

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2002**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Pete Lavoie, Joyce El Kouarti, Margaret Stevenson, David Landry, Parks Christenbury, Frank Torr, Beth Thompson, Ron Cole

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chuck Maglaras, Dennis Ciotti, Anthony McManus

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Stancel, Planning Director; Steve Bird, City Planner; Chris Parker, City Planner and Jacqueline Freeman, Recording Secretary.

Chairman Cole brought the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

Ron Cole asked the Board if they had any objections to moving ITEM #1 Citizen's Forum to ITEM #7 a. He said that this will allow the quicker items to be heard first.

Ron Cole announced that Items #6 and 7, Lafrance Hospitality, would not be heard because of outstanding issues that have to be discussed.

ITEM #2: Approval of the minutes

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

VOTE U/A

ITEM #3: Consideration and acceptance of a Driveway Waiver for Walter Lewis, Assessor's Map 12, Lot 96, zoned RM-10, located at 11 & 13 Elm Street. (P02-51)

Walter Lewis stated that he is requesting a waiver. He said that a new curb and sidewalk was installed leaving his tenant with no parking. He had photos that showed the front lawn of his duplex that was formally used as parking. The duplex has two 3-bedroom units. He said that the parking on the lawn was existing for as long as he knows. He said that he can park two cars on one side and is now requesting a driveway on the other side of the front walkway. Mr. Lewis said that he has been working out an alternate plan with the neighbors and would like to table this until another meeting.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to table.
David Landry seconded.

Peg Stevenson said that she would first like to hear from the abutters who were present.

Parks withdrew his motion and David withdrew his second.

Ron Cole opened a public hearing.

Johnnie Koromilas, 36 Summer St., stated that Mr. Lewis allows sub-letters in his duplex resulting in too many cars. She said that each lot on the street has one cut for a driveway. Mr. Lewis has the smallest lot and wants the largest cut. She was concerned with where the snow would go. She said that the cars parked in the yard overhang the sidewalks and it would be a huge waste of tax dollars to rip out the existing sidewalk. She also said that it would be an eyesore and urged the Board to deny the waiver.

Dawn Haines, 15-16 Elm Street, stated that Mr. Lewis's present plan allows for no landscaping or grass and the car would hang over on the sidewalk. She would like a more creative plan where there might be 3 spaces on the 11 Elm St. side and 1 space on the 13 Elm St. side and this would allow for a grass area. She is also concerned with drainage because her driveway is lower. She said that her husband is an architect and he has some ideas, aesthetically correcting the situation. She said that they object to a full scale paving. She suggested a smaller walkway up to the house to allow for more room for parking. They would not like Mr. Lewis to pave right up to their drive way and want the 5 foot setback to be maintained.

Scott Perry, 38 Summer St., is an abutter on the side elevation. He said that he shares some of the same concerns as the prior speakers. He said that the Lewis parking has been gravel for some time and something does need to be done. His concern is that he would not like to see the entire frontage of his building to be paved. He would like to see some green space kept.

Ron Cole recessed the public hearing.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to table.

David Landry seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #4: Consideration and acceptance of a lot line adjustment of land for Michael Davis and Pat Brady, Assessor's Map N, Lots 2-2 & 2-4, zoned R-40, located on Three rivers Farm Road. (P02-54)

Kevin McEneaney represented the applicant. He said that the lot line adjustment will facilitate sighting the Davis house on the property.

Frank Torr made the motion to accept the application.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signatures to the final plat.
2. Revise the plat to correct the scale in the title block.
3. Revise the plat to add the Strafford County Registry of Deeds recording number for the reference plan #2.

Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #5: Application for a site plan of land for the City of Dover, Assessor's Map H, Lot 12, zoned R-20, located at 25 Alumni Drive. (P02-52)

Ron Cole reminded the Board that their approval is not required for a City project.

Nick Skaltsis stated that they were present as a courtesy. He said that they have been through TRC. He said that this addition will be on the blank wall of the Auditorium. There will be four classrooms on the first floor and 4 on the second floor and the addition of 9 parking spaces.

Joyce El Kouarti 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 gave the staff recommendations stating that they are non-binding.

Beth Thompson made the motion to approve with the following non-binding recommendations:

1. Add wall-mounted lights to the addition.
2. Provide floor plans of the addition.
3. Provide architectural rendering of the addition.
4. Provide digital version of the site plan to the Planning Department.

