

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
JANUARY 26, 1999**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Preston, Margaret Stevenson, Mike Bobinsky, Jerry Reese, Reuben Hull, Frank Torr, Karin Crittenden, Ron Cole

MEMBERS ABSENT: Paul Beecher, Anthony McManus, Charles Maglaras

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Steven Stancel, Planning Director; Bruce Woodruff, City Planner; and Jacqueline Freeman, Recording Secretary

Vice Chair Reuben Hull brought the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

Jerry Reese made the motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Brian Preston seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #1: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a Minor Lot Line Adjustment of land for Phyllis Pelczar and Gerard Remy, Assessor's Map D, Lots 51 & 52, zoned R-12, located on Maplewood Avenue.

Rachel Pelczar, represented Phyllis Pelczar. She said that they are selling a back lot to Mr. Remy.

Jerry Reese made the motion to accept the application.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Jerry Reese made the motion to approve with the condition that the Strafford County Registry of Deeds recording plan number be added to note 4-a.

Margaret Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #2: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a Minor Subdivision of land for Richard W. Kay, Assessor's Map H, Lot 26, zoned R-20, located on Old Littleworth Road.

Bob Stowell represented the applicant. He said that the original parcel is 13 acres of land and they are subdividing 1 acre for a building lot. He stated that the State Subdivision Approval is pending.

Jerry Reese made the motion to accept.
Margaret Stevenson seconded.

Frank Torr stated that he is a neighbor and abutter but there is no financial benefit.
VOTE U/A

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

Jerry Reese made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add the owners' signature to the plat.
2. Revise plat to add 75 foot wetland setback for septic systems to sheet S-1 and change 50 foot wetland setback on sheet S-2 to 75 feet.
3. Provide the Planning Department with a copy of the State Subdivision permit and add permit number to the plat.
4. Revise plat to add the standard subdivision note #11 regarding the source of topography data.
5. Revise plat to indicate soil types.
6. Verify that there is a minimum of 20,000 square feet of upland on lot.

Karin Crittenden seconded.
VOTE U/A

ITEM #3: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a Minor Subdivision of Land for the Estate of Dorothy Josselyn, Assessor's Map L, Lot 107, zoned R-20, located on Dover Point Road.

Atty. Jim Schulte represented the applicant. He stated that Dorothy Josselyn's will provided that her house and sufficient land to meet the zoning requirements be given to her brother Burnon Josselyn and the balance of the land be given to her nephew Roy Josselyn. The purpose of this plan is to subdivide the lot. The estate owned a lot deeded to the family by the City of Dover, L-108, which is about 3500 sq. ft., to insure that the remaining land on L-107 had sufficient frontage. He said those lot lines are to be abandoned. He said a question was raised about the lines between lot 105 and 107 on the plan. He said that 105 is a separately deeded lot. In 1981 the Tax Assessor consolidated the two lots and the lots have been taxed as a single lot since then. Back in 1981 the property was owned by Herbert Josselyn. Atty. Schulte said that at the time Mr. Josselyn was 99 years old and died the following year and Dorothy Josselyn came into title. There is nothing in the records in the Assessor's office to indicate why the merger was put into effect. There is separate access for the two lots. Mr. Schulte said that Lot 105 does not have sufficient lot frontage to be a separate lot if it were to be subdivided today. The lot does have deeded access across the narrow strip of land for the dirt drive between 104 and 105A and there is a deeded access across that. The current ordinance provides that if there are two non-conforming lots which are adjacent and which are in the same

ownership then they would be merged. The predecessor to that ordinance, Mr. Stancel informed him, was to the effect that if there was a non-conforming lot and a conforming lot then there would be a merger. The ordinance was amended in 1987 to intentionally make it more difficult for that automatic merger to take place. Atty. Schulte said that his position is that given that there is no indication as to why the lots were merged, or what notice was provided to the property owners, and particularly because the owner was elderly and infirm, that they ought to continue to be treated as separate lots.

