APPROVED

AMESBURY PLANNING BOARD
APRIL 11, 2016
CITY HALL AUDITORIUIM
62 FRIEND STREET
AMESBURY, MA 01913

Meeting called to order at 7:08 pm

PRESENT: David Frick, Lars Johannessen, Scott Mandeville, Lorri Krebs, Robert Laplante, Karen Solstad, Ted Semesnyei.
ABSENT: None.
ALSO PRESENT: Nipun Jain, City Planner; Joan Baptiste, recording secretary.

MINUTES: MARCH 28, 2016
Motion by Robert Laplante to approve minutes of March 28, 2016, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

Motion by Lars Johannessen to take an agenda item out of order, second by Scott Mandeville.
Motion by Lars Johannessen to open the new public hearing for 23 South Martin Road.
City Planner, Nipun Jain leaves the meeting to retrieve some paperwork
Motion by Lars Johannessen to withdraw the motion.

SIGN APPLICATION: 194 Main Street - Our Neighbors Table
Motion by Scott Mandeville to continue this item (per applicant) to the April 25 meeting, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF

Motion was made by Lars Johannessen to take the next item out of order on the agenda (Titcomb Landfill). Motion was seconded by Scott Mandeville. AIF

23 South Martin Road-Hunt Road, Site Plan application review. Titcomb Landfill – Solar Facility
Applicant: SunEdison, LLC. Representative: TRC, LLC
Nipun Jain: reads the public hearing notice. TRC Environmental has submitted a site plan review application on behalf of SunEdison LLC for a proposed 2.8 megawatt solar photovolt facility.
Request by applicant to continue this hearing to May 23, 2016
Motion by Scott Mandeville to continue this public hearing to May 23, second by Lorri Krebs. AIF

SIGN APPLICATION: 284 Elm Street, HAMPTON INN
Representative: Joseph H. Bachholz, Jr. / Kay Gee Sign and Graphics.
Applicant not in attendance.

Motion by Scott Mandeville to continue the sign application to April 25 meeting, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.
Discussion: Scott Mandeville: the subcommittee had a chance to review. We felt the sign was a little large for the size of the building and the free standing sign is also taller than what the DRC felt was necessary. It is located at the highest point on the site which also exacerbates the height of the sign. We recommend they reduce the overall height of the sign. The location on this plan deviates from the original plan as well. There is some discussion as to whether it needs to be where it originally was, or is now, and discussion on height and style of the sign.
Motion by Scott Mandeville for the DRC to meet with the applicant for the sign at 284 Elm Street on Thursday, April 14 at 5:00 to discuss concerns, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

47 ½- 57 Kimball Road Subdivision
Definitive Subdivision Plan approval with 3 special permits:
Cluster Residential, Common Access Driveway and Water Protection Resource District.
Applicant: B C REALTY TRUST and Phil Parry, Esquire.
David Frick: We tried to correspond with the developer but we received no response.
Nipun Jain: This is not a common occurrence in our office, so it is challenging to recommend the appropriate strategy. Based on some legal opinions, there are a couple things the board can do. You can mail a formal letter, return post, and send a copy to the city clerk so that it is fully vetted, and follow up with a request from your legal counsel to advise you on how you would go about issuing a decision on this matter. When there is no response and the application is primarily incomplete and lacks the information for the PLB to make a determination and take final action. That is the part that I'm not sure how it is worded when there is no response.
David Frick: I think it would be appropriate to let them know that they have the option of withdrawing without prejudice.
Nipun Jain The original application was filed in March 2015. It was determined that they were missing a special permit application that was also applicable to the project. A public hearing was held in June of 2015 for all of the permits. All of those were combined into one hearing. Then the PLB peer review consultant issued a memo around the end of October and met with the applicant's engineer at that time to go over comments and determine that it is clear what the development team has to do to address those comments. Since that time, we have not received any updated information, but did receive formal requests to continue the public hearing, which was through the March 2016 meeting of the board, but since then, we've not received any formal requests to continue the public hearing.
Motion was made by Ted Semesnyei to send a formal letter to the applicant, with a copy to the city clerk, requesting a response to repeated attempts to where they stand on the project. To ask city counsel for advice on how to proceed if they don't respond to our request.
Amended by David Frick to add that they have the option to withdraw without prejudice. Motion was seconded by Lars Johannessen. AIF.
Nipun Jain: Well, you've taken that action. Since you don't have a request to continue the public hearing, you do need to officially continue this hearing to a date certain. It should be four

weeks out, given the lack of response and further action by city counsel, and us sending a registered letter. That takes us out to May 9.
Motion by Scott Mandeville to continue this hearing to May 9, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

