

Town of Scarborough

Zoning Board of Appeals

July 11, 2007

AGENDA

1. Call to Order (7:00 P. M.)
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes (June 13, 2007)
4. Appeals
 - a. Appeal No. 2375 – A Special Exception Appeal by Nathan Clark and Sandra Sargent, 4 Blueberry Lane, Assessor’s Map R4 Parcel 11, to operate a pet grooming business in the R-F Zone
 - b. Appeal No. 2379 – A Variance Appeal by Fred and Kathleen Bayley, 76 Jones Creek Drive, Assessor’s Map U22 Parcel 33, to construct a utility room 6.5 feet from the side property line in the B-2 Zone
 - c. Appeal No. 2382 – A Practical Difficulty Appeal by Jeremy Grondin, 117 Holmes Road, Assessor’s Map R31 Parcel 14, to construct a dormer 44 feet from the front property line and 28.01 feet from the side right of way and a mudroom 44 feet from the front property line and 26.16 feet from the side right of way in the R-F Zone
 - d. Appeal No. 2383 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal by Mark Nicholas, 141 Gorham Road, Assessor’s Map U54 Parcel 32, to construct a garage with living space 10 feet from the side property line in the R-2 Zone
 - e. Appeal No. 2384 - A Special Exception Appeal by Mark Nicholas, 141 Gorham Road, Assessor’s Map U54 Parcel 32, to create an accessory unit in the R-2 Zone
 - f. Appeal No. 2385 – A Special Exception Appeal by Marcie and Joseph Welsch, 188 Pleasant Hill Road, Assessor’s Map R78 Parcel 56E, to construct and operate a Day Care Center in the R-2 Zone
 - g. Appeal No. 2386 – A Variance Appeal by Barbara Silke, 4 Old County Road, Assessor’s Map R73 Parcel 3, to construct a garage, breezeway and porch 22 feet from the front property line in the R-2 and Shoreland Zone
 - h. Appeal No. 2387 – A Special Exception Appeal by Central Maine Power Co., Mussey Road, Assessor’s Map R55 parcel 5 and R56 Parcel 6D, to construct an electrical substation in the Industrial Zone
5. Zoning Board Comments
6. Adjournment

NO NEW ITEMS SHALL BE TAKEN UP AFTER 10:30 P. M.

Town of Scarborough

MINUTES

Zoning Board of Appeals

July 11, 2007

Members Present

Staff

Mr. Craft
Mr. Loisel
Mr. Maroon
Mr. Massengill
Mr. Temm

Mr. Grysk, Code Enforcement Officer
Mrs. Logan, Recording Secretary

1. Call to Order

Mr. Maroon called the meeting to order at 7:00 P. M.

2. Roll Call

The Recording Secretary called the roll; Messrs. Blaise and Dryzga were absent. Mr. Maroon authorized Messrs. Loisel and Temm to vote.

3. Approval of Minutes (June 13, 2007)

Mr. Massengill noted that Mr. Dryzga was absent from the June meeting and Mr. Maroon had called the meeting to order. Mr. Craft moved to approve the minutes of June 13, 2007 as with that change; Mr. Massengill seconded.

Voted 5-0

4. Appeals

a. Appeal No. 2375 – A Special Exception Appeal by Nathan Clark and Sandra Sargent, 4 Blueberry Lane, Assessor’s Map R4 Parcel 11, to operate a pet grooming business in the R-F Zone

Mr. Clark wanted to have a dog grooming business in one of the bays of their garage at the end of this deadend street.

Mr. Maroon read letters in opposition to the appeal by the following five neighbors: Carroll and Gladys Libby, 132 Burnham Road; Christine Hall, 2 Blueberry Lane; Richard Kelley, 1 Blueberry Lane; William Clark, 146 Burnham Road; and Gary and Rachel Howard, 3 Blueberry Lane.

At the suggestion of Mr. Maroon, Mr. Clark stated that he would like to table the appeal to the next meeting so he could address the concerns with the neighbors. Mr. Maroon stated that the appellant must notify the Code Enforcement Office by July 20, 2007 that he would like to be on the August agenda.

Mr. Massengill moved to table the appeal; Mr. Loisel seconded.