Steve Stancel stated that the City's position is that these two lots have been combined and are under one tax card. The owner has been receiving one tax bill since 1981 and therefore, they are not currently subdivided. He said that as such, there were abutters that were not notified and they did come into the office and have expressed their concerns about that. He said that they received a copy of a plan that was recorded at the Registry of Deeds in 1994, that would seem to indicate that it was one parcel. It talks about the total area being 813,000 sq. ft. and 18.7 acres. It does still list the two separate lot numbers and shows the dotted line where the property line is but has no meets and bounds. He added that this plan has not been listed as a reference plan on the plans before you tonight which is another area of concern.

Jim Schulte stated that if you look at that plan you will see that lot 108 which the City treats as a separate lot is identified the same way with a dotted line. He stated that it is a perimeter survey plan and the proof of that is that Lot 108 on the City maps continue to show as a separate lot.

Jerry Reese made the motion to not accept the application because there is a lot of missing information.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #4: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a minor Lot line Adjustment of land for Middleton Building Supply and the City of Dover, NH, Assessor's Maps 40 & D, Lots 22 & 10A, zoned B-3, located at 58 Old Rochester Road.

Margaret Stevenson stepped down for Items #4 and 5.

Kevin McEneaney represented the applicant. He explained that there is just under 1 acre of City owned land added to the Middleton parcel. He said they are consolidating the tax map parcels for tax purposes.

Jerry Reese made the motion to accept.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

Mary Lou Staples, an abutter to Longhill Park, stated that once the park is gone, it's gone. She spoke about the business that was once a dress shop that is now a car stereo shop. She said that maybe Middleton will be a nice neighbor but if they go out of business, who will come in next. She said she would like to see the trees stay.

The public hearing was closed.

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

1. Add both of the owners' signatures to the plat.
2. Revise plat to add the zoning district boundary separating the R-12 and B-3 districts.
3. Revise plat to add minimum building setback lines for both lots.
4. Revise plat to label the southern lot lines of lots A-10 and A-10A as lot lines to be abandoned.
5. Revise plat to add drainage easement for encroachment of detention pond fence onto City property and Day/Hale property.
6. Revise plat showing either the relocation of drainage easement or abandonment as necessary.

Brian Preston seconded.

VOTE 4 - 1

Opposed - Jerry Reese

Vice Chair Reuben Hull turned the meeting over to Chairman Ron Cole.

ITEM #5: Consideration And acceptance of an application for a Site Review of land for Middleton Building Supply, Inc., Assessor's Map 40, Lot 22, zoned B-3, located at 58 Old Rochester Road.

Kevin McEneaney stated that Middleton wants to build an 11,700 sq. ft. storage building on their site. As part of the sale of the property from the City, the funds will go back into the park. Also, the Board and the City Council approved a rezoning of that 1 acre parcel so that it will be conveyed as B-3, as is the existing Middleton Supply location. He said it is not for a retail use, it is strictly for storage and for deliveries and pick up.

Paul Connolly, of Civil Works, stated that the building will use no water or sewer services but will have electric. He said there is a 24' wide bay that runs down the middle of the building that will allow for tractor trailer units to pass through so building supplies can be offloaded by forklift. Paul explained the traffic pattern in the parking lot. Paul said that they will have to remove some of the trees to reshape the lay of the land along the southern property line to construct a subtle swale that will have a crush stone bottom. That swale will be able to accommodate up to or beyond a 50 year storm event. He spoke about the traffic pattern and showed an alternative tractor trailer exit which would eliminate 3 extra turns in the parking lot. He said that this would be an exit for tractor trailer units only onto Long Hill Road. It would be gated and a controlled egress for trucks only. Paul Connolly stated that there would be 4 or 5 loads delivered per day. He said that there is no proposed lighting for the proposed building.

Kevin McEneaney stated that he wants some guidance from the Board regarding the alternative exit and the drainage situation. He said that there is an existing drainage easement that allows the City to drain water from Old Rochester Road through a series of catch basins and manholes to the detention pond. The existing easement required that the City maintain that area. Kevin said Middleton has been maintaining the detention pond and the drainage area themselves since they have owned the parcel. He said that Middleton is willing to take over the maintenance of the detention pond and the drainage line within their property, with the stipulation that the City would still have the right to drain the water that they now drain and any additional increase. He said that any upgrade to the lines etc., would be born at the City's expense or whoever would be responsible for that. If there were a development across the street that required some offsite drainage that would tie into the system and upgrades would be necessary, it would not be at the expense of Middleton Building Supply but at the expense of the developer.