Request by Ted Semesnyei to take 28 Lake Attitash out of order.
Ted Semesnyei: We have a request from the applicant to continue this hearing to April 25.
Motion by Ted Semesnyei to grant a continuance from the applicant for 28 Lake Attitash Road to April 25, second by Lars Johannessen. AIF

60 Merrimac Street – Hatter's Point Marina
Motion made by Lars Johannessen to grant the request of the applicant to continue the hearing for Hatter's Point Marina to April 25, second by Ted Semesnyei. Six in favor, Robert Laplante recused.

103 – 107 Macy Street – Amesbury Chevrolet
Definitive Site Plan Review – Response to Peer Review
Represented by Woody Cammett, Cammett Engineering
Nipun Jain: Quick update: we just passed out the review letters from Stantec both on the site plan and the traffic assessment by Stantec. I gave this to the applicant's representative as well.
Woody Cammett: We have met several times with the Design Review Committee and have made all the changes that they requested to the architectural façade of the building, also the lighting being softer than what we had originally had. Phase III as explained before will be the exterior lighting in the parking lot, which is all changing to LED recessed lighting and also the remainder of the parking lot will be repaved, reconstructed, and part of the drainage will be upgraded to storm water performance standards. Phase III will begin once Phase II is approved, so they know they have a project going forward. Also, we are addressing and looking at putting an entrance-exit going onto Clarks Road to help alleviate some of the traffic issues on Route 110. The traffic study shows us that it is not necessary, because the impacts are minimal compared to what is going on in that intersection in the next 20 year period. But it also will be very helpful to be able to have west turning movements at the intersection. Currently, they are not allowed to turn left. When MASS DOT widened the roadway they did not put traffic signs (no left turn) at the driveway entrances. They put them across the street. That is one of the reasons we've been seeing accidents, due to people taking illegal left turns. In the design under Phase II, we have added a slightly raised median and a directed right turn lane, so the cars will have to turn eastbound only. That is the way widening was done on Route 110. We've already addressed most of the concerns by Stantec regarding traffic. A 15 minute meeting with Stantec, police and fire will be all that is needed to straighten the remaining things out. The widening addressed the left turn issue into Route 110.
Karen Solstad: So you're saying a left hand turn out of the dealership is not allowed?
Woody Cammett: Correct, it is not allowed by the Route 110 widening, but the only sign they have up is a meager sign "No Left Turn" and it is across the street. We put signs at the entrance and the exit. We're bringing it up to MASS DOT standards.
Nipun Jain: So one of the things that will be required as part of the proposal is they have to go to MASS DOT to get an amendment to the existing curb cut permit, because you are also closing two existing driveways and making improvements to the one driveway that you will have. So

part of that is working with MASS DOT to address some of the concerns that have been raised by the public safety officials. In talking to Stantec and the applicant, it appears that Stantec brought up some issues that are still outstanding but nothing that cannot be discussed with them in a meeting to resolve those. The most recent memo makes clear there are no remaining stumbling blocks at all. I will be setting up a meeting with the applicant and the police, and other city officials to make sure that they have reviewed the traffic study that has been presented and that they are satisfied with the responses that the applicant has had in the next couple of days. That takes care of the memo and the concerns of the public safety officials in this matter.

Discussion for clarification was had between Woody Cammett, Karen Solstad, Ted Semesnyei and Robert Laplante concerning increase or no change in runoff from the site. The report from Stantec makes certain points / suggestions.
Motion was made by Robert Laplante to continue the hearing for 103 Macy Street to April 25, second by Lorri Krebs. AIF.

