

**CITY OF LEWISTON  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MINUTES for December 14, 1999 - Page 1 of 10**

**I. ROLL CALL:**

This meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m. and chaired by Harry Milliken.

**Members In Attendance:** Rob Robbins, John Cole, Tom Peters, Harry Milliken, Mark Paradis, and Dennis Mason.

**Staff Present:** James Lysen, Planning Director; James Fortune, Planning Coordinator; Gil Arsenault, Deputy Development Director; David Hediger, Land Use Inspector, and Doreen Asselin, Administrative Assistant.

**Member Absent:** Lewis Zidle.

**II. CORRESPONDENCE:** The following correspondence were distributed at this meeting in regards to the Rezoning for the Coca-Cola Property at 1750 Lisbon Street, Lewiston: A. City of Lewiston Rezoning Plan; B. Rezoning Proposal; C. Petition for Conditional Rezoning; C. Quitclaim Deed with Covenant; D. Exhibit C, Existing Site Plan; E. Exhibit D, Proposed Building Floor Plan; and F. Exhibit E, Proposed Parking and Loading Plan.

The following motion was made.

**MOTION:** by **Tom Peters**, seconded by **Dennis Mason** to accept the above correspondence, as submitted, and place on file to be read at the appropriate time.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

After this motion, it was briefly mentioned that this item is to be scheduled for a Public Hearing at the next Planning Board Meeting to be held in January, which was later determined at this meeting to be Tuesday, January 11, 2000.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

A. *Amendments to the Zoning and Land Use Code Concerning Lot Layout and Configuration.*

**Jim Fortune** read the memorandum that he prepared and was dated December 7, 1999. After reading the memorandum, **Jim Fortune** then made copies of the Revised Proposed Ordinance Pertaining to Lot Layout and Configuration and distributed them to the Planning Board Members, since they were not included in the Planning Board packets.

The revisions to this ordinance were made as to the issues raised at the last two (2) Planning Board Meetings of November 9 and the 23, 1999. The revisions made at the November 9, 1999 Planning Board Meeting are included in the minutes for the November 23, 1999 Planning Board Meeting. There was only one (1) revision made at the November 23, 1999 Planning Board Meeting and that was made to Section 3. General Provisions, Sub-Paragraph (3), which was re-worded to state, as follows: *“For all proposed single-family and two-family lots the minimum lot width shall be **at least equal to** the minimum frontage requirement.”* Also stated in the memorandum was that Planning Board Staff Members will be updating the site plan review ordinance and design guidelines to include examples of “irregular-shaped” lots. **Jim Lysen** said that Site Design Guidelines are a tool of the Planning Board and that the examples will be put in that document along with the other examples that correspond to the code. The Planning Board has control over those documents. The City Council will receive this in January 2000 with the examples included

in their package. **Tom Peters** agreed that examples would make it easier for the City Council to understand. **Jim Lysen** said that we are trying to avoid having irregular-shaped lots. **Jim Lysen** then asked what is the use of showing an irregular-shaped lot that is not allowed in the code. What could be shown is what would be permitted, for example, what was proposed by Mrs. Bowie and what was allowed. This would define irregular-shaped lots and avoid getting in trouble with words. The Planning Board is trying to craft a code that would not let this occur. The Planning Board is now re-defining that code to establish a lot width requirement (a certain distance back the width should equal the lot frontage) in order to avoid irregular-shaped lots. If the code is working properly, there will not be irregular-shaped lots. Hopefully the new requirements will avoid the creation of irregular-shaped lots. The whole idea of the revisions to this ordinance is to eliminate or try to prevent irregular-shaped lots. **Jim Lysen** said that this could go to the City Council at their second meeting in January and that the examples will come back to the Planning Board on January 11, 2000. The January 2000 schedule will be addressed later on in this meeting. The Planning Board usually has an organizational meeting in January.

