

**WALKERTOWN PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**WALKERTOWN LIBRARY AUDITORIUM**  
WEDNESDAY MARCH 10, 2010 3:00 P.M.  
CHANGED DUE TO SCHEDULE CONFLICT WITH LIBRARY

**MINUTES**

Chairman Al Slater called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Present for the Board were Al Slater, Kevin Briggs, Larry Marshall, Don Whitaker, and Robert Butler. Staff present was Lynn McKinnie, Bo Houff, and Scott Snow. The audience included Molly Bovender, Jenny Morris, and Peggy Leight. Also present were Glenn Simmons and Gary Roberts.

Mr. Marshall motioned and Mr. Whitaker seconded approval of the agenda as presented.

By motion of Mr. Butler and seconded by Mr. Briggs, the minutes of FEBRUARY 2, 2010 were approved as written.

**PUBLIC SESSION** - Please limit your talk to 3 minutes. Non-Agenda Items only.

Public Session was opened and closed at 3:05 p.m. with no speakers.

**BUSINESS AT HAND**

**1. PUBLIC HEARING**

Advertised 02-25-10

WA-40 – PROPERTY ON WEST SIDE OF DAVIS ROAD, NORTH OF JACKSONVIEW ROAD

RECOMMENDATION: TO CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO TOWN OF WALKERTOWN

**DISCUSSION:**

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED AT 3:06 P.M.

There were no speakers.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED AT 3:06 P.M.

Mr. Whitaker asked if this would be RS-20 – and Mr. Houff said the zoning of the property does not change – it remains the same.

Mr. Marshall asked if this was similar to the one we had last month and was told this is a similar action but with a different address.

**MOTION: TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL APPROVAL OF WA-40 ZONING REQUEST TO CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO TOWN OF WALKERTOWN**

**BY: KEVIN BRIGGS**

**SECOND: LARRY MARSHALL**

**VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**2. PUBLIC HEARING**

WA-UDO-14 – TEXT AMENDMENTS REQUESTED AS PER CITY-COUNTY  
PLANNING BOARD

**DISCUSSION:**

GARY ROBERTS: This is a batch – Unified Development Ordinance text amendments. It's a combination of four different text amendments that have been adopted by Forsyth County and the city of Winston-Salem. We put them together in this batch but I'll go through each one of the four and feel free to ask questions at any time. We did make one change as per your joint session a couple of weeks ago with the Council but I'll also go through that.

**SECTION 1**

PAGE -1-

On the copy that Lynn sent you see it's the ordinance – WA-UDO-14 and flip over to:

PAGE -2-

*Section 1 – General Business District is a high-intensity commercial district which is generally found along older urban commercial corridors of Winston-Salem. And, by the way, I do not believe Walkertown has any GB zoning – has a lot of HB – Highway Business – but no GB.....but we do recommend this for ordinance consistency. This district currently requires a minimum 20-foot front setback, which limits redevelopment opportunities for properties of this type of zoning. Removing this front setback requirement would allow greater flexibility in redeveloping GB zoned property and would promote more pedestrian and transit-friendly commercial infill development in accordance with Legacy principles.*

*The Analysis - Many properties within the existing GB zoning are located in (Growth Management Area) GMA 2 or that's, "Urban Neighborhoods" which ya'll do not have any of. I brought you tonight several copies of the colored map, which shows your Growth Management Area 1 – your Town Center boundaries and it does have property lines on it. You've got Growth Management Area 1 and 3 and 4, but no 2 – Urban Neighborhoods. To better accommodate this type of development, staff believes it would be beneficial to eliminate the front setback requirements for the GB District. Additionally, it would be appropriate to include GB in the current ordinance provision allowing pedestrian oriented developments in the PB (Pedestrian Business) and LB districts to satisfy up to 35 percent of their parking requirements through on-street parking, with approval of the Walkertown Town Manager in the case of town-maintained streets or the North Carolina Department of Transportation.*

*While commercial development with an urban form could also be achieved through the requirements of the PB zoning district, staff believes it would be unnecessary to require owners of GB zoned property to petition for a rezoning of their property to implement good urban design. Additionally, while the PB District has no front setback requirements, it is mainly intended for locations adjacent to downtown Winston-Salem and less intense Activity Centers and is better suited for urban mixed-use development than for the large-scale commercial development often found in the GB district. Staff believes these changes will make underutilized urban properties with GB zoning along transportation and transit corridors more desirable for infill and redevelopment in accordance with Legacy recommendations.*

Any questions? Again, this section was adopted by Winston-Salem and Forsyth County in May and June of 2008.

