

**CITY OF LEWISTON
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES for March 17, 2003 - Page 1 of 7**

I. ROLL CALL: This meeting was held in the City Council Chambers, was called to order at 7:02 p.m., and was chaired by John Cole.

- **Members in Attendance:** John Cole, Rob Robbins, Robert Connors, Jeffrey Gosselin, Lucy Bisson, John Racine, and Tom Truchon.

- **Members Absent:** Roger Lachapelle and William Horn.

- **Staff Present:** Gil Arsenault, Deputy Development Director; James Lysen, Planning Director; and Doreen Christ, Administrative Secretary - Planning Division.

- **Student Members Absent:** Wade Morgan and Ethan Chittim.

II. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA: None.

III. CORRESPONDENCE: None.

IV. FINAL HEARING: *Application for re-approval of the Darcy Drive Subdivision off Grove Street near Gina and Mark Streets in Lewiston.* Both *Robert Gagnon* of A.R.C.C. Land Surveyors, Inc. and *Bill Turner* of Maine Source were present at this meeting.

At the last Planning Board Meeting held on March 3, 2003 this application had been determined to be complete and that it be scheduled for a final approval at this meeting.

James Lysen stated that two (2) things have changed since the last meeting. 1. The Conditional Agreement has been revised to create a model of this type of Conditional Agreement, which basically says that all public improvements need to be completed, approved, and accepted by the City before lots can be sold. This type of agreement is a form of a performance guarantee and is Note #19 on the plan. 2. In regards to the issue raised by Public Works in regards to the looping. James Lysen said that a compromise has been reached. Once Phase IV commences the City would then require the looping of the watermain from about 550 feet all the way over to Mark Street. The requirement for the looping of the watermain has been placed as Note #20 on the plan.

Bill Turner said that this project has been phased for economic reasons. There is a two-(2-) year period between the phasing. The completion date for this whole subdivision is 2011. Phase I is already complete. John Cole said that his understanding is that from the date of approval to a date two (2) years from now in 2005, Phase II would be complete, therefore, the completion dates, for each phase, would be as follows: Phase II - 2005; Phase III - 2007; Phase IV - 2009; and Phase V - 2011. There will be eight (8) years between Phase II and Phase V. John Cole stated that he did not see anywhere on the face of the plan or in the application a fixed date of completion. John Cole suggested that the language in Note #19 be changed. Currently it reads, "All such improvements of this subdivision shall be completed from the effective date for each Phase with the exception of the watermain on Note #20, as recorded on the plans for a total of eight (8) years to complete Phases II-V. John Cole said that he would like to have shown on the plan, a date by which each of the phases are supposed to be completed so that it is clear and that way the particular benchmarks would be known. If none of them are completed in a timely fashion, than they would have to come back to the Planning Board for approval. Bill Turner stated that he did not have a problem with adding a particular date. John Cole said to Bill Turner that hopefully everything would go ahead as planned, that this project would roll right along, and that it is not known if a bump may occur along the way. John Cole said that he feels that it is important to state what the distinct date is and to be place it on the plan as to when the phases are to be complete. The effective date shall be completed two (2) years for each phase from the effective date of approval for that date of the plan, i.e. Phase II would be completed on 03/17/03. It is very important to state the dates of the phases on the plan. These five (5) phases were shown in colors on the Plan presented to the Planning Board.

Bill Turner said that his assumption is that its approved so long as you meet the deadline for each phase without extensions. He also stated that everything has been resolved with the Public Works Department in regards to the water.

John Cole stated that the correct language shall read, "That all such improvements shall be completed within two (2) years from the effective date of March 17, 2003".

This item was opened to the public for comments.

