

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
MAY 11, 1999**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Anthony McManus, Margaret Stevenson, Jerry Reese, Frank Torr, Ron Cole, Reuben Hull, Mike Bobinsky

MEMBERS ABSENT: Karin Crittenden, Jeff Mason, Jeff Peasley, Paul Beecher

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

Chairman Cole congratulated the Main Street Committee for all the hard work especially Tony McManus.

ITEM #1: Approval of the minutes.

Jerry Reese made the motion to approve the minutes.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

Chairman Cole stated that no vote will be taken tonight on the Chadwick Farm subdivision, it will stay on the table.

ITEM #2: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a driveway waiver for Hope Community Church, Assessor's Map E, Lot 73A, zoned R-12, located on Sixth Street.*

Steve Spring, Pastor of Hope Community Church said that this access will be used on Sunday when the traffic is at its lowest. He said that they would make the present drive enter only, and if granted, the right-of-way would be the exit. This would help during funerals and to maximize their property.

Frank Torr made the motion to accept.

Jerry Reese seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that the main concern is that the second access would come on to Sixth St. at an angle which makes turning left more difficult than the existing driveway. He said that it wasn't clear in the application what the reason was for the need of a second drive. He said if the Board did wish to approve he would recommend the one way in and the one way out.

Mr. Spring stated that reversing the order of the driveways would be difficult because of the layout of the facility and the dropping off of handicap or senior citizens.

Frank Torr asked if they could make an exit so that it would be perpendicular to Sixth Street verses an angled entrance.

Mr. Spring stated that it may be possible. He said that on paper it looks like it is not safe but it is actually safer now that the trees on that corner have been taken down.

Jerry Reese stated that he doesn't want to say no if there is any way they can work with the contractor, but on the other hand, he does not want to say yes because it looks like a very dangerous left hand turn.

Tony McManus made the motion to table with the hope that they can work something else out with Mr. Mitchel, the contractor. He said his problem is a left hand turn coming out of there.

Jerry Reese seconded.

VOTE U/A

Steve Stancel reminded everyone that we are having a public hearing tonight for Site Regulations to limit the number of driveway accesses.

Mike Bobinsky stated that he was not sure the applicant was clear on the next step which was that they get an engineer to take a look at the egress and entrance and look at some options in turning the radius..

ITEM #3: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a site review of land for Mark Phillips, d/b/a Southwest Partners Realty, LLC, Assessor's Map H, Lot 36B-1, zoned I-2, located on Knox Marsh Road.

Malcolm McNeill, with the firm of McNeill & Taylor, represented Southwest Partners, LLC. He explained the location of the project and stated that all the uses on this site are permitted uses in the I-2 zone. The use taking up the greatest part of ground is a self-serve storage facility. He said the site is serviced by 1 driveway off Knox Marsh Road and is curved which affects direct viewing into the site. He said as you enter the site on the left is a 3,000 sq. ft. general office facility with 6 parking spaces. The user of that site will perhaps be a tradesman. The self-service facility consists of 7 buildings of various sizes. There are three initial buildings and then four larger buildings that are close to the railroad right-of-way. The average size of the storage space is 10 x10, however, that can vary as customer demand varies. The self storage facility won't be serviced by water or sewer or electricity. He said there will be the 1,000 sq. ft. office building. On the first floor will be the rental office and a manager's apartment the second floor, which will provide for security. A small fence is proposed behind the office and there is a large area on the northerly side where the brook runs through, where there will be no disturbance. The storage use will be barely visible from the street and the large use, close to the office,

will be the only use that is seen. All the utilities are underground and the hours of operation will be approximately 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM. These spaces are rented on a month to month basis. He said that Mark will not accept long term types of rental arrangements. They have obtained a Wetlands Permit, Driveway Permit from DOT and the Site Specific is in progress. The Conservation Commission gave their approval. Malcolm said they are on the fringe of the Groundwater Protection Zone where there is a 20% coverage requirement and the coverage here is 27.5%. The Conservation Commission recommended a waiver of the 20% requirements so as to permit the 27.5% in this case. He said they agree as a condition of approval that there be no further development on the southerly side of the site and that be noted on the plan. Malcolm said that they also agreed to no further cutting in the area of Knox Marsh Brook, except within an area 50 feet back from the entryway for adequate site distances. Malcolm said that the chairperson of the CC requested that a provision be put in all rental agreements that no hazardous substances be stored within these units and they agree to do that.

