



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of

PLANNING BOARD

P.O. BOX 827
CARLISLE, MA 01741
(508) 369-9702

MINUTES October 28, 1996

PUBLIC HEARING: Definitive Subdivision Plan for Hunters Run (off Nickles La. and Oak Knoll Rd.), Brian E. Hebb Builders, Inc., applicant

PUBLIC HEARING: Special Permit for Accessory Apartment, 45 Pine Brook Road, Gordon J. Hardy, applicant

PROGRESS REPORTS:

Overlook Drive Special Permit (Bishop)
Ice Pond Subdivision (Hebb)

TOWN MEETING ARTICLES:

Request for consultant services
Scenic Roads bylaw amendments

Vice Chair Hengeveld called the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m. Duscha, Epstein, Hengeveld, LaLiberte and Tice were present. Yanofsky joined the meeting in progress; Colman was absent. Also present was Planning Administrator Mansfield, Building Inspector and Fire Chief Koning and Selectman Chaput.

The **minutes** of the meeting of October 10, 1996, were approved as amended on a motion by Tice, seconded by LaLiberte, 4-0-1, Epstein abstaining. The amendments were:

- p. 3 In the third paragraph, Duscha suggested that the term "safe" be replaced with "exempt from any changes in the bylaw."
- p. 6 Duscha recommended that the first line read "Tice pointed out that they may lose the opportunity to obtain future services"
- p. 5 LaLiberte observed that the minutes should show that he had recused himself from the discussion of Ice Pond.

Mansfield explained that the legal services associated with the acceptance of Hartwell Road should be deleted from the Board's approval of the current Kopelman and Paige bill.

LaLiberte agreed that he would take responsibility for responding to the October 25 request from the Finance Committee prior to the November 30 deadline with regard to the FY98 budget request guidelines.

Hengeveld announced that the Town of Concord will be holding a forum addressing the balance of land use and values, increasing the diversity of housing and maintaining open space on Saturday, November 2. She asked if a Board member could attend. Duscha said that she could not go but suggested that we call subsequently for any written information that may be available. LaLiberte said that he might be able to attend.

PUBLIC HEARING: Definitive Subdivision Plan for Hunters Run (off Nickles La. and Oak Knoll Rd.), Brian E. Hebb Builders, Inc., applicant

LaLiberte recused himself from deliberation on this application, since his firm is involved in litigation with the applicant. Hengeveld opened the hearing at 7:30 p.m. Yanofsky joined the meeting. Present were Brian Hebb, the applicant, and Lynne Remington and Chuck Caron from David Ross Associates, his engineering representatives. Also present, from Nickles Lane, were Karla Johnson, Stewart Roberts, Burt and Kathy Rubenstein, Susan McAndrew, Rick Meyer and Laurie Engdahl; from Oak Knoll Rd., David and Jo Anne Kelch and Jon Longley; from East St., Ed and Beverly Humm; Ferris Taylor of Hemlock Hill Rd., and Robert West of Clark Farm Rd.

Caron described the proposed subdivision. He explained that the new roadway would connect Nickles Lane and Oak Knoll Road, both presently dead end streets. Six new building lots would be created, and a seventh lot that could be further subdivided would be retained by the current owner. The new roadway would be 1600-1700 ft. in length. The design of the road, he said, is constrained by the steep topography and the configuration of the wetlands on the site. In addition to the wetland which traverses the site from north to south, there are two isolated wetland areas on the site. The roadway plans propose a maximum grade of 8% at three locations and a wetlands crossing. This will require deep cuts and a lot of fill. A 10x3 concrete box culvert is shown to cross the stream, so as to minimize the impact on the wetlands. Also proposed is a combination fire pond and detention basin containing 2 to 3 times the volume of water required by the fire chief.

Caron reported that he had received the comments of both Land Tech and the Planning Administrator and would be addressing them. He agreed to explore the suggested realignment of the road to better fit the terrain, noting that it was to the client's benefit to reduce the amount of fill. But, he said, proceeding from Nickles Lane, relocating the road by 5 or 10 feet will not substantially change the cut required. Moreover, he said, a design speed of 30 mph requires that the roadway be kept quite straight. However, he added, if a 10% grade were permitted by the Board, the cut required at the Nickles La. end could be reduced from 15 ft. to 5-6 ft., and the fill required at the Oak Knoll Rd. end would only be 3-4 ft. deep, except in one limited area. He asked for more input from the Board as to what deviation from the regulations might be acceptable in the areas of roadway grade and design speed.

