

**TOWN OF PITTSBORO
PLANNING BOARD
RESCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING
JULY 16, 2007**

CALL TO ORDER: Mr. Hoyle called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

ATTENDANCE: Ken Hoyle, Ethel Farrell, Jimmy Collins, Harold Howard, Shannon Plummer, and Freda Marsh.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES of the Regular Meeting of June 4, 2007. **Ms. Farrell made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Ms. Marsh seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

NEW BUSINESS

ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT, ARTICLE III, SECTION 3.2, AND ARTICLE V, SECTION 5.3.3.37, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS.

Mr. Hoyle introduced this item and informed the Board that they had looked at this item once before when it was attached to an application. Monroe reminded the Board that this application was originally prepared by the Wooten Company on behalf of DHIC as they were preparing a development plan for a site on Masonic Street. He said that the Planning Board reviewed it based on the document and felt that it was an improvement over the language in our zoning ordinance and recommended that it be approved. When it went to the Commissioners there were several members who were concerned about the subjective nature of the appearance of the buildings.

Monroe said that he has tried to present some language that tries to make that less subjective and provide some guidelines to applicants and reviewers. He said this language is from a Unified Development Ordinance from the city of SeaTac, Washington. SeaTac is a large bedroom community south of Seattle and adjacent to the Seattle/Tacoma International Airport and it is the location of thousands of apartments. In doing research, he said he felt that it might be a good starting point and it proved to be very fruitful in terms of having good definitions and good relationship of how one can view the external façade of a multi-family unit and make that façade softer and appear consistent with adjacent residential development. He said that what he had done here is provide the Board with a means of breaking up that solid wall in defined terms that developers understand.

Mr. Hoyle referred to the second page of Monroe's memo and said there is a statement he would like to be clarified somewhat. He noted that the memo said "with the substitution of the --- language, or some form of it"; he asked Monroe if he proposed changing the language contained in the memo. Monroe said that

what he was suggesting was that if there was something that the Board felt needed to be changed it should feel free to do so. Mr. Hoyle concluded that the Monroe had used the information from SeaTac and modified it to fit the town's needs. Monroe said he simplified it a little bit because that portion of the UDO was about 30 pages long and he said he culled out what he believed to be significant elements that would be appropriate for Pittsboro. He said that some of their buildings were intended to have nearly 300 feet of lineal face and he said he didn't anticipate seeing that kind of Planned Unit Development on that scale; so he reduced the scale and made the language simpler.

Ms. Farrell said she thought he did a good job with it because she could understand it. Mr. Hoyle asked Mr. Howard if he was comfortable with the standards since he is in the construction business. He said that in item three it says that "use of material variations such as contrasting colors, brick, or metal banding"; he asked what "metal banding" meant. Mr. Howard said that he didn't know what kind of metal they are using. Monroe said that metal banding is used frequently in the northwest to provide a protected surface between changes in textures, such as going from brick to another texture. It is frequently employed as an intermediary step that allows that change in texture to occur and still maintain an integral surface that is impervious to water intrusion.

Mr. Hoyle asked Board members if they had any questions regarding these standards since it seems rather clear. **Ms. Farrell made a motion that the Board recommend approval of the standards. Mr. Plummer seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Mr. Hoyle introduced the **Spoon rezoning** at Lowe's Drive. He noted that the request addressed a 1.105-acre site on 15-501 south of Lowe's Drive, and Mr. Spoon is requesting a change in zoning from R-12 to C-2.

Monroe indicated that the property is a portion of the front yard of Mr. Cooper's residence and is adjacent to his convenience store/gas station. He said that the property is adjacent to an outparcel Mr. Spoon owns and that is associated with Bellemont Station. The request obtains consistency since it seeks an extension of the C-2 district.

Mr. Hoyle asked Monroe if Mr. Spoon was simply requesting a zoning change. Monroe said that was correct. Mr. Hoyle indicated that there was no point in getting in to what is proposed. Monroe said that the Board had to consider all the available uses in the C-2 district as being available to the site.

Ms. Farrell asked if all of the property to the north was currently zoned C-2. Monroe said that it was, and that across the street was Powell Place, which is zoned MUPD. Mr. Hoyle asked that status of the convenience store. Monroe said that the site was zoned R-12 but the use was grandfathered as an existing non-conforming use and could continue so long as it did not cease operations for eighteen consecutive months. He said the same status applies to the used car lot, which is south of the convenience store.