MR. WHITAKER: For Walkertown, I question doing away with the 20-foot setback. I don't know where it will be appropriate to do that here in Walkertown. I don't know what the rest of the panel thinks about it.

MR. SLATER: Before I comment on our get-together with the Council and the Planning Board at the work session that you had on that, I would see what the Board approves. Let's just go ahead to the next section and what we did talk about taking out.

MR. ROBERTS: Ok. I believe that was in Section 4. I'll go on ahead in Section 2.

## SECTION 2

Page -6-

*This UDO text amendment is proposed by City-County Planning Board staff to allow greater flexibility in the platting requirements for commercial, industrial, multifamily residential, and institutional uses that are part of a master-planned site. Section 2 corresponds to UDO-193 which was adopted by Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Planning Board in December, 2008.*

*As development projects have become increasingly complex in recent years, the need to separate them into separate pieces/phases for the purpose of financing has increased. This need to phase a project may require the developer to subdivide the overall project into separate lots to secure financing from one or more lenders and, to further satisfy lending requirements, may require that each lot be separately owned. Currently, the UDO requires that staff only approve subdivision plats that meet all ordinance requirements (in regard to access and dimensional size issues, etc.). On a large commercial or multifamily site, it may be difficult to subdivide the overall project into parcels that meet all requirements of the UDO.*

*Given the evolving nature of development financing, staff understands the need to allow greater flexibility in securing financing for large commercial or multifamily projects. Staff proposes language be added to Chapter D (Subdivision Ordinance) that would allow greater flexibility in the platting requirements of large development projects. The language proposed would allow staff to approve a plat for a piece/phase of the overall development, which may not by itself, meet all minimum requirements of the UDO. The overall project would still meet minimum UDO requirements and approval of the plat would tie its compliance to the overall site.*

So there would be a note on the plat that that individual parcel, which maybe doesn't meet the size or setback requirements or access issue, access requirements for the overall development – there would be a note that ties that plat to the overall development and this would be for the purpose of separating parcels out for financing. And, again, that was adopted by the Planning Board in December of 2008. Any questions?

Ok. Let's go on to Section 3 – my personal favorite! In regard to parking reductions. And this was adopted by the Winston-Salem and Forsyth County in January and February of last year (2009).

## SECTION 3

Page -8-

*In response to the recently adopted Phase II Stormwater Requirements, the Winston-Salem City Council asked Planning Staff to consider the feasibility of reducing minimum parking requirements for various land uses as a means of encouraging reduced impervious surface coverage. Staff reviewed information on parking standards from the American Planning Association and other sources, and determined some land uses had*

existing UDO parking requirements which were higher when compared with municipalities across the Country. Staff also observed that many existing sites classified as these land uses were required to include more parking than was necessary. Staff recommends reducing parking requirements for these uses, which are primarily retail and office uses, by approximately 15%.

Staff believes reducing parking standards for selected uses by approximately 15% will promote reduced impervious surface coverage in new developments and will also allow increased flexibility for re-using existing property, particularly in densely developed urban areas where land is limited. This ordinance also allows drive-through stacking lanes to be credited for minimum parking requirements. This provision is based on the knowledge that vehicles using these stacking lanes would otherwise be using parking spaces.

In addition to the aforementioned parking reductions, this ordinance also proposes a 5% reduction in minimum parking requirements in exchange for the inclusion of bicycle parking in a development project. The UDO currently allows a 2% parking reduction for the use of bicycle parking. Staff believes a greater parking reduction will promote the more frequent use of bicycle parking in new development and will provide the community with a greater variety of transportation options. Staff worked with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator for the Winston-Salem DOT to develop greater specificity in the bicycle parking standards of the UDO and revised the bicycle parking standards and dimensional requirements of the ordinance. Staff recommends approval of this text amendment.

Any questions?