Kevin LaPlante (55 Mark Street) stated that he was concerned with the brook that runs through the property at Lot Nos 16 and 17 that feeds into a pond. The runoff will go to a detention pond which will dump into the pond that is already there that has fish in it. He said he is concerned if all that runoff water will affect the wildlife in the pond so that area children cannot fish there? James Lysen said that this design is very similar to what was previously approved back in 1994. James Lysen stated that he does not know if any environmental conditions have changed since the last approval. He feels that the system, the catch basin, and curbing will handle some quantity flow issues. This is not a project the size that would require looking at quality issues. Stormwater runoff picks up phosphorus, etc. Bob Gagnon stated that sedimentation settles in the detention pond and then it drains into a central body of water. This is what is

supposed to be happening. James Lysen said that if this was a fishery, this is something that could be problematic. As long as the criteria in the ordinance is satisfied, there is not much authority for the Planning Board concerning this issue.

John Cole stated that he does not feel that the Planning Board has the authority to deal with concerns with wildlife. This is not the Planning Board's jurisdiction. Kevin LaPlante would like this preserved for the kids of the next generation. James Lysen said that stormwater management system needs to be maintained properly.

James Morin, who resides at the corner of Mark and Gina Streets, said that he has lived there since 1973. He stated that reconstruction has been done in the past on the retaining wall or dam. This was redesigned and does not hold as much water. He said whoever put the fish in there did it without authority or approval. This is a nice site. Children ice skate on it. He then asked where would the detention pond be located. James Lysen then showed him on the plan. When this project starts up, the detention pond will be installed.

Kevin LaPlante asked who has proceeded to put a road through there - the trees are cut down and leveled without an approval? Bob Gagnon of A.R.C.C. Land Surveyors said he cut this area to locate all traverse points and base lines to lay out the road.

The public portion was closed and turned back to the Planning Board for deliberation.

John Racine questioned the detention pond. He asked, "How close to a body of water?" James Lysen said it is designed to not exceed the flow that currently is coming from the existing site.

Rob Robbins asked James Lysen about the Conditional Agreements and the Performance Guarantee. Rob Robbins asked, if the City of Lewiston has ever procured or written an Agreement with the Developer, it has always been reflected as a note of Agreement on the plan. James Lysen responded with yes. Is that the practice of other larger Maine municipalities. James Lysen responded again with yes. James Lysen said that this is a form of a guarantee that is required to be placed on the plan and that document goes to the recording office. Rob Robbins said that there could always be a form of agreement that would also be recorded with the registry of deeds as well. He said he just wondered what other cities were doing. James Lysen stated that the safest place is to put it on the plans.

John Cole said that this is a form of agreement that, in most cases, will not be performed in one (1) year and that would require a Statute of Limitations Clause signed by the party who would be responsible for implementing the agreement. John Cole said that it might not be a bad idea to develop a boiler plate agreement that could be referenced by book and page number when the plan is recorded and reference on the plan to contain that signature on the binding part. Rob Robbins stated that the City of Portland requires a Performance Guarantee. Rob Robbins asked if the reason we are going with a Conditional Agreement as opposed to a Performance Guarantee is to streamline the development process? James Lysen responded that this has been an option since 1988. A letter of credit costs money. The other option that a developer has instead of a letter of credit is to say that they are not going to sell lots until the road has been constructed or completed. John Cole said that the ordinance says the Conditional Agreement shall be endorsed by the Planning Board on the Plan. John Cole said that with the point that Rob Robbins raises, these may not be enforceable after one (1) year. The City could say no approval and at the same time there may be a contractual issue that the City could be exposed to. John Cole said that it might not be a bad idea to start doing agreements that go as a collateral piece of these. Bill Turner stated that the developer has to obtain a building permit and without a building permit you cannot do anything.

Jeffrey Gosselin arrived at 7:31 p.m. and remained stepped down from the Planning Board on this item due to a conflict.

Lucy Bisson mentioned getting an opinion from the City Attorney. James Lysen mentioned that he could speak to Richard Flewelling of the MMA to get his opinion. James Lysen stated that in this case, you have a surveyors signature on it. There are plans in the recorders office that says you cannot sell lots or get building permits before it is completed and accepted. There is complete control, based upon the plans. If the developer was to do something, it would be in violation of the Zoning and Land Use Code, which would be subject to a fine. Everything is on the plan and it is pretty clear.

