

**TOWN OF DUCK
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
January 6, 2010**

The Planning Board for the Town of Duck convened at the Duck Municipal Offices at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 6, 2010.

Present were Chairman Jon Britt, Vice Chair Joe Blakaitis, Ron Forlano, John Fricker and Randy Gilbreath.

Absent: None.

Also present were Director of Community Development Andy Garman and Town Clerk Lori Kopec.

Others Present: Frank Klahre and Jim Conners on behalf of Duck United Methodist Church, Monica Thibodeau and John Jenkins.

Absent: Permit Coordinator Sandy Cady.

Chairman Britt called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Board for January 6, 2010 at 6:39 p.m. He noted that Council Liaison Burdick was running late.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Chairman Britt stated that, with the Board's permission, he would like to move up New Business. It was *consensus* of the Board to move New Business up in the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

ZTA Zoning Text Amendment Application Submitted by Mr. Frank Klahre on behalf of the Duck United Methodist Church to add a "Columbarium" as an Accessory Use to the Church in the Village Commercial Zoning District

Director Garman stated that Frank Klahre and Jim Conners had submitted an application on behalf of the Duck United Methodist Church to put a columbarium behind the church. He noted that the Board had the conceptual drawing in their staff report. He stated that the design had not been finalized but in advance of the actual design, Mr. Klahre and Mr. Conners had applied for a text amendment to allow it specifically as an accessory to the church. He stated that staff had discussed the text amendment language with the church and they found the language acceptable to meet the needs of their project. He added that staff had recommended approval of the application.

Vice Chair Blakaitis stated that he was confused with the layout of the columbarium. He clarified that it would be put in near the end of the new parking area. Director Garman stated that it would be directly west of the chapel. Vice Chair Blakaitis asked if the existing trees on the property would remain. Frank Klahre was recognized to speak. Mr. Klahre stated that they would. Director Garman noted that there currently wasn't much vegetation in the area. Jim Conners was recognized to speak. Mr. Conners stated that they had tried to set the columbarium in the available space on the property.

Member Fricker clarified that the zoning text amendment was not tied to the church's point. Director Garman stated it was a legislative change. Member Fricker clarified that the Board did not have to be concerned with the concept that showed a structure that was higher than five (5) feet when the zoning text amendment stated that it could not be higher than that. Frank Klahre stated that it would not be higher than five (5) feet. Director Garman pointed out that the concept did not say it would be higher than five (5) feet. Member Fricker clarified that the concept was not in conformity with what was being recommended since it was a legislative change. Director Garman stated that the drawing was just a concept at this point and that the plans have not been finalized. He added that once they come to a consensus on a plan, it will be presented again.

Vice Chair Blakaitis asked if the applicant would have to come before the Planning Board again. Director Garman stated that they would, but it would be for a Conditional Use Plan amendment.

Chairman Britt clarified that the application before the Board was administrative to allow the columbarium. Director Garman stated he was correct.

Member Forlano asked who came up with the limit of five (5) feet. Director Garman stated it was a staff suggestion. Member Forlano asked if there was a reason for the suggestion of five (5) feet versus eight or nine (8 or 9) feet. Director Garman stated that the language was pulled from other ordinances that dealt with columbariums.

Vice Chair Blakaitis clarified that the remains would be stored in the wall. Frank Klahre stated he was correct. Director Garman explained that there were pre-designed niches for the ashes with a faceplate in front of it.

Member Fricker stated that Council Liaison Burdick had asked him what would happen if the church wanted to expand the size of the columbarium. Member Fricker stated that, inside the perimeter of the columbarium was just earth so that a core could be taken out, ashes could be put in, the earth would be packed back in and let nature take its course. He clarified that the applicant was designing a columbarium that had compartments so that at some point it would have to be expanded. Frank Klahre stated he was correct.

Jim Conners noted that what they were presenting to the Board was conceptual at this time. Chairman Britt stated it was good for the Board to have an idea of what would be presented at a later date. He added that the Board needed to focus on allowing columbariums in the district. Members Forlano and Fricker stated they did not have any issues with it. Member Fricker thought the five (5) criteria appeared to have minimal impacts to the adjacent property. Vice Chair Blakaitis and Member Gilbreath stated they did not have any issues either.