Regarding the Board of Health disapproval of the plan, Caron explained that Ross has obtained more test data for the septic systems from the firm that undertook those tests, but they have not yet had time to analyze it. There is no test data for Lots 4 and 5, and it is too wet to do perc tests at present.

Regarding Land Tech's comments, Caron had the following responses:

Is a dam permit from DEM required for the detention pond?

It is not an automatic requirement; DEM is reviewing the plans and it is not likely that a dam permit will be required.

Are the vertical curves designed adequately for a 30 mph speed?

We think so and will discuss this further.

Drainage analysis:

We believe that most required information is in the calculations. We will review them and clarify any discrepancies with LandTech.

Is the existing detention basin on Nickles La. adequate to contain the newly-created runoff?

The Nickles La. subdivision drainage calculations took the future development of this tract into account. This feature was approved then by the Planning Board.

Will the proposed box culvert retain water in such a way as to affect the wetland?

We do not believe that it will.

Do the provisions of the Rivers Bill apply to this project?

No regs. have been promulgated to date to support this Act, but we do not believe that it is applicable here because the stream is an intermittent one, drying up in the summer.

Is there a vernal pool in one of the isolated wetlands?

No, a vernal pool has to be certified by the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, and also must be located within the wetland resource area. Nevertheless, we have tried to avoid disturbing that area in the layout plan.

Caron then addressed the P. A.'s comment that the plan does not appear to minimize disturbance to the site, as required by the regs. He acknowledged that disturbance is quite extensive, but that to satisfy all the other requirements of the regs., such disturbance cannot be reduced because there are no open areas on the site.

Hengeveld asked for questions from the Board. Epstein expressed his concern about the effect on the existing abutters of the significant earth movement for this project. He made reference to the 50,000-100,000 estimated cubic yards of fill required. Remington replied that according to their recent calculations, only 21,150 cu. yd. of fill were required, and the cuts will remove 11,850 cu. yd. of earth, for a net requirement of 9,200 cu. yd. She added that these calculations were for the roadway only and did not include, for example, the fire pond or wetland replication area. She explained that their engineer's estimate of 100,000 cu. yd. of earth required, given on the site walk, was an extreme inaccuracy. Tice asked how many truckloads of fill would result from their calculations. Caron replied about 300.

Epstein asked for a written response to the LandTech and P.A. comments. Remington suggested that a meeting be scheduled with Mansfield and Mark Sleger, LandTech's engineer, to review the issues that have been raised, and that they would prepare a written response to follow upon that meeting. Mansfield said he would set up that meeting.

Duscha questioned the common driveway shown on the plans, and Caron explained that a common driveway special permit application will be submitted subsequently. Hengeveld asked if sidewalks and/or trails were proposed for this site. Caron replied that a sidewalk is proposed for the entire length of the roadway on the south side, connecting with the existing sidewalks on Nickles La. and Oak Knoll Rd., but that if the sidewalk was shifted to the opposite side of the road, less fill would be required. Hengeveld noted that there are existing trails in the neighborhood and asked if any links are proposed. Caron replied that he has not seen any trails on or near the site, and Duscha suggested that Ross be provided with a copy of the Trails Committee map suggesting locations for connecting trails. (It has been given to them.)

Epstein asked what rights the applicant might have to Rangeway Rd. Caron replied that it is a discontinued way, and therefore there are no access rights. Duscha asked about the proposed guardrails. Caron explained that since the roadway is 20 ft. above existing grade at its highest point, standard metal highway guardrails are proposed.

Duscha then asked the Fire Chief to comment on the design of the proposed fire pond. Koning replied that he needs more details regarding the pond, but he did have several observations. He said that since all drainage from the street goes into the pond, he would be concerned about silt buildup; that he is not sure about ground water availability in this area; that he needs some documents on the design and construction of the pond; and that the sidewalk proposed for the same side of the road may restrict the access to the dry hydrant. Caron then described the pond's design, but Koning said that he needs certification from a qualified engineer that this design is adequate. Koning also questioned the radius of the curve of the road, and Caron replied that it is 300 ft., which Koning agreed was adequate for fire trucks.

