

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
SEPTEMBER 9, 2003**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Margaret Stevenson, Dennis Ciotti, Beth Thompson, Park Christenbury, Pete Lavoie, Anthony McManus, Donald Andolina, Ronald Cole, Eric Tooke, Frank Torr

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Swatzenruber and Allen Schintzius

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Stancel, Planning Director and Jacqueline Freeman,
Recording Secretary

Chairman Cole brought the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Alternate Donald Andolina sat on the Board.

ITEM #1: Citizens' Forum

No one spoke.

ITEM #2: Approval of the minutes.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.
Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Chairman Cole explained that ITEM #5, a lot line adjustment for Linda Moreau was removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

ITEM #3: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a minor subdivision of land for Rick Drew (Owners James & Karen Towle Rev. Trust) Assessor's Map I, Lot 4A, zoned R-12, located on Mast Road. * (P03-50)

Randy Orvis represented the applicant and stated that it is a simple subdivision of one 16,000 sq. ft. building lot from 18 acres.

Beth Thompson made the motion to accept the application.
Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.
There were no comments.
The public hearing was closed.

Peg Stevenson made the motion to approve the plan with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signature to the plat.
2. Provide the Planning Department with a digital version of the final plat.
3. Revise the plat to correct Note #1 – R-12 District is Medium-Density Residential
4. Revise the plat to correct Note #2 – Add all the dimensional requirements for the R-12 District.
5. Revise the plat to add the minimum building setback lines to Lot 4A.
6. Revise the plat by adding a note that the lot will be served by municipal water and sewer.
7. Revise the plat to add two GIS points so that the survey is tied into the Dover GIS system.
8. Revise the plat to add the common subdivision plat notes #1, 7, 12, 22, 24, and 25.
9. Revise the plat to show a proposed 30-foot wide sewer easement along the existing sewer line after confirming the actual location with the Community Services Department.

Beth seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #4: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a minor subdivision of land for Austin & Edna Nikerson, Assessor's Map 33, Lot 71 & 72, zoned R-12, location on Washington Street/Brookline Ave. *(P03-47)

Paul Connolly represented the applicant. He explained that the lot has frontage on a private road, Myra Street, that was formerly a public highway and then discontinued by the City Council in 1970. He said that it currently has frontage on Brookline St. He explained how the Gliddens bought up 22 different lots at the time when land was carved up into little slices. He said that the Assessor's Office has shown the premises as two separate lots and he had no idea how that came into being. Paul Connolly stated that the garage laps over onto the other lot. He said that they are asking for a subdivision instead of a lot line adjustment because from their assessment of title they could see no other way than to call the entire 58,000 sq. ft. as one parcel.

Beth Thompson made the motion to accept the application.

Dennis Ciotti seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

Scott Rogers, abutter at Lot 89, stated that he had no concerns other than where the location of the new house and the driveway onto Brookline Avenue would be.

Paul Connolly explained the conservation area and that the building envelope, depicted on the plan, is where the house must be located. Paul added that due to the steep slope the driveway would be located nearer to Washington St.

The public hearing was closed.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signature to the plat.
2. Provide the Planning Department with a digital version of the final plat.
3. Revise the plat to add the surveyor's stamp and signature.
4. Revise the plat to show the portions of the property that are in the Conservation District.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #5: Application for a minor lot line adjustment of land for Linda Moreau, Assessor's Map 25, Lots 72, 73, 73A, zoned R-12, located on Cocheco St. (P04-49)

This item has been withdrawn by the applicant.

ITEM #6: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a site plan of land for Pilot Construction, Inc., (Yvon Cormier Construction Corp.) Assessor's Map D, Lot 2, zoned B-3, located on Webb Place/Winshire Gardens. (P03-44)