#### SECTION 4

Page -21-

Since the adoption of the UDO, several clean-up text amendments have been presented to the Planning Board. These amendments address conflicts or practical difficulties discovered by City-County staff through daily use of the ordinance. The changes in this text amendment were collected between February 2008 and December 2008 with the intent of being presented as one unified text amendment. These modifications do not substantively change the ordinance, but improve its clarity and remove conflicting or outdated regulatory language.

MR. ROBERTS: This ordinance is divided up into 8 sections – and this is the one where there was Section 7 – that dealt with sidewalks and we took that out after your joint session. And I can read over that, too, just to remind you what that was.

MR. SLATER: Gary, if you will, for the benefit of someone that wasn't at our work session – if you would cover Section 7 as it was in the previous UDO.....

MR. ROBERTS: .....Yes.....I sure will.....

MR. SLATER: .....and then what it was in that we agreed unanimously at the work session with the Council and the Planning Board to take that section out so it would be more in line with our ordinance for sidewalks. If you'll go over the first part of it – and what it was – and then that we took that part out.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. Sure will. And I assume you want me to read up through that section, too, starting with 1.....

MR. SLATER: .....If you would – please.....

MR. ROBERTS: .....Okay. All right.

Page -21-

This text amendment consists of 8 separate subsections, each of which is described below:

Subsection 1. *Subsection 1 makes minor changes to the definitions section of the ordinance, including creating a definition for cross-parcel access easements.*

And, again, as I read through these several sections, if anybody has any questions, feel free to interrupt me.

Subsection 2 and 3. *These subsections remove the site plan submission requirement for the NSB (that is Neighborhood Shopping Center) and C Zoning Districts (that's Campus Zoning Districts. And I don't think Walkertown has any of those zoning designations either). The current site plan submission requirement for these districts is vague and does not specify when a site plan must be submitted or who is responsible for reviewing the site plan (either Planning Board, or Staff, or Council – it doesn't specify). Inspections staff have considered site plans which are required to obtain a building permit as satisfying this requirement, and as such staff recommends removing this unnecessary ordinance language.*

Subsection 4. *Subsection 4 amends table B.3.4 to reference the correct minimum setback requirements for the GB Zoning District. Minimum setback requirements for the GB District are proposed for elimination as per Section 1 of this subject text amendment, WA-UDO 14 (UDO-187). However, UDO-187 inadvertently left out the needed change to this table. (There's a table that goes with that and that's what this includes here and that was this previous section I read at the beginning of today.)*

Subsection 5. *Subsection 5 amends the section of the ordinance regulating combined driveway and access by requiring that any cross access easements between properties (property owners) must be formally recorded.*

Subsection 6. *This Subsection modifies the buffer yard standards of the ordinance. These changes clarify that the buffer yard requirements of the ordinance apply to the construction of a new structure, and allow the Director of Inspections to approve bufferyards in locations other than the outer perimeter of a lot, where the intent of the buffer yard section is still met. (So you don't necessarily have to screen the whole lot, if you've got a 5-acre lot, that's a lot of plantings where you really are just developing one acre. You can put the buffer just around what you are developing – that's what that would give you – flexibility towards.)*

The “new” Subsection 7 – which is the “old” Subsection 8 – Subsection as the correct cross-references for the amortization of signs to the non-conforming uses section of the ordinance.

Subsection 7. *This subsection adds the correct cross-references for the amortization of signs to the Nonconforming Uses section of the ordinance.*

Subsection 8. *Subsection 8 eliminates the requirement for Special Use District Zoning petitions containing two or more zoning districts to be considered as two separate zoning petitions. Currently, General Use Zoning petitions requesting two or more zoning districts may be considered as one zoning petition. Staff believes the existing Special Use District requirement is unnecessarily burdensome and should be removed.*

So you can just call if you submit a request for going to GB-S and HB-S – it can just be one petition. And the previous #7, which was adopted by Winston-Salem and Forsyth County and originally.....

MR. SLATER: .....Gary - - - if I may - - - - if the Board has a copy that was given to them at the last Board meeting or if they attended the work session between the Council and the Planning Board, if they'll look on page 21, they can follow you on that Subsection 7 that we agreed to be taken out.....

