

**Town of Rockport Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, May 12, 2010 – 7:00 p.m.
Rockport Opera House Downstairs Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22**

Present: Kerry Leichtman, Chairman
John Alexander
Terri McKenzie
Tracy Lee Murphy
Frederic W. Coulon
John W. Priestley

Also Present: Thomas M. Ford, Planning Director
Nancy Ninnis, Recording Secretary

AGENDA

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Atlantis Maritime**, 229 Commercial Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Site plan review to redesign and expand an existing boat storage and maintenance facility by enlarging an existing building and adding two new buildings (continued from the 4/14/10 meeting). Represented by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying.
Property: 229 Commercial Street – Tax Map 27, Lots 179 and 185-3
District #907 Modified – Mixed Business/Residential District

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Southern Venture, LLC**, c/o Andrew Morlet, 11 Church Street, Rockport, ME 04956
Request: Site plan review to improve parking and vehicular circulation. Represented by Peter T. Gross, Architect.
Property: 11 Church Street and 10 Summer Street – Tax Map 29, Lot 157
District #901 – Harbor Village District
3. **Tiffany Andrews**, 4 Lily Pond Drive, Camden, ME 04843
Request: Site plan review for a 900 sq. ft. restaurant. Represented by Landmark Corporation Surveying & Engineering.
Property: 3 Camden Street – Tax Map 29, Lot 113
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District
4. **Maine Coast Heritage Trust**, Aldermere Farm, 70 Russell Avenue, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Site plan review for the development of a community gardening center. Represented by Ron Howard, General Manager.
Property: West Street – Tax Map 27, Lot 193
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

OTHER BUSINESS

5. Review and Approval of Minutes

SITE WALKS

- 6:00 P.M. Atlantis Maritime, LLC – corner of Route 90 and Route 1
6:20 P.M. Tiffany Andrews – 3 Camden Street
6:40 P.M. Southern Venture, LLC – 11 Church Street and 10 Summer Street

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m.

Chairman Leichtman: We have an agenda change. Maine Coast Heritage Trust has requested that their application be continued to a future meeting.

I. ATLANTIS MARITIME, LLC

Representation: **William B. Gartley**
Gartley & Dorsky Surveying & Engineering
59B Union Street, P.O. Box 1031, Camden, ME 04843
Tel: 207-236-4365; Fax: 207-236-3055
William Morong, 339 Turnpike Drive, Camden, ME 04843
Tel: 207-720-0477; Fax: 207-236-4495
Edwin Morong, Atlantis Maritime, LLC
Re: 76 West Street – Map 27, Lot 179
229 Commercial Street – Map 27, Lot 181
District #907 Modified – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Site plan review to redesign and expand an existing boat storage and maintenance facility by enlarging an existing building and adding two new buildings (continued from the 4/14/10 meeting).

Chairman Leichtman: The preapplication meeting was held on April 14, 2010 and we took a site walk this evening.

PRESENTATION:

William Gartley: Atlantis Maritime proposes to construct two new commercial buildings and add a 611 sq. ft. addition to the existing building currently identified as Building #1. The first building to be constructed (Building #5) will have a footprint of 3,990 sq. ft., while the second building (Building #8) will have a footprint of 5,984 sq. ft. In addition to the new construction, the applicant will be removing Building #3 and six trailers that are located throughout the site. Building #5 will be constructed when the existing building is torn down, with a paved apron and the gambrel end facing Route 1. Water and sewer are on site. There will be new water service from Route 90 for sprinkler line upgrade. With regard to stormwater, we will add soil filters before water enters the stream. Water from Building #8 will sheet flow across the field to the stream. A Department of Environmental Protection permit by rule has been received. Proposed lighting is similar to Building

#4 and will be minimal at each door with recessed cans under the building eaves as shown in the photographs submitted. We have provided elevations for all buildings, a complete site plan, a detail sheet and West Street landscaping plan.