Vice Chair Blakaitis moved to recommend to Town Council that the Zoning Text Amendment application as submitted by Mr. Frank Klahre on behalf of the Duck United Methodist Church to add a columbarium as an accessory use to the church in the Village Commercial District be approved. Member Fricker seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

OLD BUSINESS

Discussion of Renewable Energy White Paper for Town Council Retreat

Director Garman stated that he had emailed a draft of the White Paper of the last discussion the Board had from December and asked for comments or corrections so he could present it at the Town Council Retreat for discussion. He stated that he did not receive any comments from the Board, but wanted to know if the Board had any additional changes or revisions that could be made.

Vice Chair Blakaitis stated that he had no objections but noted that the White Paper was also an attempt to have Council give the Board direction on whether they wanted the Board to proceed with the issue or not. He stated that some people thought the direction was not needed and that it should be something the Board does on its own. He thought it was discussed in the past that the Board wanted to see some direction from Council. Chairman Britt agreed with Vice Chair Blakaitis' comments. He thought it was driven by the timing the Board had before the Retreat as well as all of them being able to attend. He stated he would like to receive input from Council.

Vice Chair Blakaitis thought if the Board was going to discuss the issue, they should be sure that Council would elicit a response to them as to whether they receive that direction. He didn't think it would be a presentation and discussion and wondered if the Board needed Council to tell them whether or not to proceed.

Member Fricker stated that he saw an analogy – just as the Board looks to staff for direction, Council was entitled to the same support from the Board but didn't think the Board was ready to present anything at the Retreat. Vice Chair Blakaitis thought the Board wasn't ready.

Member Fricker stated that he was trying to articulate at the Board's December meeting when he thought the threshold questions that should be asked were whether the Planning Board supported and encouraged the use of wind turbines in (a) residential lots, (b) commercial or municipal properties and was the Board prepared to recommend it to Council with some parameters that had been discussed. He noted that his questions were not on the White Paper. He pointed out that the White Paper noted that there were questions that needed to be answered before an ordinance could be drafted. He stated that he did not know where the questions were. Director Garman stated that the questions were on the last page of the White Paper.

Member Fricker felt that asking Council what they thought about the issue was not fair to them. He felt the Board needed to be more specific as to what the issues were. Director Garman stated that he did not write any conclusions in the White Paper. He stated that he had tried to draw

information from the research he had completed to come up with the conclusions. He noted that the wind energy survey showed that more people opposed turbines in residential areas than supported them.

Member Fricker wondered what the Planning Board viewed as their role with regard to renewable energy was at this point. He wondered if it was to take a position on it or not. Member Forlano didn't think the Board had to take a position at this point. He thought with what the Board came up with from attending meetings and lectures, the White Paper covered a lot of the stumbling blocks the Board would be faced with in order to draft an ordinance since it was contradictory to the Town's current Land Use Plan. He thought if Council thoroughly read the White Paper, it should give them direction as to what the Board's problems will be when drafting the ordinance.

Member Gilbreath thought the biggest problem was that there weren't any lots that could sustain renewable energy given the current setback requirements in Duck. Chairman Britt thought that by doing it, the Board was implying that they weren't confident enough to bring it to Council as they saw problems with renewable energy. Member Forlano agreed. Chairman Britt thought that if Council felt the issue was important and that the Town was willing to push the envelope, then it would be pushed. He thought if it was a simple issue, the Board would not be discussing it.

Council Liaison Burdick asked what the expectation would be to have the issue on the Council Retreat agenda as far as the outcome. Chairman Britt thought it was input and direction. He pointed out that with regard to wind turbines in residential areas, the Board saw problems with it, but noted that the Board also thought renewable energy was a good thing. He wondered how Council weighed it with it conflicting with the Land Use Plan. Council Liaison Burdick clarified that the Board was looking at the Council Retreat to give the Planning Board some better guidance with regard to the direction they should take. Chairman Britt noted that it would be a hot button subject if Council does give the Board direction. He stated that he wanted to be sure that Council was behind the Planning Board, giving their full support. Member Forlano noted that it was going to be a tremendous amount of work for the Planning Board. Chairman Britt added that it would be the most complex ordinance the Board ever drafted.

