

**Town of Rockport Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, July 13, 2011 – 7:00 p.m.
Rockport Opera House Downstairs Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22**

Present: Kerry Leichtman, Chairman
John Alexander
Terri Mackenzie
Thomas Murphy
Sarah Price

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

AGENDA

NEW BUSINESS

1. **Village at Rockport, LLC**, 689 Commercial Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Subdivision preliminary plan review of Village at Rockport Phase II. Represented by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying.
Property: 689 Commercial Street – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

OTHER BUSINESS

2. Review and Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

I. VILLAGE AT ROCKPORT, LLC

Representation: **Andrew D. Hedrich**
Gartley & Dorsky Surveying & Engineering
59B Union Street, P.O. Box 1031, Camden, ME 04843
Tel: 207-236-4365; Fax: 207-236-3055
Anthony Casella and John Richardson
Village at Rockport, LLC
689 Commercial Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Property: 689 Commercial Street – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Subdivision preliminary plan review of Village at Rockport Phase II.

Chairman Leichtman: The original agenda description has been revised due to a misunderstanding of what the applicant is requesting. Because we did not approve a master plan for the project in March when we approved the first phase, the current application is actually for Phase II of the project, which is a subdivision onto itself. Accordingly, technically we should have had a preapplication meeting. It would be appropriate for the Board to waive this requirement because we met with the applicant a short time ago in March 2011 and the preapplication discussion has essentially already taken place. We can reschedule the site walk to be after preliminary plan review rather than before. If we do not waive the preapplication meeting requirement, we would be putting an undue burden on the applicant because he has prepared for preliminary plan review rather than a preapplication meeting. What is important is that as stewards of the Town we not give the Town short shrift in terms of the land use standards.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To waive the preapplication requirement of Article 5 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Chairman Leichtman: We are not cutting any corners or review requirements because Phase I of this project was reviewed and approved during Planning Board meetings of January 19, 2011, February 9, 2011 and March 9, 2011 and, as far as I can tell, Phase II is similar to Phase I.

Anthony Casella: Yes, and there is going to be less density than originally discussed.

Mr. Murphy: And the Board already walked the front third of the property at the time of Phase I review.

Ms. Price: Just to clarify, Article 5.1 states that the purpose of preapplication review is: “The purpose of the preapplication meeting and on-site inspection is for the applicant to present general information regarding the proposed subdivision to the Board and receive the Board’s comments prior to the expenditure of substantial sums of money on surveying, soils identification, and engineering by the applicant presenting general information.”

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To schedule on-site inspection to take place after preliminary plan review rather than before.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: We will take the site walk before the next stage of review. Tonight we will hear the applicant's presentation, take Board questions on the application, determine whether the application is complete, discuss the application, take public comment and vote on the preliminary plan. As always, the applicant should not assume that approval of the preliminary plan means that the final plan will be approved. As noted during review of Phase I, as Assessor I have had many dealings with Tony Casella and John Richardson, but that will not affect my ability to objectively review this application.

Andrew Hedrich: We propose to add ten residential units to the property. During Phase I we received approval for nine units, but only six are being constructed, as Buildings 3 and 5 only have three units each per the plan presented tonight. Buildings 1 and 2 are being expanded to each accommodate six units consisting of four two-bedroom units and two one-bedroom units. Building 7 will consist of a single stand-alone unit. There will be a total of 19 units after Phase II has been completed. We plan to install two new septic systems and add a new system to replace the existing system to serve Building 3. The cabana house is being relocated from the Phase I area to the rear of the property. The northern access drive named Hill Top Drive will serve Buildings 3, 5 and 7, and Cabana Drive will serve the rear of the property. We will widen the road to 18 feet at the intersection and will include wider entrances. It will be a two-way road at the entrance, but Hill Top Road will be a one-way drive. We will carry forward the widening previously agreed to. We have remodified the shape of the exit, which is still being widened. We will put in additional wells with the configuration taking into account the location of wells in relation to septic systems. There is an existing well for Buildings 3 and 5 and we will add one or two in the area of the new buildings. We are still working with the Fire Chief on fire suppression. We also need to work with the Department of Transportation on a change of use permit. This is a minor process, but we will have feedback on the entrances and exits. Even with this Phase II traffic counts will not increase over the prior motel use.