**Tom Peters** asked **Arthur Montana** if this would be helpful to him to show examples. **Art Montana** agreed that you do need some guidelines for irregular-shaped lots. There are some cases where you cannot get away from them. You have to make an exception for turn-around or a cul-de-sac. Some towns go to a diameter where you have to fit a 100 foot diameter circle in that lot equal to the required 100 feet of road frontage. The lot could be going a certain way, but it could be a lot wider. This is based on a certain amount of minimum lot frontage. So any point there you have a 100 foot buildable area. Your lines will then be so many feet apart, no matter how your lot is. Your lot is not always going to have right angles. This holds your frontage and your lines can be huge, but you are never going to have less than that on your frontage. In other words, **Harry Milliken** stated, that the diameter is based on minimum frontage for that zoning area. You need to maintain your minimum frontage on your setback line and half of your lot width to make this work. In some cases this would require more lot area, as stated by **Jim Lysen**. **Arthur Montana** said that the Town of Turner uses the diameter procedure. This procedure avoids a lot of doubt. **Tom Peters** said that he would like to obtain some examples. **John Cole** stated that if you create a lot, it should meet standards and he also agreed that examples should be included. **Harry Milliken** then said that this could be tabled until Staff comes back with some examples, particularly using the diameter method, or make amendments to this.

As mentioned by John Cole, under Section 3. General Provisions, Sub-Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be underlined, since these are considered new items under this section. The public portion of this meeting was closed and the following motion was made.

**MOTION:** by **Tom Peters**, seconded by **John Cole** to table these Amendments to the Zoning and Land Use Code Concerning Lot Layout and Configuration to the January 25, 2000 Planning Board Meeting; have the Planning Board Staff come back with either the same or revisions to the Ordinance with examples to be included as Exhibit A and the Planning Board's concepts of radius/circle, based on the frontage as Exhibit B to the Ordinance (no re-notice to the paper is necessary); and let the people know, in this profession, that there will be a continuation of this Public Hearing at the January 25, 2000 Planning Board Meeting, so that the public can come in and comment on this.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

After this motion, **Arthur Montana**, said that if **Jim Lysen** will give him some sort of a notification, he would then mail it out to other surveyors for their input. He said he has a chapter of those who would be interested. **Harry Milliken** said any input that they could make would be appreciated.

*Out of sequence on the Agenda, the following items were addressed.*

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. New Business:

2. *Review of a Proposal to Allow Self-Storage Facilities as a Conditional Use in the Highway Business (HB) District.*

**Jim Fortune** read the memorandum that he prepared and was dated December 7, 1999. **Gary Boilard** was present at this meeting. He was requesting a change to Article XI, Section 10 of the Lewiston Zoning and Land Use Code by amending (d) *conditional uses* in the Highway Business (HB) District. Gary Boilard is proposing to add self-storage facilities as a conditional use in this zoning district. Included in the Planning Board packets were a copy of the proposed amendment to Appendix A, Zoning and Land Use Code, Article XI, Section 10, Highway Business (HB) District and a petition signed by 15 Lewiston City residents. Currently there are only two (2) zoning districts where self-storage facilities are allowed and they are the Urban Enterprise (UE) and Office-Service (OS) Districts. This was brought to the Planning Board for review and to schedule this item for a Public Hearing.

**Gary Boilard** said that he has done a lot of research and that there is a need for this. He said that the occupancy rate is 90 percent in both Lewiston and Auburn. There is only a couple of areas where this is allowed. There is not a lot of land for development for this. He is looking at an area zoned UE past Old Chadbourne Road in Sabattus (near BJ's Dairy Treat). **Tom Peters** asked, "How would this impact other areas zoned HB?" **Jim Lysen** said that **Gary Boilard** is proposing this to be a conditional use. Most of these would be minor projects. **Jim Lysen** asked **Gary Boilard** how much square feet he was looking at? **Gary Boilard** responded with 26,000 square feet. **Jim Lysen** then said that this would require Planning Board review with a conditional use permit. **Jim Lysen** went on to say that a conditional use permit would allow **Gary Boilard** to create other conditions that would make it more suitable to specific locations. In some locations it would not be allowed. **Harry Milliken** said that his suggestion was to have the Planning Board schedule a Public Hearing on this and that Staff have a map ready to show different HB districts and how it would affect the City. There are some non-conforming self-storage facilities, i.e. the one (1) on Merrill Road and at Spare-Time Recreation, Inc. Most of these self-storage facilities are made up of inexpensive material. **Tom Peters** mentioned that Lewiston's main arteries are zoned HB. **Jim Lysen** responded that portions of the main arteries are. **Tom Peters** also said there may be other areas to be reconsidered to be changed to accommodate this. This will be reflected on the map provided at the Public Hearing. The following motion was made.

