

**Town of Rockport Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
Wednesday, February 15, 2012 – 5:30 p.m.
Rockport Opera House Downstairs Meeting Room
Meeting Televised on Channel 22**

Present: Kerry Leichtman, Chairman
Terri Mackenzie
Thomas Murphy
James Ostheimer
Sarah Price

Also Present: Scott Bickford, Code Enforcement Officer
Nancy Ninnis, Recording Secretary

AGENDA

OLD BUSINESS

1. **Village at Rockport, LLC**, 55 Hilltop Drive, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Subdivision preliminary plan review to add Phase III (21 dwelling units) to Village at Rockport. Represented by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying.
Property: Hilltop Drive – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Penobscot Bay Ice Co., Inc.**, 211 Union Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Site plan preapplication meeting to locate an 8 ft. x 20 ft. Graffam Brother's Seafood Shack Restaurant. Represented by Kimberlee S. Graffam.
Property: 210 Union Street – Tax Map 30, Lot 107
District #901 – Harbor Village District
3. **David E. Herrick and Carolyn A. Cavanaugh**, 70 Rockville Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Request: Site plan preapplication meeting to develop a 6,000 sq. ft. commercial building with an attached 1,200 sq. ft. office and apartment. Represented by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers.
Property: Commercial Street – Tax Map 20, Lot 133
District #907 and #907M – Mixed Business/Residential District and Modified

OTHER BUSINESS

4. Review and Approval of Minutes

The meeting was called to order at 5:32 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, Village at Rockport, LLC
55 Hilltop Drive, Rockport, ME 04856
Property: Hilltop Drive – Tax Map 10, Lot 55
District #907 – Mixed Business/Residential District

Request: Subdivision preliminary plan review to add Phase III (21 dwelling units) to Village at Rockport.

Chairman Leichtman: The preapplication meeting was held on January 11, 2012 and a site walk was taken on February 8, 2012. Tonight we will address preliminary plan review, consisting of applicant presentation, Board clarifying questions, determination if the application is complete, review of application, public comment and vote.

Andrew Hedrich: We are here for review of Phase III of the Village at Rockport condominium development. Phases I and II total nineteen residential units and we propose to add 21 additional units for Phase III with fifteen units in the large building to be located in the middle of the development as well as five individual cabins. We will also convert the office space under Unit #3 into a residential unit. As with Phases I and II, we will utilize septic systems and wells. We have shown four potential septic system sites based on preliminary soils investigations and test pits. Because of setback requirements in relation to development and wells, one is located under a proposed parking area, but will be concrete to allow use of the area for parking and motor vehicle traffic. We also propose to impact 14,650 sq. ft. of wetlands along the rear portion of the property located in front of the stream and have applied for a permit under the Natural Resources Protection Act. The Department of Environmental Protection will visit the site on February 22. Permits are pending from the DEP and the Department of Transportation. We have applied for a Permit by Rule for the disturbance of more than one acre of soil, and if we don't hear anything to the contrary, we will receive that approval in two weeks. The DOT is considering whether to leave the exit road in place to be used as an exit for emergency vehicles only and for winter maintenance. We need a DOT permit for change of use because of the increase in the number of trips over the prior motel use. We have not yet personally coordinated with the Rockport Fire Chief, but will do so prior to final review. With regard to parking, we are utilizing 20 spaces inside the garages to reduce the overall footprint so that there will be one garage space inside and one outside for each unit.

BOARD QUESTIONS: There were no questions from the Board members.

Chairman Leichtman: Before moving to the issue of completeness, I want to clarify the following from Subdivision Ordinance Article 7.1.A (Preliminary Plan for Major Subdivision/Procedure): “Within six months after the on-site inspection by the Board, the applicant shall submit an application for approval of a preliminary plan at least fifteen days prior to a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. Applications shall be submitted to the Board in care of the Planning Office. Failure to submit an application within six months shall require resubmission of the Sketch Plan to the Board. The preliminary plan shall approximate the layout shown on the Sketch Plan, plus any recommendations made by the Board. Paragraph D states: “Within thirty days of the receipt of the preliminary plan application, the Board shall determine whether the application is complete. If the application is not complete, the Board shall notify the applicant of the specific additional material needed to complete the application.” Paragraph E states in part; “A public hearing shall be held within thirty days of the Board’s determination that it has received a completed preliminary plan application. The Board shall cause notice of the date, time and place of such hearing to be given to the applicant and be published in a newspaper of general circulation in Rockport, at least two times, the date of the first publication to be at least seven days prior to the hearing.” We advertise every meeting as a public meeting and allow the public to speak at every meeting.