John Cole said that the City's ordinances and requirements of the approval letter indeed strap any agreement beyond that period of one (1) year period that might otherwise be involved. Not every agreement is going to be like this one. John Cole said that it might be worthwhile to just adopt a boiler plate kind of performance agreement. James Lysen said that he would look into that. There, being no further discussion, the following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Lucy Bisson**, seconded by **Rob Robbins** that the Planning Board finds that the application for re-approval of the Darcy Drive Subdivision off Grove Street near Gina and Mark Streets meets all the application approval criteria under Article XIII, Sections 4 and 5 and grants final approval, subject to making specific requirements of specific dates on the phasing.

VOTED: 6-0-1 (Jeffrey Gosselin Abstained).

Jeffrey Gosselin joined the Planning Board on the remainder of the agenda items.

V. CONTINUED DISCUSSIONS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED RESTRUCTURING PLAN:

This item was discussed at the last Planning Board Meeting held on March 3, 2003 for its impact on the Planning functions of the City. At that time, John Cole stated that he had asked James Lysen to give the Planning Board his views and input on what the impact of the restructuring would be and to provide the Planning Board with a written report. Enclosed in the Planning Board packets were an organizational chart showing a proposed restructuring alternative and a narrative entitled, "Objectives Met by Development Department Restructuring Alternative". At the March 3, 2003 Planning Board Meeting, both City Administrator James Bennett and members of the Historic Preservation Review Board (H.P.R.B.) were present. The issue was focused away from individuals, but focused on where Planning should be in the hierarchy within the City. Mr. Cole said that this provides a kind of tension between a number of worthy objectives in the City in creating a kind of check-and-balances that are balanced of all of those and how it is necessary. The challenge was to create a structure to keep that kind of balance, but to also meet a number of the other objectives that James Bennett has, i.e. reduction in cost and budget.

James Lysen stated the alternative proposal saves about \$100,000, as opposed to James Bennett's plan of \$115,000 for the Development Department. Another objective was the creation of more departments - shorter and wider. James Lysen stated that his structure is pretty much parallel to the existing structure that has been around in the City for 20 years. James Lysen said that the alternative structure makes sense and accomplishes a lot of the savings. There are some linkages that are still important. Even though Gregory Mitchell would be an Assistant City Administrator. He will also still be in charge of economic development and there is going to be a direct relationship with him and Lincoln Jeffers regardless of where Lincoln Jeffers ends up. James Lysen said that both Lincoln Jeffers and himself are co-responsible on a number of initiatives. He said the natural place for Lincoln Jeffers to be is in Planning. He attends the Planning Board meetings and voices the economic development point. Community Development is a program which is funded from the Community Development Block Grant program funds. All the people in that department are funded out of that program. By keeping Planning with a certain level of the hierarchy, Planning is able to give a high level of service to the following boards: 1. Planning Board, 2. Historic Preservation Review Board, 3. Downtown Advisory Board, and 4. the Staff Review Committee. The Planning component needs to be of a high, professional standard so that we can continue to do expanded review authority, site location law, stormwater management law, traffic management law, etc. Other people in this alternative structure includes Planning Assistant/GIS Analyst Peter Parker. Peter Parker does, besides mapping, analysis work, supplies graphic needs, and answers planning questions for the public. James Lysen said that his alternative proposal keeps Peter Parker in planning as a support person. James Lysen stated that we need people to respond to the public. David Hediger is currently in Code Enforcement as the Land Use Inspector. His position is unique. A lot of municipalities do not have this type of position. He makes sure projects go right after the approval process and deals with environmental issues, such as stormwater management, timber processing, etc. James Lysen stated that the mission is to support one another and within this department, there are a lot of collaborative efforts. He said that Planning does a lot more than development review. There are a lot of needs out there that Planning needs to met. The proposed City Planner position will be placed under Code Enforcement. The Planning Board are the keepers of the Comprehensive Plan. Currently, the City is due for an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

James Lysen stated that the streamlining has been tabled again until the City Council Meeting on April 1, 2003. With the streamlining process, projects regardless of size will require only one (1) meeting. James Lysen said that there are a lot of important decisions right from the start and a lot of the decisions will be left up to the Planning Director. The streamlining process needs to be monitored to make sure it is working properly.