**MOTION:** by **John Cole**, seconded by **Rob Robbins** to schedule a Public Hearing and direct Staff to provide the requested information to be brought back to the January 11, 2000 Planning Board Meeting on the Proposal to Allow Self-Storage Facilities as a Conditional Use in the Highway Business (HB) District.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

*John Cole stepped down from the Planning Board stating this item to be a conflict.*

3. *Request for "Diminimus Change" approval for Harley-R-US, 839 Main Street and to sign the plans.*

**Jim Fortune** read the memorandum prepared by him and dated for December 7, 1999. In the memorandum he mentioned that this site plan was previously approved at the August 31, 1999 Planning Board Meeting. **George Schott** has recently submitted a revised plan showing a diminimus change to the original plan. The "as-built" plan includes a 350 foot small boiler room attached to the southwest side of the main building.

**Arthur Montana** showed a plan of the area with the minor change for the boiler room. The new 350 square foot boiler room is shown as attached to the southerly side of the building. There has been no building permit obtained for this to date. The out parcel on the property is owned by an abutter and is the only remaining house left between Schott's and Dube's. Outlined on the plan was the edge of the pavement at Alice's Attic, the edge of the pavement where the driveway is, and the pavement up to the house. Because it has not been a year, it is considered an impervious area that is grandfathered by matter-of-right. Public Works told **George Schott** that this could not be done without drainage calculations. **George Schott** then decided to pave just where the house was. The main reason now is to grandfather the impervious area, which can be done as a matter-of-right. The whole lot is gravel. **Arthur Montana** then showed a map of what it looks like now, as requested by **Dennis Mason**. In front of the side parking lot, **George Schott** is paving towards the street. **George Schott** wants to pave only the area where the house was. The garage still remains. **Mark Paradis** asked, "Is **George Schott** planning to keep the garage?" The response was, "Yes". **Tom Peters** asked if there would be any loss of green space and the response was "No". This is all common ownership, but separate lots of record. This is all owned by **George Schott**. **Harry Milliken** said that he is concerned that this whole project is going to be paved. It keeps coming before Planning Board for more paving. Is this a full-blown amendment or a diminimus change? **Dennis Mason** said that most of this is all paved now. **Art Montana** said that in his understanding, because it was impervious you can keep it impervious. **Gil Arsenault** said that Public Works has come up with an operating rule that they work by. Essentially if you do a demolition, they will credit you with whatever was impervious for up to a year. After that they do not give you any credit. **Jim Lysen** said this applies to drainage only. This still does not exempt any other process. **Gil Arsenault** then asked, "What level of review are we going to require?" At the minimum, it is going to be a diminimus change. The worst case would be that you have to go to the Planning

Board for a full blown amendment.

**Dennis Mason** then asked, "Is this new pavement going to meet the minimum front yard, which is 20 feet?" **Gil Arsenault** responded that the impervious can be grandfathered. There is no reduction in the front green space because there wasn't any replied **Dennis Mason**. **Tom Peters** said that this area needs more green space. **Harry Milliken** then asked the Planning Board if this should be considered a diminimus change and ask for a requirement of some green space in the front or have to come back with a full-blown review and show plans of where the green space will be? **Jim Lysen** said that **George Schott** would be better served with taking the credit for the impervious and putting it in and setting it in further back to the street and adding the green space or making it part of the parking lot that he could then use. Rather than grandfathering the footprint, the square footage in the non-revegetated area would be grandfathered.

**Art Montana** stated that Public Works had said if **George Schott** goes outside the footprint, then he is going to have to come up with a full-blown amendment. **George Schott** just wants to preserve the impervious. He does not want a full-blown amendment. **Arthur Montana** said he presumes that the Planning Board would like **George Schott** to get green space on setback and move the footprint back **Tom Peters** said that he is suggesting and is in agreement with **Jim Lysen** as to giving the credit for that amount and put it somewhere else. **Tom Peters** said that this item should be tabled. **Harry Milliken** asked, "If we grandfather this and give **George Schott** the credit, should there be a time-frame on this credit?" **Jim Lysen** said that the Planning Board needs to get Public Works to sign off on this. **George Schott** does not want to lose his pavement out there, if he doesn't have to. **Harry Milliken** said that something, in writing, is needed from Public Works on what those concerns are. This is the Planning Board's call. The following motion was then made.

**MOTION:** by **Tom Peters**, seconded by **Mark Paradis** that the Planning Board moves that the application for Harleys-R-US, 839 Main Street is determined to be a "Diminimus Change" and to table the boiler room issue until the first meeting in January, which is January 11, 2000, to finalize how to handle the impervious area and for the plan to come back as a full-blown application.

