chandler, Bennett Chandler Design & Construction, LLC, explained that, in late 2020, the Town issued a building permit for the Wangs to create a main house and pool house on the property. He noted that this proposal is to convert space inside the already approved pool house into an in-law apartment. He noted that this proposal is allowed by right, but that there are restrictive covenants in the neighborhood that only allow the apartment to be utilized by related individuals. This is what he believes the space will be used for.

Arnie Rosenblatt asked if the assertion being made is that this apartment will only be used by related individuals of the family. Mr. Chandler affirmed that this is the assertion being made and that there is a strong neighborhood association to check on this item.

In response to a question from Tracie Adams, Mr. Chandler stated that the proposal keeps the same proposed square footage and footprint for the pool house and will work well with the residential character of the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Tracie Adams regarding proposed parking on the property, Mr. Chandler stated that the main house has a three-car garage, and the pool house has a one car garage as part of the already approved building permit. There is room outside of the garages to comfortably park an additional three cars.

In response to a question from Bill Stoughton regarding why a garage was proposed inside a pool house, Mr. Chandler stated that the Wangs wanted a fourth parking spot in a garage.

Bill Stoughton asked if the original stormwater management plan for the property anticipated this amount of impervious area: a five-bedroom house, a pool, a pool house, and associated driveway. He asked if these impervious areas fit into the original stormwater plan for the development. Mr. Chandler stated that none of the proposed impervious areas have changed due to this change in use and he believes that the impervious area would have been reviewed previously by the Building Department as part of the building permit. Bill Stoughton stated that the Planning Board is responsible, individual from the Building Department, to make sure that the Town regulations are satisfied.

In response to a question from Tom Silvia regarding a septic system on site, Mr. Chandler stated that he has the approval and permit for the septic design, including a one-bedroom Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU).

Tom Quinn stated that his primary concern regarding this proposal is for the neighbors. He suggested that the Board include a condition to restrict the proposed ADU to related parties. He also noted that this is a non-conforming lot at 1.4 acres instead of 2 acres.

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

Natasha Kypfer explained that the Staff Report includes a note that the acreage size of the lot conforms with the zoning ordinance in place at the time of approval.

Tom Quinn asked about restricting the ADU to related parties on the plan. Mr. Chandler noted that he believes this request would be inconsistent with NH case law.

**Tom Quinn moved to deny the application.**

**There was no second to the motion, thus it died on the floor.**

In response to a question from Bill Stoughton, Mr. Chandler stated that he does not have any issues with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report.

Bill Stoughton stated that he would like to add a condition precedent #2: confirmation that the impervious area added by the proposed structures on site, including the ADU, does not exceed the capacity of the development's stormwater system.

Mr. Chandler stated that the ADU does not add any square footage to that which was approved by the building permit. He stated that he is not okay with the proposed additional condition, as it places the entire project, including the construction already completed, in jeopardy. He noted that questions were already answered, and relevant materials were already provided to the Town through the building permit process. The construction on this project is already in process.

Bill Stoughton stated that he would still like to see confirmation on this issue. Mr. Chandler stated that he would not agree to the proposed condition.

Tom Quinn stated that the foundations for these structures are already in the ground, making this sort of a moot point.

Dwight Brew stated that he supports Bill Stoughton's proposed condition.

In response to a question from Chris Yates, Bill Stoughton stated that this property is part of the larger Founder's Way development. Chris Yates asked if these items (footprints and impervious surfaces) would have been previously laid out as part of the Planned Residential Development (PRD) process for Founder's Way. Bill Stoughton explained that a certain amount of impervious surfaces was likely assumed for each lot in the development. He wants to make sure that the true amount of impervious surface being proposed on this lot was assumed, or that the system can handle what is being proposed. Bill Stoughton stated that he believes the amount of impervious surface on this lot is more than what was previously determined for each lot in the development.

In response to a question from Chris Yates, Bill Stoughton stated that he wants to be sure that this item is within the envelope assumed for this development, or, if above that, can still be handled by the system.

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

Tom Quinn noted that this proposal does not change the footprint previously approved for the building permit but addresses a change in use of the building. His concern is regarding the small lot, the nearby neighbors, and the use of this structure. He would like for there to be a condition that limits the use of this structure to related family members only, so that a future owner cannot turn it into an Air B&B or rental unit, which might disrupt the neighborhood.