John Chagnon stated that he was representing Pilot Construction and that this plan was approved less than 1 ½ years ago with a building that was going to be centered on the lot. He said that they have shifted the building to the left of the property leaving the same total impervious area on the site. He said that it will be a Class A office building. He explained how the landscaping in the parking lot would dress it up. He said that they have redone the lighting. He said that they have submitted a fence upgrade plan to replace the stockade fence that was approved and asked that the Board indicate if they were in favor of the upgrade. He went over the conditions of approval one by one. He said that it is not stated on the plan that the fence would be 7 feet tall but that is what would be constructed. He said that it will be either the stockade or the upgrade as the Board decides. He said that they would work with NHDOT and explained how they would like to flatten out the slope. He said that they have written NHDOT a letter and have not heard back but they are amendable to working with the State. He said that they are in agreement with Condition #6 to make the off-site improvements to the Webb Place/Central Avenue intersection as recommended in the traffic impact analysis. Mr. Chagnon spoke on Condition 7 saying that the space right now is speculative. He said that they have specified some parking calculations based on the definition for general office which will be one-third of the building. He said that two-thirds of the building will be a medical office that has a parking requirement of 1 space for every 250 sq. ft. He said that they have 139 total spaces on the project and based on the square footage of the building it will break out to meet the ordinance. He said that the applicant doesn't have a problem with a stipulation that at the time that a tenant does become interested in leasing a space, the owner would go to the appropriate City official and explain the use and look at the parking requirement with the understanding that they have 139 spaces for

the whole building. He said that they would like a little bit of flexibility as they move forward.

Peg Stevenson made the motion to accept the application.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that 30,000 sq. ft. was previously approved on this site and this is a 7,000 sq. ft. increase. When the previous owner came through for approvals, through extensive discussion with them, they convinced them to do a more of a mixed use project as opposed to all residential. He said that they did have some concerns as to whether the office space would ever get built given the market conditions out there. He said that he is very pleased to see this project come through and felt that it would be a great asset to the community. He said that they recommend approval with 7 conditions.

Parks Christenbury said that the only problem would be with the traffic.

Steve Stancel stated that the applicant's traffic engineer did a traffic analysis and Bruce Woodruff, our traffic planner, went through the analysis and concurred with the analysis. He said that there were some recommended off site upgrades for the project and the applicant has agreed to do those at their expense.

Tony McManus stated that he would vote in favor of this because it has already been approved to some extent. He said that his concerns are with the traffic and even with the figures that the developer's expert has given, it shows that some of the intersections in that area are close to unacceptable, right now, even without this project being built. He said that a lot of this is based on computer models and not based on what is actually happening on the ground. He said that at a busy time everyone knows that the waiting times are more than what is represented in the analysis. He said that this does not factor in the new hotel. He said that we have been given the figures for that development and now this separate development and he doesn't think that anyone stops to accumulate the total impact of all of the proposed development. If we just keep approving development in areas like that we are just asking for trouble. He said that the figures show that in 2014 without some improvement to the area three out of four of these intersections will be in failure. He said that everyone is saying that at some point the State of NH will come in and put in interchange 10 or a plan to fix up Exit 9. He said that he doesn't feel that it is proper planning to approve major developments knowing when we do it that we are adding to the failure of those intersections and at some point we need to say no.

Steve Stancel stated that he wanted to clarify that when these traffic studies are done they do take into account all previously approved and under construction traffic figures. We are not looking at each of these as an individual basis; they are all tied in in the traffic

model and in the traffic studies that are done. He said that they even include projected background traffic growth during the next 10 years. What this study shows is that there is one intersection that goes to failure in the year 2014, but it goes to failure with or without this project and there will be an increased delay ten years down the road. Steve Stancel said that between now and then, there will be improvements made within the road system and improvements to the traffic signal coordination.

Tony McManus said that he thinks that that is a phony argument to say that the intersection will go into failure with or without this development. It certainly will go into failure quicker with more development than without development.

Steve Stancel pointed out that included in the Board packets was Table 7 – Level of Service Results With or Without Mitigation. It show that even in the Year 2014 that the mitigation that this developer is building into their off-site improvements, there is no Level F, there is a Level E on the Weeks Lane westbound but the mitigation brings it up from Level F even 10 years projected down the road.

Ron Cole stated that this project will have a positive financial impact for the City. It also is an indication that the community is healthy, otherwise it would not be happening. He added that he is with Tony 100% with the traffic situation.