Reuben Hull made the motion to accept the application

Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Chris Jacobs, of Norway Plains, explained the drainage on the site.

Frank Torr made the motion to approve with the staff recommendations as follows:

A waiver be granted to permit an aisle width of 20 feet instead of the required 22 feet and a Conditional Use Permit for lot coverage exceeding 20%, and approval of the application with the following conditions:

1. Provide the Planning Department with a copy of State Site Specific Permit and add permit number to the plan.
2. Provide the Planning Department with a copy of the NHDOT driveway permit.
3. The Engineering comments per memo dated 5-10-99 as follows:
 1. A more detailed sewer/drain crossing should be shown for the box culvert on 155. The present detail calls for a 15" sleeve with insulation. A detail showing the type of insulation and inside diameter of the sleeve in relation to the proposed 8" PVC sewer pipe should be shown.
 2. The water main should be shown on the road profile.
 3. Drainage calculations for the second cross culvert need to be supplied.
 4. The detail of the box culvert extension on 155 should call out a manufacturer for the pre-cast culvert or show the concrete reinforcing needed to construct the culvert.

4. Also, the following conditions from a letter from the Chairman of the Conservation Commission Tom Fargo, dated 5-10-99, with the following conditions:

The applicant agrees to include in the deed and the development plan that there be no further development on area south of the plot and there be no further cutting in the wetland areas except within 50 feet of the road and the developer agrees to provide the Conservation Commission and the Planning Department with a copy of the generic rental agreement which will state that hazardous substances and petroleum products will not be stored in the facility.

5. The stockade fence that is shown in the southwestern corner of the property is listed as 6 feet high and the regulations require a 7 foot stockade fence.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #4: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a minor lot line adjustment for Portsmouth Christian Academy & Arthur Gasses Revocable Trust, Assessor's Map J, Lots 1 & 1C, zoned R-40, located on Seaborne Road and Garrison Road.

Dennis Runey, Headmaster of Portsmouth Christian Academy, stated that he has joined with Art Gasses to request a Lot Line Adjustment of approximately one acre equal exchange of land, to allow them to have free access to the athletic facilities. He said that Jack Gagnon of Oak Point will field any technical questions.

Margaret Stevenson made the motion to accept the application

Reuben Hull 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 all of the owners' signatures to the plat.
2. Revise plat to add minimum building setbacks lines to both lots.
3. Revise plat to change approval block title from "Town" to "City".

Jerry Reese seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #5: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a site plan of land for Portsmouth Christian Academy, Assessor's Map J, Lot 1, zoned R-40, located on Seaborne Road.

Dennis Runey stated that there are adjustments made to the access from Garrison Road into Seaborne Drive, so they can deed the upper road back to the City per the agreement that was struck between the previous owners in 1984. He said the plans include an addition to the existing parking lot; the site for the gym, which will be attached to the existing building; and the construction of a playing field to the south and east of the current structure. Mr. Runey stated that they will construct the field within the next several weeks and hope to use the field this fall.

Jerry Reese 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.

Dennis Runey said that he wanted to comment on condition number 5, with respect to Spruce Lane and Back River Road. He said that the previous conditions didn't talk about fair share of construction cost, it said specifically to pay for new signs and road striping. He said that that was the understanding. He said it sounds to him that the Planning staff has expanded the burden we are suppose to share beyond striping and signage.

Steve Stancel stated that the \$17,000 covers the striping, curbing and drainage of the intersection. He said there is about a 30% contingency added to the \$17,000. It's anticipated that the cost will be significantly less. He said that his fair share would only be the percentage of the traffic increase for that intersection.

Reuben asked Mike Bobinsky about the fence being in the sewer easement.

Mike Bobinsky stated that if there were an emergency requiring them to get in there, they would remove the fence. The city would not be held liable if there were any damage.