Mr. Murphy: We did continue this meeting from the regularly scheduled meeting last week on February 8 because we did not have a quorum, and I checked with the Town Attorney to confirm that notification was properly provided.

Chairman Leichtman: Paragraph F states: “Within thirty days from the public hearing, or within another time limit as may be otherwise mutually agreed to by the Board and the applicant, the Board shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the preliminary plan application. The Board shall specify in writing its findings of facts and reasons for any conditions or denial.” Paragraph G states: “When granting approval to a preliminary plan, the Board shall state the conditions of such approval, if any. Paragraph H states: “Approval of a preliminary plan shall not constitute approval of the final plan or intent to approve the final plan, but rather it shall be deemed an expression of approval of the design of the preliminary plan as a guide to the preparation of the final plan. The final plan shall be submitted for approval by the Board upon fulfillment of the requirements of this Ordinance and the conditions of preliminary approval, if any. Prior to the approval of the final plan, the Board may require that additional information be submitted and changes in the plan be made as a result of further study of the proposed subdivision or as a result of new information received.” That is the intent of tonight’s meeting and we will first determine whether the application is complete. The application requirements are listed under Article 7.2.D-Submissions and I find no deficiencies in the application as presented.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To accept as complete the application of Village at Rockport, LLC for preliminary plan review to add Phase III (21 dwelling units) to The Village at Rockport condominium development as shown on Preliminary Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1.2 prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated January 25, 2012 on property at Hilltop Drive located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in District #907.

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

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: I have two problems with the location map. Existing subdivisions in the proximity of the proposed subdivision are required to be identified and they are not. I know of at least the Ledges, Sea Light, Roxmont and South Street in the area, although those might not be their correct names. Also, the names of existing and proposed streets are not included. We can approve the preliminary plan on the condition that the plan is resubmitted with the required information. We will now review the applicant's submission point by point, discussing only those items where issues arise:

3. The boundary survey from Phase I should be included in the information package for this submission so the Phase III package is complete.

5. A copy of the deed restrictions should also be included with this submission.

6b. Change the wording of soils "should be" suitable to "are" suitable.

7. The definition of Public Water System is: "A water supply system that provides water to at least 15 service connections or services water to at least 25 individuals daily for at least 30 days a year." I understand that the wells will be utilized for no more than 14 connections to avoid classification as a public water supply. Do you customize it by the number of people using it?

Andrew Hedrich: It goes by the number of service connections.

Chairman Leichtman: I am okay with that. Under No. 11, are there no trees with a diameter larger than 24 inches?

Andrew Hedrich: There are none in this development area.

Chairman Leichtman: Under No. 21, how is the area where trees are to be cleared shown on the plan?

Andrew Hedrich: The proposed tree line is shown as a dark green scalloped line and the existing tree line is shown as a lighter green scalloped line.

Chairman Leichtman: 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.” If none of the Board members have any reservations about this, I propose that this item be waived.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To waive Application Requirement No. 23 of Subdivision Ordinance Article 7.2.D (Preliminary Plan for Major Subdivisions/Submissions/Application Requirements) requiring a hydrogeologic assessment.

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

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: No. 25 states: “For subdivisions involving 40 or more parking spaces or projected to generate more than 100 vehicle trips in the peak hour, a traffic impact analysis, prepared by a professional engineer registered in the State of Maine with experience in traffic engineering, shall be submitted. The analysis shall indicate the expected average daily vehicular trips, peak-hour volumes, access conditions at the site, distribution of traffic, types of vehicles expected, effect upon the level of service of the street giving access to the site and neighboring streets which may be affected, and recommended improvements to maintain the desired level of service on the affected streets.”