With regard to parking, the Ordinance requires two spaces per unit. We propose to reduce this to 1.8 spaces for a total of 35. Many of the units will be occupied by single owners with one car and we will provide a bank of guest parking. We do not anticipate that every unit will need two parking spaces and we will assign spaces to the specific units. There will also be drive-in garages under the buildings. We certainly do not want to have inadequate parking and there are options to expand the parking if needed. However, we are trying to minimize impact. There will not be a T turn-around for fire trucks, but the placement of Building 2 will provide maneuvering room for a truck.

BOARD QUESTIONS:

Mr. Murphy: No questions.

Ms. Price: No questions.

Mr. Alexander: No questions.

Ms. Mackenzie: No questions.

Chairman Leichtman: What are you using now for the Building 3 septic system?

Andrew Hedrich: The existing system is still being used.

Anthony Casella: We met with the Code Enforcement Officer and he agreed the system was capable of taking four units, but for anything above that we would need a new system. We have connected to

Building 5 and dropped the existing system down to only Building 3 because we have already put a new system in to serve Building 5.

Andrew Hedrich: The new Building 3 system is up front and there is no use of any existing systems at all.

Anthony Casella: We are redesigning the systems to fit the current configuration. We will also dig up the system for Building 1 and the well for Buildings 1 and 2 before the next meeting.

Andrew Hedrich: The plan is a work in progress, so we will be relocating the systems shown on the plan presented tonight.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to plan completion, I found no deficiencies.

MOTION – John Alexander/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To accept as complete the preliminary plan for Phase II of The Village at Rockport represented by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying as shown on Preliminary Phase II Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1.1 prepared by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying dated June 28, 2011 on property at 689 Commercial Street located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in Districts #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: We will continue with discussion of issues.

Ms. Price: I am concerned about the water supply.

Anthony Casella: There will be a separate well for twelve of the units. The well depth and holding tank keeps enough water to supply the units.

Ms. Price: You are also working with the Fire Chief to be sure there is adequate water for fire fighting?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes. However, if we have fourteen connections to one well it is considered to be a public water supply. We want to make it clear that we won't connect more than thirteen to an existing well because of setback issues of 500 feet for public wells and extensive testing requirements.

Chairman Leichtman: Is a public well specifically defined anywhere?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes.

Ms. Price: In the definition of a subdivision. I would like to see evidence from the abutters that there is sufficient water. Is the existing well adequate in itself?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes, but it may not be adequate for the entire development, so we put in another well.

Ms. Price: We usually get statements from at least three abutters that their wells are adequate.

Andrew Hedrich: We are working under the assumption that the demand on the existing well won't exceed need.

Anthony Casella: When we talked to the Code Enforcement Officer, he was happy to know that it would serve six rather than thirteen units. It has served for twenty years, so the assumption is that it would be adequate.

Chairman Leichtman: The Article 8.2.D.1 final plan submission requirement states that evidence be provided as follows: "When water is to be supplied by an existing public water supply, a written statement from the servicing water district shall be submitted indicating the district has reviewed and approved the water system design. A written statement shall be submitted from the fire chief approving all hydrant locations or other fire protection measures deemed necessary. When water is to be supplied by private wells, evidence of adequate ground water supply and quality shall be submitted by a hydrogeologist familiar with the area and/or evidence from wells on a minimum of three adjacent properties."

Planning Director Ford: In this case we have an existing well on which it is easy to get data and to determine what else is needed beyond that. This particular development has a well that is already functioning.

Chairman Leichtman: I think that would fulfill the requirement because the abutters are not close enough to serve as evidence.