Voted 5-0

b. Appeal No. 2379 – A Variance Appeal by Fred and Kathleen Bayley, 76 Jones Creek Drive, Assessor’s Map U22 Parcel 33, to construct a utility room 6.5 feet from the side property line in the B-2 Zone

Mr. Jim Fisher, of Northeast Civil Solutions, displayed the site at Pine Point and noted that it fronted on the river but not on the ocean; he stated that the Bayley family had owned the property since 1945. Mr. Fisher stated that the appellants would like to retire to this house following renovations. He stated that they would like a variance for infill between the existing garage and the house so the utilities could be moved from the basement. He stated that there was a full foundation and basement under the house but it was a low area with a flood hazard; he stated that that the house was above the flood plain but the basement was always wet with the sump pump running most of the time. Mr. Fisher stated that the Bayleys wanted to fill in the foundation and have a cement cap so there would be no more water issues, and the utilities would have to be moved. He stated that from a stormwater perspective this would be better because they would turn the existing impervious tar into a garden when they renovated the house. Mr. Fisher stated that there was no building envelope on the lot because of the many layers of zoning.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fisher read the criteria as presented in writing.

To a question from Mr. Maroon, Mr. Grysk replied that this would bring the site into compliance with the flood plain but not with the Shoreland Zone. Mr. Maroon stated that he had a problem with Variance Appeals because of the reasonable return criteria but in this case the properties in this area needed year round use to be economically effective and it would be closer to compliance. He stated that there would be no gain other than making sound property decisions. Mr. Loisel noted that this was a good location for the room and it would not change the character of the area. Mr. Massengill stated that this was a good reason for a Variance Appeal because of the safety issue and the higher standard with the utilities out of the flood plain. Mr. Temm and Mr. Craft agreed that this was a wise decision. Mr. Maroon stated that this was a reasonable use of the Variance Appeal.

Mr. Maroon moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Massengill seconded.

Voted 5-0

c. Appeal No. 2382 – A Practical Difficulty Appeal by Jeremy Grondin, 117 Holmes Road, Assessor’s Map R31 Parcel 14, to construct a dormer 44 feet from the front property line and 28.01 feet from the side right of way and a mudroom 44 feet from the front property line and 26.16 feet from the side right of way in the R-F Zone

Mr. Massengill noted that he had a professional and personal relationship with the appellant but did not feel that would affect his vote.

Mr. Grondin noted that this was a two-part appeal; he stated that he wanted to replace his back steps, which were falling away from the house, with a 5 by 10 foot mudroom, which would be the same style as the house. He stated that the mudroom would be more functional and would not encroach on the side setback any closer than the existing garage. Mr. Grondin stated that the original survey was incorrect and a new survey had put his garage right next to the side property line. Mr. Grondin stated that the second part of the appeal was for a full dormer of about 27 feet which would be above the existing house with no additional setback infringement.

Mr. Grysk noted that any construction needed Zoning Board approval because of the front setback. To a question from Mr. Maroon, Mr. Grysk replied that the appellant was before the Board so the dormers could be stacked with the back wall rather than built in one foot on each side.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Maroon and Mr. Grondin addressed the criteria. Mr. Maroon stated that this was a straightforward appeal and the boundaries in the whole neighborhood were wrong and the shift in the property lines caused the nonconformance.

Mr. Craft moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Temm seconded.

Voted 5-0

d. Appeal No. 2383 – A Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal by Mark Nicholas, 141 Gorham Road, Assessor’s Map U54 Parcel 32, to construct a garage with living space 10 feet from the side property line in the R-2 Zone

e. Appeal No. 2384 - A Special Exception Appeal by Mark Nicholas, 141 Gorham Road, Assessor’s Map U54 Parcel 32, to create an accessory unit in the R-2 Zone

Mr. Nicholas stated that he wanted to build an accessory unit and needed to tear down a one car garage and join a new garage to the existing house with a 29 by 40 foot addition. Mr. Grysk noted that he had discussed this appeal with the appellant and had questioned the size of the garage; he stated that the appellant wanted more space upstairs for the master bedroom with the accessory unit in the rear, and the back portion of the garage to be a pool house. Mr. Nicholas stated that the existing house was built in 1933 and was only 1,300 square feet; he stated that the stairs to the basement were unsafe and he wanted to move the laundry equipment upstairs to eliminate trips to the basement. Mr. Grysk stated that this was the best way to accomplish what the appellant needed to do. Mr. Nicholas stated that his neighbors had no problems with the request.