Frank Torr asked about the public access.

Steve Stancel stated that when they came in for the Change of Use they talked in great detail, and Portsmouth Christian Academy is not opposed to a public access but they have some concerns about security issues. He said they are willing to discuss it. He said in regard to the fair share, the difference with the Change of Use and this is that you are now adding playing fields and a gymnasium.

Tony made the motion to approve the application with the following conditions:

1. Add owner's signature to the plan.
2. Provide the Planning Department with a copy of State Site Specific Permit and add permit number to the plan.

3. Revise plan to add extend the no parking fire lane along the entire length of the driveway on the west side of the building.
4. Revise the plan add Engineers stamp and signature to all sheets.
5. Applicant to pay for its fair share of improvements to the Spruce Lane/Back River Road intersection prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy. The Engineering Department has calculated the total cost to be \$17,000 and the applicant's share will be determined by the Planning Department after conducting traffic and turning movement counts at the intersection.
6. 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 lot easements subsequently obtained by the City.

Mike Bobinsky seconded.

VOTE 5 - 1

Opposed - Jerry Reese

ITEM #6: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a site plan of land for Hannaford Brothers Co., (Shop & Save) Assessor's Map 37, Lot 24 H, zoned B-3, located on Central Avenue.

Mary Gamage, from Hannaford Brothers Co., said they are requesting an expansion of approximately 15,000 sq. ft. She that 14,142 sq. ft. will be added in the rear of the store and 1,200 sq. ft. to the vestibule area in the front of the store and a 557 sq. ft. addition to the Ames receiving area. The other site changes will be 56,000 sq. ft. of re-paving and re-grading. She said they will be adding approximately 140 sq. ft. of pavement but will be eliminating it in another section so there will be no increase in impervious surface. She said at the curved area at the entry way will have to be changed, taking about 10 feet of this area because of the trucks traffic. She said that the drainage patterns will stay the same. We are requesting a Conditional Use Permit as a result of the parking ratio being less than what the Dover Zoning Ordinance requires. The zoning department asked us to have 659 parking spaces for the shopping center. Currently there are 494 parking spaces in the front portion of the parking lot and there are 72 spaces in an outparking area. They have done a parking study to determine if the parking is adequate. She said they found that the required parking right now is 251 parking spaces, which is almost half of what is there and with the expansion we will need 284. She said that the highest number of cars that were in the parking lot when they did the study was 230. The traffic study showed that the signalized intersection will have acceptable levels of capacity. She ended by saying she is asking for approval and a Conditional Use Permit for their parking.

Frank Torr made the motion to accept.

Tony McManus seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

Suzanne French, 6 Hall Street, represented her father, Noel Goulet, who is an abutter and is concerned with the noise that comes through. She said that the fence has been very good at buffering it out, but there has been a lot of damage to the fence this winter and they are requesting that the fence be maintained.

The public hearing is closed.

Peg wanted to know if the connector road was in Dover or Rollinsford, and if in Dover, can we require some stop signs on it.

Steve Stancel stated that the road is located in Rollinsford.

The public hearing was closed.

Mike said perhaps as a friendly suggestion from us to representatives of Shop & Save, they pursue the stop signs.

Frank made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add owners signatures to the plan.
2. Preparation of a formal agreement between the Planning Board and the applicant for the conditional Use Permit. Said agreement to be recorded at the Strafford County Registry of Deeds, at the applicant's expense.
3. Provide the Planning Department with proof of Rollinsford Planning Board approval.
4. Approval of the pump station analysis by the Engineering Department.
5. Provide detail for the mountable concrete island at the entrance needs to be included.
6. Repair the fence along the southwestern property line.

Margaret Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #7: Public hearing to consider amendment to the Site Review Regulations in relation to driveway location of parking lots, landscaping, outdoor lighting, and architectural design standards, for non-residential uses. The complete text is available in the Planning Department for review.

The public hearing was opened.