Parks Christenbury said that Dover has not been an easy place to develop and that is one of the reasons that we have not had the development that Somersworth or Rochester has had. Parks said that the Planning staff in the City is very meticulous. He said that he is amazed at some of the things that we require developers to do that quite frankly, they probably don't have the right to do, but they will comply just to get into Dover. He added that even in the economy that we have right now, we have a developer that is willing to take the risk to build a building like this in Dover. He said that he does not believe that staff is lax in these issues or that they are not looking at the long-range picture. He said that he feels that they are doing a good job and he could not let these comments go by without defending what he has seen staff doing the last few years.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve the application with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signatures to the plan.
2. Provide the Planning Department with a lighting plan and analysis to prove compliance with Chapter 149-14-E-2(b).
3. Revise the plan by adding the deed reference in a note.
4. Revise the plan by specifying that the fence will be seven feet tall and add stockade fence or approved upgrade.
5. The applicant agrees to work with the NH DOT to develop a plan to stabilize the steep bank in the area northeast of the proposed building.
6. The applicant agrees to make the off-site improvements to the Webb Place/Central Avenue intersection as recommended in the traffic impact analysis. A plan depicting the details of the improvements shall be prepared and submitted to the Planning Department for approval prior to the issuance of the building permit. The

improvements shall be completed and accepted by the City prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy or secured by a letter of credit.

7. Due to the fact that there is no specific tenant for the medical office space, the number of medical professionals occupying the space shall be limited to 14 (100 spaces/7 per professional [assuming 5 spaces per professional and 2 support staff] = 14). The Building Inspector shall have the right to alter this number based on actual building occupancy.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #7: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a site plan of land for Liege Corporation, (30 International Drive, LLC) Assessor's Map G, Lot 31-5, zoned I-2, located on Crosby Road. (P03-39)

John Chagnon represented the applicant. He stated that this is the southerly lot of a 3 lot subdivision. He said they are proposing a three-bay building with some parking in the front with access off of Crosby Road and loading in the back. The developer is an importer of hardwoods which he resells through the internet. He will occupy 1/3 of the space. John Chagnon said that they are specking out the other 2/3 of the space and the developer is looking forward to moving his operations from Portsmouth to Dover. He said that the second condition of approval is that the owner add a four foot decorative block wall to the front of the building. He said that they submitted a proposed rendering. Mr. Chagnon said that it is a prefabricated metal building and the staff has asked if they could make it better and the owner has agreed to do that. He will submit a proposed rendering as he gets closer to construction.

Peg Stevenson asked if there was a picture of what the building would look like right now even though there will be revisions.

John Chagnon stated that he did not have one with him but that it would be flat faced and there would be some block to break up the bottom. He said that the height would be in the 20 to 24 foot range.

Discussion ensued with regard to actual picture of the proposed building.

Beth Thompson made the motion to accept.

Dennis Ciotti seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Ron Cole asked Steve Stancel how he felt about not having an accurate rendering of the building.

Steve Stancel stated that it was made a condition of approval that it be reviewed in advance.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signature to the plan.
2. Provide the Planning Department with an architectural rendering of the proposed building that depicts the bottom 4-feet of the building being decorative block or brick.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #8: Old Business

**a. Discussion and possible vote on a preliminary Open Space Subdivision, located on Westwood Circle. (3 lots) (P03-39)
40**

Frank Torr made the motion to take this off the table.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Atty. Malcolm McNeill stated that he was representing the applicant. He stated that this is a small subdivision in the Westwood Circle area. He said that this is a 4 acre parcel in an R-40 zone. He said that this zone has had a very interesting evolution. He said that the original subdivision approval was over 40 years ago where lot sizes, at that time, were at approximately ½ acre. He said that since then there were further evolutions to up the lot sizes to 40,000 sq. ft. and making the lots non-conforming. He said that the City then made the OSS concept mandatory in the R-40 zone. He said that this is a test as to whether there is strict compliance with law and in this case, they feel that there clearly is. This plan has been the subject of evolution and discussed with the Planning Department for months. The major issue for the Planning Department was whether the yield plan for this sight presented a feasible four lot subdivision. Under the new law what a yield produces has a bearing on the maximization of the development. The Planning Department has come to the conclusion that the yield plan for 4 lots is feasible and doable on this site.