77 Elm Street- David Martin- Site Plan and 3 special permits applications.
Applicant: David Martin
Representative: Nick Cracknell.
Brian Couture, Horsley-Witten Group, Senior Landscape architect and civil engineer:
We're here today to discuss some of the changes and updates we've made to the plan. We've been working with Stantec as well as Nipun, DPW, and building inspector. We have submitted initial response letter to the first round of comments from Stantec. We've also issued a second response letter to some follow up comments provided today to the Planning Office as well as to ConCom. We received comments from the DPW on April 4 and on April 8 we got additional comments from the building inspector and we got an e-mail with some comments from the police department. The largest change that has been made to the site plan relates to the parking lot. Working with the DPW dept. and the building inspector, we adjusted some of the grading. The initial concept was to balance the wall heights and the slopes to the parking lot, the fill required, as well as stairs. We only have so much area to provide the stairs to get to the users of the parking lot up to the upper lot. So those grades have been revised and we now meet the 12% that was requested by DPW, and we're providing just under 5% for the cross slope of the parking lot, but the ramp as you come down the parking lot it comes in at a smoother slope as it comes in from 12% to 5%. I have phone calls in to DPW and the building inspector just to make sure they are agreeable to these changes. Concerning Stantec, in discussions and in response letters, we've addressed most of their comments to their satisfaction. There may be a follow up phone call with them. We've also received comments from the fire dept. regarding the turning radius. We submitted a turning radius plan and worked with the fire dept. to develop a turning radius template, using their fire truck dimensions and specifications when the turning radius was submitted, so we believe we have improved the condition that exists out there, and fire access is allowable to the rear of 77 and 79 Elm Street. DPW also had some comments on the storm water design, the biggest one being we were proposing just a dog house manhole that would just be covering the pipe, then cutting into it. They preferred we put a whole new structure of which we were agreeable to, so we'll be providing a new manhole which will be located closer to the DPW drainage system. Those are the updates on the changes that have been made.
(no one on the board had any questions when asked by Mr. Frick).

Nipun Jain: Concerns from DPW and the building dept. have been getting addressed by the applicant and will be satisfactory to both depts. Once completed. No major stumbling blocks currently exist. Stantec will be releasing its final review letter, but I asked them what is the status of the review of the most recent submission as well as updated information. They found that no issues so far would need to be addressing in any further detail. The areas on Fruit Place are being improved, especially the driving width and turning radii in making it much safer than it is today. The applicant indicated that they will be updating the parking lot slope in the driveway as well as the parking lot. That will satisfy the building dept.'s concerns and also those concerns of DPW. The loading zone area will be marked and will meet requirements of DPW and building inspector. The applicant is working with DPW to improve the infrastructure in that area. Brian says they have acceptance from DPW but we will have that in writing. So the remaining items they need to tie up fall under a waiver request, which they have provided to us. So that has been addressed. They will provide details on guard rails and granite curbing, just details they need to provide.

The retaining wall along Fruit Place needs to be moved back a little bit as it interferes with the turning radius. They are working with National Grid to clearly identify the location of the utilities. They could then update their plans once they get that information from National Grid. All utilities will be placed underground on Fruit Place. The landscape plan will be updated to include a solid fence where it is needed, if it does not meet the landscape requirements. At a later date, they will be providing a more detailed signage package. They need to provide some legal documents for the access and utility easements and temporary construction easements. They are working to provide those. Those are the highlights of the issues that need to be wrapped up, and they are looking to wrap that up in the next few days.

David Frick: About the slope of the parking lot discussed in e-mails: I don't know which way it is sloping. Could you go through that and what the whole thought is? Are you changing the grading in there from what it is today?

Brian Couture: The road is very steep as it comes down Fruit Place that ties into what we call Fruit Place Extension. The lot slopes from the upper portion of Fruit Place (western portion). We'll be trying to match the slope of that lot grade. There will be wall height issues, as well as the need for stairs to get people up. You'll be coming from Fruit Place into the parking lot at a 12% slope for about 27 feet. Then it will drop about 3 feet over 27 feet. So from 12% it will flatten out at the upper portion of the lot to about a 4.8% grade slope for a smoother transition.

Robert Laplante: You mentioned you work with various city departments, but you didn't mention the police department.

Brian Couture: We did receive a memo from the police as well. Most of their concerns related to traffic related issues. We have a traffic consultant on the design team who has been addressing those. We did put a response in our letter to DPW addressing that concern. Concerns actually relate to one-way or two-way on Clark Street.