MR. ROBERTS: Um hmmm. Yes. It's two paragraphs and it's Subsection 7 – *Revises the sidewalk construction requirements of the UDO to place limits on the amount of sidewalk that can be required of developments requiring Planning Board or elected body approval....* Which is basically special use zoning or planning board review items – Not general use cases, which would not come before you.

*.....Currently such developments can be required to construct sidewalks along all street frontages identified in the Winston-Salem Urban Area Sidewalk and Pedestrian Facilities Plan – major and minor thoroughfares and collector street, regardless of the size of the proposed development.*

So, if you add on, say, a 1,000 square foot addition, and you have to come back for council review, you could technically be required to extend sidewalk along four or five hundred feet of street frontage – if you own that much street frontage – just for a 1,000 square foot addition, and, obviously, sidewalks being, probably \$18 or \$20 or more a linear foot, you can see how that cost would add up in proportion to the addition that you are actually making.

(Question was asked but not heard on tape) Mr. Roberts continued: It requires it right now. So what this does, is it allows you to have some flexibility or gives people a little bit less stiffer of a requirement based upon the size of development they bring in.

*Staff believes this requirement may be overly burdensome for developments which have little impact, yet still require Planning Board review, or elected body approval. Staff proposes applying the existing ordinance limits on sidewalk construction for non-residential development and multi-family development not requiring approval by the Planning Board or elected body – basically general use request. If you're zoned HB, you don't have to come before ya'll or the Council. We recommend applying the same standards that those properties would have to adhere to.*

*Sidewalks are not required unless 10,000 square feet or more of new building construction is proposed. That's getting back to the proportionate of what's really – what we feel like is rational – and no more than 1 linear foot of sidewalk per 10 feet of building area is required, regardless of the amount of street frontage of the proposed development - to developments requiring approval by the Planning Board or elected body. The sidewalk construction requirements for non-residential development and multi-family development not requiring approval by the Planning Board or elected body will remain the same. And perhaps Glenn and I did not fully – maybe we weren't clear in relaying that or maybe we were and ya'll – you did still want to keep that out. We'll be glad to answer any questions if I haven't explained it thoroughly – but this is what we did take out. But obviously, it could be put back in if you want it to. Staff recommends that you keep it – that you put this back in and that's what Winston-Salem adopted but it's your ordinance, so – you know – feel free to ask us questions. I'll be glad to try and explain it more.*

MR. SLATER: Does anybody have a question to Gary about this section that was removed? While you may be thinking of a question, I'll update you - - - I think all but one Planning Board member and all Council members were present the night that Gary and his representatives from the City-County presented this and I guess unofficially we can say that we asked that this section be eliminated because it did not

correspond with the ordinance that we have here in Walkertown, which we wanted to maintain that ordinance in there. Is that plain correctly the way you take it, or close to it?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, ummm, I think ya'll did definitely agree to take it out but.....this 10,000 square feet is already in the ordinance for general use, right? So there's a limit for general use zoning on how much sidewalk you got to put in whereas, the way the ordinance is now, it almost penalizes you if you are zoned Special Use or if you have to get a Planning Board review. If you have to come back before one of your bodies' review, it almost penalizes you just for doing a small 5,000 square foot, say, for instance, or a 1,000 or a 9,000 square foot addition. Plus, there's no limit to the number of linear feet that you've got to do so - - - I guess maybe 66 might be a good example. Some properties along 66 that may have 1, or 2, or 3, or 4 more hundred feet of road frontage, that they made just a small expansion and they are zoned Special Use – and they have to come back before ya'll, they could be responsible for putting several hundred feet of sidewalk in there for a relatively small building addition. Now, if ya'll know anything about me – you know I'm "Mr. Sidewalks" - - I love sidewalks and I'm glad to see them anywhere – even on 158 and 66 because I think we're going to eventually need them more. But, you know, we felt like that it was really penalizing properties that were zoned Special Use – they weren't afforded this leeway that general use zoning already has; so that's the purpose of this ordinance.