Andrew Hedrich: We will be creating more than 40 parking spaces, but not exceeding 100 trips. We are seeking a waiver from that requirement.

Chairman Leichtman: The language says “or” and “shall” and I am not comfortable with waiving this requirement. My feeling is that a traffic impact analysis is required, but will allow it to be provided with the final plan. Are there any other issues?

Ms. Price: With regard to the water supply, supporting documentation was provided for Phases I and II.

Chairman Leichtman: That comes under Subdivision Ordinance Article 8.2.D.1 (Final Plan for Major Subdivisions/Submissions).

Ms. Price: I would want actual assurances addressed for Phase III.

Anthony Casella: For Phase II when the wells were put in we verified what those wells could serve. For Phase III it can be made a condition that Scott Bickford police that and provide a report, and we have to do it by law anyway. When the wells are installed, we can provide that information.

Chairman Leichtman: It will be provided with the final plan.

Ms. Price: My other concern is that for Phase II the parking lot in front of Building 2 did not cover that well. The design standards limit how close a street can be to a well and here the parking lot covers the well. Is this a change to the Phase II plan?

Anthony Casella: This is a parking lot and not a road, and the well is not covered, but we put a stone in front of it so we can service it.

Ms. Price: Does No. 11 mean that trees more than 24 inches in diameter cannot be cut?

Chairman Leichtman: We want them identified so we can work with the developer to not cut them, if possible.

Anthony Casella: We actually paid Gartley & Dorsky to move the location of the driveway so we could avoid cutting down a tree.

Ms. Price: Under No. 13, the contour lines represent a steep slope, but when we walked there on the site walk it didn't seem to be there anymore, so maybe what is shown on the plan is not really representative of the terrain.

Andrew Hedrich: This survey was completed during Phase I. What is missing is the mountain of top soil pulled out of Phase II and temporarily stockpiled in that area, so, yes, the contours have changed.

Ms. Price: It would help me to see it if elevations were included.

Andrew Hedrich: When we come back for the next meeting we will include the proposed final contours. The existing lines are close, but the wells and drainage will be addressed.

Ms. Price: Under No. 14 for the zoning district, I need clarification of where the clustered development applies because the requirements are very different. Does it even apply here?

Chairman Leichtman: The standards for clustered subdivisions in District #907 are listed in Land Use Ordinance Section 907.5.6.

Andrew Hedrich: We are not using the clustered subdivision ordinance. We are going by the basic District #907 standards. The way I read it, people use clustering to get smaller lot sizes.

Chairman Leichtman: And you are well under any limits because all the undeveloped back land counts.

Andrew Hedrich: It would also affect our ability to use the maximum building height of 42 feet from the lowest point of grade.

Chairman Leichtman: The Height of Building definition in the Land Use Ordinance states as follows: "Except as otherwise specified in this Ordinance, measured from the ridge line of the structure, no structure shall measure more than thirty-four (34) feet in height at the highest point

of the original grade adjacent to the foundation and shall measure no more than forty-two (42) feet in height at any other point above the finished grade adjacent to the foundation, provided the roof pitch is 8/12 or greater for residential structures and 5/12 or greater for commercial structures. The maximum building height for structures with a roof pitch of less than 8/12 for residential structures and 5/12 for commercial structures shall be no more than thirty-four (34) feet from all points above the original grade adjacent to the foundations. This measurement shall not include uninhabitable architectural elements such as cupolas, turrets, spires, etc., and projections, such as antennae, chimneys, windmills, and ventilators and these uninhabitable elements, including chimneys, shall not exceed a total height above the thirty-four (34) foot height line by six (6) feet.”

Ms. Mackenzie: Did you say at one point that one building would operate as a hotel?

Andrew Hedrich: No, that was never our intent.

Ms. Price: How do we decide what the finished grade level is at this point?

Chairman Leichtman: That is the responsibility of the Code Enforcement Officer.

Ms. Price: I request that we be provided with the elevations of buildings because of the line of sight of abutters.