Member Fricker stated that his concern was that with all the items on the Council Retreat agenda, the issues the Board have been grappling with regarding renewable energy may not be understood. Chairman Britt thought it was reasonable to think that there wasn't a lot of time to put the issue in front of Council. Member Fricker thought it was supposed to be done at the December Council meeting but wasn't for obvious reasons. He stated that the Board was acknowledging now that because of the three (3) new Council members, this may be an efficient and quick way to educate the new members.

Council Liaison Burdick thought it was a great idea. He stated that when he read through the materials and the survey, two (2) things came to mind – was there a way to “gerrymander” the ordinance within the Land Use Plan and if Council was willing to go near the issue based on what the survey said. He thought that was the overriding issue before the Board spent a lot of time on the ordinance. Chairman Britt noted that it would not be a quick decision on Council's part. Council Liaison Burdick noted that the survey showed that people were not interested in

wind turbines at all. He stated that he had no reason to disbelieve it based on the input he had received from residents. He added that wind turbines were the last thing they were interested in. He thought at the Retreat, Council should address the issue as to whether the Town should look into whether wind turbines should be allowed or not and then look at the rest of the issues.

Member Gilbreath noted that the survey showed that Duck as a community was in favor of renewable energy. Chairman Britt agreed and noted that the survey contradicted itself. Vice Chair Blakaitis didn't think that the survey results did not show that the people of Duck were not in favor of renewable energy. He pointed out that 2,400 people were given the survey and only fifteen percent (15%) responded. He thought there was an obligation to the entire community, including those that did not respond to the survey. He thought if there was any work on renewable energy, windmills should not be eliminated – all forms of renewable energy should be addressed. Chairman Britt agreed and stated that something had to be done.

Director Garman stated that former Planning Board member Claiborne Yarbrough was now in the business of selling renewable energy applications. He stated that she has talked to several clients in Duck who were interested in putting in wind turbines in residential areas. He noted that the wind turbines they were interested in were wind spires, which was a vertical access wind turbine that is under thirty-five (35) feet. He noted that the current ordinance does not prohibit them and as long as the owner meets the setbacks and does not exceed the height limitation, it can be considered an accessory structure. He wondered how it would be treated any different from a flag pole or anything else that would be considered an accessory to a single-family dwelling. He noted that there were several people interested in them and he and Town Manager Chris Layton had discussed a potential moratorium on wind turbines until the Planning Board and Council had a chance to draft an ordinance.

Member Fricker asked for a description of wind spires. Director Garman went on to explain wind spires and how they work to the Planning Board and audience.

Vice Chair Blakaitis reiterated that wind turbines could not be excluded unless Council came out and said such. Member Forlano thought that windmills may be difficult but responses on the surveys showed that one hundred eighty-one (181) people were highly supportive of renewable energy. He thought the Board owed it to the public to study renewable energy. Council Liaison Burdick agreed. Member Forlano noted that the Board needed to look at all forms of alternative energy and not just one aspect of it. Council Liaison Burdick didn't think the Board should put all their focus on wind turbines. Member Forlano pointed out that the Board wasn't. Council Liaison Burdick thought that they were and noted that other sources of renewable energy were important.

Council Liaison Burdick thought Council owed it to the Planning Board to let them know what the priorities were based on the input received so far in terms of the survey and the potential difficulty in doing something. Vice Chair Blakaitis asked what priorities Council Liaison Burdick was talking about. Council Liaison Burdick stated it was regarding which renewable energy form they should research. Vice Chair Blakaitis noted that a priority could not be assigned to one (1) particular form of renewable energy. Member Forlano added that the Board had to take the whole package into consideration.

Council Liaison Burdick wondered if the Board really wanted to spend a lot of time on the issue if the Council decides it's not the direction they want to go. He thought that would be some input that Council could give the Board. Chairman Britt thought it was part of it. He asked the Board if they thought something could be done on a residential property as a Conditional Use Permit. Member Forlano thought they would have to, considering that there were people in the residential district that were interested in putting in some type of renewable energy. He stated that staff needed something from the Board.

Chairman Britt stated that a lot of the public opposition to renewable energy was due to misconceptions about it. He thought the White Paper was a good starting point.