The hearing was then opened for public comments:

Stewart Roberts of 109 Nickles La. explained that he was the major abutter to the site. He displayed his own plan for the proposed cut and fill for the road and expressed concern about the confusion that appeared to exist over the amount of fill required. He noted that, no matter what is the accurate estimate, it is an extensive engineering project for the town of Carlisle and a large number of trucks to impose on neighborhood streets. He said that there is a lot of ledge on this property and expressed concern for the potential blasting within 200 ft. of his house and 15-20 ft. from his well. He also questioned the wisdom of locating the fire pond on a rocky knoll, being concerned about the additional blasting required to create this feature. He said that the fire pond proposal, including a chain link fence, would be unattractive for the neighbors and asked that a cistern be considered as an alternative. He said he is also concerned about the aesthetics

of the proposed guardrail. Roberts said he had safety concerns about both the construction trucks and all traffic that would be descending the slope onto the existing Nickles La., adding that the intersection of Nickles La. and East St. is a dangerous one because of poor alignment. Finally, he raised several wetlands issues and presented a map of the wetlands modifications.

David Kelch of 11 Oak Knoll Rd. stated that this proposal would disrupt a fragile ecological environment. The road as proposed, he said, would be both unsightly and unsafe. The construction trucks will damage neighborhood streets, and the connection between the two neighborhoods will reduce the security within those neighborhoods. He presented a petition signed by 57 residents of the area in opposition to the subdivision.

Hengeveld explained that as long as the applicant is in compliance with all the rules and regulations of the Planning Board, the Board does not have the option to deny a Definitive Subdivision Plan. But Epstein noted that the Board also needs to address the need for an earth transfer permit, which is a discretionary function of the Board, and without which this subdivision may not be able to be built.

Karla Johnson of 108 Nickles La. read a letter signed by 20 residents requesting the Board to deny the permit to allow the fill to be brought to the site. The letter also expressed concern "about the lack of commitment to quality and completion that this developer has exhibited in another recent Carlisle subdivision." Epstein asked Brian Hebb to respond to this question, noting that he had no personal knowledge of it since he was not a member when the other subdivision referenced, Ice Pond, was before the Board. Hebb replied that recent representations by the Board in the newspaper regarding his performance at Ice Pond are false, and that his lawyer has sent a letter to Colman regarding this issue. He said he would rather not comment on something that may lead to litigation, but that he has the full intention to complete the Ice Pond subdivision.

Kathy Rubenstein of 71 Nickels La. raised a question about the guardrails, and Caron once again confirmed that steel guardrails are needed.

Richard Meyer of 104 Nickles La. suggested that Town Counsel be asked for an opinion regarding the applicant's access to Rangeway Road, and asked what was proposed for the land being retained by the owner. Caron replied that he had no information on this, and Hebb added that the owner will not sell him that piece.

Robert West of Clark Farm Rd. suggested that the estimates regarding the trucks required to provide the fill are on the low side.

Hebb then asked the residents of Nickles La. whether there is a provision in their deeds that there was expected to be an extension of the road and a subsequent subdivision of the adjacent land. Several abutters replied that this is true, but that there are no details contained in their deeds.

Selectmen Chaput made reference to a similar subdivision, Elizabeth Ridge, where the Board and the petitioner had worked with a landscape architect and had established steeper grades while reducing the design speed to 20 mph. This required waivers, she said, but acknowledged that the Planning Board could suggest these or other alternatives. Caron replied that he had looked at Elizabeth Ridge as a comparison, and found that the cuts there are in the same order of magnitude as those proposed here.

At this point, noting that the time allotted to this hearing had expired, Hengeveld proposed that the hearing be continued to November 25 at 7:30 p.m. Remington asked if there could be any input from the Board regarding the likelihood of waivers, but Hengeveld said that this discussion should wait until the applicant's engineers have met with LandTech and the P.A. and reviewed the issue that have been raised. **The hearing was continued as proposed, by a 6-0 vote.**

PUBLIC HEARING: Special Permit for Accessory Apartment, 45 Pine Brook Road, Gordon J. Hardy, applicant

Hengeveld opened the public hearing at 8:38 p.m. Present for this hearing were Gordon and Alice Hardy, Gunilla Lacoche, Chris Leary, Marge and Ned Berube, Kate Bauer Burke and Ken Ernstoff.