James Lysen stated that there has never been a development review decision overturned by a court of law. The Code is a very important document. The legal framework will be tightened up with both Attorney's Rob Robbins and John Cole on the Planning Board. James Lysen stated that his planning expertise saves a lot of money for legal fees.

James Lysen stated that there is only a \$15,000 difference in the budget. He does not feel that this is much of a budgetary issue with the alternative restructuring. He stated that this proposed structure is worthy of consideration by the City Council as well as James Bennett. At the March 25, 2003 City Council Meeting, the budget will be presented. This needs to be presented before any action is to be taken on James Bennett's restructuring proposal.

James Lysen referenced the position recently advertised for a couple of weeks ago, entitled, "City Planner". He said that basically the qualifications call for a four- (4-) year degree with planning and related courses. The salary depends on qualifications. James Lysen said that the City Council should hear some alternatives before a process is put into place.

Mr. Lysen thanked John Cole for helping him prepare the alternative. He concluded by saying that there is a need to keep Planning as a functioning and valuable department to the City.

John Cole then opened this item up to the Board for discussion.

Robert Connors asked, "Where does this save \$100,000. James Lysen responded that with the Planning Coordinator's position being vacated and not refilled and the elimination of an Administrative Assistant position, this alternative restructuring plan would save \$100,000, with 90 percent of what James Bennett is proposing to save. James Lysen's main concern is to not hire an entry level planner. He feels that James Bennett will eventually need to upgrade

this position (City Planner). James Lysen stated that there is a direct linkage between what Lincoln Jeffers and Gregory Mitchell do. With James Bennett's plan, Gregory Mitchell would report directly to the City Administrator.

Jeffrey Gosselin stated that what James Lysen provides the Planning Board is both very helpful and he clarifies complex issues. Jeffrey Gosselin said that restructuring is not uncommon in the corporate world. Jeffrey Gosselin stated that when you downsize, you try to keep consistency. Jeffrey Gosselin suggested that the Planning Board send a letter to the City Council with a recommendation that this be considered to retain James Lysen and not fill the recently advertised City Planner position. As far as the alternative restructuring proposal, Jeffrey Gosselin does not feel that the Planning Board can provide that level of detail. He then said that the question should be asked as to what is the best way to do planning and development? He stated that \$15,000 will not replace James Lysen's 15-16 years of experience and variety of engineering background that he has. In other words, Jeffrey Gosselin stated that he does not want to start out fresh. The Planning Director's position needs to be preserved and protected.

John Cole stated that this proposal has all the elements of the present economic development staff. John Cole said that the only concern that he has is that if the Planning function is going to be appropriately addressed, preserved, and protected in a form of restructure. John Cole then asked Gil Arsenault, "Does this fit together well?" Gil Arsenault responded that when he first saw the restructuring alternative he was shocked. Gil Arsenault said that whatever model that is used, as far as the Planning Board is concerned, he feels there would not be much of a difference. The support is needed for the Planning Board. Gil Arsenault stated that he does have some reservations with respect to James Lysen's plan. There are competing forces out there. Gil Arsenault said that he does not think that this is going to short-change the Planning Board as far as getting the information that is needed. Planning is not a department, it is a division. Gil Arsenault said that he does not buy into the streamlining argument. There is not much of a change in his perspective. Streamlining occurs with less staff. He stated that if i.e. James Lysen left, he would hope the Planning Board will not lose their expanded review authority. Gil Arsenault stated that he feels that Lincoln Jeffers' position is not aligned that well with planning. Lincoln Jeffers is better off in community development. The land use inspection officer (David Hediger) is an important position in code enforcement. As with the Planning Assistant/GIS Analyst, Gil Arsenault said that he totally agrees with James Lysen that there would be a net loss in losing that position to MIS. There is no capacity to fill that position with anybody else. Mapping is needed and so is land use expertise. This would all be lost. Grant writing is a valid concern. Gil Arsenault stated that we do have a grant writer on board, however, this person could be better utilized. Another option would be, you could have another department within the City comprising of the Planning Director, a Planning Assistant, and Administrative Support Staff. Overall, Gil Arsenault stated that he is not convinced that James Lysen's alternative plan is better than James Bennett's. Gil Arsenault's major concern is to retain James Lysen as an employee. There is a tremendous value there. It would be hard to make that up.