**VOTED:** 5-0-1 (Cole Abstained).

After this motion, **Arthur Montana** mentioned that he has an application from Bates College on Strawberry Avenue and would like to have this placed on the agenda for the next Planning Board Meeting. It was agreed that this will be placed on the January 11, 1999 Planning Board Agenda.

**Harry Milliken** then thanked **Arthur Montana** for the comments in the newspaper and also said that it had been a pleasure over the years doing business with him.

*John Cole remained stepped down from the Planning Board on this next item.*

**V. A PRESENTATION ON THE UPDATE OF THE BATES COLLEGE CAMPUS PLAN AND RELATED PROJECTS**

**Jim Lysen** read his memorandum dated December 10, 1999. This item was brought to the Planning Board concerning future development plans for Bates College. Both **Peter Fackler**, Vice President for Financial Affairs and Treasurer of Bates College and **Pat Murphy**, Director of Physical Plant of Bates College were present at this meeting. **Peter Fackler** provided the Planning Board with an overview of Bates College's current planning process, updating the 1992 Bates College Campus Plan. **Pat Murphy** made a presentation on the current projects underway and those that Bates College anticipates in the near future, including the tennis court relocation and the athletic field complex proposed near the corner of LaFayette and Russell Streets.

Distributed at this meeting was correspondence dated December 14, 1999 from **Pat Murphy** of Bates College. In the correspondence, she was requesting the re-zoning of three (3) properties located on LaFayette Street from the Neighborhood Conservation A (NCA) District to the Institutional Office (IO) District. Attached to this correspondence was a map of the existing and proposed re-zoning.

The first presentation was by **Peter Fackler**. **Peter Fackler** said that on behalf of Bates College, they would like to work together with the City of Lewiston on strategic planning efforts. **Peter Fackler** referred to the 1992 Bates College Campus Plan and mentioned that Bates College has done almost everything on the Campus Plan since 1992. He said that Bates College is now entering another major phase. Bates College's hired consultant is, "The Dover Firm". Some of the questions they will be responding to are: What does Bates College want to do? What kind of space do they have to work with? Dreams are to become a reality and then the result. Their consultant will come back with some rough cuts at their January 2000 Board Meeting. This will be the beginning of a new process. The aim is to get to the short development within the next five (5) years. They will not be coming back until Spring 2000 with the short-term plans. Some of the new, long-range, proposed projects include a new campus center, building renovations, a completed lab, library project, and maybe a new administrative building.

**Peter Fackler** went on to say that Bates College is a city campus, bounded by properties it does not own. He started his presentation with the development of Russell Street as a main thoroughfare. He said that Mount David is not a developable area. He questioned, "Where might the college grow?" He anticipates out to Sabattus Street and the downtown area. Most of Vale Street area is zoned Neighborhood Conservation A (NCA). He went on to say that Bates College may want to connect to the downtown area. Bates College wants to integrate with the City's downtown plan. Bates College wants to continue to develop efforts with the City and is relying on the City. **Peter Fackler** then extended an invitation to keep in touch and communicate with the Planning Board. In response to **Peter Fackler**'s presentation, **Tom Peters** said that he agrees that the Russell Street overpass will happen. He expressed concern that Bates College and the City do need to co-exist and grow together. He said there is a need for a forum in February or March 2000. Input and feedback is needed. **Tom Peters** said that **Congressman Baldacci** wants to be part of this process. Bates College needs to coordinate and interface with the City. In March or April 2000 Bates College should come forward with a conceptual plan. The Planning Board will get back to Bates College. This is a community event.

Next, **Pat Murphy**, the Director of Physical Plant, did her presentation. Her presentation was based on the specifics of what Bates College is doing. She mentioned the following four (4) projects.

1. 129 Russell Street - Tennis Courts. This project is classified as a Non-Intensification project. The completion date is scheduled for June 2000. Bates College is working with the Public Works Department on the increase in impervious surface. The original tennis courts (eight) will be going back to grassed areas. **Paul LaRochelle** is doing the drainage calculations for the Public Works Department.
  