GLENN SIMMONS: I work with Gary in Planning. Gary's correct in what he said. I think the part that is important, though, is that this provision – this exemption – exists for general use zoned properties and it would not be available for Special Use district zoned properties if they came through the process. And what's interesting about this, though, is even though this exemption, because this exemption does not apply, the Council could not take away that requirement to put a sidewalk in for a very small addition over a long frontage of property. But the interesting thing is that the Council has that discretion through Special Use zoning to require it if – you adopted the potential for this exemption to be there - the Council could still require it if they wanted to. So, it doesn't take away their authority to add this if they wanted to but it does provide them to not require it if it doesn't seem appropriate. And then that decision not to require a large amount of sidewalk for a small amount of development already exists in general use zoned properties – and so the important thing was just to have parallel language for Special Use that already exists for general use properties. Again, it was considered an oversight – it wasn't considered - - - there's no reason why it's not in the discussion use – it just wasn't there because it wasn't referenced that way. So that's the purpose – is to provide parallel language for both types of development so as not to potentially penalize a Special Use zoning for a privilege that general use zoned properties already have. And, again, it doesn't take away the authority that Council to add whether or additional conditions they wish to have if they so choose, but it does provide the option for them not to require it if they don't want to. So, flexibility exists totally with the elected body –this just provides them the same level playing field as it would be for other general use zoned properties. I'll just mention real quickly that the reason, again, Gary described the purpose of it pretty clearly, but that exemption – or that limitation, I should say – of the amount of sidewalk that's required is really there as a matter of equity to have the development and the sidewalk would probably be consistent with the scale of the development. That was a condition that was really discussed at some length with the homebuilders, and realtors, commercial realtors, and the developers as a condition for getting their support for the sidewalk ordinance when it came through Winston-Salem and Forsyth County.

MR. ROBERTS: And it's really just an oversight that this wasn't included in the original.

MR. SLATER: I think I'll give this question to the manager. Did we not think at our joint session that night that this Subsection 7 was in conflict with what our ordinance in town is? Is that the way you understood the reason we wanted to take it out?

MR. SNOW: I think the concern was that possibly you know that the intent of the sidewalk ordinance and the other ordinances we have \_\_\_\_\_ more sidewalks to create that connectivity and create more \_\_\_\_\_ in the town. I guess on the surface it appears that \_\_\_\_\_ is lessening those requirements but as explained there under Special Use zoning case you can always require that even if the ordinance exists you can always require that as a condition under Special Use zoning case. This change would only affect Special Use zoning cases \_\_\_\_\_ ordinance requires sidewalks with 10,000 trigger there with \_\_\_\_\_ in general use so those those cases that don't come before the board or the council, that's already been required of them. This is just giving the council the I guess the option if I guess the petitioner made the case. They should be required to install the sidewalks \_\_\_\_\_ such a small a small change, they can make that case and then the council could make that decision. As the ordinance stands now, the petitioner wouldn't be able to make that case – they would be required to install the sidewalk no matter what. I think it's just kind of making the special use zoning and the general use zoning match up as far as those requirements and gives the council a little bit of option \_\_\_\_\_ a small, a small change. \_\_\_\_\_

MR. SLATER: Okay. Any board members have a question about this? Or you fully understand it? Any questions at all for Mr. Roberts?

Thank you, sir.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED at 3:35 P.M.

There were no speakers.

PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED AT 3:35 P.M.

MR. SLATER: Turn this back to the Board. I will attempt to answer the question that Mr. Whitaker had about the setbacks. There, again, with the majority of the Planning Board and the Council being present that night, we decided that we would go along with the changes in the 20-foot setback. It is still your option to make a motion to voice your disapproval or whatever way you may think of. But, again, I just wanted to say that with all the – but one person not being present that night, that the Council and Mayor and Planning Board did agree that we would go along with that section where we'd approve the 20-foot setback. Also, it was unanimous approval that we would ask that Subsection 7 be eliminated – and it has been done so today in the presentation by Mr. Roberts.

Okay. The Board is now open for discussion – how you want to handle this situation and send it on to our Council.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, I'm still concerned about the 20-foot setback. Where does that apply to? What's the limitations on that?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it would apply to the GB district (General Business) and I'm not aware that Walkertown has any General Business district zoning. But you could in the future – it's conceivable that you could. And this doesn't force property owners to build right up to the property line but it gives them the opportunity to and, again, a more urban form is what you typically see in downtowns, small towns, where you have the buildings pulled up to the sidewalk on street parking and people being able to window shop and what makes that possible is the building placement – the buildings being close up to the street. And you can't do that when you are required to be 20-feet off the right-of-way. The HB district (Highway Business) requires a 40-foot front setback and we're talking

about doing away with that in Winston-Salem - - - not to force buildings to come up to the street, but to give them the opportunity. And when you've got to be back 20 or 40 feet, you might as well just go ahead and put your parking lot in there and be back 60 feet. So it really kills and undermines the potential walkability of a compact urban form. And I realize that Walkertown is not downtown Winston-Salem – and you don't want to be downtown Winston-Salem – but just any typical small town will have a town center and it's typically made by the building placement so this just gives people the option. It does away with the requirement of 20-foot and allows them to build up to the property line in the GB district if they want to.