Nipun Jain: Just to summarize, the applicant's basis of design is on current conditions, which is one way on Clark Street. It was asked, if it returned to two-way or if it remained one way, what would that mean to the traffic study? The traffic consultant answered that question with that under either scenario, under the proposed design, the traffic would operate normally. Stantec has not said that the traffic circulation doesn't work.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Richard and Camille Sandler, 79 Elm Street: Camille: We've expressed in the past how excited we are to see this building renovated, but we do have concerns about traffic impact of a parking lot for retail or a restaurant. Office space usually gets assigned parking spaces. Their patrons have nowhere to park, and it is usually one or two people at a time. When you have retail, it is very different. You have car doors slamming, people stay 5-10 minutes, maybe an hour, it is random. Re: impact on traffic: There are about 6 cars a day that go down Fruit Place right now. If you're trying to tell me that if there were retail businesses in there, that will actually make their way around to park there, that that is not going to impact the traffic on a residential street, I think you're sadly mistaken. There will be more traffic and more noise and pollution with idling cars, etc. It would be even worse with a restaurant, which would bring people outdoors smoking, because you can't in restaurants. Sound carries from there up into our area. We hear people talking from there. It could attract rodents with a restaurant.
Richard Sandler: Same with a dumpster, which is situated next to our building. We have a deeded easement of 4 feet wide along this area. We have to maintain it. The dumpster plans show it will be placed on our 4 foot wide easement. Abutters will be asked to sign off on these plans. There is no way I will sign off on anything that takes my deeded rights away.
Scott Mandeville: Has your legal shared this with the applicant in this level of detail?
Richard Sandler: Not at this juncture, no, we have not. The last thing I want, too, is the smell of a dumpster that close to where I live and work.
Ellen Grossman, attorney for the Sandlers: This hearing tonight has brought up a couple other things that I noted. They showed a loading zone of 9 by 35 feet on this revised plan C5. We're wondering what that is going to do their rights to use the passage way. You'll note on the survey that clearly does say passageway SEE DEEDS. The passageway is in the Sandler's deed, and it goes all the way back in the chain of titles. The title to 77 Elm does make notice of the rights of others to make use of the passageway. As Mr. Sandler said, there is a 4 foot right of way in that courtyard area for the owner of 79 Elm Street to be able to maintain building. So if there are plantings and active use of the courtyard due to a restaurant that could interfere with their deeded four foot right of way. We also noted that in the Stantec report there seemed to be a presumption based on the applicant's original application that it was office use and some retail use proposed. Retail on first floor, offices on the second floor. There is no mention with regard to restaurant use. In reading through the Stantec memo and reading through the responses, it is replete with information having to do with office and retail. Whether that has to do with traffic concerns or parking concerns, the noise level, the traffic, all the different uses for such a building as a restaurant instead of offices, in my opinion, the response submitted on March 11 and again on March 17 to Stantec did not refer to restaurant use. That is what Stantec is reading, with nothing about restaurant use. If retail and/or restaurant use is allowed there, the main issue is parking. In the past, the Sandlers dealt with many parking issues, with people parking in their parking lot despite several NO PARKING signs posted, etc. That interferes with Mr. Sandler's business there, and there is also liability, in case anything happened to someone parked on his land, personally or to their car. So that needs to be taken seriously. It also appears from the March 11 correspondence from the H-W Group in response to the Stantec memo that there is an awful lot of variances and waivers being requested, saying well, it's an old mill site, mill development, and lots of requests speaking of waivers, etc. for low volume office spaces. Also on page five of this memo, there is nothing said about retail or restaurant use. Fruit Place

extension doesn't really exist. It's Fruit Place that comes down and goes to the end of the Sandler property, then goes down to Clark Street. I don't know how their traffic studies and plans will square with the loading area that is proposed as significant. Snow plowing is done by the city, but I don't know how that loading area is going to interfere with that, if at all. There is a waiver that is being requested as they stated in their March 11 correspondence, requesting a smaller loading zone, because of the uses being proposed. Well, if the uses being proposed is office, fine. If the uses are restaurant, it is not fine. Then elsewhere in that same letter they speak of "limited retail use." It was only in the March 10 correspondence, which was a traffic response, it was the only time that restaurant was mentioned in all their correspondences between Stantec and the petitioners. Stantec does mention in its initial letter on Feb. 5 and speak about " the Street that is known as Fruit Place Extension. A portion of the Fruit Place extension improvements to Clark Street are located upon an abutting lot, Map 40 Lot 268, which is the Sandler's property. It is unknown if the abutter has agreed to the proposed improvements on his property shown on the plans. We also have not been contacted about sitting down and going over. A lot of questions are posed by Stantec with regard to the passageway. Those have been ignored, with all the different plans that are being submitted to this board and elsewhere, because it is a passageway and is replete in the Sandler's deeds.

Lorri Krebs: I think it would be really helpful to the PLB if you could put all that in writing so we could review it. You have a lot of interesting points.