Epstein noted that one abutter had requested a continuation of the hearing in writing so that her husband could be in attendance.

Gordon Hardy presented his request for a one-bedroom accessory apartment in a single-family dwelling currently under construction. He described the plan and the access to the unit. Duscha asked where the parking would be located, and Hengeveld asked how close the driveway would be to the lot line. Mansfield explained that the submitted plans showed that the driveway would be expanded to provide parking next to the garage, and that at its closest point the driveway would be 11 ft. from the lot line. Duscha asked Hardy if he would be willing to provide screening of this driveway/parking area from the abutter's property. Hardy agreed that he would, and explained that the plan of the house and site had been accepted by the Town before he bought the property.

Gunilla Lacoche of 766 North Rd., the abutter to the portion of the site where the driveway is to be located, voiced complaint about the clear-cutting of the site and the siting of the house. She contended that the house was four stories in the rear in violation of the zoning bylaw, and that there was living space planned for the fourth floor. Hardy reiterated that everything was done according to the plans approved by the Town.

Hengeveld asked Lacoche if screening was desirable, and she replied that it was. Hengeveld then asked if the parking area was designed to accommodate 5 cars. Mansfield replied that the bylaw required that such area be set back 40 ft. from the lot

line if it was designed to accommodate more than 4 cars. (This was in error; Sec. 5.3.5 requires a 40 ft. setback for parking of more than 3 cars.) Lacoche stated that she expected that more than 5 cars would be parking here. Hardy replied that the parking area was not being increased in size for this apartment.

Hardy explained that he does not expect to be in Carlisle during the winters, so is requesting the accessory apartment to avoid leaving the house vacant for that long period. Lacoche responded by asking what constitutes a "bonafide temporary absence," as specified in the owner-occupancy requirement of Sec. 5.6.5.5 of the Zoning Bylaw.

Yanofsky asked Hardy how much screening he would propose to install. He replied that he has talked to Mrs. Lacoche's husband and agreed to allow him to use Hardy's driveway for access to Lacoche's property, on which Lacoche would install spruces. Yanofsky replied that this property should be appropriately screened in the judgment of the Planning Board, and that Hardy should submit a landscape plan showing the appropriate screening located on his own property line. Hardy asked if he would have to screen the parking if he did not apply for an apartment, because the impact on the abutter is the same either way. Yanofsky said that the Board encourages accessory apartments, but wants to be sure to protect abutters from any effects of increased density.

Kate Bauer Burke of 76 Pine Brook Rd. said that there has been a lot of prior controversy surrounding this lot. The problem, as she sees it, is that abutters on all sides are used to having green space in this location. The siting of the house and the location of the berm were dependent on Conservation Commission and Title V regulations. But from the plans presented, she said, there is no sense that there is a separate apartment in this dwelling and she has no objection to it. In fact, she said, there is an advantage to having this home occupied throughout the year.

Lacoche replied that Ms. Burke represented the former owner, Mr. Sommer, in the sale of the property. She contended that it is not good for the neighborhood to have rental property.

Hengeveld, acknowledging the request to continue the hearing, asked Hardy if he would meet with his neighbors and try to resolve the difficulties before 11/25. He replied that he has already done this. She suggested that he come back with a plan for landscape screening located on his property, but again he replied that the Town had already approved the parking area as it is. Koning interjected that there is no parking requirement in the bylaw for a residential zone.

Duscha asked whether lighting was specified in the plan. Hardy replied that there is one sensor-controlled light mounted on the garage, and he does not care what type it is. Epstein again asked if he is willing to install screening, and Hardy again replied in the affirmative.

Duscha expressed willingness to continue the hearing, but Yanofsky doubted that there would be any new information presented. Ms. Burke voiced concern that the paving is scheduled for November 1, but LaLiberte said that was not a concern because he was not interested in seeing the parking relocated. Hardy explained that he had held off the paving to allow his neighbor access to his property with equipment for planting. Lacoche described the background of the negotiations between Hardy and her husband, saying that the estimated cost of \$4000-5000. to install the trees on their property was too steep.