Joyce El Kouarti seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #6: Application for a minor subdivision of land for Lafrance Hospitality/Opechee construction, Assessor's Map 39, Lots 78, 83, 89-94, zoned B-5, located at Weeks Crossing (P02-42)

Ron Cole stated that this will not be heard tonight because of outstanding issues.

ITEM #7: A. Citizen's Forum.

Malcolm McNeill said that he was speaking on behalf of his wife who owns property at 180 Locust St. and is not representing any clients. He said that he was not able to attend the meeting where the Subdivision and Site Review Regulations were discussed but has some comments. He feels that there has been some significant overreaching and lack of attention to detail that will come back to haunt everyone as a result of these proposals. He said that Peter Laughlin has written a book that says that you cannot dictate the design of building or building elements such as window openings, color or other aesthetic considerations unless the municipality has gone through the historic district process. (He passed out copies of this page to the Board) He said that what disturbs him the most is the far reaching nature of these regulations. Does this mean that he cannot have a contemporary building? Who do they go to for the design police of Dover? He said that this leaves no place to go except Superior Court. He read over proposed ordinance and said that it was subjective.

Malcolm McNeill said, regarding another item, that applicants would typically come to the Board with an ADS for two reasons. One was that they would be seeking a density bonus or there were some unique characteristics in the land. Now there is nothing to guide anyone with regard to an ADS. He said that the developer always had the option of doing a conventional subdivision with standards that were clear and now they have no choice. He said that the standards are subjective. Creativity may be the goal but what are the standards? He said that anyone who has been in Dover for a while, knows that if the Board liked the ADS, it got through and if the Board didn't like them, they didn't get through. He said that there is no clear density bonus because there is nothing to compare the project to. There is no longer a conventional subdivision. The subjective nature of this ordinance leads to gross uncertainty with regard to development and inability on the part of the developers to even guess with any degree of certainty whether their investments in this community makes sense. It encourages an atmosphere of complete uncertainty. He said that there should be reasonable standards for developers and not the quagmire that exists with regard to this proposed ordinance. He agrees with the entire concept to try to restrict the residential activity in this community and diversity in the commercial, but when you have an occasion where a residential developer comes in here, there should be reasonable standards. He said that he has projects in his office right now and because you have posted this, he doesn't know what direction to point them in. He said that he thinks that private property owners in the US should know their constitutional rights of knowing what they can do with their property without having to guess.

Kevin McEneaney, 8 Goldpost Road, stated that he agrees with Mr. McNeill. He said he was on the committee that recommended the Open Space Subdivision and he was in the minority. He was not in favor of it because it was too subjective. He said that as far as the rezoning goes, he has a concern that has to do with existing lots of record. He said that they are in the process of changing setbacks to wetlands so there are a number of houses out there that were built recently, that currently would be non-conforming. He asked if impact fees apply to additions on houses, or on businesses. He said that this will make extra work for the Zoning Board. Regarding Site Review Regulations, it is important that all the commercial land owners were notified of these regulations. He said

that he is not sure that the landowners have had time to digest the information. He said that the Site Review and the Subdivisions amendments get approved by this Board and don't have to go to another hearing before the Council. He said Kevin Kelly, who wasn't able to be here tonight and owns about 14 acres located on County Farm/Watson Road in the ETP zone. Kevin McEneaney said that Mr. Kelly is asking that the ETP be included in the TDR as sending and receiving areas. He is also asking that there be a residential component in the TDR. Mr. Kelly would like Elderly Assisted Care and Congregate Care added to the ETP. These uses are allowed in most of the zones but would like to see them allowed in commercial zones, given the fact that we have a graying society and they can also be considered a commercial type development because they are run for profit.

Glen Jerry, 33 Wallace Drive, is opposed to the rezoning. He said that 66% of the rezoning is in his neighborhood, which is unfair and unconstitutional. He said that they were given a false sense of hope after the last rezoning in 1999. He said that many of the children on Wallace Drive go to private school so it is not a problem for the Dover school system.