Scott Mandeville: Just to formalize your points and issues that you have.

Nick Cracknell: 3-4 quick points in response. From a communications standpoint, we are certainly willing to go over the details, now that the plan has been formalized and reviewed by Stantec twice. I've reached out to the abutters over the last couple of weeks, and he put me in touch with his attorney, but until we got this plan where it is tonight, it hasn't been clear where things like the dumpster were eventually going to be proposed to sit, where things stand re: the improvements on the corner of Fruit Place and Fruit Place extension, or the so called passageway. We need to know exactly what we're looking at before we frame how we are going to go forward together, and make this a success for Amesbury with both the Sandlers and my clients. The best news that I can convey to the Sandlers is that we are not proposing to put a restaurant in the ground floor of this building at this time. We pulled that from the application, it is in the memo that I drafted relating to the off street parking requirements dated Mar. 29, 2016. The concern we had which was telegraphed as early as Oct. with the PLB and the pre-application conference, because we don't have enough parking to deal with restaurant uses. We have repeatedly stood here and stated, so we would be so fortunate to find more parking, then we would modify this application and come back for restaurant use on the ground floor. And it wouldn't be the whole ground floor, just a portion of it. We did look at it in the traffic analysis, as you all know, but we determined earlier this year that it just wasn't going to work in the short term. Also, David (client) is working with the planning dept. to put together a three party TIF agreement next door, to have between 24 and 28 spaces created. That agreement should be consummated any time with the abutting party that would create dedicated parking for 77 Elm Street on that abutting property across the road. We ask only that this be considered, and if that parking is created, then my client may come back and seek to amend the plan to include a small restaurant. But that is not what is before us now and that parking does not yet exist. So we are dealing with two uses as presented earlier. All three floors as office is Option 1. We are proposing 24 spaces on site with the 5 behind the building and the 19 in the proposed parking lot. The gap between what we are required under zoning and what we are providing on site in those

two locations, we are proposing to meet in the public parking lot, using Section VIII.F of the zoning bylaw that allows use of public parking within 300 feet. If you look at the transportation center and the available parking there as a public parking lot, and you look at the overflow lot on lower Water Street, it is all interconnected. There are over 250 spaces in those three areas on Water Street, upper, lower, and transportation center. So we propose to use the public parking for those two scenarios, not for a restaurant but for an office or office on the top two floors and retail on the ground floor. In respect to the dumpster, I think we covered a little bit of this back in March.

The sensitivity was expressed by the abutter or board members about the dumpster location against the abutting property on the corner of Fruit Place and "Fruit Place extension. We're willing, if it is the right solution for everybody, to remove yet another parking space and put it in the parking lot being built on Fruit Place. As far as the easements, I don't think we've been aware of the 4 foot maintenance easement that suggested tonight along the side of the building. I'd like to suggest being someone very familiar with that space, but it is clear there is a lot going on between those two buildings, in that space, and a lot of them are not well maintained. There is drainage and water going everywhere from both buildings into the passageway directly into the river. I would like to think, if there is such an easement there and I have to believe it is true, that through relocation of the dumpster, I don't think there are any issues on our side in leaving the overhead utilities the way they are. I believe the pole is located on my client's property and not the abutter's. National Grid doesn't even have an easement for that pole on our property. I just think with the water coming out of your building and your downspouts spilling into my client's property, there is a way for these two folks to work together and come up with a really exciting space. Personally, I'd like to see someday the abutters have more windows back into that courtyard where they have been closed up over time. If we got together, I think we could write agreements to deal with your roof drains and have this work without scuttling the courtyard vision and all the improvements involved for that space. The way we have designed the improvements on the abutter's property, we are proposing nothing other than repaving and a slight regrading on that corner. So should we have an impasse, and we have rights to pass and repass, we have the ability to make minor modifications to this drawing and not touch their property in respect to the roadway, and still create the kind of space that you are seeing on that plan, for fire trucks, for public safety vehicles, etc. and improve the drainage for both facilities.