Chairman Leichtman: There are no Board clarifying questions. I find no deficiencies in the Written Statement or on the site plan.

MOTION – Tracy Lee Murphy/SECOND – John Priestley: To accept as complete the application of Atlantis Maritime, LLC for site plan review to redesign and expand an existing boat storage and maintenance facility by enlarging an existing building and adding two new buildings as shown on Site Plan by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying dated April 28, 2010 on property at 76 Commercial Street located at Map 27, Lot 179 and at 229 Commercial Street located at Map 27, Lot 181 in District #907 Modified.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: We will determine compliance with District #907 Modified, review the site plan, take public comment and review Sections 800 and 1000. Boat sales are not currently permitted in District #907 Modified, but were when the business was established, so the current use is grandfathered. If the voters approve proposed Ordinance changes in June, boat sales will again be permitted in this district. The building footprint permitted is 6,000 sq. ft. and all buildings are less than that size. Maximum lot coverage is 50% and development is well under that limit at about 31%. There is one inconsistency to be cleared up. No. 2 of the Written Statement does not mention sales, but the general note on the site plan does.

William Gartley: We will correct the Written Statement and also conform the size of Building #5.

Chairman Leichtman: I will review the performance standards. Under No. 1305.5/Surface Water Drainage I note the easement proposing limits to use to avoid pollution of the spring.

William Gartley: We don't actually know where the spring is and the property is now all back together as one big piece. Because the boatyard has to meet FDS and DEP requirements and has ongoing stormwater management, there are extra precautions the applicant has to meet.

Chairman Leichtman: That issue has been addressed.

Ms. McKenzie: You received your DEP permit recently?

William Gartley: A copy goes to the Town and they usually don't even send a permit. If you don't get a call in two weeks, you know you're good to go.

Chairman Leichtman: The permit by rule allows what you're doing, so you send the paperwork saying so.

William Gartley: They have two weeks to respond from the time the application is sent in, so if you don't hear from them, you're okay.

Chairman Leichtman: Are there any comments on the landscaping plan?

Mr. Coulon: The requirement on Route 90 is for a string of canopy trees along the highway. The plan designates crabapple trees, but traffic would have a significant view of the side of the non-gable end of the building. Can you add trees to the next telephone pole?

William Gartley: The problem with going further to the west is that the applicant anticipates continued expansion that involves grading up into the road, so those grades will need to change. Anything planted to the west will get disturbed in the next couple of years.

Chairman Leichtman: I agree with Mr. Coulon, but understand what you're saying. Can you add trees to the east?

William Gartley: There is the same problem in that direction because of renovations to that building.

William Morong: When we finished on Route 1 we landscaped that area and will do the same on Route 90. With the potential build-out we will have a whole row of trees. If we can get more trees in that won't have to be disturbed, we are certainly willing to do so.

Mr. Priestley: What if someone else owns the building in two years, so I am not sure the Planning Board can do that. I feel we have to look at the development before us now.

Ms. Murphy: If you have to delay construction for ten years, there could have been ten-year-old trees there.

William Morong: It is fair to say that within two years we will do more tree planting. How big a tree do we need to plant?

William Gartley: That is one reason we picked crabapple trees because they make a good visual effect, but are not tall enough to interfere with the power lines. We can add another tree in each direction.

Mr. Priestley: The definition of a canopy tree in Section 1002.5.2 is thirty feet.

William Gartley: We can't do that because of the power lines.

Chairman Leichtman: We can waive that requirement because the elevation of the road is so much higher that the same affect will be achieved.

MOTION – John Priestley/SECOND – John Alexander: To waive the requirement for canopy trees along Route 90 and stipulate that understory trees will be planted.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0.

William Morong: I think it's a non-issue, as the trees can be transplanted if we continue development. Is a total of five trees acceptable?

Chairman Leichtman: Yes. With regard to architecture, we have renderings of the buildings.