Member Fricker didn't think there needed to be a moratorium because of Ms. Yarbrough. He thought that if there was a structure that was to be built and there wasn't any ordinance against it, and the Board hadn't even discussed it, there should be some recommendation on a moratorium and voted on at the Council Retreat. He suggested a ninety (90) day moratorium, subject to renewal. Director Garman noted that a moratorium was not meant to penalize anyone in particular. He stated that if the Board decided to allow wind turbines that were not past the height limit or did not have shadow flicker impacts, and met certain setbacks, the Town would receive complaints about it. He stated that the Board should come to some conclusion on how it should be regulated, even if it was under thirty-five (35) feet.

Chairman Britt stated that he hated moratoriums but thought it may be applicable for this issue. Director Garman noted that it may not have any impact as the plans were not immediate. Chairman Britt stated that he was in favor of having a wind turbine in his back yard. Director Garman asked if the Board wanted businesses in Town to put up vertical wind turbines by the side of Duck Road. Chairman Britt stated that Council would have to decide that at the Retreat. He thought a ninety (90) day moratorium may be beneficial.

Chairman Britt asked the Board if they were comfortable with the White Paper being presented at the Council Retreat. Member Forlano asked if it should be brought up to Council that the Town may be faced with the installation of a vertical wind turbine and that maybe a moratorium would be needed until a decision was made. Member Fricker, Chairman Britt and Council Liaison Burdick thought it was a good idea.

Director Garman stated that he would put the White Paper into a presentation format for the Retreat and will suggest forwarding it to the Planning Board. Chairman Britt suggested that the presentation stress that the entire Board was in favor of renewable energy with certain rules.

Vice Chair Blakaitis asked if a homeowner would need a permit to install a wind spire. Director Garman stated that they would need a building permit. Member Forlano clarified that a thirty-five (35) foot wind turbine was allowable if it was ten (10) feet from the property line. Director Garman stated he was correct. Council Liaison Burdick asked if there were any exceptions. Director Garman stated that the exceptions were included in the White Paper.

Member Fricker understood that as the ordinance was currently written, no wind turbine in excess of thirty-five (35) feet from the ground would be allowed. Director Garman stated he was correct. Vice Chair Blakaitis stated that it wasn't because it was a wind turbine but because of

the height restriction. Member Fricker asked if a wind spire would be allowed under the present ordinance. Director Garman stated it would as long as it was less than thirty-five (35) feet.

Member Fricker moved to recommend to Town Council that a moratorium be placed in effect to preclude for a period of ninety (90) days or such other length of time that Council might decide was appropriate for construction of these type of facilities within the Town of Duck.

Member Gilbreath thought the motion went against what the people who completed the survey said, since a good number were in favor of renewable energy. He thought a moratorium wasn't necessary. Member Forlano pointed out that the moratorium wouldn't mean that the Town was against wind energy. Member Gilbreath agreed, but noted that putting out a moratorium would sound bad. Member Forlano stated that a moratorium meant that the Town needed time to study the issue. Chairman Britt thought it showed prudence. Director Garman stated that it would state that the Town had not had a chance to come up with a set of values to address wind turbines and the moratorium would give the Town time to do that in that staff would not accept any permit requests for wind turbines during the ninety (90) day period. Member Fricker stated that that was not what his motion stated; he stated it was just for wind spires.

Member Forlano asked Member Fricker to clarify his motion. Member Fricker stated that he understood that this type of facility was the only type of structure in the wind turbine family that would be permitted to be built in Duck. Member Forlano disagreed and stated that a regular wind turbine could be built up to thirty-five (35) feet high. Vice Chair Blakaitis pointed out that the Town had not put out a moratorium on wind spires since the Board had not considered them a problem at this point. Member Forlano felt the moratorium should be on all types of renewable energy.

Member Fricker thought the concern with wind spires was that it was perceived that they could blow over, it may be an eyesore and that there wasn't engineering criteria established that would have to be met. Member Gilbreath stated that the engineering would be part of the permitting process. Member Fricker pointed out that there was no criteria in place to make a judgment. He wondered if there should be a motion made that was broader in scope. Member Forlano thought there should be. Vice Chair Blakaitis thought the motion should be broad enough that any structure unless it was an attachment to a house that was over the thirty-five (35) foot limit, needed to have a moratorium in place.

Member Fricker withdrew his motion.