Mr. Hoyle asked if they could switch businesses. Monroe said the business could change so long as the proposed new business was no more intense a use than the current business. He said there had been a number of changes in the used car lot in the last few years but all of them have been within the parameters of the non-conforming use clause.

Ms. Farrell said she found the application consistent with the Land Use Plan and the zoning ordinance and made a motion to recommend that the property be rezoned from R-12 to C-2. Ms. Marsh seconded the motion. Monroe asked that the motion be amended to incorporate adoption of the Resolution of Approval. **Ms. Farrell amended her motion to include the Resolution; Ms. Marsh amended her second to also include the resolution. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Hoyle introduced the **Spoon rezoning on Russet Run.** Mr. Hoyle said that before the Board got started on this request he asked Mr. Spoon if he had heard anything from the UNC Autism Center. Mr. Spoon said that he went to the center a couple of weeks ago to ask them about their opinion of the application. He said that Mr. Gene Bober is in charge of the response; Mr. Spoon said he told Mr. Bober exactly what he intended to do and Mr. Bober had not yet responded. Mr. Spoon said that the rest of the neighbors are behind him. Mr. Hoyle again affirmed that this is nothing more than a request to change the zoning. Monroe said that was correct, he said that what Mr. Spoon was requesting was traditionally considered a transitional district between residential districts and commercial.

Mr. Plummer asked if the adjacent property would be rezoned. Mr. Spoon said that his intention was to develop some retail facilities against 15-501 and residential behind that. Mr. Spoon said that this would be a transition to that. Mr. Hoyle asked if the mobile home along the side of the road was on his property. Mr. Spoon said that the mobile home encroached on his property by about eight feet but that it did not belong to him and he was not responsible for it being there. Mr. Spoon asked Monroe to contact Mr. Dye and ask him to remove that.

Ms. Farrell made a motion that the Board recommend approval of the request. Ms. Marsh seconded the motion. Monroe asked the members to consider amending the motion and second to include adoption of the Resolution of Approval. **Ms. Farrell amended her motion and Ms. Marsh amended her second. The amended motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Hoyle introduced the next item, the **Habitat for Humanity** rezoning for some property on the corner of Farrell and West Street, a property that used to be an old service station and now is the Pittsboro Family Eye Doctor. Monroe said that in his memo he explained that the property is bounded on two sides by the Chatham County Board of Education, on the east and the south. He said we can rest relatively assured that those properties will not change hands any time soon unless something dramatic happens. He concluded that there

would be no further pressure for continuing C-2 zoning further down the street to the east.

He noted that across the street is the Griffin Funeral Home and to the west is the Habitat Store. He said that, clearly, this is where the C-2 ends. Mr. Hoyle asked what the house between the Habitat Store and the Car Wash is zoned. Monroe said the property is zoned O&I; Mr. Plummer confirmed that conclusion. Mr. Hoyle said that Monroe's memo states that the request is consistent with the Land Use Plan and that it is difficult to discern how the rezoning of this property could affect the value and enjoyment of the adjoining properties.

Ms. Farrell made a motion to recommend approval of this rezoning. Ms. Marsh seconded the motion. Monroe asked if Ms. Farrell and Ms. Marsh would amend their motion and second to include adoption of a Resolution of Approval. **Ms. Farrell amended her motion and Ms. Marsh amended her second to include adoption of the Resolution of Approval. The motion was approved unanimously.**

Mr. Hoyle introduced the **Sixty-four Crossing at Eubanks Road-MUPD**. He noted that a rezoning request on this property had been presented to the Planning Board in the past and that it had been withdrawn from the town review to rework it as an MUPD application. Mr. Hoyle said there was a lot of material and the Board would want to address the concerns expressed by Monroe as well as any concerns they may have among themselves.

Monroe said that the format presented for the Board's consideration is the existing regulations governing the Mixed Use Planned Development criteria for submittal have been taken paragraph by paragraph. Shown in italics in the submittal document are the responses to the specific requirements that have been shown.