Mr. Maroon and Mr. Nicholas addressed the criteria for a Limited Reduction Appeal. Mr. Nicholas stated that he would have about 2,800 square feet of living space. He stated that moving the addition five feet in to meet the setback requirement would make the area only seven feet wide and that would not accommodate a usable dining room which they needed because the kitchen was very small. He stated that he could not move the addition back because of the location of the underground pipes for the pool.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing for the Limited Reduction Appeal; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Loisel asked whether the applicant had talked with anyone about changing the shape of the structure and rearranging the layout to fit the lot; Mr. Nicholas replied that he had considered different layouts and any other layout would change the flow of the home. Mr. Massengill stated that he did not think the appellant had demonstrated there were no other alternatives; he noted that the accessory unit would be 696 square feet and the addition would be 1,160 square feet. Mr. Nicholas stated that he was making the garage larger than normal because of the four feet needed for stairs to the accessory unit, which would bring the width of the garage down to 24 feet as needed for two vehicles. He stated that he would also like to keep his seasonal vehicles inside. Mr. Loisel stated that it should be shown that all possible ways to design this structure had been exhausted.

Mr. Maroon noted that this appeal was less stringent than a Variance Appeal; he stated that he had never thought about the loss of four feet in the garage for the stairway to an accessory unit. He stated that he understood that the appellant had worked with Mr. Grysk, who felt this was the best way to build this addition. Mr. Temm stated that the position of the mudroom wall could be changed but without the extra

space for the stairway, the garage would be useless for two cars; he stated that this was a good option. To a question from Mr. Loisel, Mr. Grysk replied that he had some concerns with the original plans so the appellant color-coded them to show what was being done. Mr. Grysk stated that it did not seem unreasonable to accommodate the stairs and a two-car garage. Mr. Grysk noted that it was just a corner piece of the structure that would impact the setback and not the entire length of the garage. Mr. Massengill stated that he was not in favor of the size but, in light of Mr. Grysk's working with the appellant and there being only a small infringement on the setback and there were no letters in opposition, he would vote for this appeal.

Mr. Temm moved to approve the Limited Reduction of Yard Size Appeal as presented; Mr. Maroon seconded.

Voted 5-0

Mr. Maroon read the criteria for the Accessory Unit. He noted that the form had not been received and that should be a condition of approval.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Loisel moved to approve the Special Exception Appeal with the condition that the notarized Accessory Unit Registration form be submitted to the staff; Mr. Massengill seconded.

Voted 5-0

f. Appeal No. 2385 – A Special Exception Appeal by Marcie and Joseph Welsch, 188 Pleasant Hill Road, Assessor's Map R78 Parcel 56E, to construct and operate a Day Care Center in the R-2 Zone

Mr. Jim Fisher, of Northeast Civil Solutions, stated that a Day Care Center was a Special Exception in the R-2 Zone and would be good for the people who lived in the area; he stated that if this Board granted the appeal, there would be site plan review with the Planning Board. He stated that the site was perfectly situated for this use on Pleasant Hill Road with a field at the front of the site and woodland toward the abutters. Mr. Fisher stated that this was a two acre parcel with plenty of room for traffic to enter and turn around without backing out. He stated that the 6,700 square foot building would look like a New England home with a peaked roof which would not be visible because it would be behind the trees; he stated that the appellants wanted the site to be as unobtrusive as possible with no children near the road.

Ms. Welsch stated that she had been in the day care business for 17 years and wanted a natural setting where the children would not hear traffic and other noise and they tried to design the site so they would fit in with the houses. Ms. Welsch stated that the hours of operation would be 7:00 A. M. to 5:30 P. M. five days per week and the playground times when the children would be outside would be 10:00 A. M. to 12:00 noon and 3:00 to 5:30 P. M. Ms. Welsch stated that they served many families from the Pleasant Hill area so the traffic was already on the road and there would not be a lot of additional traffic. She stated that they were applying for a Day Care Center for 85 children.