Architect John Hansen: We have changed the doors on the gambrel roof building and added more windows. On Building #5 we have moved the color band to the top of the overhead doors and increased the height of the windows. On Building #8 we have added a blue roof, a horizontal metal band with a board and batten and clapboard look. We have added a large single hangar type door on the back side rather than single doors. The building is 34 feet high with a cupola.

Chairman Leichtman: There are no issues with Section 800.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

Chairman Leichtman: Thank you for an excellent presentation.

MOTION – Frederic Coulon/SECOND – John Alexander: To approve the application of Atlantis Maritime, LLC for site plan review to redesign and expand an existing boat storage and maintenance facility by enlarging an existing building and adding two new buildings as shown on Site Plan Sheet C-1 and Site Details Sheet C-2 by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying dated April 28, 2010 on property at 76 Commercial Street located at Map 27, Lot 179 and at 229 Commercial Street located at Map 27, Lot 181 in District #907 Modified, contingent on the following:

1. Correction to the Written Statement
2. Adding two trees each to the east and west of the building on Route 90

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0 and four copies of the plan were signed.

II. SOUTHERN VENTURE, LLC

Representation: Peter T. Gross, Architect, P.O. Box 1215, Camden, ME 04843
Tel: 207-236-3717; Fax: 207-236-6321

Re: 11 Church Street and 10 Summer Street – Map 29, Lot 157
District #901 – Harbor Village District

Request: Site plan review to improve parking and vehicular circulation.

PRESENTATION:

Peter Gross: When the applicants bought the old Schoolhouse property, it had nine rental apartments and eight suites for offices. Parking was in a divided parking area on Summer Street with limited parking off Church Street that was very inadequate for the uses. The applicants are renovating the building and converting three floors on the south side as their own residence. The existing apartments will be renovated so that there will be a total of nine residences in the building when renovations have been completed. There will be no business uses. We are also working on the outside of the building, adding wrap-around porches. We propose to modify the site to provide better access to a total of ten parking spaces, and cars will be able to reverse direction in the parking area rather than having to back out into Summer Street. We propose two parking spaces on Church Street for the owners and four additional perpendicular spaces on Church Street that will be unpaved and look like lawn when completed.

Mr. Coulon: With regard to the parking on Church Street, there is a substantial rise in the bank. Might there be a cistern in that area?

Peter Gross: We have heard that there might be, but a raised area may be in there.

Mr. Coulon: Is there a legal requirement that it be filled?

Peter Gross: I don't know, but it would make removing the earth easier if there is a cistern there. The owners would possibly use it to harvest rainwater, so that is a question we will have to address.

Mr. Priestley: What material will be used for the new retaining wall?

Peter Gross: It will be a stone wall. I don't know if we have included that, but it will be high enough to require grading and it is being looked at by engineers.

Chairman Leichtman: Since the applicant is not here to create an apartment building, but just to discuss the parking and vehicular circulation, the application may appear incomplete since some items are not applicable to this project. On site plan review we will waive Nos. 2, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13. Unlike the Subdivision Ordinance, currently site plan review does not give the Board the flexibility for limited review, but it will after June if the Ordinance changes are passed.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – John Priestley: To waive Nos. 2, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 13 of Section 1305 of Site Plan Review.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: Multi-family buildings are not permitted in District #901, but the applicants are not here for approval for that. They are establishing a new apartment building, but the property also had grandfathered status. The big issue at this property has always been the parking situation. The way the new owner is dealing with it is by reducing the number of dwellings and removing the business uses that would involve client visits. For nine dwelling units Section 800 requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit for a total of eighteen parking spaces. The applicant proposes to provide sixteen. Despite the fact that this is a big improvement, this would require that we waive the required number and the parking table does allow for Planning Board discretion. I had a conversation with the Police Chief about this number of parking spaces at this location and asked if he thought it would be a problem and if parking had been a problem before. He said it had not previously been a problem with a less efficient layout.