The applicant has taken the Table of Uses and has modified those uses to eliminate some uses that they felt were not as consistent with the residential nature of the adjoining property and therefore could create some conflict in uses. By looking in the last column it is clearly defined which uses they would like to have permitted as part of the set of standards that apply to the MUPD document. Monroe said there are a couple of area that he thinks the narrative could benefit by some discussion and clarification; they are not significant things but they are not areas that we should have defined more clearly so that we know we are not giving an open ended change over certain standards. The most important of the standards is the request by the applicant a variation in the parking standards be permitted. It is not unusual that different standards be requested, but Monroe said that he felt this was a fairly open-ended request that could result, if the town affirmatively acted upon this document, it could result in wholesale changes in the parking requirements and that would not have been what the Planning Board would have wanted or the Commissioners intended. He said he did not think that was the intent of the applicant, but the language is independent of what he desired, and the item would benefit from some discussion.

The application further asks that a deferral of the sign plan be allowed until some time after an approval for rezoning, and that is not at all uncommon. The application indicates an intention to use the Master Sign concept but not to apply for the sign plan until the rezoning is approved.

Monroe said they had gone into great detail about the specific roadway improvements that are proposed and the roadway improvements on Eubanks Road are based on a tier of roadways beginning with a full boulevard at the intersection of Eubanks with 64 Business; from that point it tapers down as the road proceeds north. These improvements are shown in Attachment 8. Monroe said he stated in his memo that he had a concern that no mention is made in the executive summary of the timing of these improvements, and that is a mistake. On page 7 there is a delineation of the roadway improvements that are proposed in addition to the improvements required of River Oaks; that is followed by a statement on page 10 that the roadway improvements will be made first.

Mr. Hoyle asked Monroe to point out on the map where the road improvements would be. Monroe pointed out Eubanks Road and showed the location of a series of driveways and said that the widening would begin at the southerly end of the road and taper down to the north; it would begin with a full boulevard, a wide street from driveway two to three and a business street to the north end of the property.

Monroe said that he also points out that there are a number of improvements listed in the document but they are assigned to the Toll Brothers project River Oaks. There should be some discussion to provide for what happens if this project gets approved and gets on the ground before River Oaks does and where required improvements are warranted based on traffic generated by Sixty-four Crossing but Toll is not prepared to do those improvements because River Oaks doesn't need them yet. Monroe said he would like the Board to have that discussion before taking action on this request.

Monroe said he had raised some questions about the Economic Impact Analysis and has received some responses prepared by Lucy Gallo that bring some clarity to the concerns he raised and puts them in perspective.

Monroe went on to say that the narrative states that they will create stormwater management devices that will satisfy the requirements of DENR and that they will in fact design to NPDES Phase 2 Stormwater Standards which exceed the current standards that are in practice. Monroe said that when he looked at the Illustrative Site Plan that is shown in Attachment 4, he noticed that there was a stormwater detention pond shown in an area that is identified as a floodplain. He said he felt there should be some discussion of that as well so that the record is clear about what the town is being asked to consider with regard to this issue. The Illustrative Site Plan does not fix that location of that detention pond where it is shown in case that is a potential issue.

Monroe said he didn't believe that any of the issues he raised were substantive in nature and Ms. Gallo's memorandum to some extent satisfied the points he raised about the economic analysis and about job creation.

Mr. Hoyle asked Monroe to explain his comment about some land possibly becoming land-locked. Monroe explained that there is a piece of property immediately on the east that is bounded on the north by the By-pass and on the south by the ramp from the by-pass to Business 64. Monroe said he felt there was no way DOT would ever permit a driveway in either of those locations so the only means of access to that property would be through the Eubanks Crossing property. Monroe noted that there is a fairly significant intermittent stream that bisects the property to the east and renders the easterly portion of it practically unusable without serious mitigation; but the westerly portion of the property would benefit by having the ability to access through the Chatham Park property. Mr. Hoyle asked Monroe how many acres are in the parcel. Monroe said he did not know. Mr. Hoyle asked Mr. Culpepper if he had heard anything from these people regarding that particular section of property. Mr. Culpepper said that Chatham Park had conducted some negotiations to purchase that piece, but with the environmental limitations on the site they felt it was too expensive. He said they had, in their original designs, discussions on this issue and they would be happy to make access to this property but they do not feel obligated to build a road to the property as long as it is connected in to their system that is not a problem at all. He said they would accept that as a condition.

Mr. Hoyle referred to Attachment 8 where a private drive is shown on the tract east of Eubanks Road and another one on the west side of Eubanks. Mr.