Mike Bobinsky was concerned with the egress on Long Hill Road because it is a secondary road.

Frank Torr made the motion to accept.
Reuben Hull seconded.
VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

Mary Lou Staples stated that her point has been made for her already and it is already getting worse. She asked how many of the members of the Board have tractor trailers running near their back yards. She asked if they could put a limit on the number of trucks. She said that nobody mentioned there would be trucks closer to her and all they mentioned was that the building would blend in with the trees.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that the following are outstanding concerns:

1. Locate and show existing drainage lines if possible.
2. Specify on plan that no storage will be allowed in parking lots.
3. Show dumpster on plan.
4. Show fuel tank and containment area on plan.
5. Show box lighting on plan.
6. Show screening and landscaping on plan.
7. Identify height of fence on plan.
8. Show existing water and sewer lines on plan.
9. Indicate proposed building height on plan.
10. Show proposed lot coverage on plan.
11. Show location of proposed erosion control on plan.
12. Add site plan notes #9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, and 22.
13. Review exit off Long Hill Road.

Kevin McEneaney stated the trucks will come in heavy and will be exiting empty.

Steve Stancel stated that they would like to examine the existing drainage lines and whether or not the city should give those over to the property owner.

Frank Torr stated that from a life safety aspect where you are only using 200 feet of Long Hill Road it would look like that would be the most feasible exit to utilize.

Steve stated that he was not satisfied with a chain link fence at TRC, and requested that a landscape architect take a look and see what they would suggest.

Frank Torr made the motion to table.

Karin seconded.

VOTE U/A

It was decided that a site walk would not be necessary.

Jerry Reese left the meeting at 8:00 PM.

ITEM #6: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a Site Review of land for Shaw's Supermarkets, Inc., Assessor's Map 38, Lot 6-A-2, zoned B-3, located at Shaw's Plaza, Central Avenue.

Greg Mikolaities, Appledore Engineering, stated that Shaw's would like to plan a 10,000 sq. ft. expansion to the right of their existing store. The expansion would not go any further than the building wall. It is a net 4,360 sq. ft. expansion. He explained how the vestibule would be expanded and there would be a new entrance. He said there are no changes to the parking lot.

Greg stated that the addition is going to be constructed over a currently impervious surface so the drainage flows are not going to increase. One of the comments that came from Engineering was that this is in a secondary recharge zone so they wanted to capture roof water of the new addition and put it into some type of recharge basin. He said what they have incorporated on the plans as a result of the TRC meeting will be a separate roof drain that will go back to the rear of the store and percolate into the ground. He said that he has provided on the plans is a note to show the capacity that they need and also a note that they need to go out there and dig a test pit to observe the seasonal high water. He added that this is not the time of the year to do that.

Karin Crittenden made the motion to accept.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

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

1. Add the owners signature to the plan.
2. Revise sheet C-1 to indicate that the parcel is located in a Secondary Groundwater Protection Zone.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #7: Public hearing on the Transportation Improvements Program (TIP). The Planning Board will hear requests, set priorities, and vote on the proposed plan.

Bruce Woodruff stated that the Planning staff has added the projects that were brought up at the last meeting to the FY 2000 Dover Transportation Improvements Program and these are the recommended priorities. He stated that priority #1 and priority #8 are really not applications, they are just recommendations that Exit 9 be a full clover leaf and the construction of an Exit 8A remain on the Long Range Transportation Plan of the Seacoast Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Reuben Hull inquired about the railroad bridge over the Cocheco River on Washington Street.

Woody stated that the reason that ended up at the bottom of the list is because of the bridge and the cost.

Brian Preston stated that in Portland, ME they take railroad bridges and they receive federal monies because the bridges have historical value. He added that that is something that can be explored.