Norm Champagne, 13 Church Street, said he read a newspaper article regarding the site review amendments, and it said "All new construction will be evaluated based on how it fits in the architectural character of the City". He said that he found that disturbing and that it is government usurping people's property rights. He said that a group wanted to establish a Historic District and people didn't want to be told what they could do with their property. He said he feels that is wrong. He said that he has no objection to this proposal except to the architectural portion. He asked who would be making the

architectural decisions. He said that something should be very specific as to what the architectural character of the city actually is.

Atty. Malcolm McNeill, stated he was representing George J. Foster & Co, and the Richmond Co., of Peabody, MA in regard to a piece of property. He said that he will later ask Mr. Paston to speak because of his experience in the national marketplace, and the probable affects of these regulations. He used Hannaford Brothers as an example of a national company, with national standards and national proposals. He said that this has bearings on the areas zoned for business uses and who we are going to attract and what options they are going have with regard to where they locate. The Foster piece is a 10 acre piece at the Weeks Traffic Circle, and has been under agreement to Mr. Paston's Co. for over a year and the only reason that over 100,000 sq. ft. of retail space has not been built on that site, is an extreme delay in acquiring surplus property from the State of NH. He added that this project would have been up and built if it wasn't for that delay. He said that he remembers standing in front of this Planning Board and the City Council on numerous occasions over the past years relative to the concept of making more land appropriately zoned for commercial uses. This was tried in the last year with regard to trying to expand out the commercial base. He said that it was tried three or four years ago when there was a great deal of anxiety to the rezoning of this piece. The concept was that that neighborhood had changed, we needed to expand our tax base; shoppers were going out of town to other locations to shop; we needed places to attract jobs for kids in town, and we needed to recognize that there were certain sections of town that no longer had a residential character and needed to be changed. He thought site review regulations, may have the effect of not bringing in the uses that are zoned to come to Dover because of the requirements, particularly, as they relate to the siting of buildings and the location of parking. We believe that there are many users that will not come to this community because of concerns over spacing of parking spaces, and location of buildings. There can be no question that we are located in a regional and national marketplace where users define the types of buildings that they wish to bring and have various competitive standards that they find efficient and necessary in this marketplace. To lose that natural marketplace, the Chili's, the Rite Aids, the Hannaford Bros., the Shaws, the other big users, tax payers, and employers, because of regulations that basically do not conform with the competitive standards that they face in the area, he feels would not be in the best interest of this City. He said this site is a unique site because it is partly in Dover and partly in Somersworth. Malcolm stated that the site has limited access and there are other restrictions for which there is no flexibility in these proposed regulations to accommodate those unique characteristics. He said they don't feel that we can comply with these regulations.

Malcolm addressed the issues that he specifically addressed in the five page memo that he supplied to everyone last week. What you have in the regulations right now are an accumulation of inconsistencies that he thinks would confuse someone in a black robe as to what your intent may be. Malcolm stated that there is a recommendation at the outset that says buildings should be sited closer to the street which indicates to him that it's a preference, it's not mandatory. But then it goes on to say after a building should be sited closer to the street "the following standards are required" (This is section K 1.) The