Culpepper indicated they are shown for internal circulation.

Mr. Culpepper indicated that he had a few comments if the Board would permit. He said he wanted to point out; he said that this document is just like everything else the Board has had tonight, it is a rezoning case. It is rather sophisticated, but it is a rezoning case. The Master Plan document is intended to establish the standards by which the MUPD would exist, it is kind of like writing its own little section of the zoning ordinance. It does not attempt to ask for a site plan approval, those would have to come later and would be followed by construction plan approval. This would establish the basic guidelines for what they propose to do on this property. This particular guideline establishes development standards. It is in large part what we are trying to get to, such as creating 100 foot setbacks near the residential areas, the maximum height and type of screening, buffer yards, buffered greenways, sidewalks; all these things are the basic elements of this mixed use development. In this case, mixed use is totally commercial and office, no residential. He said that it is not the place that they feel is appropriate for residential, between these two major thoroughfares.

He said they had eliminated many of the uses permitted in the MUPD zone because they did not feel some of them would be appropriate for the type of development they want to do in this area. He said, frankly, if the town had a

conditional use rezoning as many jurisdictions do (and you may be interested in looking at maybe changing the ordinance), they would have gone to that very quickly; but the town didn't have that for them to do that and the only way they could do it was through the MUPD to get to these type of conditions.

He said they are including everything they have been hearing should be included in projects in Pittsboro since he has been coming around here. He said they propose street trees every fifty feet, all the way down Eubanks Road and along Highway 64 Business. He said they planned sidewalks. He said they provided cross-sections of the roads not so much to show what they plan to do with the roads so much as the type sidewalks they plan and the street trees. He said the sidewalks are outside the street trees so that people are not walking right beside the road. The sidewalks are where people should put them and the sidewalks are lighted; cars have headlights so you don't have to light the streets. He said they had included greenways and open space; in fact the ordinance probably does not require them to have any open space because they don't have any residential property. They are supplying more than the necessary open space that would be required if they were doing residential.

Mr. Culpepper referred to the comment about the variance in the parking requirements he would add to the last sentence "subject to your approval". He said what they were trying to do was simply state that if, when they got to a site plan and they thought they needed to have this variation in the parking plan that they would submit that to the town at that time. It was not meant to be as open ended as it turned out to be and he proposed to add the additional language. He said that he would like to point out that they are proposing the lighting standards that the town is still considering. Monroe informed Mr. Culpepper that the town had adopted the lighting ordinance. He said they were applying that standard and would change the language in the plan to indicate it is the adopted ordinance.

He said one of the stipulations that they have, and everybody has been looking for it, is a tree within 100 feet of every parking space. They will be of reasonable size; they have to be maintained and have to be replaced if it dies.

In dealing with the stormwater management, he said they show a detention pond and under certain circumstances a pond can be designed in a floodplain but it was not intended to say that is the only place it can go. It will meet all the regulations and, in fact, all the new forthcoming regulations and, wherever practical, they will use the innovative techniques of low impact development such as rain gardens, infiltration swales, inverted islands, etc. He said they are not trying to ask for that detention pond to be approved, it was just intended to show they were planning to do something with stormwater without getting in to the details that will come about under the site plan.

Again, that Illustrative Site Plan is only intended to show how they might use the property under these standards.

He said that, quite possibly, the road improvements that are now associated with Toll will probably have to be done by Chatham Park Investors under the current circumstances. He said it is not any good for them to have this development out there without having those improvements in place.

He said they came to the Board earlier with a general rezoning and there were a lot of concerns about that expressed by the neighbors. He said they held a meeting at the Community House and invited all the neighbors and had about 45 people present. He said they stayed for several hours and took their comments. He said he has sent a copy of the same plan the Board got to everybody who was at that meeting and offered to meet with them to discuss any further concerns. He said Monroe was the only one who got a response from that. Monroe said that he had a telephone conversation with Mr. Wayne Britt; he is the property owner who moved here from the Town of Cary and was formerly a Council member in Garner and had expressed displeasure at the prospect of having a commercial development in his neighborhood. The tone of the conversation we had indicated that he was quite satisfied that this applicant had made every reasonable effort to respond to the requests that the neighborhood residents had made and he felt very strongly that, given the possibility of this property being developed commercially, this was probably the best deal the neighbors were going to get. Mr. Culpepper said they had given everything they could possibly give and what they have done here is to set a standard. He said they want to set the standard for what commercial and office development should look like. He said this plan does not try to use the land to the highest possibility, but to a reasonable level. You will notice that they put in a maximum of 50 foot building height and in the area near the residents they limited the maximum to two stories. He said everywhere they could address, they have tried to address things properly.