Dan Gabriel, said that he was asked to serve on two of the tasks forces. He said that he agrees with Malcolm McNeill. He said that someone who has a residential structure that is changed to a commercial zone, will be un-financable when they go to get a mortgage because that it is a non-conforming property. Impact fees will discourage developers. He said that someone who subdivided years ago and paid their impact fees and that lot became a lot of record should not be subject to the new impact fees. He said that we all know of subdivisions that have been asked for plow trucks, etc., those are impact fees in themselves. He said that there are people who have lots reserved for their children and have already subdivided and should not be subject to those fees. He said that he was assured that this would not happen and somehow that has changed during the process. He asked that no votes be taken tonight because it is hard for him to try to follow the process and there are many here that feel that there are some changes that need to be made to the proposals.

Ted Englis, 23 Wallace Drive, said that he agrees with Mr. Jerry. He said that he is near an industrial neighbor and was awakened this morning by 10 huge bangs at quarter of 8:00. He understands the reason for rezoning; however, whether it's light industrial or offices, these properties will all have dumpsters and trucks coming in and out. He doesn't want to deal with that. Urges the Board to vote no on 13, 14 and 15.

Nadine Duchetto, 28 Wallace Drive, said that this rezoning will create an island surrounded by industry. She said that she was surprised there were no other options in between Industrial and the Residential. She said that people will move out. She said that the motive was on how to pay for schooling, and they feel that if the zoning goes through more of the professionals that live in that subdivision will move out. She said that the residential brings in more professional that may be able to solve the issues and help provide solutions to the problems of lack of funding for schools. She would like to see the industrial parks filled before any more are created. She doesn't see any industrial

customer knocking down the door to build tomorrow. She said that she was sorry that she does not have any solutions to offer.

Susan Martinen, 27 Wallace Drive, said that 3 ½ years ago this Board voted that it was not in the best interest of the City to rezone this particular area. She said that growth is critical but it must be balanced between residential and commercial. She questions why 66% of the land proposed for rezoning in the City is in one specific area. She questioned why the industrial parks are empty. She asked if this parcel could be looked at as ETP which would maintain her value on her property. She said that she would like the Board to work with the residents to find better uses for the land.

Citizen's Forum was closed.

Ron Cole explained that the Planning Board recommends the rezoning to the City Council and that it is the City Council that makes the final decision. It takes a 2/3 vote of the City Council to overturn the recommendations of the Planning Board.

Ron Cole explained that Tony McManus could not be present because of previous commitments to the Russians who are visiting in the City. Ron added that Tony McManus recommended that the Board not take any action on the amendments this evening and that one more workshop be held.

David Landry thought that it might be appropriate to move some of the things to the next meeting but not the entire slate of items. He said that there are some things that could be passed tonight. He said that moving 41 items to another meeting doesn't seem like a particularly bright idea. He said that the 345 acres that are being rezoned to I-4, which is one of the industrial zones that has far fewer storage facilities, and smoke stack industries, is the less negative of the industrial zones. Of those 345 acres, 150 acres are presently zoned I-2. It's actually an improvement to go to I-4. Some people seem to think that the entire 345 acres are going from residential to industrial. He said about 400 acres are being left out of the calculations that is being used by some of the abutters as a percentage of rezoning. David said that there are three different office zones and he has a problem with the height of 65 feet. It's hard for him to think of a transitional zone with the 65' height.

Parks Christenbury asked to move the CWD to the front because it has been discussed in detail and the only comments have been positive. He said the only issue that is hanging out there is that we have to insure the abutters that if there is development on the bluff area that there will be a protective covenant between those residents and where that development would occur. He thinks that the general public is in agreement.

Ron Cole suggested going down the list of items and if anyone has any issues it would be referred to a workshop. He said that any items that no one has any issues with could be voted on tonight.

The Board went over each item one by one. **Items 1, 2, 3**, no issues - **Item #4** Frank thought that should be held up; **Item #5** Ron Cole stated that he has a conflict and David Landry felt it should be held for a workshop, **Item #6** Ron Cole said that he has a conflict on that but there were no issues, **Item #7** was held up for a workshop; **Items #8, 9** no issues; **Items #10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15**, were held up; **Items #16, 17** no issues; **Items #18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24** were held up; **Item #25** no issues; **Item #26** was held up; **Items #27, 28, 29** no issues; **Item #30** was held up; **Items #31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41** no issues.