Yanofsky then moved to close the hearing, and LaLiberte seconded the motion. But Tice said he wanted to see an agreement to plant some evergreen trees reached before the hearing was closed. The motion failed to carry by a vote of 1-4-1, Yanofsky in favor, Hengeveld abstaining. Duscha then **moved to continue the hearing to November 25, 1996 at 7:15 p.m.** (recognizing that another hearing is scheduled to begin at 7:30). Epstein seconded the motion, and Hengeveld reiterated that a screening plan should be presented to the Board then, if indeed the applicant wishes to propose one. **The motion carried 6-0.**

Overlook Drive (Rutland St.) - Compliance with approved Common Driveway Special Permit plans and conditions

Les Bishop, the developer of the property, explained that he had received a letter from the Planning Board expressing concern that his work on the site was out of conformance with the Special Permit as approved by the Board. The specific areas of concern, he noted, were the pitch of the driveway, the drainage structures, and the boulders he had placed along the edge of the driveway. He said that the roadway was rough-graded for the summer, and paved with binder coat about one month ago. The grades were shot, he said, by his surveyor, Stephen Patrick, and were shown on a stamped plan and profile that he presented to the Board. He also submitted a second plan, left with the Conservation Commission at their meeting of October 9, which showed the updated locations of both the permanent and temporary drainage structures currently in place. These include two temporary detention basins that will remain through the winter months. He also has added an additional 2 ft. of depth to the permanent basin at the bottom of the slope, and the temporary pond at the wetland crossing may remain on the final as-built plan. He also said he would leave the row of boulders on the northwest side of the driveway if the Board approves of this change, but would remove them if the Board so desires.

LaLiberte replied that he would like to get the Board's engineer's opinion of the desirability of the boulders. Yanofsky expressed her concern about the precedent set by the ongoing process of revision that seems to characterise this project. Mansfield noted that, on a visit to the site, he found that one of the driveway turnouts is on the opposite side of the roadway from that as shown in the plan, a change not mentioned by Bishop. Bishop replied that the pavement here follows the inside track and is not really at odds with the plan, but it too could be adjusted if the Board wishes. Tice asked if that means

the centerline of the driveway is off coarse. Bishop replied that the centerline of the pavement where it is graded is accurate.

Mansfield explained that the difficulty with this situation is that, as in the case of most Special Permits the Board has approved, there are no provisions made for inspection of the work as it progresses and no project review fee retained to cover the cost of such inspections. Bishop said that he would be willing to pay for inspections to be performed by the Board's engineer.

Yanofsky asked if Bishop would be able to propose today which changes he would seek as amendments to the plan, and which he would correct to the original as approved. But Bishop replied that he would prefer to wait until the work was nearer completion. Tice stated that, in his opinion, the work should only be done as per the approved plan unless an amendment is submitted and approved. Yanofsky asked Bishop when he would expect to file a request for amendment, and he responded that he could do so in one to one-and-one-half months.

Hengeveld then asked Building Inspector Koning to report on the current status of the work at Overlook Drive. Koning replied that he had issued a stop-order on building construction because the Board had informed him that the work on the site improvements was not in conformance with the approved plan. To release that order, he said, someone has to tell him that Bishop's work has come into compliance. He suggested that the Board obtain an independent review of Bishop's engineering. Duscha asked Bishop if he would be willing for LandTech to review the engineering based on the plans he had just submitted. He replied that he would. Hengeveld pointed out that the main issue was that of the grade as built, and LandTech should concentrate its review on that, but Duscha said that she was also had questions about the design of the retention pond at the top of the hill.

LaLiberte suggested that the Board ask the Building Inspector to remove the stop-work order subject to LandTech's review. Bishop asked if he could obtain an interior inspection of a house now under construction as scheduled for the following day, subject to a subsequent engineering confirmation. LaLiberte did not respond to this question, but rather **moved that subject to review and confirmation by the Town Engineer that the Common Driveway as presently constructed is in conformance with the approved Special Permit plan, the Planning Board recommends that the Building Inspector remove the stop-work order on this development.** Duscha seconded the motion and it was **approved 6-0.** The Board, by agreement, delegated the review of LandTech's analysis to Tice so that this recommendation could proceed prior to the next Board meeting.

At this point, Tice and Yanofsky excused themselves and left the meeting.