Woody stated that if it turns out that the bridge structure is deemed historic there may be other avenues or venues to get money to refurbish it. Woody stated that TEA21 will begin this coming fiscal year. He stated that all of ISTEAs programs have been carried forward and there are now more programs. He said that the funding is flexible between programs, and that is one of the big differences between the two pieces of federal legislation.

Mike Bobinsky asked about #12, the upgrades to county Farm Road. He stated that they may be considering some property at the County Farm location for athletic fields and the need to do an upgrade to that section of roadway. That planning effort for the use of County Farm property will unfold in February/March. He asked if we could look at bumping that up.

Bruce Woodruff stated that the MPO model took a look at the traffic, especially the traffic from the gravel pits and the increased traffic to Enterprise Park and the industrial

uses up in the I-4 and the B-4 zone and the ETP. He said that coming from that quadrant of the City there is no quick way for those trucking firms to get to the turnpike. With the construction of a new bridge over the Cochecho on County Farm Road, the upgrades of those roads would be required. He stated that the model sees a lot more traffic on those roads in future years. The demand is there, or will be.

Reuben Hull asked if there is a reason why we are prioritizing Item #1 Exit 9 and Item #8, Exit 8A. He said that personally, he would rather see more upgrades to things like existing roads, County Farm, Dover Neck, the bridge over County Farm Road.

Bruce Woodruff said that the reason to expand Exit 9 to a full clover leaf is the rezoning that has occurred in the north end, the development of the I-4/B-4 zone up in Enterprise Park and the ETP. Another contributor to traffic flow through there is the commercial enterprise that happened on High Street. Something that we should not forget is that right-of-way for the expansion for Exit 9 is already there. This is the City's way of letting the State know that it is a priority and it shouldn't be put on the back burner or forgotten.

Steven Stancel stated that he thinks that one of the reasons why Exit 8A is at #8 is assuming the rezoning on Littleworth Road area. If that rezoning is not approved, he stated that it could be a condition that it be dropped down and that would bump up the construction over the Cochecho River and County Farm Road to #10.

Frank Torr inquired why in #1 the date FY06 is used.

Woody stated that you really can't tell the State to do a turnpike project. That is why Exit 8A and Exit 9 projects are not going to be applications. He said that they are just going to be letters asking that they retain Exit 8A and Exit 9 in their long range transportation plan. Neither of these plans will go into the State's 10 year plan and that is because legislation has to be proposed for turnpike projects.

Frank Torr stated that he was going to start legislation to do that and was asked by the Commissioner not to do that and to see what came out of the 10 year highway plan.

Steve Stancel asked if that could be switched to 02?

Woody stated that the problem there maybe that the State would come forward and say OK you can have that project, but you can't have any of the others because you are physically constrained. He said that is his fear.

Frank Torr stated it would be great to see it done in coordination with whatever you do on the County Farm Road and also the bridge because it certainly will generate a lot of traffic.

Bruce Woodruff stated that the only down side would be that the State has indicated that they have equal priorities for Exit 10, the widening of the turnpike north of Exit 12, and

the Newington-Dover Turnpike Project. The schedule for the 2004 – 2008 time frame and NHDOT admits there is not enough money to do all three.

The public hearing was opened.

David Landry, 5 Trakey Street, Ward 5 City Councilman. He stated that he came specifically for Item #9. City wide community bicycle/pedestrian travel route. He feels it is a worthwhile and doable project. It would serve many purposes, such as increased access to alternate popular forms of transportation that promote a healthy environment as well as personal health. It would help with traffic congestion, it would be a conduit linking the future train station with employment centers, library and City Hall, major residential areas, as well as the Sawyer Mills. Because it would follow along the Bellamy River, it would provide a safe alternate route for both Middle and High School students. He said since it does have link with Durham Road, it completes another important link to the Bicycle Transportation Route program from Dover to Durham and finally down to Pease Tradeport. He likes the idea of the phases approach tying in #25 with #9. He said it would be a shame to separate those two permanently. He would like to see those included in the proposals. He indicated a full cloverleaf at Exit 9 was an alternative to Exit 10, and we need to keep that. He stated that he supports #3, #7, #10, and #20.