Mr. Priestley: Can you characterize the apartments in terms of size, capacity and number of occupants?

Peter Gross: There will be eight rental apartments that will be studios or one bedroom, so they could be occupied by a couple with two cars. The owner's unit will have several bedrooms, but will have parking on the other side of the building. The spaces on Summer Street will serve the rental apartments.

Chairman Leichtman: Will there be assigned spaces?

Peter Gross: That hasn't been discussed.

Mr. Priestley: There will be ten spaces for eight apartments?

Peter Gross: Yes, with four on Church Street that could be used on occasion.

Ms. McKenzie: No. 5 of the written statement says the method of solid waste disposal will remain the same, which consists of dumpsters by the building. If there are no plans to locate it elsewhere on the site, it could encroach on cars backing up for two of the parking spaces.

Peter Gross: We haven't talked about that question, but can certainly find a place for it where it won't interfere with traffic circulation.

Ms. McKenzie: It has to be where trucks can access it as well. While this is certainly an improved parking situation, there is still concern whether it will be adequate.

Mr. Alexander: Will the landlord provide trash removal for the rentals? Maybe the dumpster is there for construction debris.

Peter Gross: My guess is that it is there for the tenants.

Chairman Leichtman: We will definitely want the dumpster screened.

Mr. Alexander: Is that something we need to be concerned about?

Chairman Leichtman: We will definitely require screening.

Peter Gross: We may decide not to have a dumpster, but will provide an enclosure near the building for trash cans.

Mr. Priestley: The dumpster does not appear on the plan.

Peter Gross: The method of waste disposal is that a company comes and takes it away.

Chairman Leichtman: It can be stipulated in the motion that it can't get in the way of vehicular access and must be screened.

Ms. Murphy: Can we make it clear that the residents on the Church Street side cannot impede tenants from accessing the four parking spaces in the back?

Mr. Priestley: I agree, since parking is not meeting the standard for me. If the front parking area is filled, can the tenants use those four Church Street spaces?

Peter Gross: There is an existing pathway along the west property line and the owners have never indicated that they would exclude people from the Church Street parking or walking along there. The pathway will have to be rebuilt.

Ms. Murphy: As long as no gate is put up.

Chairman Leichtman: The plan describes two parking spaces near the house for the owner's residence, but it doesn't say that about the other four spaces.

Peter Gross: We can make that pathway more explicit. We have studied the parking very carefully and cannot get more than ten legitimate parking spaces on the Summer Street side. We are trying to provide spaces that can actually be used. As previously configured with both residential and business uses, the requirement was for 42 parking spaces.

Planning Director Ford: As a counterpoint to the comments by the Police Chief, the Summer Street parking situation was chaotic and everyone had to back up onto Summer Street to get out. I think this is a vast improvement over what was there.

Mr. Alexander: I tend to agree with Peter Gross's argument and the owners can write any restrictions they want to into leases about using the pathway and the Church Street parking.

Mr. Priestley: We can approve the plan contingent on the four Church Street spaces being available to all residents of the property.

Ms. McKenzie: But we need a real extension of the pathway connecting to the Summer Street side to make those parking spaces really useful.

Mr. Priestley: I think that problem will sort itself out as long as spaces are available.

Chairman Leichtman: We received a letter from abutters Dan Sosland and Betsy Elwin expressing concern about three issues: lighting, drainage and noise.

Peter Gross: We have no plan to change the lighting in the parking area, and there should be no change in water flow, as we are removing asphalt. It will continue to drain onto Summer Street, as it does now. On the Church Street side it may even improve. The parking will be further away from the neighbor and landscaping will be added. Once construction is completed, there should be no noise issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

Chairman Leichtman: There are no issues with Section 1000 and the only issue with Section 800 is the parking.

MOTION – Fredric Coulon/SECOND – Terri McKenzie: To waive the requirement for 18 parking spaces and accept the 16 proposed parking spaces.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0.