Ms. Mackenzie: Is a well driller a hydrologist? I agree with Sarah that we need to see something substantive.

Andrew Hedrich: I am not sure what a certified well driller would not provide that a hydrologist would.

Planning Director Ford: In review of past subdivisions we have used well data provided by well drillers. We rarely hear from hydrologists.

Chairman Leichtman: The wells will be drilled before the final plan, so you will have concrete data.

Andrew Hedrich: Exactly.

Chairman Leichtman: And the Fire Chief has to sign off before they can get an occupancy permit and sell any units. Your response to No. 7 states that there is an existing well near Building 3, but Plan Note 6 states: "Owner verified that the well previously identified under Building 3 does not exist."

Andrew Hedrich: Two wells are there. There is one under the building that does not exist and the other well is the one referenced.

Ms. Price: Article 11.2.A.1 – Water Supply states: "Any subdivision within the area designated in the comprehensive plan for future public water supply service shall make provisions for connection to the

public system. When public water supply service will not be available at the time of construction of the subdivision, a “capped system” shall be installed within the subdivision to allow future connection when service becomes available without excavation within the right-of-way of any street within the subdivision.” This is based on the State subdivision law, but I assume there is no specific plan to provide public water in this area.

Chairman Leichtman: Good point. If there were a concrete plan to have public water down Route 1, this project would have to allow for that.

Ms. Price: Article 7.2.D.14 (Preliminary Plan for Major Subdivision/Submission Requirements/Application Requirements) states: “The zoning district in which the proposed subdivision is located and the location of any zoning boundaries affecting the subdivision.” This is a condominium development and not a clustered housing development, so there is no specific concern about closeness to property lines. However, I see this as a little bit of a grey area, particularly for Building 7 and maybe for Building 5. Article 7.2.D.20 states: “The zoning district in which the proposed subdivision is located and the location of any zoning boundaries affecting the subdivision.” My concern is with the word “improvement.” Is there a landscape plan for the common land? I assume the walking trails don’t exist yet, but is that a definite part of the plan as we approve it? The project includes a densely packed building area balanced by a large open space.

Chairman Leichtman: That doesn’t apply because this is not a clustered development.

Ms. Price: So could they develop the open space?

Planning Director Ford: With each unit they are using up part of the parcel and you would score this the same way as with any subdivision. The applicant could provide lot coverage calculations.

Andrew Hedrich: In round numbers, there could be 75 units of 20,000 sq. ft. per unit on 35 acres.

Mr. Murphy: Are you thinking of doing that?

Andrew Hedrich: I am not sure. It has been discussed, but it depends on the market.

Anthony Casella: We talked about a maximum of 55 units for three phases, so we would be twenty under the maximum allowed, which is included in the condominium documents. Our goal is 39 units. Although we are showing six units per building in Phase II, we may not do that.

Chairman Leichtman: You are requesting approval for how many units in Phase II?

Andrew Hedrich: Thirteen units.

Chairman Leichtman: But you may develop only ten, and you can’t develop fourteen.

Anthony Casella: We received approval for nine units in Phase I, but only developed six.

Chairman Leichtman: So the same square footage is being used, but for fewer dwelling units.

Anthony Casella: We did not increase the footprint size.

Chairman Leichtman: We are approving what your maximum can be, but you can go under that.

Ms. Price: I thought we might need a landscape plan, and if it included a walking trail, how would the residents ever change it?

Andrew Hedrich: We don't traditionally deal with subdivision landscaping, and the homeowners association will abide by the rights and restrictions set out in the bylaws.

Anthony Casella: We are supplying landscaping as we develop the units. We have hired Plants Unlimited to do the design work, which we are putting together as we build, so it changes as we go along.

Mr. Murphy: I feel comfortable about what is going on there as long as the infrastructure is in place.

Mr. Alexander: I think our concern is only as far as we can see from Route 1 and they can do whatever they want beyond that.