Again, Jeffrey Gosselin said he does not feel it is the Planning Board's role to try to come up with an alternative. He said his biggest concern is having or not having James Lysen. There is a tremendous value in retaining him which goes over and above \$15,000. Jeffrey Gosselin would like to keep James Lysen in doing what he does with the Planning Board.

Lucy Bisson said that she agrees with Jeffrey Gosselin. She stated that the Planning Board would like to keep as much of the high level of expertise that they have with James Lysen and to keep him on board if possible. She also does not think it is the Planning Board's place to give the City Council specifics on how this should be accomplished.

John Cole said that there are a lot of people in places that could be reshuffled a bit one way or another. John Cole stated that the Planning Board is used to operating with a Planning Director and a level of planning expertise that has served the Planning Board well for a long period of time. That function is one that the Planning Board feels should be retained by the City and the reduction in costs to that function is vastly outweighed by the benefits that someone like James Lysen brings and provides to the Planning Board on an on-going basis.

Jeffrey Gosselin stated that that expertise not only is just general overall planning knowledge, it is general knowledge of planning to the City of Lewiston and being involved with the Comprehensive Plan.

Rob Robbins said that institutional memory is a wonderful thing. It is an amazing thing that allows the City to separate out what is going and not going to work and cruise forward. He also said that planning is an extremely important component, not only as it relates to the Monday Planning Board Meetings, but also in charting the course of the City in connection with economic development in the City. Rob Robbins said that he feels it should be empathized on how important planning is. Planning has a very substantial role in what the City does. As land becomes scarce, development becomes more difficult. The balancing act that has to go on becomes even more difficult. Planning is absolutely essential to that process.

This item was then opened to the public for input.

Natalyn Dunlap stated that she has lived in Lewiston for 56 years. She said she has been deeply involved in community activities. Lewiston grew by pressures from developers. She admits she has a bias to Planning. If you have a City that is lacking expert Planning, your undermining the very efforts you are trying to do in development. She said she feels very strongly that it is important for the Planning Board and other outspoken citizens to speak up and defend the position and role of Planning in this community. Planning is crucial. In closing, she said she sees Planning as an important ingredient in the entire City.

Steven Myers (Platz Associates) said that he is a planner by education and was the Community Development Director in the past for the City of Lewiston. He believes in neighborhood, city, and comprehensive planning as a basis of good growth. Planning is a good practice. The people within the structure are important. Institutional memory is very important. If you lose a position that is already filled and bring in somebody new, you are starting all over again, and there will be a learning curve that is going to affect the Planning Board and those who are bringing projects here. This will make it a lot more difficult. He said he hopes that whatever is done, does not jeopardize the local review authority. Steve Myers advice to the board was, "If you've got good people, don't lose them, and don't make it more difficult!"

John Cole stated that the Planning Board is charged with the enforcing the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is something to keep your eyes on. There has been 5-6 years since a major amendment has been made to this plan. This will need to be looked at again. This will put a lot more pressure on everybody in doing a lot more. This will be a lot busier place for the people who are employed. With the scarcity of land, is this a healthy function? He then asked Gil Arsenault, "As a result of this, are we stretching this too thin?" Gil Arsenault said that he needs David Hediger in code enforcement. He has only one building code inspector and plumbing inspector. He stated he has no backup. His department is very skinny. In the past Planning has had a several people. With the proposed restructuring, there would be backup to code enforcement.

Jeffrey Gosselin said that the additional \$15,000 can be justified.