Planning Director Ford: Part of this effort is to memorialize the number of units in the building now, so that should be included in a motion.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Fredric Coulon: To approve the application of Southern Ventures, LLC for site plan review to improve parking and vehicular circulation as shown on Existing Site Plan C-1 and Schematic Site Plan C-2 by Peter T. Gross Architects, P.A. dated April 28, 2010 on property at 10 Summer Street and 11 Church Street located at Map 29, Lot 157 in District #901, contingent on the following:

1. Approval is granted for nine dwelling units.
2. That trash disposal be situated so as not to impinge on traffic circulation and be screened wherever located.
3. That 14 of 16 parking spaces be accessible to tenants.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Alexander: I am uncomfortable saying that 14 out of 16 spaces can be used by tenants. The owners are not present and I don't know their intention or want to tell them how they can be allocated.

Chairman Leichtman: We are going by what it says on the plan that two parking spaces on Church Street are allocated to the owners, which I think is stating their intention and I don't feel we are imposing anything on them.

Ms. Murphy: We can say that only two are reserved for use by the owners. I think they recognize that there are not enough parking spaces per Ordinance requirements and so have included those on Church Street.

Peter Gross: That's correct.

Mr. Priestley: As long as the wording of the contingency doesn't require the owners to move their vehicles if someone wants to park.

Chairman Leichtman: I amend the third contingency as follows: Only two parking spaces can be exclusively reserved for use by the owners.

Mr. Coulon: I withdraw my second.

Mr. Alexander: I second the modified motion.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0 and two copies of the plan were signed.

III. TIFFANY ANDREWS

Representation: **Thomas A. Fowler**, Landmark Corporation Surveying & Engineering
219 Meadow Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Tel: 207-236-6757; Fax: 207-470-7020
Re: 3 Camden Street – Map 29, Lot 113
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Site plan review for a 900 sq. ft. restaurant.

PRESENTATION:

Thomas Fowler: We have submitted a site plan application for a proposed breakfast restaurant with seating for sixteen patrons, which is a permitted use in District #907. The landscaping plan was prepared by Michael Farmer and the rendering is depicted as-built. The property is accessed from Camden Street with 22-foot wide travel aisles. We have provided nine parking spaces, including a handicapped space. The Ordinance requires one space for every three seats for a minimum of six. Physical space on the site limits providing more parking. We have provided an HHE200 septic design for a system to be located in front of the cedar hedge on the Marriner's side of the property. The distance from the nearest point to the river is about 120 feet. We do not need any State permitting. No NRPA permitting is required because there are no wetlands and it is below the DEP's threshold for stormwater permitting. The total footprint should be 1,200 sq. ft. because that includes the porch, which is well under the footprint maximum of 6,000 sq. ft. in this zone.

Chairman Leichtman: I see no deficiencies in the plan or written statement.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Tracy Lee Murphy: To accept as complete the application of Tiffany Andrews for site plan review for a 900 sq. ft. restaurant as shown on Site Plan by Landmark Corporation Surveying & Engineering dated May 4, 2010 on property at 3 Camden Street located at Map 29, Lot 113 in District #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: A restaurant is permitted use No. 23 in District #907 provided it is not a drive-through, lot coverage is less than 32% and the setbacks seem to be in line.

Mr. Coulon: How did the Police Chief arrive at twelve parking spaces?

Chairman Leichtman: I'm not sure either, but apparently they squeezed in as many as possible. If you remove the shed, could you provide more parking?

Thomas Fowler: Definite one more. The number of restaurant seats and plan for the restaurant was established by the owner. The number of seats is also restricted by the size of the wastewater disposal system.

Mr. Coulon: Are there any parking restrictions on Camden Street?

Thomas Fowler: I don't think parking is possible on Camden Street because of the width of the road. At 22 feet it doesn't allow for two passing lanes.