Planning Director Ford: We used to combine site plan review with subdivision review, but the review process doesn't work that way any more. Since this is a developed site, it is appropriate to look at the two new buildings, but full site plan review doesn't have that much relevance. Land Ordinance Section 1303.1 (Site Plan Review/Applicability) states that site plan review and approval is required for "The construction or expansion of buildings, including accessory buildings and structures, for commercial use by a total floor area of 1,000 sq. ft. or more, or a lot's alteration of more than ten thousand (10,000) square feet at multi-family residential properties."

Ms. Mackenzie: What is already there is of sufficient standard and we would be infringing on the rights of the homeowners association by getting into further detail.

Ms. Price: Article 11.9 is entitled "The Proposed Subdivision Conforms with the Duly Adopted Subdivision Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Ordinance of the Town of Rockport" and states: "All lots shall meet the minimum dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance for the zoning district in which they are located. The proposed subdivision shall meet all applicable performance standards or design criteria from the zoning ordinance. In making this determination, the municipal reviewing authority may interpret these ordinances and plans." Accordingly, I was not sure how much detail we need to get involved in.

Planning Director Ford: That is appropriate and is based on the State statute. The Board does have the power to apply any aspect of the Land Use Ordinance to subdivision review, but not to go to the extreme.

Chairman Leichtman: The further language narrows it down so that our scope is limited to the particular district. The Comprehensive Plan portion of the statement is a red herring because it doesn't hold up under legal challenge; rather, it is a guideline for creating ordinances.

Ms. Price: I can't tell from the plan what the level of vegetation is in the open space.

Andrew Hedrich: It is wooded.

Ms. Price: The open space is also part of the plan. Since it is a forest, there are rules about clear cutting, but otherwise we don't appear to be dealing with it.

Anthony Casella: About 50% of it is wetland and therefore under heavy restrictions about what we can and cannot do. We can create a 6-foot wide path, but we cannot add rocks, dirt or boulders. The guidelines for a walking path are very restrictive. We are hiring Gartley & Dorsky to map out a route for the walking path that will cause the least disturbance.

Ms. Price: So it is inaccessible?

Anthony Casella: Yes.

Ms. Price: My concern is that you might decide to build down there.

Chairman Leichtman: That is really none of our business. Our only concern is what we are being asked to approve now, not what might happen in the future. Accordingly, anything they could do is none of our business until it comes before the Board, and they would have to come back to the Board for any further development. We would be exceeding our authority by looking beyond the current application.

Ms. Price: Application Requirement No. 23 states: "The Board may require a hydrogeologic assessment in cases where site considerations or development design indicate greater potential of adverse impacts on ground water quality. These cases include extensive areas of shallow to bedrock soils." Who knows if the test pit results are that situation?

Chairman Leichtman: The question is, what is shallow bedrock?

Andrew Hedrich: Traditionally we only need about 18 inches for a septic system.

Chairman Leichtman: This is not a densely developed area and everything is obviously flowing down to Route 1 and being taken out. I have a question about parking. You are asking for 35 spaces instead of 38. By my calculations you only need 34 based on six units in the first two buildings and six units each in the two new buildings plus the cabin.

Andrew Hedrich: Based on a total of nineteen units we would need 38 parking spaces.

Mr. Alexander: If you are going to Phase III, you will have to put in more parking anyway.

Andrew Hedrich: Yes, but our goal is to minimize impact.

Mr. Murphy: The Police Chief has asked to speak to the Board about this issue and has requested that there be 38 parking spaces.

Andrew Hedrich: We were not aware of his concerns, but can certainly accommodate that.

Ms. Mackenzie: I checked the MLS real estate listings and my concern is that you don't really have anyone living there yet to provide a history or experience of parking or traffic flow. Phase I is not yet occupied, so there hasn't been a shakedown period and I would be skeptical about Phase II.