David Trenello, Lynnfield, MA. Attorney for David Martin: I thank my client for the opportunity to jump into this at this juncture to discuss the rights of the abutters and the deeds and public records going back on these properties in this area also contain a vehicle right of way, as it is adjacent to property zoned commercially. Right of way for vehicles and otherwise from Gales Court and from Elm Street to the granted premises of 79 Elm, over land formerly of Colchester Mills. Said right of way not to exceed 20 feet in width. Vehicles have been passing and repassing over the lands, their land and my client's land, dating back to the early nineteen hundreds, where the original grant of deed of grant in 1923. So while there is an easement to pass upon a portion of it, those easements are reciprocal, belonging to all abutters. Not only is our property burdened by, but also benefitted by those easements. That includes vehicular traffic. We're not proposing to increase vehicular traffic but proposing to work out a solution as our design team alluded to earlier to come to a compromise, so that what has been in use for that property and for that land can continue as it has since 1923. The public record is clear. We'll be happy to supply copies of those if PLB deems them necessary. Thank you.

David Frick: I think it might be good to have for the record, if you could send those in.

Karen Solstad: Regarding other people parking in your parking space, we can't as a PLB legislate that people read signs and act civilly. We hope they do, but we'd have no development anywhere in the downtown area if every property owner protested any type of development that a client of another property might park where they shouldn't be parking. I'm sympathetic to that, I won't say that we need to inhibit any development at 77 Elm because some past clients of 77 Elm have not been civil. I don't know how to handle it if you post no parking signs and they get ignored.

Camille Sandler: I agree with you on that point. But when something comes before the PLB and the requirements according to the town's laws require X amount of parking spaces, with the property to be able to do it, and this requires either a variance or some kind of permission to be able to proceed without what is stated as necessary. Then to disagree is ok. There was a retail establishment in the building, which was Mill 77. It is now on Route 110, and doing quite well. Yet when it was located at 77 Elm Street, the business failed. I asked him why? He said the nature of a retail patron is, they see it, they stop, they go in. It is not necessarily a destination. However, that being said, if you put in the address, the GPS goes a little crazy in our area because the bridge is blocked off, there is no R Street anymore. So they naturally end up parking anywhere. Because we have a precedent that one retail business failed there, and he also contracted with the gas station to be able to have X amount of parking spaces. He did that on his own. It was not the landlord who did it for them. Even with that parking, it didn't work, because people, if they parked in our lot and are asked to leave, it is a negative feeling and did the business no good. It is a dangerous curve to begin with. If we installed a gate, it would cause a danger to people making our deliveries in 18 wheelers, as well as danger to our employees coming in and out. Is there an easy solution? I don't know.

David Frick: So from your perspective, what would you propose should happen at 77 Elm Street?

Camille Sandler: We own a commercial building. We supply our own parking.

David Frick: Well, there has to be some give and take. I hope you will continue to work together with the petitioner.

Nick Cracknell: This project as proposed without the restaurant does meet the off street parking requirements. We're not seeking a variance for this project without the restaurant, we're not seeking a waiver for parking without the restaurant. One of the biggest differences between the flea market that was in the building a few years ago and today is that the flea market was on two floors, not just one floor. That's a big difference. It is doubling the retail space, and there was no transportation center with any public parking across the road…not that that would've solved all the problems, but it is certainly a significant difference from the current condition. We're obviously also going to be building an 18 or 19 space parking lot that was not there at the time the flea market was in that location. So I know you all know that, but it's important to know we are not looking for relief, we're meeting the zoning requirements, we're not seeking variances, etc. We need to work together, to respect each other's property rights. This is a substantial investment to move this old mill building forward. These two parties need to come together. If a fence is needed at some point, that is something you may need to consider, because you have a parking lot that may be inviting. We are willing to help our neighbor. It needs to be a mutual collaboration to handle the issues.

David Frick: Any comments from the board? Hearing none, what is the pleasure of the PLB?

Motion by Scott Mandeville to ask the two parties to meet, discuss their thoughts and concerns, and formalize both sides to create a letter to the boards so that we can have that on record to take under advisement, and continue this discussion to the next meeting of the PLB on April 25th, seconded by Lorri Krebs. AIF.

David Frick: We have no other formal business on the agenda. I did meet with Mr. Jain and Mr. Scott. What I was hoping to do away with these easel type things come up, we could project it, since all agenda items and information is now available online for all projects. Bill Scott wasn't excited about projecting, but preferred getting a 75 inch television that would be on some kind of a stand that can be rolled around so the board can see it, the developer could see it, and the audience could see it. It would be attached probably through WIFI to a PC that you could pull up and put all those up as we go through public hearings.

Motion by Scott Mandeville to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m., second by Lars Johannessen. AIF.

Transcription by Paul Bibaud