Chairman Leichtman: I suggest a contingency should parking become a problem that the applicant will remove the shed and try to provide more. I am comfortable with the Ordinance requirement, but would like to give heed to the Police Chief's comments. What about other staff and how many will there be?

Thomas Fowler: We can accommodate one car next to the shed and there will be one or two planned for staff members.

Chairman Leichtman: Is the handicapped space required?

Thomas Fowler: Zero to 25 spaces require one handicapped space and a handicapped ramp is also required.

Chairman Leichtman: We will have you designate that as employee parking and make the shed disposable.

Ms. McKenzie: The Public Works Director brought up a concern about cars coming off Route 1 at high speed. Can you provide signage that requires people to turn right leaving the property?

Chairman Leichtman: If we force a right turn, we will force drivers up Main Street to make a left turn there.

Mr. Priestley: If the entrance meets the sight distances, we should rely on that and there are good sight lines there.

Chairman Leichtman: I turn off there frequently and rarely see any problems.

Ms. Murphy: I think forcing a right turn would cause more problems.

Chairman Leichtman: Will there be a dumpster?

Thomas Fowler: Behind the shed.

Chairman Leichtman: It will require screening.

Thomas Fowler: We will put it behind the shed for that reason.

Chairman Leichtman: Will there be lighting in the parking lot?

Thomas Fowler: There will be lighting at the doors to the building and illuminated exit signs, but no lighting in the parking lot.

Chairman Leichtman: What are the hours of operation?

Thomas Fowler: From 7:00 a.m. to 2:00 or 3:00 p.m., so early darkness will not be a problem.

Mr. Alexander: Is there any chance of expanding hours to serve lunch or an early dinner?

Jeremy Tucker: It will be primarily breakfast with maybe takeout if it looks like a possibility.

Thomas Fowler: The lighting is planned to allow for getting into the building safely.

Chairman Leichtman: Our concern is about dark parking lots, so if you expand your hours you will want to consider that and we can make it a contingency of approval. We will address landscaping and architecture under Section 1000.

Thomas Fowler: The building will have green asphalt shingles.

Mr. Priestley: The rendering looks nice, but sketchy, which leaves a certain amount up to interpretation.

Chairman Leichtman: Are there plans you are working from?

David Ober: Not yet.

Thomas Fowler: The sketch is based on reality.

Chairman Leichtman: There are no other issues with Section 800.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

MOTION – John Priestley/SECOND – Fredric Coulon: To approve the application of Tiffany Andrews for site plan review for a 900 sq. ft. restaurant as shown on Site Plan and Detail Sheet by Landmark Corporation Surveying & Engineering dated May 4, 2010 and Landscape Plan by Michael T. Farmer dated May 4, 2010 on property at 3 Camden Street located at Map 29, Lot 113 in District #907, contingent on the following:

1. If hours of operation are extended past 4:00 p.m., parking lot lighting will be provided.
2. If parking becomes an issue, additional space will be found and the gravel area is designated as an employee parking space.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Fredric Coulon	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri McKenzie	Yes
	Tracy Lee Murphy	Yes
	John Priestley	Yes

The motion was passed 6-0-0 and copies of the plan were signed.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Tracy Lee Murphy: To approve the minutes of the Planning Board Public Hearing of April 14, 2010 as presented. The motion was passed 5-0-1 with Terry McKenzie abstaining because she was not present at the meeting.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Tracy Lee Murphy: To approve the minutes of the Planning Board meeting of April 14, 2010 as presented. The motion was passed 5-0-1 with Terry McKenzie abstaining because she was not present at the meeting.

Chairman Leichtman: This may be the last meeting at which John Priestley will be a member of the Board. If anyone is willing to serve the Town in this capacity, we would appreciate your letting us know.

Mr. Priestley: I will be gone in June, but can possibly be available in July and August. I will try to continue to participate until we get a new Board member.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.

The next meeting of the Planning Board has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 16, 2010.

Nancy Ninnis
Recording Secretary