MR. SLATER: It would also give them the opportunity to put more of their parking in the rear.....

MR. ROBERTS: .....To side and rear, exactly!.....

MR. SLATER: .....and enter the front of the business with a sidewalk.....

MR. ROBERTS: .....Right. ....And it also gives them the opportunity to get up to 35% credit if they want to use on-street parking. Because maybe some streets in the future Walkertown where you want to have striped spaces for on-street parking and it's reasonable to give those businesses credit for that. Again, it's not a requirement – it's just basically giving more options. But I understand your concern.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, 20 feet is not much more than the length of a car – that's getting pretty close to a property line.

MR. SLATER: Any further discussions or concerns? If not, I will call for a motion – either to recommend approval or not approval.

MR. WHITAKER: I still think we should question Section 1.

MR. BUTLER: I'd like to remind everybody that this is just a recommendation to the Council.

**MOTION: TO RECOMMEND TO THE TOWN COUNCIL APPROVAL OF WA-UDO-14 TEXT AMENDMENTS AS REQUESTED AND PRESENTED BY CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

**BY: LARRY MARSHALL**

**SECOND: KEVIN BRIGGS**

**VOTE: MOTION PASSED 4 TO 1**

**FOR: MARSHALL**

**BRIGGS**

**BUTLER**

**SLATER**

**AGAINST: WHITAKER**

**MR. ROBERTS: AND THAT DID EXCLUDE #7?**

**MR. SLATER: YES, IT DID.**

MR. BUTLER: Do we need to put that in the wording? That this does exclude that item - #7?

MR. HOUFF: You didn't have it. It was not presented.

MR. SLATER: Yep. Yep. And the motion was as it was presented in this last text.

3. **DECIDE ON JULY – DECEMBER PLANNING BOARD MEETING DATES??**

**DISCUSSION:**

Mr. Slater reminded the Board that dates had been set for the Planning Board meetings up through June. However, July through December were left up for a later decision. He said that we now need to make that decision so that Lynn can get with the library and set the dates. Some had indicated that it would be good to have some meetings at night time – maybe it would encourage our public to come to meetings – and it may not. This is the decision to be made. Mr. Whitaker asked if any requests had been made to change the meetings – and no requests have been received. Mr. Houff said he had found that even in the evening meetings, people didn't attend unless they had an "ox being gored". And even when people did attend, they would leave the meeting as soon as their case had been dispensed with.

**MOTION: TO LEAVE THE PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS SET AS THE FIRST TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH AT 3:00 P.M. AT THE WALKERTOWN LIBRARY**  
**BY: LARRY MARSHALL**  
**SECOND: ROBERT BUTLER**  
**VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. CONTINUATION OF FAÇADE DISCUSSION

By consensus of the members, this topic will be continued to the April meeting in the hopes that the members could research more information.

**PUBLIC SESSION** (IF NEEDED) Any item.

At 3:52 p.m., the Public Session was opened and then immediately closed with no speakers.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 3:53 P.M.**  
**BY: DON WHITAKER**  
**SECOND: KEVIN BRIGGS**  
**VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

**SUBMITTED BY:**

**LYNN MCKINNIE**  
**PLANNING BOARD COORDINATOR**

**2010 MEETING SCHEDULE - TO BE DECIDED AT MEETING**

LIBRARY @ 3:00 P.M.FIRST TUESDAY OF MONTH

APRIL

**MAY 3, 2010**

**\*CHANGED DUE TO LIBRARY SCHEDULE CONFLICT**

JUNE

JULY

AUGUST

SEPTEMBER

OCTOBER

**NOVEMBER**

**\*DUE TO ELECTION DAY**

DECEMBER