Mr. McNeill stated that the site has been through Technical Review and there have been no significant TRC issues. This is a very small subdivision and at this stage proposes the addition of two house lots only. He said that they completely agree that the proposals that are the subject matter of their favorable recommendation. This plan meets or exceeds all requirements of the zone. Under the ADS the minimum lot size in this zone and the common lot size in the Westwood Circle are is 20,000 sq. ft. The average size in this proposal is 40,000 sq. ft. The proposal is one lot less than permitted by the yield plan. The trade off that the developer proposes is to make it three because he is requesting a waiver with regard to the setback of the house which under the regulations requires 100 foot buffer. Mr. McNeill said that the house can be moved and the

developer will consider moving the house. He said that the diminution of one additional lot is reasonable grounds for the granting of the waiver of that provision.

Atty. McNeill stated that the argument that the lots are inconsistent with the neighborhood is true; these lots are larger. He said that this was a prototypical 50's/60's/70's type project; this is 2003. he asked if the neighbors would rather have something like this than something conventional. He said that in their view they don't have an option under the present law. Mr. McNeill stated that the covenants are not relevant in this case because this project, with regard to this frontage, consists of two lots that were formerly in the Westwood Circle subdivision and consisted of approximately 1/2 acre each. This particular house that we are retaining sits on one of those lots. Those two lots were part of the old project approximately 40 years ago. He said that the land to the rear is not part of the Westwood Circle subdivision and not part of the approved plan and as such, is not part of the covenants. The authority doesn't exist with the Planning Board to enforce covenants. He said that he would like to submit that the developer has not maxed out this site, there could be one more house on this site and the trade off that they are requesting for the diminution in size is the waiver for the house on the front. The alternative is to go forward with the four lot subdivision. It's not his intent but they feel that it is entirely legal.

Chairman Cole reopened the public hearing.

Peter Stroykovich, 35 Westwood Circle, stated that he is the largest abutter to the project. He said that he is not so sure that this does fit the Open Space Subdivision. It was a subdivision as it stands and now we are proposing to divide that subdivision. Maybe it does meet all the regulations but he said that he is not so sure that it was the intent of the OSS to squeeze this in. If that's the case, he is also a big property owner and could get together with a neighbor and could probably come in with another bunch of houses in the back. He stated that he hopes that the Planning Board considers both parties point of view.

Elisa Stroykovich, stated that she would like to thank the members of the Board and the Planning Department for coming to Westwood Circle on a very hot and humid afternoon. She said that she was very encouraged when she heard about Dover trying to preserve open spaces but she did not think that the open space was going to become a subdivision. She said that in listening to Atty. McNeill, she asked what has happened to the land that she has been paying taxes on and isn't it part of the Westwood Circle subdivision.

Malcolm McNeill stated that the back portions of the lots are outside of the confines of this subdivision. He explained that it doesn't detract from her ownership.

Elisa Stroykovich stated that they have been told that four houses could be built but should be thankful that only two would be built. She asked why they are not building all four houses. If they are going to built two and will be loosing money, they should move the house and build four. Let's do it and we'll have crowded schools and will need a new

one. He said that she wanted to thank Ms. Freeman for her kindness and for answering all her questions during the past few months.

Rob Cartmel, 41 Westwood Circle, an abutter on the other side of the proposal said that it seems that the Planning Board has been taken out of any sort of decision making process. If everything that the attorney said is true, then there really is no point of having this meeting. He said that he questions the tactics. He said it is like saying, "we can really screw up your neighborhood or we can screw it up a little bit." It seems like a tough tactic.

Bruce Robichaud, 20 Westwood Circle, diagonal abutter to this proposal said that the attorney spoke about the original development as half acre lots and that the land in the back was never part of the Westwood Development. He said that it's true but he said that now they are taking from the original intent and actually making a driveway to get access to land that was not originally developed. He said that he just wanted to make that observation.