David Landry suggested that the Board take a vote on the items that no one had any problems with.

Ron Cole went over the items that the Board was in agreement on and listed them as: **Items #1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 16, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31 through 41.**

Steve Stancel wanted to clarify that even if the Board voted on these items as a lump, the Council could address them one at a time.

The Board agreed that the Council could vote on them individually.

Joyce El Kouarti made the motion to approve **Items #1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 16, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31 through 41** and send them to the City Council for their attention individually.

Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE 6 - 1

Opposed – Pete Lavoie

Chairman Cole called a recess at 8:55 PM.

Chairman Cole brought the meeting back to order at 9:05 PM.

Ron Cole said that he had a Board member ask for an explanation on #4, the minimum non-wetland portion of the lots be contiguous.

Steve Stancel said that the minimum lot size would be required to be in upland and contiguous, meaning touching each other. You couldn't have pods of uplands on your lot.

David Landry thought that this item is absolutely critical. He wanted to point out that this is for new lots and new subdivisions. People that have existing lots of record would follow the existing guidelines, even if this were to pass.

Steve Stancel said that existing lots of record would be grandfathered.

Parks Christenbury stated that he pulled **Item #17**, "to convert existing dwellings to more than two units" at the request of a constituent and was notified that they now don't have a problem with rgua . He said that he has no objection with putting #17 back on the block.

Ron Cole asked if anyone was opposed to **adding Item #17** to the list of items to be submitted to the City Council as approve.

VOTE 6 – 1

Opposed – Pete Lavoie

Chris Parker said that only 41 zoning changes were read off and there are actually 42. He said that between Items #38 and 39, there is another amendment that adds some definitions pertaining to the CWD.

Ron Cole asked for a motion to accept that into the list going to the Council. Ron said that we could call it **Item #42a**.

David Landry made the motion to include **Item #42a** in the items going to the Council. Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Frank Torr needed a point of clarification and asked where in the ordinance does it say that anything that is in existence is grandfathered.

Steve Bird said that if you look at the details of the amendments, the wording being added is “the minimum non-wetlands portions of any newly created lot shall be contiguous.” It is specifying that that is only for the newly created lots.

Steve Stancel said that from a legal standpoint, we can't create a lot that is unbuildable. If somebody has an existing lot of record, you cannot make it unbuildable by passing a regulation.

Frank Torr said that he is still not comfortable with Item #4.

David Landry said that not all votes will be unanimous but he felt that we should move on and take a vote on some of these things.

David Landry made the motion to approve **Item #4** and send it to the Council. Joyce El Kouarti seconded.

Discussion ensued with regard to the wetlands. Steve Stancel said that as an example, Alden Woods would have been significantly reduced from the 69 lots because of the wetlands. He said that while it is a very nice subdivision, many of those lots have limited uplands on them and by the time they actually fit a house on the parcel, sometimes they have to fill. He said that he knows that they will have problems with people slowly but surely wanting to fill the wetlands for gardens or playgrounds. The conclusion was that a Variance was always a potential.

VOTE 5 – 2

Opposed – Frank Torr, Pete Lavoie

Ron Cole asked for a vote on **Item #5**.

David Landry said that he may be the only one that has an issue on that. He said that he can't see any need for these zones.

Ron Cole asked Frank Torr to take the chair on this item.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve **Item #5** and send it to the Council.
Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE 6 - 1

Opposed - David Landry

Ron Cole asked if the Board wanted to vote on **Item #7**.

Discussion ensued, with regard to the transitional zone and the 65 feet.
Steve Stancel stated that could be handled by voting on it and going back and fixing the height as a separate motion.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve **Item #7** and send it to the Council.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE 5 - 2

Opposed - David Landry, Peg Stevenson

Ron Cole asked if the Board wanted to vote on **Item #10**.

David Landry was concerned that there was no buffer for the residential neighborhood and Joyce El Kouarti agreed with David. Discussion ensued.

Beth Thompson made the motion to approve **Item #10** and send it to the Council.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE - 4 - 3

**Opposed - Joyce El Kouarti, David Landry,
Peg Stevenson**

Ron Cole asked for discussion on **Item #11**.

Joyce El Kouarti stated that it should be left as it is.