The public hearing was closed.

Mike Bobinsky made the motion to approve and recommend to the City Council the FY2000 TIP and recommend priorities #1 through #10 be applications into the regional and State TIP.

Frank Torr seconded.

Brian Preston stated that he wanted to be sure that we are including #25 into #9 as part of the train station site.

Hull stated that his original suggestion was that the acquisition of properties be included with the bikeway. He said he would like #25 added to #9.

Ron Cole stated that we need to add that as an amendment to the motion.

Brian made the motion to add the amendment.

Frank Torr seconded.

Steve Stancel asked for a clarification that no construction for #25 would be applied for at this time.

Ron stated that the amendment will read as follows: "Add purchase of right of way and railroad bridge of Cocheco River off Washington Street." He called for the vote on the amendment.

VOTE U/A

Ron called for the vote on the main motion.

VOTE U/A

TEM #8: Old Business

a. Discussion and possible vote on Portsmouth Christian Academy, located on Seaborne Drive.

Margaret Stevenson made the motion to remove this item from the table
Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

Steve Stancel stated that the site walk was held last Saturday. Steve gave the staff recommendations for the project.

Reuben Hull stated that a number of the comments from Engineering are just comments, not actual direction.

Steve Stancel stated that it is his understanding that those will be requirements.

Brian Preston stated that we are going to have a loss of \$80,000 of property tax because Portsmouth Christian Academy has tax exempt status. Brian stated that we will be obligated to furnish busing to any students in Dover. He said that taking one or two students out doesn't decrease that bill by \$5,500 or \$11,000. He said it is a loss to the School Department. He stated that the roof of the building has been leaking for years and he is concerned with the safety of the walls being taken down. He quoted RSA-149-5. He said that he does not see that this is in the best interest of the City of Dover and he will not support it. He said for the safety of the students, he implored them to look into the effect that the leaking roof will have as far as taking down walls.

Stephania Pearce, School Business Manager stated that it is a State law that they provide transportation.

Dennis Runey, Headmaster, stated the opportunity to enjoy tax free status is one that St. Mary's and St. Thomas Aquinas and churches in the community enjoy as well. In respect to bussing, he believes that St. Thomas and St. Mary's enjoy the same bussing service. He stated that the contribution to the community he believes is that St. Thomas, St. Mary's and PCA offer a wide variety of excellent choices for parents along with the fine public school system. He said it gives great opportunities for people and corporation that want to come in to see excellent education across the board so he said they contribute a lot. He does not know the exact dollar savings but over the last seven years we have had 20 to 25 students from Dover and that amounts to some savings.

Mr. Runey stated that the road arrangements were made in 1983 and 1984 with the current owner. He said that this condition has existed for 15 years and now he is being asked to spend \$6,000 to rectify what the owner and the City have not been able to do. He said that what the City believes is the fairest way to accomplish this he'll accept that decision but he does not understand it. He said they will be glad to discuss the issue of a river trail but he doesn't think that it will work if you want to parallel the river.

Steve Stancel stated that issue regarding the road is simple, the applicant or owner is responsible, and whether that is Seaborne Hospital or yourself, as the new owner, you will be responsible for meeting the original conditions. The fact that it wasn't done until this point is moot. Steve said that the reason for sending new projects to the Planning Board when their use is changed is to be sure that all the conditions are met and that the roads are safe. He said that this road needed to be public in order for the lots to be created in the first place, otherwise they would have insufficient road frontage. He said that today we require bonds and letters of credit so if the developer doesn't bring the road up to City standards, within a certain period of time the City takes the bond or cashes the letter of credit and does the work itself. Back in '83 or '84 he can only assume that it was not the practice and this may be one of the reasons that the City began the practice. On the issue regarding the access easement, this came up at the site walk and it is a good idea because this parcel is relatively close to the Fish & Game parcel and the parcel that the City owns adjacent to that. He stated that he can see where in the future there might be a possibility of an extended riverwalk along that entire section of the City. We're suggesting that it go within the 100 foot area adjacent to the river and that is because our conservation regulations require that any buildings or structures be setback at least 100 feet from the river, so that would be an area of the property that wouldn't be used for other purposes. He said that is a reason why we change granting a public easement to discussing a public easement.