Mr. Maroon and Ms. Welsch addressed the criteria for a day care and the Special Exception criteria as presented in writing. Mr. Maroon noted that there should be a circular driveway so no one would have to turn around.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing. Attorney Brian Hanson, who represented Daniel and Vicky Flynn, of 186 Pleasant Hill Road, stated that the Flynns had owned their abutting property since 1994 and had not envisioned this and were opposed to the plan. He stated that criteria b., c., and i. had not been met.

Mr. Hanson stated that there would be an increase in traffic when all the children were dropped off at the same time that would only add to the delays now experienced at the intersection of Pleasant Hill Road and Highland Avenue. He stated that the staff and delivery vehicles would also add to the traffic. He stated that any on-street parking would add to the problem. Mr. Hanson stated that this would create public safety issues because the size of the day care would mandate monthly inspections which required more fire protection. Mr. Hanson stated that this proposal would not be compatible with the neighborhood with respect to noise and hours of operation because the children would be screaming and there were no other playgrounds nearby which made this noise. He stated that although most people would be away from their homes during the day, others who worked at night or were home for other reasons during the day would have to listen to them. Mr. Hanson stated that the appellants would not experience any economic hardship if not able to build this structure but the neighbors would if it were built. He stated that there were other neighborhoods where this could be done.

Ms. Penny Salevsky, of 196 Pleasant Hill Road, stated that she had received a letter from the appellant. Ms. Salevsky stated that she was opposed to the size of this project and as a taxpayer she was opposed to the added dangerous traffic. She stated that the traffic was bad between 5:00 and 6:00 P. M. and she did not see how this would fit in the neighborhood.

Mr. Paul Corbeau, stated that he lived on Highland Avenue and his daughter lived at 192 Pleasant Hill Road and worked nights and slept during the day. He stated that one could not make a left turn into Pleasant Hill Road because people did not stop at the stop sign. He stated that he and his daughter were opposed to a day care center and felt the neighborhood should remain residential.

Ms. Jennifer MacLeod, of 28 Powderhorn Drive, stated that her daughter attended the appellant's school and they lived very close to this area. Ms. MacLeod stated that there was a definite need for day care in this location and there were three large neighborhoods within a quarter mile which would benefit, as well as Hannaford's headquarters less than half a mile away and the other businesses along the road. She stated that the appellant had made a great effort to make the structure look like a house and had contacted the neighbors; she stated that most people worked during the facility's hours and they would not be open evenings or weekends. Ms. MacLeod noted that there was a day care center in a residential neighborhood on Black Point Road that was a perfect example of how the building could work. She stated that affordable, high quality child care was rare and this was the best she had seen with well-trained workers.

Mr. Charles Solevsky, of 196 Pleasant Hill Road, stated that this 7,000 square foot structure would dwarf the existing 2,000 square foot homes; he stated that the Black Point Road neighborhood was more spread out and had less traffic. He stated that they had so much traffic and this would add more.

Ms. Cybele Brooks, of 33 Gunstock Road, stated that the Welschs had always wanted to be in a quiet neighborhood and there was a great need for quality day care in the area. She stated that about half the clientele lived in this area and a lot of the children were dropped off at different times. She stated that Pleasant Hill School was around the corner and this proposal was not a drastic change.

Ms. Vicky Flynn, of 186 Pleasant Hill Road, stated that she had lived at this address for 20 years and had three children; she stated that they had a private yard and, with the zoning, that was what they expected it to remain. Ms. Flynn stated that anything more would increase all the services and the traffic; she stated that a family would not generate 85 children with the vehicle trips. She stated that her husband worked nights and slept during the day and would be impacted with children in the yard for four hours per day. She stated that their property values would go down because they would no longer have the home they bought and they were opposed to this day care.

Mr. Maroon read letters in favor of the project from Chelsie Woods, 20 Fowler Farm Road; Shaun and Susan Nixon, 128 Highland Road; Ray and Susan Johnson, 126 Spurwink Road; Timothy and Monica Wright, 32 Powderhorn Drive; and Rich and Cybele Brooks, 33 Gunstock Road. Mr. Maroon read a letter in opposition from Kenneth and Susan Ross, of 189 Pleasant Hill Road.

Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Massengill asked that traffic be addressed. Mr. Fisher stated that traffic had increased everywhere; he stated that they had coordinated, but not yet done a traffic study which would be required by the Planning Board. He stated that there were two peak traffic periods, A.M. and P.M. He stated that in the Pleasant Hill area most of the traffic flowed toward Route One from beyond the Highland Avenue intersection and would be on the same side of the street as this building so there would be no traffic backup because the flow would be in that direction in the morning. He stated that there would be very little cross-traffic. To a question from Mr. Massengill, Mr. Fisher replied that during the afternoon pickup, there would be some traffic backed up but the intersection was over 500 feet away and, though he used the road daily, he had never seen traffic backed up to the intersection; he noted that there was no waiting for a light to change at the intersection because of the stop sign.

Mr. Massengill asked about the burden of public safety; Mr. Fisher replied that any public issues would be with the Fire Department, not the Police Department, and there would be an increase, but the monthly inspections were routine for the Fire Department and not a burden. Mr. Massengill asked whether other sites had been considered; Mr. Fisher replied that day care facilities required a Special Exception Appeal in every zone except the Industrial and business zones. He stated that the Welschs had considered where their children came from and their safety when they were looking for a site; he stated that they had looked at many other sites and this was ideal for them because it was away from the road and could be nicely camouflaged.

Mr. Craft asked about the level of noise and the view; Mr. Fisher replied that there was no panoramic view because of the existing trees which would remain and the area looked over the industrial yard. Mr. Fisher stated that this would be a one story structure and the view would not be an issue. He stated that children do make noise but they would not all be outside at the same time; he stated that the playground would be 300 feet away from Pleasant Hill Road and 50 to 60 feet away from the closest neighbor and they would erect any fencing or landscaping requested. Mr. Fisher reiterated that the clientele were already on the road and would not be adding to the traffic on their way to work. Mr. Craft noted that the stop and go of all the cars would back up traffic; Mr. Fisher stated that he would agree if it were cross-traffic but this is on the right side of the road in the direction toward Route One. Mr. Fisher stated that the driveway was so long that there would be no stacking problems on the street.

To a question from Mr. Temm, Mr. Fisher replied that the site was less than two acres and the building would be 50 feet from the back property line and 75 feet from the trailer area. He stated that they would work with the Planning Board and the neighbors to place the building and landscaping. Mr. Loisel asked how the appellant came up with the size of the building and the number of children; Ms. Walsch replied that in her letter to the neighbors she had indicated the number of children they were now serving, but she wanted to serve more to take care of the waiting list. She stated that the lot size would allow 92 but her license would allow up to 85 children.

Mr. Maroon stated that he was glad this business was in Scarborough but he did not think this was the place for it and he did not think the criteria had been met. He stated that a turning lane for this site would be necessary. He stated that 100 people in a facility would cause an impact and they did not meet Criteria c. regarding public safety problems; he stated that Criteria b. and i. could also not be met. Mr. Maroon stated that because of the criteria and the opposition from the neighbors, he could not support this appeal.

He stated that he was uncomfortable denying the appeal and asked whether the appellant wanted to re-group. Mr. Fisher stated that a lot of work still had to be done before going to the Planning Board for site plan review; he noted that this would not require a full traffic permit so the DOT would not approve another traffic lane. Mr. Fisher reiterated that the pickup and drop off was not all at the same time and the inspections were not a great burden on the Fire Department. He stated that there was no residential area in Scarborough where they could go because day care facilities were Special Exceptions in all residential zones. He stated that he would not want his children on Route One or in an industrial area. Mr. Maroon stated that without a traffic study the data provided was an opinion that may affect people's lives.

Mr. Temm asked whether the appellant could live with a smaller building; Mr. Fisher replied that the proposed building could not be expanded because of the lot size but if a smaller building were built, it could be expanded later. Mr. Loisel stated that he knew the traffic patterns in both directions and no one would be able to make a left turn toward the fire station; he stated that he did not think any data could be presented that would pass Criteria b. for traffic safety with this size facility. Mr. Loisel stated that the size of the building would not be compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Fisher noted that less than a quarter of a mile away there was a huge office building with 700 employees turning in and out.