Mr. Murphy: I don't think it is relevant to bring up the MLS listings.

Chairman Leichtman: That is the case with any subdivision ever proposed and the Ordinance requires that the Trip Generation Manual be used to calculate traffic flow and parking. Skepticism

based on facts and the evidence before you is appropriate, but not based on whether or not they have sold units.

Ms. Mackenzie: But I have concerns about traffic because the property is not yet occupied.

Chairman Leichtman: That doesn't matter.

Ms. Price: In the parking memo the applicant states: "The applicant anticipates that a handful of the units, specifically the studio or one bedroom units, will only have a single occupant and will not need a second space a majority of the time." Maybe the word "anticipates" is the problem.

Chairman Leichtman: If the Ordinance says the applicant has to provide a traffic count based on a specific manual, there is no more that can be done. I understand your concern, but we need to keep our judgment within the parameters of the Ordinance. That is all you are authorized to judge them on and we have to check our skepticism at the door. What we are concerned about is whether whatever is put on the ground is within the parameters of the Ordinance. I have voted for projects I hated, but which met the Ordinance standards.

Ms. Mackenzie: I certainly don't want to demonstrate bias.

Chairman Leichtman: Your statement was on the edge because you said you would look at it skeptically, but it is okay in light of the request for reduced parking.

Ms. Mackenzie: That is where it came from.

Anthony Casella: We have twenty men working there, so we have a lot of traffic flow and have experienced no problems.

Ms. Mackenzie: That's a good point.

Chairman Leichtman: I was hoping the applicant would talk about the trip generation figures.

Andrew Hedrich: The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has studies for different categories of development. We calculate the number of trips per day and peak hour trips. Based on those values, we apply a numerical value. The number of peak hour trips can trigger the Department of Transportation review threshold. It is all based on averages and statistics.

Mr. Alexander: I used to own the campground across the street from this property. With 100 units and big rigs coming in and out, we never had a traffic problem.

Mr. Murphy: I think the calculation of the number of trips generated is well below what it will actually be.

Ms. Price: I think the main concern is the exits.

Mr. Murphy: Originally there was just one entrance and one exit and now you can enter both ways.

Chairman Leichtman: I agree that the sight distances are excellent, so as long as the roads meet the dimensional standards of the Ordinance, including the setback from the abutter, I have no concern. The question is whether you are meeting the standards with the type of traffic on the property.

Anthony Casella: We reviewed this with the Code Enforcement Officer. His concern was about the proximity to the abutter, so we revised the plan accordingly.

Ms. Mackenzie: I still have a problem with the location of the dumpster. You will have nineteen units and only one large dumpster. I am concerned about whether that will be sufficient and the logistics of traffic flow. It is a long way from Building 7 to the dumpster.

Anthony Casella: We have included in the Condominium Declaration that maintenance people will pick up trash once a week and put it in the dumpster.

Ms. Mackenzie: A week's worth of garbage? Where will it be kept in the meantime?

Anthony Casella: In garbage cans. The dumpster is sized for forty units.

Mr. Alexander: I don't foresee any problems.

Anthony Casella: We chose the dumpster location for convenience and ease of pickup and it will be screened by shrubs.

Ms. Price: I have a question about visitor parking spaces versus assigned spaces. Are residents buying a parking space?

Anthony Casella: No, they are getting an assigned space or spaces based on need. Our sales trend is for buyers over sixty because we went for the downsizing market.

Ms. Price: Is there any need for handicapped spaces?

Andrew Hedrich: People won't buy the units without acceptable parking.

Anthony Casella: Handicapped parking is designed for retail businesses. The parking assigned will be closest to their front doors.

Ms. Price: So they will buy a unit knowing which space goes with that unit?

Anthony Casella: Yes.

Ms. Mackenzie: And the Homeowners Association will have control over any issues that come up.

Ms. Price: What if someone has three guests?

Andrew Hedrich: That is the intent of having a bank of guest parking.