Member Fricker moved that the Planning Board recommend to Town Council that a moratorium of ninety (90) days or such other length of time as Council would think is appropriate should be imposed on construction of any free-standing structure in the nature of a wind turbine in excess of thirty-five (35) feet until such time as the Town can come to an agreement with the staff and Planning Board and Council to determine reasonable and adequate criteria for public safety. Member Forlano suggested that instead of focusing on just wind turbines, it would be any alternative or renewable energy source. Member Fricker didn't think it was a good idea.

Chairman Britt thought there should be a specific definition for wind turbines to close any loopholes. He stated that the Land Use Plan needed to be looked at to defend any decision. He

thought that the fact that the Land Use Plan did not address wind turbines at all gave the Town every right to have a moratorium in place.

Member Fricker withdrew his motion. Chairman Britt thought it should be simplified.

Member Fricker moved that the Planning Board recommend to Council a moratorium of ninety (90) days or whichever period of time that Council decides, be imposed on the construction of any wind turbine in the Village of Duck. Member Forlano seconded.

John Jenkins of 104 Dune Road was recognized to speak. Mr. Jenkins wondered why the Planning Board was so hung up on wind turbines. He thought they were ugly, obtrusive and had sonic effects to them. He stated that he had a friend in Southern Shores that could not construct a wind turbine because there were too many trees around. He stated that a wind turbine could be put on a house but it would cause a sonic vibration throughout the house. He thought that because the construction was so expensive, the issue may go away on its own. He stated that he would hate to see wind turbines in Duck.

Motion carried 3-2 with Vice Chair Blakaitis and Member Gilbreath dissenting.

Chairman Britt asked if a recommendation was needed for the White Paper. Director Garman stated there wasn't one needed. He suggested working on a presentation and forwarding it to the Board if they wanted a copy. Chairman Britt suggested that any questions be forwarded to Director Garman.

Discussion/Consideration of Ordinance Amendment regarding Replacement of Non-Conforming Signs

Director Garman stated that the ordinance was drafted based on the Board's December meeting to change the way the Town looked at how a sign would lose its non-conforming status. He stated that previously, signs that would become non-conforming if they deteriorated more than fifty percent (50%) of its appraised value. He stated that after previous discussions, appraised value of a sign was difficult to determine correctly. He added that staff suggested looking at replacement value and some percentage of it as well as the percentage of a sign that was actually damaged. He stated that the Board discussed the issue at their December meeting and felt that the Town should be as restrictive as possible with the remaining non-conforming signs in Town. He added that the Board felt that an ordinance should be drafted to state that if a sign should lose its non-conforming status, if it was damaged or deteriorated in any way and could not be corrected by simply re-painting the sign, it would need to be replaced. He stated that the draft ordinance was in front of the Board for their review.

Chairman Britt thought the ordinance was clear and to the point. Member Fricker stated that he liked Subsection B, but wondered why paragraph 2 did not apply with regard to change of copy. Director Garman stated that it referred to reader boards. Member Fricker thought it should be changed as such. Chairman Britt suggested striking the second sentence. Vice Chair Blakaitis suggested eliminating or striking it. Chairman Britt noted that it was addressed in Subsection B under repainting and refacing.

Monica Thibodeau of 126 Sea Hawk Drive West was recognized to speak. Ms. Thibodeau asked if there was list of non-conforming signs in Duck. Director Garman stated there was. Ms. Thibodeau asked if the Board was discussing signs that would be illegal or grandfathered. Director Garman stated that free standing signs would need to be replaced by July, 2010. Ms. Thibodeau asked if there will be signs that will not have to be replaced. Director Garman stated that there would. Ms. Thibodeau asked what would happen if a free-standing sign fell over. Director Garman stated that if the ordinance was adopted, the sign would have to become conforming. Chairman Britt stated that there was very low tolerance for non-conforming signs.

Member Fricker asked if the ordinance should be modified. Chairman Britt stated he still did not like #2 in the draft ordinance. Member Fricker agreed it should be stricken. He suggested taking out the second sentence altogether and change (b) to subparagraph 3 and take out the first sentence and the word “however”; and change paragraph B to C.