Mr. Massengill stated that he thought this was a fabulous business that should remain in Scarborough but the Board had to make a decision based on the facts and rules; he stated that there was not enough specific information and with some documentation he might be able to overcome the issues of Criteria b., c., and i. Mr. Craft stated that 85 cars would have a significant impact and, though there was a need for this day care, he agreed that another area in Scarborough would be better suited for this business. Mr. Temm stated that the appellant could ask to be tabled and come back with more information and a traffic study.

Mr. Maroon called a recess at 9:40; the meeting resumed at 9:45 P. M.

Mr. Fisher asked that the Board vote on the appeal.

Mr. Maroon moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Craft seconded.

Voted 0-5 – The appeal was denied.

The Board discussed findings of fact as follows:

Mr. Maroon stated that the appellant had not met the Special Exception criteria b., c., and i. He stated that there was no traffic study to back up the information, that the facility was too large for the neighborhood and the noise of traffic and children playing were not compatible with the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Massengil moved to approve the findings of fact; Mr. Temm seconded.

Voted 5-0

g Appeal No. 2386 – A Variance Appeal by Barbara Silke, 4 Old County Road, Assessor's Map R73 Parcel 3, to construct a garage, breezeway and porch 22 feet from the front property line in the R-2 and Shoreland Zone

Mr. Jim Fisher, of Northeast Civil Solutions, stated that Ms. Silke wanted to build an attached garage with a breezeway and porch. He stated that the property had been in Ms. Silke's family for many generations and that Old County Road had been their driveway but had been taken by the town to alleviate the traffic problems entering Black Point Road. He noted that the Hunnewell House, across Old County Road, had been donated to the town by the appellant's family. Mr. Fisher stated that the road taking created a set-

back problem for this property, which had a grandfathered house next to the marsh and they could not move the proposed garage back because of the septic system. Mr. Fisher noted that there was a building envelope but it was 60 to 80 feet from the house and was not practical for a safe garage. To a question from the Board, Ms. Silke replied that she had a holding tank that connected to the public sewer system.

Mr. Grysk stated that this was a complicated lot because of the two streets and the Shoreland Zone.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fisher read the criteria as presented in writing. Mr. Maroon stated that this was a good use for the Variance Appeal and the land taking got him past the hardship criteria. The Board agreed that this was a reasonable request.

Mr. Massengill moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Temm seconded.

Voted 5-0

h Appeal No. 2387 – A Special Exception Appeal by Central Maine Power Co., Mussey Road, Assessor’s Map R55 parcel 5 and R56 Parcel 6D, to construct an electrical substation in the Industrial Zone

Mr. Mark Christopher, of TRC Associates, showed the location of the proposed substation on Lot 12 of the Walter Nielson Industrial Park off Mussey Road. He stated that there was a need for the substation to serve the new U. S. Postal Service building and the other businesses in the subdivision. He stated that CMP would use the 1.2 acre lot under the transmission line for this 480 square foot substation and would relocate Border Road to accommodate the stormwater detention. He stated that there would be no regular vehicle traffic to this site. He stated that the shed-type structure would house the control room and would be surrounded by a chain link fence; he stated that there would be three driveways for emergency access.

Mr. Grysk noted that this project had been planned when the subdivision was created and was on the master plan.

Mr. Maroon and Mr. Christopher addressed the criteria.

Mr. Maroon opened the public hearing; no one spoke for or against the appeal; Mr. Maroon closed the public hearing.

Mr. Massengill moved to approve the appeal as presented; Mr. Temm seconded.

Voted 5-0

5. Zoning Board Comments

Mr. Massengill noted that it would be very helpful if there were an aerial view of the area in the plans.

Mr. Maroon stated that he was sorry to hear that Mr. Babine and Mr. O’Riley had resigned from the Town Council. He noted that Ruth’s Recyclables, a very valuable resource for the schools, had found a new home thanks to UNUM Corp. Mr. Maroon asked that tonight’s discussion of traffic not be forgotten when SLOTS came back to town.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 P. M.