Chairman Leichtman: I agree, as the proposed building is huge. I request that you not only show what it will look like, but how much of it will be visible from Route 1 and the effect on side abutters and what they are going to see.

Ms. Price: The abutters were present at the site walk and expressed concern about a spotlight shining at an open house.

Chairman Leichtman: I am not expecting the neighbors to see nothing, but want to be sure that what is constructed won't be an imposition on them.

Anthony Casella: It will be the same height as Building 2 and I am not sure it will even be visible from the street. It will be three inches short of 42 feet from the garage slab and it will look identical to Building 2, but with five balconies.

Ms. Price: I would like to be sure that on the final plan it is clear how to measure any buffer zone.

Chairman Leichtman: There are setbacks, but what do you mean by buffer zone screening? The Ordinance says screening, and I want to be sure the neighbors see something reasonable.

Anthony Casella: The trees behind the building are staying and they are as tall as the building.

Mr. Murphy: My concerns have been addressed.

Mr. Ostheimer: I have no comments.

Ms. Mackenzie: Does the parking area for the large building eliminate a possible septic system site?

Andrew Hedrich: No, parking will be located over the site and the septic system will be constructed with concrete chambers.

Chairman Leichtman: Unit owners can park in the garage, in their driveways and in an adjacent space to provide each with a total of three spaces?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the preliminary plan of Village at Rockport, LLC to add Phase III (21 dwelling units) to The Village at Rockport condominium development as shown on Preliminary Subdivision Plan Sheet C-1.2 prepared by Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers dated January 25, 2012 on property at Hilltop Drive located at Tax Map 10, Lot 55 in District #907, contingent on the following:

1. The location map should be upgraded to include existing subdivisions in the proximity of the proposed subdivision, and the locations and names of existing and proposed streets.
2. Elevations of the larger building should be provided, including views from Route 1 and neighboring properties.
3. The boundary survey and restrictive covenants should be provided with the final plan.
4. Amend the last sentence of No. 6b from “should be” to “are.”
5. A traffic impact analysis by a professional engineer is required.

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

The motion was passed 5-0-0.

Chairman Leichtman: With regard to the emergency exit situation, will you have the Fire Chief sign off on this plan?

Andrew Hedrich: Yes, that is our intention.

Anthony Casella: We will also have a letter from the Department of Transportation.

II. PENOBSCOT BAY ICE CO., INC.

Representation: **Kimberlee S. Graffam, President**
211 Union Street, P.O. Box 340, Rockport, ME 04856
Tel: 207-236-3397; Fax: 207-236-6715
Property: 210 Union Street – Tax Map 30, Lot 107
District #901 – Harbor Village District

Request: Site plan preapplication meeting to locate an 8 ft. x 20 ft. Graffam Brother’s Seafood Shack Restaurant.

Kimberlee Graffam: Last year we set up a seafood shack on this parking lot area and applied for a vendor’s license. The business was very successful, we had a lot of customers, so we are now applying for site plan review for something more permanent.

Chairman Leichtman: Your project was very well explained and your preapplication submission was excellent. Will your new structure be attached to the ground?

Kimberlee Graffam: No, it will still be a shack, but located further back on the lot.

Chairman Leichtman: The landscaping requirements could be problematic, as they require a lot of plantings. We will need to modify those requirements so they will be appropriate for what you are doing, as I don’t see a need to plant boulevard trees on this lot. You will also need to submit a landscaping plan, but you do not need to follow Section 1000 dogmatically and you do not have to plant trees. What is practical is that you create an attractive site. We are trying to be realistic, as our intent is to dress up the area and have a business not look trashy. We don’t want to overburden the applicant with unnecessary plantings, and you will be providing picnic tables and screening.

Code Enforcement Officer Bickford: This application will also require Zoning Board of Appeals special exception approval for a change of use.

Ms. Price: What was the previous use?

Kimberlee Graffam: It was a used car lot and a parking lot and associated with Smith’s Garage.

Code Enforcement Officer Bickford: It was a garage and grandfathered for many years.

Ms. Price: My concern is the abutter.