He said Monroe had pointed out some minor revisions and he wanted to point out that this is a book of standards. He said Monroe had asked for the standards to be stated as concisely as possible and that is what they have tried to do. They have tried to keep it as user friendly as they possibly could. He said they have tried to address the quality of the project, they have listened to what people have said and they respectfully request that the Board recommend approval.

Mr. Hoyle said that this was one of the most exact and precise applications and could almost be used as a prototype to be used by others who want to apply for this type of rezoning. He said he could find only one thing to be critical of in the presentation and that was that it would have been nice to have tabs in the document.

Mr. Hoyle addressed the Board and said that they had heard Monroe's comments and Mr. Culpepper's responses and they have the material and asked if any members had questions. Ms. Marsh said she was okay with everything.

Mr. Plummer said he thought it was to the point and it answers most of the questions that the Board has encountered with other rezoning request. He said

that he did not have a question. Mr. Howard said that he had not read it because he only got it this morning because he was out of town. He asked what this project would do to the traffic, especially at the circle. Monroe said that this project would probably have less impact than others because it is out on a transportation node and located closer to an exit on 64 By-pass. Some traffic would come to this site on East Street but most of it would use the by-pass. Mr. Plummer asked Monroe if he thought people coming to the project from 15-501 north would use the by-pass but they would not for Pittsboro Place. Monroe said that he did because the project is right there at the by-pass, they don't have to drive three miles back in to town to get to the project. Mr. Howard said he thought that there was just a mile between Pittsboro Place and this project. Monroe reminded the Board that this project was less than half the size of Pittsboro Place. Mr. Hoyle interjected that there are no condominiums or apartments. Mr. Howard said it looks good from what he has seen. Ms. Farrell said her only question was the traffic and she is satisfied with the answer. Mr. Hoyle asked what the procedure is following Planning Board action. Monroe said it would proceed to the Commissioners and a public hearing would be held. Ms. Farrell asked Monroe if he was satisfied with the responses, and if there was anything sticking out that the Board is not seeing. Monroe said he didn't think there was any glaring issue between the proposed standards and the responses we have heard tonight. He said that he thinks the only issue comes down to the question of whether or not the Board thinks this project is appropriate for the site and for Pittsboro.

Ms. Farrell made a motion that the Board recommend approval of the MUPD for Sixty-four Crossing at Eubanks Road. Ms. Marsh seconded the motion. Mr. Hoyle asked Monroe if there should be changes to the submission. Monroe asked that the responses presented by Mr. Culpepper be incorporated in to the text which is sent to the Commissioners. **Ms. Farrell amended her motion to include the changes. Ms. Marsh amended her second; the motion passed unanimously.** Mr. Hoyle introduced the **Powell Place Condominiums** indicating this was an application from the Livingston Building Company which seeks to develop 120 condos in the Powell Place mixed use project. He said that it is not an East West Partners application. Monroe said that was correct. The Powell Place Illustrative Mater Plan identified this area of the project as the location of multi-family uses and this application represents roughly half of that multi-family area. Monroe said he has a preliminary draft of a minor subdivision that would create the tract on which this project would be sited; he said he believes the minor subdivision should be completed this week.

Monroe said his memo raises a few issues which ought to be discussed because they do relate to the way the project is designed. He said there are three real issues that he feels are important to resolve. The first involves the proposed retention wall; approximately one third of the way toward its center the height of the wall would be approximately 21 feet from the base to the top of the wall.

That represents a fairly significant structure that Mr. Spoon's property would be facing. Mr. Spoon owns the triangular piece of property north of this site. If he were to develop something on that land he would be looking at an exit ramp and a fairly sizeable wall. That is an issue that bears some discussion. He said he also raised the issue that there is no access shown through this tract of land in to Mr. Spoon's property. He said he had been provided a revision to the site plan which extends a driveway between buildings 8 and 10 to the property line. That change would resolve the need for a physical means of access.