following standards are required: Parcels in the B-3, B-4, B-5 Districts, with frontage and driveway access on an arterial, which would be the Foster site, with parking requirement with 100 spaces or greater, that says that a minimum of 50% of the parking spaces shall be located to the side or rear of the building. It shows no flexibility. When you go to the next paragraph, with regard to parking that relates to small users, there is an ability for some flexibility with regard to parking. It says whenever an applicant voluntarily complies with the standards above, the applicant shall be entitled to a 25% reduction in the amount of landscaping. He said it's a bonus for compliance. He said that their initial concern is the front and side parking requirement, which you didn't see in the Hannaford plan and you wouldn't see in any of our shopping centers that exists in Dover. The front and side parking requirements is an extremely difficult matter for any substantial developer. Under the terms of the regs as they are written, there is flexibility in other areas but not in this area. He suggested two ways of considering this issue. He proposes this language to the amendment, "The recognition of the unique circumstances of some parcels of land, the Planning Board may approve projects which do not strictly conform to the standards herein, provided that a finding is made by the Planning Board that strict application of the regulations would be unreasonable as applied to a particular applicant." He said that the term "unreasonable" was used rather than the word feasible, which is the term used by the Planning Department in some of their language, feasible is a word that means possible. The usual standard of review for an ordinance is its reasonableness, not its feasibility. He said that he is proposing that there either be a preamble or language that incorporates this flexibility language so you can recognize as sites are processed that there may be unique circumstances where you have to say that strict enforcement would be unreasonable. The difficulty here is that you are the ultimate arbiter, and this is not a case of going to the Zoning Board. It's up to the Planning Board to pass Site Review Regulations, and it is up to the Planning Board to be flexible with the regulations if they wish. The other alternative is what was proposed by Steve Bird on 4/27/99. He said that Steve Bird's proposal was that, as to the parking section, that there would be an addition that says "In recognition of the unique circumstances of some parcels of land, the Planning Board shall be permitted to vary the standards set forth in section K. The Planning Board may approve projects that do not conform strictly to the parking lot location standards above, provided that a finding is made by the Planning Board that the unique circumstances of the parcel make compliance not feasible. Malcolm said that feasible, is a possibility word rather than a probability word, and he would like to request that whenever that word is used that it be replaced with the term reasonable, because that is the type of term that courts are accustomed to interpreting. He said that with regard to the parking requirement, he would like to have a provision in the regulations that provides for waivers. He is concerned that the way the ordinance has been drafted, it could be perceived by a third party that a waiver was not intended as to this use. He said with regard to spacing standards between the roads, which is not a particular consequence as to the Foster piece because they do not have any flexibility with regard to roads, but with regard to the ordinance itself, there is provision that says that under certain circumstances the Planning Board can impose a higher standard with regard to spacing standards in H 2. He said he has never seen that before, that provides absolutely no guidance to an applicant, no standard and no control. He said a high standard could be the standard of this Board and it could be a different standard the week

after. He said it has no rational basis to it, without any study to it, without any master plan back up to it, it could easily be found to be arbitrary, capricious, and without rational foundation because there is no basis for the "higher standard". He said that he thinks that the City recognizes the issue when Steve Bird also on 4/27/99, proposed that language be deleted as part of his memo to the Planning Board. He submitted that memo to the Board.

Atty. McNeill said that with regard to the parking lot locations, users wish to have cars park in a safe area; have quick and easy access to the front of the store; be able to get to other adjoining stores without crossing over other traffic isles; to know where the front of the store is, to have some consistency in their appearance as well as access points. He said to have 50% of the parking on the side or the back of the building is something that will present a very serious problem as to whether this project will go forward. The impression one would get from the landscaping requirements is that the project should be invisible and the developers are asking that the public is able to see the project. We believe that the very tight perimeter buffer that is being proposed may seriously detract from that. He said if that provision is adopted, the signage requirements should be changed because there needs to be a way to alert the where these various users are. This market place is extremely competitive in terms of where people are going to go and where they are going to locate. He said that it is the collective desire of this City that desirable national users come here and he said this flexibility would assist in having that happen.

Mr. McNeill said that all reasonable developers will engage in reasonable discussions with regard to design standards. He quoted Peter Loughlin's book that says that design standards, except in Historical Districts in NH, are not legal. He says in NH a builder's location on his site can be controlled by site review, its setbacks, height and use can be controlled by zoning but its design can only be regulated through the adoption of a Historic District Ordinance. Municipalities do not have the authority in this state to dictate the design of the building or the elements of the building such as window openings, color, or other aesthetic consideration unless the municipality has gone through the historic district process. Who is going to decide what is an attractive commercial environment, who is going to decide the styling of the front façade, and decide architectural details and features. These particular types of criteria are so susceptible to aesthetic considerations and without a legal foundation and without standards, they really are not capable of realistic application. He said that the Board should require developers with plans of 5 or 10 thousand sq. ft., to bring an elevation. But in terms of your collective expertise, or anyone's expertise, to make this call, it seems to him it's unreasonable. He said he has gone over with Steve Stancel what is a historic color in Dover for about 6 months, and that continues to be unresolved. He said that he believes when you pass a regulation you'd like it to hold up and it detracts from the overall regulation if a portion of it is not sustained quickly. He suggested that the City attorney be consulted regarding Mr. Laughlin's citation. The regulations on the Somersworth side are different from the regulations on the Dover side. This site in order to be economically feasible has to be extensively developed. The buildings on the site are designed and were designed long before there was any consideration of these site review

regulations. They have provided for easy access for truck traffic in the rear so there is no interference with commuter traffic. It provides for entrance for the main stores so that they are easily accessed by users without confusion. He said they are requesting that there continue to be the flexibility without being stuck with regulations that appear to be inflexible.