Kimberlee Graffam: We actually are the abutter.

Code Enforcement Officer Bickford: When this goes to the Zoning Board of Appeals, it will lose that grandfathered status as a result of the change of use.

Ms. Price: Will the occupants of the abutting property be screened?

Chairman Leichtman: Everything has to be screened with headlights not shining into windows.

Kimberlee Graffam: There won't be a dumpster on this property – we will use the one on the other side of the street.

Mr. Murphy: They are supplied by Graffam Brothers across the street, where you can buy alcoholic beverages, but the crosswalk is down the street.

Chairman Leichtman: That is not applicable because we don't regulate how anything is delivered.

Kimberlee Graffam: We approached the Public Works Director about a crosswalk and we were told we have to be in business for a least a year, and customers cannot drink beer on this lot.

Ms. Price: Since people often park parallel to the bike path, it might help to have stripes painted over the bike path section as was done at the property next to the driveway to the Pen Bay Y.

Kimberlee Graffam: That happens very rarely. They usually park in the area between the pavement and the bike path.

Chairman Leichtman: The Town does that type of painting?

Mr. Murphy: I suggest discussing it with the Public Works Director.

Chairman Leichtman: Are you preparing the plan yourselves or retaining an engineering firm?

Kimberlee Graffam: Ourselves.

Chairman Leichtman: You show a certain number of tables with seating, but we only require parking spaces for the number of seats.

Ms. Price: Actually, Land Use Ordinance Section 803.1.2 (General Standards of Performance/Traffic Circulation, Access and Street Design Standards/Off-Street Parking and Loading Standards) requires 25 parking spaces for drive-in restaurants, snack bars and take-out restaurants.

Chairman Leichtman: You don't have to draw the parking spaces on the ground, but you do have to show that you have 25. We look forward to seeing your plan.

III. DAVID E. HERRICK AND CAROLYN A. CAVANAUGH/HERRICK'S GARAGE

Representation: **Thomas P. Fowler**
Landmark Corporation Surveyors & Engineers
219 Meadow Street, Rockport, ME 04856
Tel: 207-236-6757; Fax: 207-470-7020
David E. Herrick, Herrick's Garage

70 Rockville Street, Rockport, ME 04856

Property: Commercial Street – Tax Map 20, Lot 133
District #907 and 907M – Mixed

Business/Residential District

Request: Site plan preapplication meeting to develop a 6,000 sq. ft. commercial building with an attached 1,200 sq. ft. office and apartment.

Thomas Fowler: We are here for site plan preapplication to construct a commercial building over 1,000 sq. ft. We are relocating the existing barn to the rear of the property and constructing a 6,000 sq. ft. auto sales and service shop building with a 144 sq. ft. connector to a 1,200 sq. ft. office building with upstairs apartment. All are permitted uses in this district. Estimated lot coverage will be well below the 50% maximum permitted in this zone. Our sketch plan shows the frontage portion of this 18-acre parcel with the development focused on a one-acre portion near the front. With regard to the connector, we are requesting a waiver of the dimensional requirements of a minimum of 20 feet long to 12 feet long in order to keep the garage structure as far from the stream as possible and to ease permitting requirements. The Planning Director spoke with the Town Attorney about this request and he responded by email that it is appropriately within the power of the Planning Board to grant such a waiver. This zone permits multiple structures of 6,000 sq. ft. or less and the intent is for them to be visually separated. The shop building will be a steel building similar to the applicant's shop on Rockville Street, with the office/apartment building being a Cape structure with dormer. A 12 ft. x 12 ft. connector is what is necessary for functional needs and a longer connector is unnecessary in this case. We are applying for a Permit by Rule for the stream crossing from the front of the lot to the rear to access parking and storage of rental trucks. The Permit by Rule application is required for development adjacent to a natural resource, the stream in this case, and within the 75-foot stream setback. We are also applying for a Department of Transportation entrance permit. The existing driveway accessed the former Ingraham's Dinner House restaurant, but it is not in an ideal location and the sight distances improve dramatically from the proposed new location.