2. 147 Russell Street - New Athletic Fields (Track, Softball Field, and Multi-Purpose Fields). This field will be a soccer-size field. The football area will remain where it is. Moving the football field is not in their short-range plan. **Pat Murphy** used an overlay on the plan of the proposed track, softball, and multi-purpose field to see what the area will look like when completed. This will need further review. This project is classified as an Intensification project. There were several options to develop. They have gone back to the first plan. The softball field will be completed in this summer/fall (this is currently the women's soccer field area). They are proposing to have the track completed by the year 2001.

**Tom Peters** expressed his concern as to where the parking will go. The new athletic fields will border onto residential areas. **Tom Peters** said the nose-in parking along Central Avenue does not accommodate the City or Bates College. **Pat Murphy** said that the Central Avenue parking is quite restricted because of the trees. She also said that **Chris Branch** of the Public Works Department is opposed to nose-in parking. **Pat Murphy** said that the nose-in parking is a result of nobody saying no to it and that it is convenient. She also said that there is ample parking available at Merrill. The parking in this area is worse this year than ever.

The next item **Pat Murphy** discussed was, as follows:

- C. 220 College Street - Change of Use. This area is zoned Institutional Office (IO). There is a five- (5-) unit apartment building owned by Bates College at this location. Bates College is proposing to put in offices here. This will need review (residential to mixed use).
  
- D. Strawberry Avenue - Stockpile and Outside Storage. Bates College would like to develop this area for storage. This is mostly shoreland zoning. Bates College would like to use this for storage of items such as, pipe, concrete curbing, etc. This is still in the process of review. Also looking to locate in this area is Tri-County Mental Health (major, large project) and the veterinary hospital (minor project). The current transportation can handle this flow, but there may be other options. There are also issues relating to Tall Pines.

After this presentation **David Hediger** asked about the issue relating to radioactive material. **Pat Murphy** responded that this was a very minor thing. She said that Woodard & Curran was working on this and everything has been removed.

**Pat Murphy** referenced the correspondence dated December 14, 1999, which was distributed at this meeting on the request to change zoning for three (3) properties along LaFayette Street. The new athletic fields would affect this area. Currently, the three (3) properties are a storage area, a multi-family, and a single-family. Bates College would like

to have this area rezoned. The Planning Board can initiate on Bates College's behalf. **Pat Murphy** is suggesting that the Planning Board look at the one (1) piece (three properties mentioned above) to get this project going. **Tom Peters** suggested that the Planning Board look at changing the zone. He said that this would be the appropriate thing to do. **Tom Peters** asked, "When do you need rezoning on the three (3) properties?" **Pat Murphy** responded that Bates College wants to break ground in late summer in order to be completed by 2001. This is a site-specific issue. If everything is looked at as a whole, **Pat Murphy** said she would be concerned with Bates College's time schedule. Bates College should initiate the petition on these three (3) properties and bring back to the Planning Board. These three (3) properties are already owned by Bates College. This would be rezoning by default. The following motion was made.

**MOTION:** by **Dennis Mason**, seconded by **Tom Peters** that the Planning Board initiate rezoning the west side of LaFayette Street and bring the proposal to the Planning Board for review on January 11, 2000 to be scheduled for a Public Hearing.

**VOTED:** 5-0-1 (Cole Abstained).

*John Cole rejoined the Planning Board.*

### **III. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

#### B. *Amendment to the Zoning and Land Use Code Concerning Signage.*

This item was presented by both **David Hediger**, Land Use Inspector, and **Gil Arsenault**, Deputy Development Director. **Harry Milliken** waived reading of the amendment and highlighted the changes from the last meeting. Most of the changes are housekeeping changes.

In reference to both Page Nos. 4 and 5, **Harry Milliken** questioned the change in permanent ground signs from extending higher than 20 feet, with the change being made to 25 feet above grade. The response was that these signs are a big ticket financial item to businesses. Mobile signs need to be enforced.

On Page No. 7, Item No. (vi) was added, which states: "Single parcels developed with multiple uses where there are separate principle vehicular entrances for the uses, concurrently visible ground signs not to exceed 40 square feet may be placed at such entrances to direct traffic to specific uses. No more than one (1) freestanding ground sign is allowed at an entrance." This could pertain to the sign at Spare-Time Recreation, Inc. and is a housekeeping issue.

**Tom Peters** suggested a time limit on permits for signs. He also questioned, "Should we permit certain kinds of signs?" **Gil Arsenault** responded that signs are tough to regulate. He also said that Lewiston does not have the sign clutter that some towns have. People complain mostly on signs - it determines their business. This item was turned to the public for comment. Since there was no public available, this item was then turned back to the Planning Board for the following motion.