Mr. Hoginski, 31 Westwood Circle, stated that he recalls the subdivision of Westwood Circle and of the three partners that bought the farm that encompasses Westwood Circle. They bought a lot more acreage than what was in the original plan that just showed the lots but they gave people that were on the outside of the circle the additional land that went up to the government land. He said that it was his assumption that whole farm was included as the Westwood Circle Development. He said that he isn't sure how that comes out to be but his assumption is that the back land is still part of the original subdivision. He said that he had a question regarding the moving the house. He said that part of the house has a cellar and a good part of it is on a slab. He said that he has never seen anyone move a house off of a slab. He said that he is just curious how they would go about doing that if they had to. He was concerned that the garbage from the new homes would be an issue because it would have to be left on Westwood Circle and there are many predatory animals in the area.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that this application has been a struggle for the Planning Department and the Planning Board. He said that he understands the frustration of the neighborhood as well. He said that until recently, right up to the site walk, the Planning Department did have some concerns with regard to the yield plan. In their mind it always fell back to the yield plan. Does the developer have a reasonable conventional subdivision that he can put on this lot and from the original plan; it was questionable in their mind. Instead of a four lot subdivision it appeared as though the applicant could only get three lots. He said that about three days after the site walk they received a new yield plan. He said that they feel that the developer, by moving the house and this house can be moved, because we have moved houses just like it off of Liberty Mutual land for the CDBG program, you can get four lots. He said that being the case, once they felt comfortable with that, then they felt comfortable with the concept of the OSS.

Steve Stancel stated that the OSS subdivision regulations are new and innovative and because of that, there might have to be some tweaking down the road. He said that he would, to a certain extent, agree that the OSS did exactly what it was supposed to do in this process. He said that there are two acres of open space on this piece instead of having a 400 to 500 foot public road with four lots; it would have been much more destructive to the neighborhood. He said that there will be two new lots serviced by a public drive. He said that they recommend approval of the OSS concept plan with the corresponding waivers with the following conditions:

1. There shall be a shared driveway for the two new lots. The driveway shall be located along the common boundary line of the two lots.
2. There shall be limited tree removal to allow for the construction of the shared driveway, and the balance of the trees shall remain to buffer the abutting properties.
3. The open space shall remain in its natural condition, with no removal of trees or shrubs.
4. The 50-foot buffer area on Map F, Lot 18F-2 shall be left in its natural state, except for minimal clearing necessary for the driveway. (There shall be not clearing except that required for the driveway.)

Peg Stevenson said that the Board can't consider the land in the back for the new houses as being part of Westwood Circle, however, she said that Mr. Cartnel's land and the applicant's land were both parts of the original Westwood Circle. She said that even though the covenants don't mention anything about no further subdivision, they do state the use of building type and they specifically state detached single family and a private garage for not more than two cars. It appears that the intent of the covenants is to restrict the number of driveways that can go on these lots. She asked that that being the case, do they have the right put in another driveway in off of Westwood Circle. If there was not access to those back lots according to the covenants, would they have the right to get into the back.

Steve Stancel stated that he is not an attorney but as he reads the covenants, it indicates that there has to be single family houses on the lots. It doesn't appear to preclude further subdivision. He explained that there is only one lot on Westwood Circle. Those lots have been combined and it is considered one lot being subdivided. He said that the other point that he would like to make is that it is not the purview of the Planning Board to get into policing protective covenants. He said if there is a legitimate legal question about the covenants, the avenue is through the Court process.

Frank Torr said that it has been stated that the land that surrounded the subdivision was given to them as part of the subdivision.

Steve Stancel stated that it does look like these lots were taken out of a larger parcel and in fact it shows a future access road to go on further onto the property in the future. He said through time it has fallen by the wayside. He said that it is not completely clear but the original 50 some odd lots did come off a larger parcel.

Dennis Ciotti asked what size the driveway would be.

Steve Stancel stated that this plan has to go back through Technical Review process and will be coming back before the Planning Board for the final approvals. It's been discussed that it would be between 12 to 14 feet.

Discussion ensued with regard to the driveways.

Don Andolina thought that the use of the word minimal was vague. He said that it leaves the potential for future disagreement and asked who determines what minimal means.

Steve Stancel stated that he will change condition 4 to read that there shall be no clearing except that required for a driveway.