Chairman Leichtman: I agree that we have the authority to modify the requirements for the connector. As Tom Fowler has stated, the Land Use Ordinance definition of a connector (An enclosed or unenclosed structure built at the second story or ground level, which connects two buildings. A connector shall have a height of not more than one story, an exterior width not more than twelve (12) feet, a length not less than twenty (20) feet and shall leave the buildings visually separated. A subterranean connector shall have at least 75% of its perimeter visually below grade and have a vegetative landscaped roof and shall have a height of not more than one story, a length no greater than the length of the connected building, a width of not more than 35 feet. All connectors must have a setback of no less than six (6) feet relative to the exposed façade. Connectors shall not count toward maximum building footprint) mentions that the purpose is to visually separate buildings. I do take issue with the statement that the two proposed buildings will be visually separated, as they also have to be complementary and compatible and the Ordinance does not allow metal buildings if they can be seen from the road per Section 1003.4.2 (Performance Standards/Architectural Review Standards/Building Materials): "Other Exterior Finish Materials Discouraged. Highly reflective surfaces or processed materials such as plastic

panels; plain, unfinished, concrete block; T-111; plywood; metal and similar materials are not permitted.” We have not previously allowed a metal building on the corridor roads.

Thomas Fowler: Rockport Marine has a metal building, but it is not visible from the road, and portions of this building also will not be visible.

Chairman Leichtman: We will look at what you propose.

Mr. Murphy: The Artisan Boatworks building is sided with shingles to address that concern.

Chairman Leichtman: I would like the Fire Chief to sign off on the shortened connector from the point of view of firefighting. I think eight feet is all that is needed, but would like him to confirm that.

Thomas Fowler: We have to discuss it with him in any case.

Chairman Leichtman: There is a 25-foot frontyard setback and we will need something physical to visually mark that so that cars on display don't start creeping up.

Thomas Fowler: There will be frontyard landscaping and we are working with Michael Farmer on a plan in compliance with the Ordinance requirements, but in order to make the business successful we don't want to create a row of plantings that will keep the cars on display from being visible from Route 1.

Chairman Leichtman: Section 1000 specifically addresses what is and is not allowed in the setback area.

Thomas Fowler: The 25-foot setback is actually within the Department of Transportation right-of-way.

Chairman Leichtman: You may have 200 feet devoted to cars on display and you are within that, with no more than 50 vehicles for sale on the premises.

Thomas Fowler: Our goal was 30, but we could only fit in 27.

Chairman Leichtman: The landscaping plan will be crucial because this is a small space and we don't want to block the view, but do want to enhance the site by making it attractive. When the applicant moved to his current location on Rockville Street, he complied with the Board's requests and created an attractive site.

Ms. Price: I would call your attention to Section 1305.7-Special Features of Development just in case it applies to this project. You should also refer to the exterior lighting requirements in Section 800 and buffer requirements for abutters. Is this considered to be industrial development?

Chairman Leichtman: No, it is mixed commercial/residential.

Ms. Price: What about signage?

Chairman Leichtman: That is the Code Enforcement Officer's role.

Thomas Fowler: We will have a sign right at the right-of-way line.

Mr. Murphy: My concern is possible noise from an air compressor and that you be aware of the neighbors and what they might see and hear.

David Herrick: The air intake will be on the outside, but the compressor will be inside.

Mr. Ostheimer: I have no questions.

Ms. Mackenzie: I have no questions.

Thomas Fowler: We will come back at the next meeting with a landscaping plan and permitting information.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION – Kerry Leichtman/SECOND – Thomas Murphy: To approve the minutes of the regular Planning Board meeting of January 11, 2012 as presented.

VOTE:	Kerry Leichtman	Yes
	Terri Mackenzie	Abstain (not present at the meeting)
	Thomas Murphy	Yes
	John Ostheimer	Yes
	Sarah Price	Yes

The motion was passed 4-0-1.

Chairman Leichtman: We have scheduled a final plan training session for Wednesday, March 7, 2012.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

The next meeting of the Planning Board has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 14, 2012.

Nancy Ninnis
Recording Secretary