David Landry was opposed because of the upgrading of the houses on Sixth Street and sight distance issues and he questions if that area could be properly developed.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve **Item #11** and send it to the Council.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE 3 - 4 Opposed - David Landry, Peg Stevenson, Pete Lavoie, Joyce El Kouarti Motion Defeated

Steve Stancel asked if in Roberts Rules of order if you have to "defeat" it.

Joyce El Kouarti made the motion to remove **Item #11** from the list.

David Landry seconded.

VOTE 3 - 4 Opposed - Pete Lavoie, Frank Torr, Beth Thompson, Parks Christenbury

Ron Cole stated that **Item #11** would go to a workshop for further discussion.

Item #12

Beth Thompson made the motion to approve **Item #12** and send to the Council.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE 4 – 3 Opposed – Peg Stevenson, David Landry, Joyce El Kouarti

Item #13

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve **Item #13** and send it to the Council.

Peg Stevenson seconded.

Beth Thompson stated that going from I-2 to I-4 is much less onerous or burdensome to the neighbors and that is why she supports this.

David Landry said that good planning includes compromise. He said that he intends to support 13 and 14 but does not intend to support **Item #15**. He said that 220 acres contiguous and in an I-4 zone on a State highway makes good sense, but he has concerns with **Item #15**

VOTE U/A

Item #14

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve **Item #14** and send it to the Council.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Item #15

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve **Item #15** and send it to the Council

Beth Thompson seconded.

Parks Christenbury said that as a City Councilor you have to look not just at the 20 families there, but at the 28,000 who also live in the community. It's a balancing act. We are struggling, not just with the kids in school, but the entire tax structure. He said that about 20% of our land is industrial and 78% is residential and that is considered a bedroom community. He said that all the houses that have been built in the last few years have not been affordable to people who continue to struggle to live in this community. We have not provided the opportunity for those people to find jobs. He said that the committees have struggled for months and there are very few areas in the City that are left. If we don't act on it tonight, that inventory will go to residential and the residential will go to 80% and the City will never recover. He wants to see the elderly, affluent, middle class be able to live in Dover. He doesn't want to see a community where the only people who can come in will be the ones able to pay 3 or \$400,000.00 for houses. He said that there are 50 potential voters out there, but he has to live here the rest of his life and he has to look at the other 28,000 people. He said that Steve Stancel would take

Steve Stancel stated that there were some concerns about allowing kennels in Open Space Subdivisions because of potential noise.

Chris Parker said with regard # 21, that veterinary offices and kennel are in the Table of Uses and are all in the same row and that's why they were included here. He said that there was some discussion on whether we could amend the footnote to stipulate setbacks.

Parks said that he would be willing to vote for this tonight if the stipulation that staff comes back with the footnote that puts in appropriate setback.

Steve Stancel that the other thing to do is to say that it isn't allowed.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve and send to the Council **Items #20, 22, 23, 24.**

Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Item #21 would go to the workshop.

Item #26

Frank Torr said that he has concerns because he feels that **Item #26** is inconsistent. He said that Portsmouth's setbacks are 100'.

Chris Parker said that it is 100 feet in Portsmouth. The wetlands that have to adhere to 100' have to be ½ acre or larger. He said that an updated portion of this section was handed out. The changes are a tool that would help to delineate a wetland, so they are clarifying and not substantive and that is why they were handed out.

It was decided that Item #26 would go to a workshop.

Frank Torr said that he thinks that putting boundaries on the wetlands is going to be extremely expensive. To him a boundary is either a concrete or a granite post.

Joyce El Kouarti said that as she understood that it was just like a sign that says "wetlands start here."

Frank Torr felt that it needed to be clarified.

Item #30

Steve Stancel stated that the School Impact Fees were included in the Board packets. He thought that they could be discussed in a workshop.

David Landry said that **Item #30** should be held to a workshop for discussion and Frank Torr also felt that a workshop was needed.

Steve Stancel stated that if the Impact Fee Ordinance is approved, as the new units come on line, the money received from these impact fees will pay for future schools and expansions.

Steve Bird suggested that the City's consultant, Bruce Mayberry, come to a meeting to present this to the Board.

The Board felt that they would like to have Mr. Mayberry go over the ordinance.