Don Andolina made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. There shall be a shared driveway for the two new lots. The driveway shall be located along the common boundary line of the two lots.
2. There shall be limited tree removal to allow for the construction of the shared driveway, and the balance of the trees shall remain to buffer the abutting properties.
3. The open space shall remain in its natural condition, with no removal of trees or shrubs.
4. The 50-foot buffer area on Map F, Lot 18F-2 shall be left in its natural state. There shall be no clearing except that required for the driveway.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE 5 – 3 Opposed – Peg Stevenson, Dennis Ciotti, Frank Torr

ITEM #8: Old Business

b. Discussion and possible vote on a Driveway Waiver for Michael Ham, located at 335 Washington St. (P03-38)

Peg Stevenson made the motion to take this item off the table.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

Chairman Ron Cole re-opened the public hearing.

Don Briand, an abutter of the property in question, stated that this new plan more truly represents the actual layout of the driveway. He said that his only concern would be the aesthetic quality of the area between his driveway and the proposed driveway and the area to the rear of the garage where there is a parking lot. He said that he is not sure if the Board has the authority to make sure that there are proper boundaries set up visually, between that property and his. He said that he urges the Board to approve this proposal.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that they recommend the driveway waiver with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall remove the existing pavement on his property that is within 5 feet of the property line and loam and seed or landscape the area.
2. All work within the public right-of-way shall be coordinated with the Community Services Department.

Steve Stancel explained that the pavement will be removed so that there will only be one access and he won't be able to use the second.

Frank Torr asked about the gravel area. On the map it shows that it is open and to him it means that it could go further.

Steve Stancel stated that there is a gravel area now and the applicant will still have to receive a driveway permit from the Engineering Department to put in the driveway. He said that they can access the gravel area to the rear. If it remains a single family use, the gravel areas in people's backyard for parking purposes are allowed. If for some reason if it becomes commercial or a home occupation, then there may be paving required and may have to come before this Board if it's 10 spaces or more but realistically, it will probably be handled by Engineering.

Peg Stevenson asked if this rescinds the deeded right of way.

Don Bryand stated that the right-of-way for Mr. Ham to use his driveway has a caveat that it is only for him to access the garage and only in effect as long as the garage stays a garage and he has made some changes to the garage that would negate that.

Peg Stevenson made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall remove the existing pavement on his property that is within 5 feet of the property line and loam and seed or landscape the area.
2. All work within the public right-of-way shall be coordinated with the Community Services Department.

Tony McManus seconded.

VOTE U/A

Steve Stancel spoke about the walk that was scheduled this morning with Dan Burden, a world known Walkable Communities advocate. He said that Mr. Burden pointed out some improvements that he recommends that the City does. He said that they have written them down and will pass them on to the City's consultant who is taking a comprehensive look at the City's downtown traffic loop. He said that during the next few years you'll see some interesting and innovative improvements to the downtown area.

ITEM #9: New Business

He said that there is an announcement in the packets for a Planning and Zoning conference that is put on by the State and Plymouth State University. He said that if anyone is interested the City will pick up the cost. He highly recommended that the Board attend.

Ron Cole reminded the Board that at the next meeting, September 23, 2003, we will be looking at possible changes to OSS subdivision regulations during the regular meeting. He said that the Orientation was set for October 14, at 6:00 PM prior to the regular meeting.

Frank Torr asked if we were taking money from developers for the synchronization of the lights, particularly at Weeks Crossing and other places within the community.

Steve Stancel stated that with the hotel project, the new set of lights going in will be timed with the main intersection signals. When the Staples project came through there was a timing that took effect at that point also and there were improvements to that intersection. He said that he has not noticed any backups at the intersection but they can look at it again. He said that another thing that is coming up on the council's agenda is that they are voting to approve the contract for the Central Ave. coordination, which starts at Weeks intersection and goes all the way down Central Avenue to coordinate the lights.

Frank Torr stated that he has not seen any real back up at the intersection either and he thinks that it functions quite well.

Steve Stancel stated that the history of Weeks Corssing said that for years we had the traffic circle and there were problems up there and because of that the City didn't approve projects in that area and we didn't rezone in that area. He said that there was a significant investment of 7 or 8 million dollars total between the City and State that took effect and the Crossing was created. It was only after that time that we did begin to rezone and approve projects in that area. He said they have been very prudent and cautious and with each project that comes through it is made to tie in with all the previous projects. The city has invested a lot of money up there and we are finally seeing a return.

ITEM #10: Adjournment

Frank Torr made the motion to adjourn.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A