**Bill Stoughton moved to approve Case #PZ14922-101321 for David and Laura Wang, for a Conditional Use Permit for a 998 s.f. Accessory Apartment in a detached structure at 4 Gatchel Way, Tax Map 5 Lot 59-21, with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report; an additional condition precedent #2: confirmation that the impervious area added by the structure, including the proposed ADU, does not exceed the capacity of the development's stormwater system, and to add an additional subsequent condition #7: that impact fees be assessed at the residential rate. Seconded by Dwight Brew.**

**Discussion:**

**In response to a question from Dwight Brew, it was noted that the foundations are already in place for this project.**

**Tom Quinn requested that the motion be amended to restrict the use of the ADU to related family members.**

**Bill Stoughton stated that he would not amend his motion to include this, as he does not believe it is within the Planning Board's purview. While the Town allows for an ADU through the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process, the HOA on site limits the use of the ADU to family members or caregivers to the residents of the main unit of the home.**

**In response to a question from Chris Yates, Bill Stoughton stated that he believes the matter of confirming that the stormwater system can handle the proposed structures on site can be handled administratively and that the applicant would not need to come back before the Board.**

**Dwight Brew noted that he will vote against the motion, because the foundations for these structures are already in the ground.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - nay, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - nay, Tom Quinn - nay, Christy Houpis - nay, and Chris Yates - aye; 2-4-0, motion failed.**

**Tracie Adams moved to approve Case #PZ14922-101321 for David and Laura Wang, for a Conditional Use Permit for a 998 s.f. Accessory Apartment in a detached structure at 4 Gatchel Way, Tax Map 5 Lot 59-21, with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report and an additional subsequent condition #7: that impact fees be assessed at the residential rate. Seconded by Dwight Brew.**

November 17, 2021

APPROVED

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - nay, Tracie Adams – aye, Tom Quinn - nay, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 4-2-0, motion carried.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 3. CASE #: PZ14588-080321 – Keith E. Healey Trustee (Owner) and Healey Tree Works, LLC (Applicant) – 307 Route 101, PIN # 008-074-000 – Non-Residential Site Plan Application. To show the proposed site improvements in order to use the property as a residence and for the operation of a tree services, cordwood, and wood-chipping business. Zoned Residential Rural. Continued from October 20, 2021.**

Sam Foisie, Meridian Land Services, and Keith Healey joined the Board. Mr. Foisie noted that the drainage waiver was addressed at the last meeting and that the Board requested more information to prove that the increased discharge rate for the 25- and 50-year storms will not have an impact on the Joe English Brook watershed. He has since completed an analysis on the watershed. The watershed is approximately 8,000 acres; this site is approximately 7 acres and minor in size to the total watershed. He compared the peak discharge rates and times for the watershed and site. The peak discharge rate for both the 25- and 50-year storms for the watershed occurs at roughly the 18<sup>th</sup> hour, while the peak discharge rate for the site is at roughly the 12<sup>th</sup> hour. As those discharge rates do not line up, there will not be an overall increase to the discharge rate of the watershed. The report also shows that the 25-year storm rate for the watershed is approximately 1,100-1,200 CFFs, well above the discharge rate for the site. The 50-year rate is approximately 1,700 CFFs, well above the discharge rate for the site. This evidence supports the evidence that there will be no adverse impact to the watershed. Sam Foisie also noted that a letter from Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., states that Mr. Nordstrom is not opposed to the possible approval of the requested discharge waiver.

In response to a question from Tom Quinn regarding the proposed performance bond for the project, Sam Foisie stated that he believes the Board previously took a preliminary straw poll on waiving this item. The reasoning for this would be to not make the applicant pay for this item twice, the fact that the applicant lives at the site and thus has an interest in keeping it in compliance, and also the good faith shown by the applicant in spending time and money to fix the compliance issue on site.

In response to a question from Tom Quinn regarding why the drainage waiver is necessary, Sam Foisie explained that this is a unique site and the work done to bring it into compliance will shrink the potential business area by quite a bit. The requested waiver will allow for there to be room for the business while not impacting the surrounding watershed area. The proposal will not affect the water quality or groundwater discharge rate to the watershed and will meet the spirit and intent of the ordinance.

In response to a question from Tom Quinn regarding what would need to be done to the site to conform to this section of the regulations, Sam Foisie stated that, without the waiver, the site will need to be raised approximately 1'. Due to existing slopes and berms on the property, the business will lose approximately 10% of its workable area. There would also be an additional

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

cost of bringing fill to the site. This would have a negative impact on Mr. Healey and his business. Mr. Quinn questioned if the 10% loss would really impact the business. Sam Foisie explained that this would be a compounding loss, as even bit of available land on site will help Mr. Healey's business.