Member Fricker moved to adopt staff’s recommendation with respect to amending the ordinance regarding replacement of nonconforming signs subject to the changes made. Member Forlano seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

Discussion/Consideration of Ordinance Amendment to Include Specific Penalties for Tree and Vegetation Management Ordinance Violations

Director Garman stated that at their December meeting, the Board discussed the tree and vegetation ordinance and that there should be specific penalties for violations to certain sections of the ordinance. He stated that the Board discussed putting two (2) primary types of penalties in the ordinance for violations to the vegetation ordinance. He stated that the first was a violation to the tree removal permit section of the ordinance, that defines that a tree greater than twenty-four (24) inches in diameter without a tree removal permit was prohibited. He thought the Board was in agreement with a penalty of \$1,000 and the issuance of a citation. He stated that the second penalty dealt with the clear cutting provisions of the ordinance on lots that were currently vacant and undeveloped. He noted that the ordinance stated that a tree could not be removed that was greater than six (6) inches in diameter without a building permit. He added that the Board agreed that there should be strong penalties for clear cutting a lot and removing the majority of vegetation. He stated that the Board discussed some sort of range of penalties that should be applied for taking down trees greater than six (6) inches in diameter on undeveloped vacant lots and the penalty would be directly related to the amount of vegetation that was removed.

Director Garman stated that he tried to come up with an ordinance that would address all of the Board suggestions and the draft ordinance was in front of the Board for their review.

Member Forlano stated that he needed clarification on #3 on the last page. He stated that a lot of people tend to over-plant and the shrubbery becomes very large after ten to fifteen (10–15) years. Director Garman stated that it wouldn’t apply as it was only for undeveloped vacant lots.

Council Liaison Burdick asked what the penalty was for an existing home where the homeowner clears their lot. Chairman Britt stated that there wouldn’t be one as long as the canopy coverage

requirements were met. Director Garman stated that they would be issued a notice of violation. Council Liaison Burdick thought it was strange that there were two (2) sets of standards. Vice Chair Blakaitis noted that there were actually three (3). Member Forlano stated that they were three (3) different conditions. Chairman Britt stated that they had to be separated.

Council Liaison Burdick stated he was more interested in it from a penalty standpoint. Chairman Britt stated that the Board felt that the fines for a vacant lot needed to be significant as the ordinance came from the fact that there were people clear cutting lots. Director Garman stated that the Town had a way to deal with developed lots. He added that if the Town wanted to come up with a specific penalty that would be assessed if someone did not address what was asked of them in the notice of violation, it could be done. He added that it was presently discretionary.

Member Fricker clarified that from staff's point of view, there was not a problem from an administrative point of view and it addressed the three (3) different set of scenarios. Director Garman stated he was correct.

John Jenkins asked how the policy related to diseased trees. Chairman Britt stated that there were exemptions presently in place.

Vice Chair Blakaitis asked if the Board wanted to change the diameter of a tree for a permit removal, it would have to be changed in the vegetation ordinance. Director Garman stated that it could be suggested as a change. Vice Chair Blakaitis stated he would like to reduce the diameter from twenty-four (24) to twenty (20) inches for trees that could be removed with a permit. Member Fricker suggested that staff could look at the twenty-four (24) inch rule as well as the multiple trunk issue and bring it back at a future Board meeting. Director Garman thought the way multiple trunks had been dealt with was that if no individual trunk was greater than twenty-four (24) inches, a permit was not needed.

Chairman Britt asked if there was any sentiment that the diameter requirement should be lower. Member Forlano thought it should be left as is and address the multiple trunk issue at a future meeting.

Member Fricker suggested changing Paragraph 2 from "have been committed" to "have occurred" and Paragraph 4a after the words "and/or", insert the word "vegetation".

Member Fricker moved that the amendments as proposed by staff and amended by the Planning Board be recommended to Town Council for adoption. Member Gilbreath seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Planning Board Meeting December 9, 2009

Chairman Britt directed the Board to review the minutes from the December 9, 2009 meeting.

Member Fricker moved to approve the minutes as presented. Member Forlano seconded.

Motion carried 5-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

STAFF COMMENTS

None.

BOARD COMMENTS

Chairman Britt asked if the recommendation the Board made at the meeting regarding renewable energy would be brought up at the Council Retreat. Director Garman stated it would be presented at the Council's February 3, 2010 meeting.

The Planning Board members welcomed Chuck Burdick as the newest Council Liaison.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Britt moved to adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried 5-0.

The time was 8:28 p.m.

Approved: _____
/s/ Jon Britt, Chairman