Ms. Price: Is stormwater management asked for?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes, and we will provide a narrative. The Department of Transportation will also be concerned about it.

Ms. Price: Land Use Ordinance Section 1002.5.d (Performance Standards/Area Landscape Regulations/Front Yard Landscaping Requirements) lists specific requirements for trees along the frontage that this property does not have.

Mr. Murphy: The property is nice as it is and it is in keeping with other properties in this area along Route 1.

Chairman Leichtman: Is Section 1000 of the Land Use Ordinance applicable to this application?

Planning Director Ford: Not per se, except when we get to Article 11 of the Subdivision Ordinance. The Board has the flexibility to interpret the Land Use Ordinance, but traditionally has not done so for subdivision review. You can choose to limit your review to Section 907 of the Land Use Ordinance to make sure dimensional standards are met.

Ms. Mackenzie: This property is already developed and you can see very little of that from the street. The purpose of landscaping is to break up large buildings and I don't see it as an issue here and I am happy with what is there.

Andrew Hedrich: Section 1000 references commercial and non-residential units. We will need to know if we have to deal with site plan review.

Chairman Leichtman: I don't believe Section 1000 is applicable and Article 11.9 defines itself by stating "minimum dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance for the zoning district in which they are located." It does not say Land Use Ordinance. I do acknowledge that this is somewhat of a grey area, but I agree about the point of Section 1000, which is stated in Section 1001: "The purpose of this section is to provide standards and guidance for the landscaping, architectural design and parking areas for all commercial properties in the Town of Rockport. The section's intent is to ensure that new commercial development, and modifications to existing structures, are done in a manner that enhances the overall aesthetic appeal and visual character of Rockport's roadways and neighborhoods. All non-residential development proposed within Rockport shall be subject to the regulations, procedures and standards specified in the following sections, in addition to those standards pertaining to the particular district in which the development occurs. To achieve these goals the Planning Board may waive requirements that it deems to be unnecessary to a specific development project." The last sentence gives us our guidance and when this Board has the power to waive a requirement, we look at intent.

Ms. Mackenzie: Any trees planted would block the water view and decrease the value of the property.

Chairman Leichtman: Subdivision Ordinance Article 11.8 is where landscaping comes in. Accordingly, I make the judgment that we consider whether the application meets Article 11.8 and not refer to Land Use Ordinance Section 1000.

Mr. Murphy: I agree.

Ms. Price: Does that apply to architectural standards and parking as well?

Chairman Leichtman: The parking for forty-plus cars has to meet specific design standards.

Ms. Price: So when we get the next plan we will be looking only at the Subdivision Ordinance?

Chairman Leichtman: Correct, except for Section 907 of the Land Use Ordinance. I have a couple of corrections for the General Site Notes on the plan. The area of the property is 37.01 acres, not 36.38 acres. The address of the applicant should be 7 Hilltop Drive, not 689 Commercial Street, and Hilltop is one word, not two.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

Andrew Hedrich: Will you be requesting a separate boundary survey? One was submitted in February 2011 for the Phase I review.

Chairman Leichtman: No.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the preliminary plan of The Village at Rockport for Phase II as shown on Preliminary Phase II Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1.1 prepared by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying dated June 28, 2011 on property at 689 Commercial Street located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in Districts #907.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: We will schedule a site walk before the next meeting.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND FINDINGS OF FACT

March 9, 2011: MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the minutes of the regular Planning Board meeting of March 9, 2011 as presented.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

June 11, 2011: MOTION – Terri Mackenzie/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the minutes of the regular Planning Board meeting of June 11, 2011 as presented.

VOTE:	John Alexander	Yes
	Kerry Leichtman	Abstain – did not read
	Terri Mackenzie	Yes
	Thomas Murphy	Yes

Sarah Price

Yes

The motion was passed 4-0-1.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

The next meeting of the Planning Board has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 10, 2011.

Nancy Ninnis
Recording Secretary