Tom Quinn stated that he is hesitant to grant environmental waivers, especially for a site that sits near an important watershed. He noted that this proposal is for a non-conforming use in a residential area. He does not believe clear rationale has been made as to how the 10% loss of land would impact the business.

There were no questions or comments from Christy Houpis, Mike Akillian, Tom Silvia, or Chris Yates.

In response to a question from Dwight Brew regarding if the waiver will not be detrimental to the surrounding environment, Bill Stoughton stated that he will support the waiver because he does not believe that insisting on compliance on this item from this applicant will give any benefit to the Town or environment. Bill Stoughton stated that he believes the peak discharge rates are out of phase with each other, and that any excess discharge will be absorbed by the large sized watershed without a detrimental effect. Bill Stoughton noted that he does not believe this waiver will have an impact on the cleanliness of the water in the area, because it will only be discharged after the first 1" of water, which the regulations work to cleanup. He noted that there is clearly a detriment to the applicant for compliance in this case.

In response to a question from Bill Stoughton regarding a difference in the listed hours of operations between the plan and the application, Sam Foisie stated that the plans will be changed to represent Monday-Saturday 7am-3:30pm, as previously discussed.

Bill Stoughton stated that there is no waiver needed for bonding because the regulations only state that the Board "may" require it. He would not insist on bonding in this case. He also noted that he would propose for impact fees to be assessed at the industrial rate, measured for the square footage of the building constructed on site.

Bill Stoughton proposed that within 24 months after the date of approval, the following items must be completed in order to constitute "active and substantial development or building" pursuant to RSA 674:39, I, relative to the 5-year exemption to regulation/ordinance changes: commencement of construction of stormwater features. He also suggested that the following items must be completed in order to constitute "substantial completion of the improvements" pursuant to RSA 674:39, II, relative to final vesting: awarding of the building permit for the maximum 3,200 s.f. building.

Tracie Adams asked her fellow Board members their opinions on the performance bond. Dwight Brew stated that he believes, if this project is not completed properly, the applicant will be given a cease & desist order. Thus, the applicant has a vested interest, and a performance bond may not be necessary.

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

In response to a question from Tracie Adams, Sam Foisie stated that he would add notes to the plan regarding the approved waivers and regarding the monitoring reports. He also stated that the applicant is willing to submit the wetland restoration reports to the Town, as well as the State.

Tom Quinn asked if the Board plans to discuss the use of fuel/maintenance chemicals on site, as this will be used as a commercial/industrial site. He noted that, if the Board plans to grant a waiver based on what is going out into the environment on site, then the Board should discuss what is being used on the site.

Arnie Rosenblatt asked for a motion for the proposed waiver.

**Bill Stoughton moved to grant the waiver requested to Section 5.A.7 of the Stormwater Regulations as the Board has determined that granting the waiver will not impair achieving the spirit and intent of these regulations, that compliance with these regulations is not reasonably possible given the specific circumstances relative to the site plan, or the conditions of the land in such site plan, and that the proposed substitute solution is consistent with the goals of these regulations and is in the best interest of the Town. Seconded by Tracie Adams.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams – aye, Tom Quinn - nay, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 5-1-0, motion carried.**

Tom Quinn asked if there was to be any discussion on the motion. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that there was no discussion on the motion.

**Tracie Adams moved to approve CASE# PZ14588-080321 for Keith Healey Revocable Trust of 2014, Keith Healey, Trustee, for a Non-Residential Site Plan to show the proposed site improvements in order to use the property as a residence and for the operation of a tree services, cordwood, and wood-chipping business, at 307 N.H. Route 101, Map 8 Lot 74, with the following conditions: conditions precedent and subsequent as listed in the Staff Report, with the applicant to be assessed impact fees at the industrial rate; and that within 24 months after the date of approval, the following items must be completed in order to constitute "active and substantial development or building" pursuant to RSA 674:39, I, relative to the 5-year exemption to regulation/ordinance changes: commencement of construction of stormwater features. He also suggested that the following items must be completed in order to constitute "substantial completion of the improvements" pursuant to RSA 674:39, II, relative to final vesting: awarding of the building permit for the maximum 3,200 s.f. building. Seconded by Christy Houpis.**

**Discussion:**

**Bill Stoughton noted that condition precedent #2 in the Staff Report mentioned security, and he stated that the Board is not insisting on security in this motion.**

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

**Tom Quinn stated that he supports businesses in Town but will be abstaining for this item because he wishes that there had been more discussion on this item. He requested that there be additional discussion on motions made in the future.**

**Arnie Rosenblatt stated that, in his understanding, there had been ample time for discussion on the application, and that Mr. Quinn, and other Board members, had all had a chance to speak to the item, if they so choose.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams – aye, Tom Quinn - abstain, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 5-0-1, motion carried.**