Reuben Hull wanted to support what Steve has been saying. He said that amenities like this for pedestrian and bicycle use is piece by piece. Hull stated that it is important that we provide these amenities, if not for today, at least for the future.

Ron Cole stated that he calls this the Dover String of Pearls which will eventually be connecting through a series of walkways/bikepaths etc., along the City's waterways.

Margaret asked if it is not allowed through the property from Seaborne drive what is going to keep people from going down through there and cutting across to get to that easement. If there is no pedestrian traffic on Seaborne Drive how are they going to control people.

Steve Stancel stated they will have to call the Police Department and have them escorted off the property. The concern of Mr. Runey in regard to the access to Seaborne drive is the fact that there will be people who will be driving down into the school area and they had a concern about safety. He said that we are more concerned with providing access

through the property from abutting parcels in the form of a trail than having people access the trail through his property off Garrison Road and Seaborne Drive.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve with the following 7 conditions of the Planning staff and the 9 conditions of the Engineering Dept.as follows:

1. The driveway at the end of cul-de-sac on Seaborne Drive be realigned and constructed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
2. Add eight additional parking spaces prior to operation of the school or present a plan outlining acceptable alternative.
3. Properly sign and stripe the circular drive in front of the building to prohibit parking and to reserve it for the unloading of students by buses.
4. Applicant to pay for new signs and road striping at the eastern leg of the Spruce Lane/Back River Road intersection, as determined by Police, Planning and Engineering Departments.
5. Applicant agrees to pursue the steps necessary to get Seaborne Drive accepted as a City Street. (Memo from Engineering outlining the requirements that would be needed to have the City accept it as a City Street.) The City Engineer estimates the cost to make these improvements is approximately \$6,000.
6. Applicant to provide plan for alternative to pedestrian access. Applicant agrees that any future sidewalk needs on Seaborne Drive and Garrison Road be the sole responsibility of the Portsmouth Christian Academy.
7. The applicant is willing to discuss a possible public access easement adjacent to the Bellamy River, with conditions agreed upon by the applicant and the City. Public access to the easement will not be permitted through the property from Seaborne Drive, but will be via adjacent lots easements subsequently obtained by the City.
8. The requirements on the memo from Assistant City Engineer Dave White dated 1-26-99.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE 4 – 2

Opposed – Karin Crittenden and Brian Preston

b. Discussion and possible vote on Capital Improvements Program.

Stephania Pearce, Business Manager for the School Department went over the list of proposed capital improvements projects and elaborated on each. She said that the School Board approved this list on December 14, 1998.

Garry O'Connell, from the Kalwall Systems demonstrated the system. He went over the guarantees and handed out brochures.

Stephania stated that the quoted price for this project is \$466,000, but it does not include all of the glass work that needs to be done in the building, the transoms, doors, windows that are not imbedded in the panelized system, and that is what the rest of the monies are for.

Reuben Hull made the motion to approve and recommend the FY 2000 School CIP to the City Council as presented.

Margaret Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

c. Letter requesting a two month extension regarding the Philbrick property on Oak and Portland Avenue.

Reuben Hull made the motion to grant the 60 day extension.

Margaret Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

Don Rhodes stated that it came to his attention that he needs an extension on the Lot Line Adjustment Gerry's Lane in November that the 60 day period on that expired a couple of days ago. He asked for an extension on that one also.

Margaret Stevenson made the motion to grant an extension until the 15th of February.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

Ron Cole stated that he was very disturbed with a perspectives that have surfaced recently in the media. He said he is disturbed by Johnny-come-lately and nay sayers, and people who work by innuendoes and in some cases half truths to put forth their feelings about a specific item in some of the areas to be rezoned. Ron stated that we had a seven months process during which time we held numerous meetings, public hearings.

ITEM #9: New business

ITEM #10: Adjournment

Margaret Stevenson made the motion to adjourn.

Karin Crittenden seconded.

VOTE U/A