

These minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 on November 2, 2016.

Ashfield Planning Board Meeting  
Ashfield Town Hall  
October 19, 2016

Present: Michael Fitzgerald (MF), Chair  
Lauren Preston-Wells (LPW)  
Ken Miller (KM)  
Jim Cutler (JC)  
Alan Rice (AR)  
Meghan Bowen (MB), scribe

Guests: Anne Yuryan  
David Kulp  
Sharon Wells  
Sheli Senecal  
Mary Fitz-Gibbon

Meeting was called to order at 7:10 PM.

- Board discussed Roger Howes's ANR with his representative, Sheli Senecal (SS). JC moved to accept the ANR as amended from its previous submission, AR seconded. All in favor, 5-0, motion carried.
- KM said that he cannot attend the FRCOG Regional Planning Board meeting on October 27 and asked whether anyone else would like to attend. AR said that he would attend if possible.

MF called the Public Hearing to order at 7:30 PM. The Public Hearing was for the following:

- The proposed Ashfield Senior Citizens Housing Bylaw. This Bylaw would set standards for senior housing within the town of Ashfield.
  - Changes to the Telecommunications Facilities Bylaw including exemptions for small antennae, colocation and incorporate restrictions on setback, camouflage, impact statements.
  - Change Bylaws to allow Associate Member to serve on the Board for the purpose of acting when necessary, on special permit applications.
1. MF asked whether there were any comments from the public about the proposed Bylaw amendment to allow the Board an Associate Member. There were no comments.
  2. MF asked whether there were any comments on the proposed amendment to the Telecommunications Bylaw.

These minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 on November 2, 2016.

- a. Sharon Wells (SW) asked what the difference would be between the current and amended Bylaws. MF said that the Bylaws would add dimensional requirements; add setback requirements from other structures; require that NEPA studies be done before applicants come to the Board; camouflage requirements; and colocation.
  - b. SW said that the camouflage requirement was loosely worded and asked why this wording was chosen. MF said that some structures might not affect neighborhood character, and that the Board already has discretion over neighborhood character.
3. MF asked whether there were any comments on the proposed Senior Housing Bylaw.
- a. Anne Yuryan (AY) commented that Section 2c requires that there be pedestrian access to amenities within 300 feet, and asked what the Board's definition of amenities was. MF replied that the Board has no specific definition for amenities. Mary Fitz-Gibbon (MFG) suggested that the Board clarify the sentence about pedestrian access, because the sentence reads now as though amenities within 300 feet are required for a senior housing development. The Board agreed to change the structure of the sentence in question.
  - b. AY commented that the document refers to the sewer district, but there is no official sewer district in Ashfield. LPW suggested that "sewer district" be changed to "area serviced by the Ashfield Wastewater Treatment Plant."
  - c. AY commented on Section 3d, and suggested that the word "substantially" be added before the word "increase". MF agreed.
  - d. AY asked whether or not the Zoning Board of Appeals be involved in the application process for senior housing developments. MF suggested that the Bylaw be under the ZBA rather than the Planning Board. AY said that the Boards could both be involved in the permitting process, which would mean that the Boards would hold joint Hearings for mixed use applications. MF said that a joint permitting process for mixed use would be possible. AY suggested that the two Boards have a joint meeting to discuss the possibility of a joint permitting process for senior housing developments on November 16, the next regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting.
  - e. AY pointed out that there is no assumed jurisdiction to waive setbacks. MF said that since there is language allowing that jurisdiction in the Bylaw, then the Board would have that jurisdiction. MFG asked whether there would be buildings exempted from waiving setbacks. MF said only if they come within 25 feet of their neighbors' buildings, and that the setback requirements are designed to encourage parking in the rear of the buildings.

These minutes were approved by a vote of 3-0 on November 2, 2016.

- f. MFG asked whether a structure's previous dimensions would be grandfathered in the case of a tear-down. MF said that this would usually be the case. AY said that the Building Commissioner usually has jurisdiction to decide whether previous dimensions would continue to apply. MFG asked whether those grandfathered dimensions still apply even if a developer decided to tear down a house that has suffered no structural damage. MF said that they would still apply, as long as the new structure is not more non-conforming.
  - g. AY asked whether these developments were intended to be congregate housing. MF said no, and that they are intended to be individual units
4. There were no further comments. AR moved to close the hearing, LPW seconded. All in favor, 5-0, motion carried.

Hearing was closed at 8:37 PM.

- LPW moved to recommend the amendment to the Zoning Bylaws to allow the Board an Associate Member, JC seconded. All in favor, 5-0, motion carried.
- JC moved to recommend the amendments to the Telecommunications Bylaw, KM seconded. All in favor, 5-0, motion carried.
- Board discussed amendments to the Senior Housing bylaw. Board decided not to recommend the Senior Citizens Housing Bylaw to the Select Board.
- Board discussed the agenda for the following meeting.
- AR moved to adjourn the meeting, JC seconded. All in favor, 5-0, motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:52 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Meghan Bowen, scribe