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

**4. REGIONAL IMPACT:**

- a. CASE #: PZ15044-110521 –Brian Russell (Owner & Applicant); 78 Merrimack Road, PIN # 004-021-000 – Conditional Use Permit - To construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit and garage. Zoned Residential/Rural.**

**Dwight Brew moved that there is no regional impact per this application. Seconded by Chris Yates.**

**Discussion:**

**Tom Quinn stated that he received no information on this item in his packet. Natasha Kypfer stated that, as this is only being reviewed for regional impact at this time, there was no additional information sent. Tom Quinn stated that, while he is not inclined to think that there will be regional impact from this item, he will abstain as there is not enough information for it to be clear to him.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - aye, Tom Quinn - abstain, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 5-0-1, motion carried.**

**The Board discussed when this item will be heard by the ZBA for a variance request. Natasha Kypfer noted that this item is proposed to be on the Planning Board's agenda for December 1, 2021, but there will not be time for it to be heard by the ZBA prior to that. She suggested that the Board continue this application at the meeting on December 1, 2021, so that the variance request can first be heard by the ZBA. The variance request has not yet been submitted.**

**Tom Quinn again noted that the Planning Board has received no information on this application in order to make decisions on it.**

**5. Distribution of proposed 2022 Zoning Amendments and discussion of timeline for public hearing**

**Natasha Kypfer stated that the packet for this item has been provided to the Board and that a copy of it has been posted to the website. The first public hearing for this could take place on**



TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

December 1, 2021, or on December 15, 2021. If a second public hearing is needed, due to substantive changes, it must take place 14 days later. This could occur in early January and still meet the necessary timelines for the process.

Mike Akillian asked about proposed amendment #4, regarding Section 4.3: Residential/Rural 35' frontage requirements. This is not discussed in the Northern Transitional Zone, in the General Office Zone, or in the Industrial Zone. He asked if the 35' frontage requirements only pertain to certain zones. Bill Stoughton explained the language for the Northern Transitional Zone is not listed in the same way, but that the frontage requirement is still there. For the General Office Zone and Industrial Zone, reduced frontage lots are not allowed.

Bill Stoughton stated that, on page 12 of the document, Section I.2.d. he would like for the sentence to read "of not less than four feet the distance required by the applicable Best Management Practices for the stormwater facility..." He would also like Section 3A, page 8, to have the word "approval" removed from the end of the sentences.

In response to a question from Dwight Brew regarding the timing of the public hearing process, Natasha Kypfer stated that the document must be posted to the website and in the vestibule of Town Hall approximately 10 days before the public hearing date.

In response to a question from Chris Yates regarding 200' minimum frontage on corner lots, Bill Stoughton stated that he believes this is the intended frontage required from each road.

Tom Quinn suggested that there be a special meeting for the Board to focus solely on making changes to this document.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he does not favor that idea, as Bill Stoughton has spent a tremendous deal of time on this document and the Board has determined previously how it would feel comfortable moving forward.

Bill Stoughton stated that he wants to make sure all Board members have an adequate amount of time to process the proposed changes. He believes the document could benefit from additional review.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes there was not support from the Board on Tom Quinn's suggestion and asked if there was support for Bill Stoughton's suggestion that there be further discussion on the proposed amendments.

Tom Quinn stated that he does not disagree with Bill Stoughton's suggestion. He stated that he believes there needs to be additional chances for the public and Board members to comment on the document. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that a public hearing will be necessary for this and give the public a chance to comment.

Dwight Brew suggested that changes be sent to Bill Stoughton prior to the December 1, 2021,

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

meeting for possible inclusion. Bill Stoughton stated that Nic Strong did the bulk of the work on this project, and that it may be more proper for changes to be worked through her.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that his concern is that the Board will continue to circle this item. He does not want a flawed product, but also wants to get the document through as there are a number of important changes proposed.

Mike Akillian agreed with allowing people to digest this a bit more, send comments in, and then for the Board to review a final document once more. He suggested that the Board submit, along with this document, a thought process as to what was being corrected and strengthened, to build support with the public.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he believes the most impactful time to address the public is right before the Town Meeting vote. He does not believe many people will attend the public hearing for this item.

Bill Stoughton suggested that any comments/proposed changes be sent to him prior to Thanksgiving. He will review them but is not positive they will be accepted. He will then work with Nic Strong to determine if any of the items should be included in the document for review by the Board on December 1, 2021.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that he would like Board members to represent that they will only speak on this topic for approximately two minutes during that meeting, in order to keep things brief.