Tall Pines - Request for lot releases

Hengeveld recused herself from participation in this discussion, and LaLiberte assumed the Chair. William Costello appeared before the Board to request that Lots 7 and 15 be released from the Restrictive Covenant for the Tall Pines subdivision. He explained that these will be the tenth and eleventh lots released (the Board had previously agreed to release up to twelve). He added that utilities and the roadway to binder course are complete to serve each of these lots. Epstein **moved that Lots 7 and 15 in the Tall Pines subdivision be released from the Restrictive Covenant**; Duscha seconded the motion, and it was **approved 3-0**.

Costello also had noted in his written request that the Registry of Deeds has required that the document releasing these and previously-released lots be not only signed by a majority of the Board but that one member's signature be notarized. It was agreed that Duscha, as Clerk, has the power to sign for the Board authorizing that the Board has taken a certain action. She agreed to sign the releases for the Board in the presence of a Notary.

Ice Pond Subdivision - Procedures for Declaration of Default and Completion of Improvements

The Board reviewed a draft letter to Brian Hebb, prepared by the P.A. in the form as recommended by Town Counsel, advising Hebb of the Board's intention to declare him in default of his obligations to complete the road and associated improvements if such improvements are not complete by December 2, 1996. LaLiberte recused himself from this discussion. Epstein asked that the letter be sent certified. Members asked that the letter also be sent to LandTech, notifying them of the Board's intent to request an inspection. Duscha also asked that LandTech look at the performance of the site drainage to be sure it will not have detrimental affect on the road.

Proposed Articles for Fall Town Meeting (Scenic Roads Bylaw Amendments; Request for Consultant Services)

Duscha explained that she hadn't yet been able to get on the Conservation Commission agenda to explain the proposed Scenic Roads amendments. Epstein noted that since both Articles fall under the umbrella of the Study Plan Implementation Steering Committee, the Board should use this opportunity to put them in context and describe very briefly the initiatives the Planning Board has been undertaking over the past 4-5 months as well as plans for the future. He suggested that LaLiberte and/or Colman make this presentation to Town Meeting. LaLiberte agreed and said he would talk to Colman about the suggestion. Duscha added that perhaps the Board should prepare a progress report to distribute at Town Meeting.

Duscha reported that the Selectmen want a public hearing scheduled on the Scenic Road amendments prior to Town Meeting. LaLiberte said that he would rather the P.A. use the time to get the RFP out. But Hengeveld said that if the Selectmen want a public hearing, the Board ought to hold one. Mansfield suggested that the time originally set aside on November 7 for a required hearing on any proposed zoning bylaw amendments could be allocated for a Scenic Roads bylaw hearing. Hengeveld stated that no legal advertisement is necessary, but that the *Mosquito* should be asked to run a highlighted notice of an "Open Meeting" of the Planning Board for this purpose in its November 1 edition.

Mansfield then reported to the Board that, although he had understood from the Town Administrator that Town Counsel had prepared a significantly revised version of the Scenic Roads bylaw amendment in response to the text submitted to them for review in the form originally approved by the Board and submitted for the Warrant, they had not yet sent a copy of their proposal back to either the Planning Board or the Town Administrator. Calls he had placed to Kopelman and Paige earlier in the day had not been returned. This, he explained, results in an awkward situation where the deadline for printing the final text for the Warrant is two days hence and the Planning Board may be scheduling a hearing on a proposed amendment it has not seen. Epstein expressed his displeasure at this lack of timely response, and asked that a list of law firms that might serve as alternative sources of town counsel services (that he had previously asked the P.A. to prepare) be distributed to the entire Board. He also resolved to place a conference call to Town Counsel the following morning.

Mansfield then asked for some direction on the preparation of an RFP for consultant services. He said he understood that one or more Board members had proposed to draft the Scope of Services section. Epstein said that he thought that either Colman or Yanofsky was going to undertake that task. Mansfield said he would check with them.

Ken Ernstoff of Cross St. asked if there had been any response from the Selectmen to the letter from Colman which had been published in the *Mosquito* regarding their denial of placing a growth control bylaw on the Warrant. Epstein replied that there had been none. Ernstoff said that he was appalled that a dialogue about growth in the town is not occurring between the Boards.

Because of the late hour and diminished attendance, no discussion was undertaken on other items of New Business: the Community Action Statement process or Carlisle 2000 business.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

George E. Mansfield
Planning Administrator