Monroe said he had raised a question about the condominium documents because they were received after the packets had gone out. He said he had suggested that those needed to be approved before the plan is approved but he has subsequently had a couple of discussions that lead him to believe they do not have to be approved before the plan is. Changes in the site plan could result in changes in the condo documents and it would be appropriate to have them approved after a site plan approval. He said that he is now not bothered by that issue but he is bothered by one thing in particular in the documents and that is that applicant desires to have every condominium unit served by its own individual roll-out trash container. Monroe pointed out that on the site plan a detail indicates that each condo would have a parking space in the driveway and a garage space. This means that Waste Management trucks would have come in to the access and pick up from one side then back up and back into the area to pick up containers from the other side. A truck serving that portion of Powell Place could easily be in that area of the project for more than twenty minutes picking up trash. Monroe said he feels that is a recipe for disaster for people who live there because they are not going to want to hear a trash truck outside their condo for twenty straight minutes every Friday. Monroe said he hears complaints from residents of Chatham Forest who don't like trash trucks going through their neighborhood at 5 o'clock in the morning; he has heard complaints from Potterstone Village and he knows that if that plan were to proceed forward it would become a nightmare for the residents and for Waste Management. He said he spoke with a representative from Waste Management and she felt this plan would not be in the best interest of the company to have 120 individual pick-ups in an area where the trucks could not drive right through; it was her suggestion that several sites be identified on the plan where dumpsters could be located and that would make trash collection simple. He said that is a more reasonable approach to take and it is a recommendation he would make.

Monroe said there is some reason for concern on sheet 4 where it appears that the first floor elevation of buildings 1 and 2 are lower than the elevation in the parking area; that suggests to him that rainwater is going to flow toward the garage and toward the residences on the back side of those garages. He said that given the experience in Dan Deacon's business park this has become an area to which the town has become sensitized and he recommended that these details be corrected.

Monroe said there is no street lighting plan neither presented nor even suggested so he asked that at least a note be added to the drawings indicating that street lighting will conform to the Town of Pittsboro regulations and to the standard of lighting established in Powell Place. He said he is confident that the Property Owners' Association and the Architectural Review Committee of Powell Place would mandate conformity to the lighting plan but he thinks it would be appropriate to have that on the plan.

Monroe said there is very little detail about the vegetation plan and there will be cars parked outside the garages and this leads him to believe this could have the potential for having a rather bleak look in the paved areas where all the garages are located. He said he thinks a better plan could be derived.

Monroe said he also has a lot of concern about building 5 where there appear to be patios and anyone in the back of that building would be immediately confronted with a 14 or 15 foot drop as the land slopes down in to a detention basin. He said he didn't see any detail that there would be a physical separation at the top of the berm from the back of the building; this has caused him to feel some concern. He said, additionally, there is no detail to indicate if the area behind the garages at building 6 would be curbed and it would be possible for someone backing out of a garage could go down into the detention pond.

Monroe said these are the kind of details that he believes should be resolved before we acted on the plan because some of those issues are going to affect building design and location.

Mr. Hoyle noted that he counted 13 or 14 major concerns noted in Monroe's memo. Ms. Farrell asked why there would be a 21 foot tall retention wall.

Monroe said he did not have an answer for that. Mr. Hoyle asked if there was a representative present from Livingston; there was no one present. **Ms. Farrell made a motion that the Board table this application until these issues are addressed. Mr. Howard seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Mr. Spoon said that he would like to meet with this applicant to talk about the access and that whenever they submit he will try to submit a plan contemporaneous with them. He said he plans on putting an office condo on his site. He said he is also a little concerned about the height of the wall because he has walked that property and he doesn't remember any 22 foot drop. He said he would like to try to work with them and work that out.

Mr. Hoyle asked the Board to consider an alternative date for the September 3 meeting. Ms. Farrell asked to make it the same week. **Ms. Marsh made a motion to schedule the meeting on September 6. Ms. Farrell seconded the motion; it passed unanimously.**

Ms. Farrell said she was concerned about the sidewalk at Beggars and Choosers and the general uncleanliness around town and wondered if someone couldn't take some time to clean things up.

Mr. Hoyle asked that some attention be given to the sidewalk in front of Town Hall to attempt some weed removal.

There being no further business, Ms. Marsh made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Farrell seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 pm.