**MOTION:** by **Tom Peters**, seconded by **Dennis Mason** that the Planning Board sends a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the amendments to the Zoning and Land Use Code Concerning Signage, as proposed.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

**IV. OTHER BUSINESS:**

A. New Business:

1. *Review of a Proposal on a Petition Submitted to Rezone the Coca-Cola Property at 1750 Lisbon Street from the Industrial (“I”) District to the Highway Business (“HB”) District and Possible Scheduling of a Public Hearing.*

**MOTION:** By **Dennis Mason**, seconded by **Rob Robbins** that the Planning Board moves to schedule the rezoning for the Coca-Cola property at 1750 Lisbon Street, Lewiston for a Public Hearing on Tuesday, January 11, 2000.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

4. *Scheduling of January 2000 Planning Board Meetings - The following is the Planning Board Schedule for January 2000:*
  - a. Tuesday, January 11, 2000, and
  - b. Tuesday, January 25, 2000.

**VII. READING OF THE MINUTES:**

*Draft Minutes of Planning Board Meeting Held on November 23, 1999.*

The following are changes to be made to the above minutes before they are placed on file.

**Dennis Mason** said he hopes that some of the Planning Board Members had read the section on LePage Bakeries. He said that his concern was in regards to some of the language or some of the personal comments.

**Rob Robbins** noted on Page No. 9, Reading of the Minutes, that the vote should read 4-0-2, since there were only six (6) members present.

On Page No. 2, delete the sentence, “**Harry Milliken** questioned the December 14, 1999 meeting.” The sentence, which reads, “**Jim Andrews** clarified that at the December 14, 1999 Planning Board meeting, it is recommended that this go forward to the City Council and that they adopt this so that it can be forwarded with the process to send out the application” should be reworded to read, as follows: “After being heard by the Planning Board at this meeting, **Jim Andrews** said that it is recommended that the Program Participation Plan go forward to the City Council at their December 14, 1999 meeting and that they adopt this plan so that it can be forwarded with the process to send out the application.”

**MOTION:** by **Dennis Mason** seconded by **Mark Paradis** to accept the Planning Board Minutes of November 23, 1999, as amended, and place them on file.

**VOTED:** 5-0-1 (Cole).

After this motion was made, **Harry Milliken** requested that if his Planning Board notebook was found, he would like it returned to his address and also that he would like to have a copy of the VCR tape from the previous meeting held on November 23, 1999.

**Tom Peters** mentioned that **Bill Johnson** has extended an invitation to the Planning Board Members and Staff to view his new building. He is very thankful for the Board's help in passing this project. **Jim Lysen** suggested going on this tour before starting the meeting scheduled for Tuesday, February 22, 2000.

**B. Old Business:**

3. No Name Pond Watershed Plan Update: Received good news from the DEP on the recent bond issue, which passed. The community septic system will most likely be funded and will take care of eleven (11) homes.
5. Comprehensive Plan Update: **Jim Lysen** said that he was meeting with the State Planning Office people tomorrow, December 15, 1999, to get the plan in compliance with some fine-tuning; to discuss the Downtown Master Plan that was just adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan; and to pursue some grant money for implementation.
8. Traffic Management Standards: The Planning Board will be getting the presentation from Public Works - **Chris Branch** and **Gregory Mitchell** concerning the overpass. **Councilor Carignan** has requested the Planning Board Staff to prepare a transportation map of everything from bicycle pedestrian trails to turnpike exits. This will all be included on one (1) map (schematic) to make people aware of transportation issues in the community.

**VI. EXECUTIVE SESSION:**

The following motion was made to adjourn and go into Executive Session.

**MOTION:** by **Dennis Mason**, seconded by **John Cole** to adjourn this meeting at 10:00 p.m. for the Planning Board Staff and Members to discuss acquisition/disposition of City-owned land and to discuss potential negotiations.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

After the Executive Session, **Tom Peters** stated that he would be looking at Harry Milliken's draft change to the City's acquisition/disposition process.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT:**

The following motion was made to adjourn.

**MOTION:** by **Dennis Mason**, seconded by **Tom Peters** to adjourn this meeting at 10:55 p.m.

**VOTED:** 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Mason, Secretary

DMA:dma\C:\MyDocuments\Planbrd\Minutes\PB12-14-99MIN.wpd