Phil Paston, President of the Richmond Co., said that they are tenant driven, they develop for retailers that tend to be nationally recognized and are in every state in the country. On an exclusive basis, we develop for TJI Fridays, Video City, Capital Grill, Country Inns and Suits and Hotels, BJ Wholesale Club. He said that he approached Mr. Foster on his property over a year ago. He said they were ready to go forward and without the issue of the State, our plans would have called to be under construction and 85 to 100% leased. He said their developments are dictated by our tenants. We build for our tenants, they have particular requirements. They are seasoned in their business and they know what their customer base looks like and in the retail shopping center industry, the norm, without exception, parking is in the front, and visibility is critical to their success and accessibility. He said that a year ago we knew we could afford to pay for the lot based on the tenants that they have. Fortunately for them based on the State situation, their tenants have hung in with them and waiting for them to bring this to fruition. If these regulations are adopted it would prevent their tenants from being able to come to this site and it would hurt the value of the site. He said that the company and the retailers that they represent are very cooperative to make sure that they fit well within the community. He said when the changes are so significant where it hurts the fundamentals of retail shopping center developments, there is no room for cooperation because they just can't make the numbers work and attract the customers. He said that the way the bylaws are written today it would make it impossible for them to be successful at this location.

Norm Champagne, 13 Church St., said that pass a bunch of new rules and new regulations and muck up the kind of development that Dover desperately needs and everybody probably sitting on the Planning Board agrees, that the type of construction that these people are proposing would be good for the City and the City's tax base and probably not bring a lot more children to our schools. He said on one side you're fighting to pass regulations and on the other side the City's trying to dig itself out of a financial hole. He feels that the City should work with these people to try to come up with something that both can accept but not just strangle it to the point that they are going to walk away from it. If it goes on much longer that is probably what will happen.

The public hearing was closed

Frank Torr thought that this needs a considerable amount of work. He said that he agrees with Malcolm. The ability to have flexibility certainly is a very important ingredient in planning both from the perspective of the city, the public, and the developer. He said that he is not quite sure what approach we should take because they are in the position to be ready to go and he is sure that Somersworth's regulations are somewhat more lenient than our own existing regulations. He said he is looking for direction as to how we can

achieve accommodating them and yet making them conform to existing regulations as far as Dover's portion of that parcel is concerned.

Steve Stancel said that whether the changes were posted or not, there are two sides to every argument and we have heard one side of the argument when we were going through the rezoning changes. People came in and said that they wanted changes to site review regulations, changes to strip malls, and if they were to occur at all in the City, they wanted them to be aesthetically pleasing. He said that that is why the subcommittee was created and they have worked hard for 7 months putting together these proposals.

Tony McManus made the motion to have a workshop on Tuesday.

Jerry Reese seconded.

VOTE U/A

Ron Cole stated that the workshop will be held at 7:00 PM next Tuesday.

ITEM #8: Old Business

a. Extension of approval for the Post Office parking lot.

Steve Stancel stated that there is a letter from the Postal Service for an extension for the Post Office parking lot. He said that through internal delays, they are before the City Council level requesting approval of the lease agreements to do the parking lot expansion and in conjunction with that they are requesting an extension of their approval.

Mike Bobinsky made the motion to approve a 30 day extension of approval.

Jerry Reese seconded.

VOTE U/A

Mike Bobinsky spoke on the informal meeting with the Gravel Pit owners. He said that the meeting was held about 10 days ago. He said that there was a lot of good dialogue. He said that they all agreed to meet again in about 6 to 8 weeks.

ITEM #10: Adjournment

Jerry Reese made the motion to adjourn.

Reuben Hull seconded.

VOTE U/A