Ron Cole said that they will be keeping **Items #11, 18, 21, 26 and 30 for discussion at a workshop.**

The Board decided that the workshop would be held at 6:00 PM, prior to the Planning Board meeting of October 22, 2002. This will be for discussion of all the items except for **Item #30**. He said that he would leave it up to staff just when the impact fees with the consultant will be discussed.

ITEM #8: New Business

Parks Christenbury said that he ran for the Council on the platform of rezoning. He said that he is proud of the Planning Board for making these tough decisions. He said that this is the most comprehensive rezoning that he can remember in 20 years. He thanked the Board for the work that they did to insure a better future for the City of Dover.

Ron Cole said that the Board is planning for 10 to 15 years into the future. He added that when the land is gone, you cannot take it back.

Joyce El Kouarti said that there is a statement of support available in the Planning office to test the waters of the community with regard to Open Space. She said that the statement does specify bonding amounts that the City is looking for and some other options as well. If anyone is serious about supporting Open Space, she urges them to stop by the Planning office and sign the statement of support.

ITEM #9: Adjournment

Peg Stevenson made the motion to adjourn.

Parks Christenbury seconded.

VOTE U/A

over 20 years."
[Again this is my driveway, not lawn. The two driveways have been used for parking at this duplex for perhaps over 50 years according to the records I have seen.]

Item #3 Line 6 - Change to "He said paving was approved for the 2 car parking on one side and is now requesting to pave the 2 car driveway on the other side."

[Clearly I am requesting permission to PAVE the EXISTING driveway at 13 Elm St.]

Respectfully,

Walter Lewis

You are welcome to contact me:
Walter Lewis dwlewis@attbi.com 431-7646 at home
lewiswg@mail.ports.navy.mil 207-438-5864 at work 6:30am - 2:30pm

=====
I will bring a hard copy of this Addendum including color photos to your office about 3:30 pm tomorrow (Tuesday).
=====

Addendum to Item # 3 of Planning Board Minutes Dated October 8, 2002.

Item #3 - Request for a driveway waiver at 13 Elm St.:

I want to make it clear that I want to pave the existing gravel driveway in front of the 13 Elm St. side of the duplex. Paving the 11 Elm St. side has already been approved and not an issue. Each driveway has 2 parking spaces for the 3 bedroom residence it serves. There is no change in size, location or use of the driveways. There have been no curbs in front of the duplex until this fall.

Additionally: The former asphalt driveway aprons were removed during the sidewalk/curb project. The 13 Elm St. tenant has had to move his cars and been denied access from his driveway as a result of the new sidewalk and curb blocking his parking spaces. There is no off street parking available

Freeman, Jackie

From: Stancel, Steve
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2002 8:18 AM
To: Freeman, Jackie
Subject: FW: Please attach Addendum to Oct 8 Planning Meeting Minutes

-----Original Message-----

From: Lewis Family [mailto:dwlewis@attbi.com]
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 11:54 PM
To: Stancel, Steve
Subject: Please attach Addendum to Oct 8 Planning Meeting Minutes

Re: Planning Board Minutes for October 8, 2002 - Item #3 Driveway Waiver for 13 Elm St

I would like to raise a concern about the draft minutes of the October 8th Planning Board meeting as written. Currently any person who reads Item #3 would think the Drive Waiver was for a new driveway on what used to be lawn. This is far from the truth. I request the minutes be changed consistent with what was said at the meeting which was tape recorded by both the City and myself. Additionally I request the attached Addendum including photos be added to the Minutes.

The following portions of the draft minutes are not represented correctly. I suggest the following changes:

Item #3 Line 1 - Add After the 1st line, "The existing driveways have 2 spaces for each residence. There were no curbs in front of 11&13 Elm St until this fall."

[It appears abutter complaints were well documented. These are only a few of the important details I presented. It seems reasonable to document them.]

Item #3 Line 3 - Change to "He had photos that showed the existing gravel driveways including parking areas for 4 cars at his duplex."
[Existing parking was clearly shown by pictures at the meeting. I did not refer to my driveways as lawn.]

Item#3 Line 5 - Change to "He said the parking in front was existing for

to the tenant now for his 2 cars.

Attached are the request for Driveway Waiver and 7 Photos that were shown and discussed at the October 8th Planning board Meeting.

I invite anyone who has questions or comments to contact me.

Walter Lewis
dwlewis@attbi.com 431-7646 (at home)