John Cole then said to the Board. It takes a couple of years to get somebody trained. He then asked, "Does the Board want to present an alternative to the City Administrator and City Council or focus the need for a senior planner?"

Tom Truchon responded that he wants to focus on a senior planner position. The structure could still be sent to the City Council.

Gil Arsenault said that he does not see the linkage with four (4) people under the Planning Director.

Jeffrey Gosselin said that first and foremost he wants a senior level planner. He then said that the Planning Board has a person now who can more than do that job. He has 15 years experience with institutional memory and planning. The only difference is about \$15,000. This is peanuts in relation to what the Planning Board will get. James Lysen said that Lincoln Jeffers could be moved anywhere. He said that there is a need to keep a Planning presence. Functionally, a lot of people will not move. James Lysen said that people do matter and that he needs a staff.

Rob Robbins commented that a specific structure does not need to be sent. Rob Robbins said he feels that the importance of planning should be stressed in relation to development, general planning, long-term, etc. John Cole said that James Lysen's alternative restructuring plan does point out that there is an extreme set of functions within this whole side of the City government. Code Enforcement is very different from Planning, and Planning and Code Enforcement are very different from Economic and Community Development. They all sort fit together, but are not the same and they do have different functions. A lot of the team players have done some of these things. There are linkages between the different departments and division. This should be continued on, because this is how we operate. You cannot subordinate planning if you are going to have effective planning. James Lysen said that he is paid to do bigger and better things and that the structure acknowledges that Comprehensive Planning, community planning and projects, etc. needs to be there. The Development Department will be down three (3) people.

It is hard to fit into the structure where the level of importance needs to be put. James Lysen stated that most communities have a Planning Department. There is a need to do planning that is necessary. Gil Arsenault stated that the City of Auburn's structure is very similar to what James Bennett is proposing and that different communities do things very differently.

John Cole stated that the whole Development Department will be under the direction of an Assistant City Administrator (Gregory Mitchell). John Cole reiterated that James Lysen's alternative plan suggests that Code Enforcement has a function, Planning has a function, and Community and Economic Development are co-equal functions and should remain co-equal functions in the operation of this side of City government.

James Lysen stated that he needs a staff. The City should have a senior level planner with significant expertise and a staff to support the planner.

Robert Connors said that he does not feel that he has enough specific information about the functions of each of these people to put this forward. He also said he does not think it is unfair for the Planning Board to say that the City should have a senior planning person who has significant knowledge of the City and has significant planning experience. He said he does not feel the Planning Board can deal with the interim structure of these departments. He also feels that there should be more input than just James Bennett's or somebody else.

John Cole said that there are some threshold principles, which are: 1. Do we feel the need for a Senior Planner of James Lysen's expertise and historical and institutional knowledge to perform the Planning functions for the City of Lewiston? 2. The planning function needs to be appropriately supported from within the appropriate branches of City government. 3. The structure is one that can be proposed as one that ought to be set up in such a way to assure the co-equal nature of Planning with Code Enforcement and with Community and Economic Development. John Cole then asked the Board if this was a fair assessment and if the Board perceived this to be another imperative. If this is the case, this is an alternative, James Bennett's is an alternative, and that there are all sorts of different alternatives that might be

formulated. He then referenced Robert Connors thoughts on how City government works. John Cole said he does not feel comfortable substituting his knowledge of the ways things work. If these are the basic operating principals, ought the Planning Board views be communicated to the City Council. Jeffrey Gosselin responded with, "Yes, with the addition about the dollar value". He said that you cannot exclude the fact of differences in what we are saying and what is proposed - \$15,000. There is perceived value for what we are getting for that amount of money.

James Lysen said that part of his structure is to be consistent with his goals and objectives of the plan. He said that James Bennett will not accept the Planning Director to not function as a manager and be paid for that.