Tom Quinn stated that members of the public may not have known they had chances to comment on this item. He would like it to be made clear to the public before the December 1, 2021, meeting. He still believes the Board should have a separate conversation on this matter.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that each Board meeting has been a public meeting. He is not trying to squelch discussions. There have been many meetings where this document has been discussed. The public is specifically invited to come to the public hearing on this item, and an additional public hearing will be held if substantive changes are made. He is concerned this will become a never-ending process and is not in favor of discussing this at the December 1, 2021, meeting. He noted how important these provisions are, in regard to new applications coming into the Board.

Mike Akillian agreed with sending any comments/changes to Bill Stoughton for he and Nic Strong to arbitrate what will be included for a final Board review. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that is not what Bill Stoughton previously suggested, and that the suggestion was for the Board to review the document on December 1, 2021.

Christy Houpis stated that this document has been discussed many times by the Board. While he would like to hear everyone's opinion, he would prefer for this to be moved forward at this time. Edits on this document will not end, but the document should now move forward to a public hearing.

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

Tom Silvia agreed with moving the document forward to a public hearing.

Dwight Brew stated that it appears the Board will review this document at a public hearing on December 15, 2021, and there could be a second public hearing depending on substantial changes. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that a second public hearing could be useful.

Christy Houpis stated that this document needs to be pushed forward to protect the Town and make it easier for the Board to do its business.

Tracie Adams agreed with moving forward with a public hearing on December 15, 2021.

Tom Quinn stated that members of the public had an issue with the ordinance in past years. He would like the Board to make an attempt to involve everyone in the discussion on this item. He noted that no one from the public is currently involved in the discussion and the Board should make more of an effort in drumming up interest.

**Christy Houpis moved to forward with this document for a public hearing on December 15, 2021, with a second public hearing to be held January 5, 2022, if necessary. If the Board has edits to be made, they should be sent along for consideration, but otherwise this document will be presented at the public hearing. Seconded by Tracie Adams.**

**Discussion:**

**Dwight Brew asked if any proposed changes will be made to the document, or if this document, as is, will be presented at the public hearing.**

**Christy Houpis noted that some Board members already have changes they are proposing. He is suggesting that this document, as is, be presented at the public hearing. Any subsequent changes, edits, deletions, etc. by the Board should be submitted to Bill Stoughton and Nic Strong, with no guarantee that they will be included. This document, as is, will be discussed by the Board at the public hearing on December 15, 2021, and the notice for this will be posted at the required time before the meeting.**

**Mike Akillian noted confusion regarding if proposed changes will be considered prior to the public hearing date.**

**Arnie Rosenblatt clarified that this document will be discussed, as is with any changes discussed tonight, on December 15, 2021. Any revisions or substantive changes discussed on that evening will be brought forward to a second public hearing, on January 5, 2022. Seconded by Chris Yates.**

**Tom Quinn asked if he could make a comment on the motion. Arnie Rosenblatt noted that he has commented several times on this item and asked if he had additional items.**

TOWN OF AMHERST  
Planning Board

November 17, 2021

**APPROVED**

**Tom Quinn stated that he believes the Board should have additional discussion on this document.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - aye, Tom Quinn - nay, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 5-1-0, motion carried.**

Dwight Brew clarified that there are to be no further changes made to this document, per the motion made. Arnie Rosenblatt stated that any proposed changes are to be discussed at the public hearing on December 15, 2021.

**6. Minutes: November 3, 2021**

**Christy Houpis moved to approve the meeting minutes of November 3, 2021, [Line 370 change “bases” to “basis.”] as amended. Seconded by Tracie Adams.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - abstain, Tom Quinn - abstain, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; 5-0-1, motion carried.**

Tom Quinn stated that he was not trying to make trouble, but he believes, in regard to zoning amendments, he believes the Board needs to be as transparent as it can in discussions, and garner as much public opinion as possible. He believes the Board has gotten in trouble for doing things in the dark in the past.

Arnie Rosenblatt stated that the Board is in no way doing things in the dark. This is a publicly noticed meeting. All documents will be posted prior to the public hearing on December 15, 2021, and again if a second public hearing is needed. This process is the proper one to allow for public input.

**Tracie Adams moved to adjourn at 8:45pm. Seconded by Chris Yates.**

**Voting: Dwight Brew - aye, Bill Stoughton - aye, Tracie Adams - aye, Tom Quinn - aye, Christy Houpis - aye, and Chris Yates – aye; motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristan Patenaude

Minutes approved: December 1, 2021