John Cole said that James Lysen's level of expertise needs to be preserved. Function and structure may come later. This is one of many ways of how it should be. John Cole said that it is not harmful to put out other alternatives. This is going more to the City Administrator than the City Council. These are just thoughts and suggestions and it is left up to the City Councilors to make the appropriate judgements in the end. Managers are not just looked at for accounting, salary, and compensation, but where things get done. This needs to get emphasized. John Cole will draft a letter to both the City Council and the City Administrator. James Lysen stated that James Bennett received all the same information in his packet as the planning board members did. He is well aware of the alternative restructuring plan. The letter to be drafted by John Cole will be completed by Thursday of this week in order to be placed in the City Council packets going out on Friday for their meeting on March 25, 2003 so that it will not get lost in the budget paperwork. The City Council is concerned with this. The Planning Board felt comfortable with John Cole's drafting of a letter and voted in the following action:

MOTION: *by John Cole, seconded by Robert Robbins that the Planning Board's view of the function of a Senior Planner with the historical knowledge of the City, proper execution of the Comprehensive Plan, and of the City ordinance is a priority and it is imperative to be preserved within the forthcoming City budget. That in the Planning Board's view, the present City Administrator's proposed restructuring will not preserve that level of expertise to be appropriately supported. A Senior Planner should, therefore, be incorporated into the stream of City government. That the Senior Planner position within this side of the City government needs to be co-equal and of equal importance to Code Enforcement and Community Development/Economic Development and that the dollar value of preserving this is well worth the additional \$15,000, which City Administrator James Bennett, himself, has said, is the difference between his budget and what the Planning Board feels is important, to achieve this budget's goals.*

VOTED: 7-0.

John Cole stated that he would draft a letter to be forwarded to the City Council for their March 25, 2003 Workshop Meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS: None.

VII. READING OF THE MINUTES: *Reading of the minutes from the March 3, 2003 Planning Board Meeting.* The following changes were made to the minutes:

- Page One: First paragraph of Item IV. Final Hearing, third line, delete the word, "is".
- Page Two: Fourth paragraph under the heading, "East Avenue Shaw's Sound Report", third line, change the first word, "Streets" to read, "Street", after the word, "Pleasant" add the word, "Street", and after the word, Marston, change the word from, "Streets" to read, "Street".
- Page Three: Second paragraph under Item V. first line, delete the word, "an" and after the word, "outcome" hyphenate and add the word, "based". In the second line, delete the word, "been". In the third line, delete the word, "decision" and replace it with the word, "way". Also in the same line, delete the word, "vacate" and replace it with the word, "eliminate". In the same paragraph on line nine, after the word, "not", add the word, "be". On line eleven, after the word, "obligations" take out the comma and add the word, "that" and change the word, "The" to its lower case. Third paragraph, last sentence, delete the word, "not". Fourth paragraph, second line, change the word, "there" to read, "their". In this same paragraph, line five, delete the word, "to" and add the word, "a". Fifth paragraph, line four, after the word, "people" place a period to end that sentence.
- Page Four: First paragraph, lines four and five, delete the sentence that read, "The Planning Director's position is proposed to be eliminated". On the seventh line, place a space between the words, "on this". Third paragraph, fourth line, place an apostrophe and "s" after the name, "James Lysen". Tenth paragraph, line four, continue the sentence after the word, "size" with the words, "of the budget".
- Page Five: First paragraph, first sentence shall be changed to read, "Rob Robbins indicated that there is substantial value in retaining a Planning Director with James Lysen's breath of experience in planning and institutional memory. He suggested the City may be able to save \$15,000 in some other manner."

Second paragraph, line three, place a semi colon after the word, “received”, lowercase the word, “Therefore”, and change the words, “April 2004, to read, “April 2003 to comment on this plan”.

After the above changes, the following motion was made.

MOTION: by **Lucy Bisson**, seconded by **Rob Robbins** to accept the Planning Board Minutes for March 3, 2003, as amended.

VOTED: 6-0-1 (Robert Connors).

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: This meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Board Meeting is Monday, April 7, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucy A. Bisson
Planning Board Member and Secretary

DMC:dmc
C:\MyDocuments\Planbrd\Minutes\PB031703MIN.wpd

