

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, February 20, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. at the Derry Municipal Center (3<sup>rd</sup> Floor) located at 14 Manning Street in Derry, New Hampshire.

Members present: Virginia Roach, Chair; Neal Ochs, Vice Chair; David Granese, Secretary; Beverly Ferrante, Council Representative; Phil Picillo, Town Administrator Designee, Randy Chase, Administrative Representative, Ann Evans, Jim MacEachern, and David Nelson.

Alternates present: Jan Choiniere.

Absent: Alternate Richard Tripp.

Also present: George Sioras, Director of Community Development; Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning Clerk; Mark L'Heureux, Engineer, Derry Public Works; Todd Connors, Sublime Civil Consultants; Stefan Toth, John Kucich, Bohler Engineering; Gregory Michael, Wiggin & Nourie; and various members of the public.

Chairman Roach called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., and the meeting began with a salute to the flag. Mrs. Roach advised of emergency exits, the location of additional agendas, and introduced the Board members and staff to those present.

### **Escrow**

There were no escrow requests this evening.

### **Minutes**

Mr. Nelson noted a correction to the last page of the minutes in the motion for approval for the Conditional Use Permit: "move" should be "make". The minutes were accepted with that correction.

### **Correspondence**

Mr. Granese advised the Board is in receipt of a copy of a letter from Town Administrator Gary Stenhouse, appointing Mr. Chase to the Board as the Administrative Representative. His term is indefinite. Mr. Granese welcomed Mr. Chase to the Board.

EBI has forwarded a notice with regard to the cell tower located at 10 Beacon Hill Road in Derry. They have collocated equipment on the tower. A plan has been provided with the letter.

There will be a Conservation Commission Institute meeting at SNHPC on February 21, 2008 beginning at 6:30 p.m.

The Town of Hooksett has forwarded notice of a ZBA hearing which was held on February 12, 2008, with regard to a variance for a cell tower. The February edition of *Town and City* has also been received.

Mr. Nelson had a question with regard to the cell tower located on Beacon Street in Derry. He confirmed the intent is to collocate on the existing tower. He noted the Board has an expedited process for that.

### **Other Business**

Mrs. Roach advised the Board has received a response from Attorney Clark with regard to escalation factors associated with cell tower removal bonds. The letter was available for the Board members to review.

Mr. Sioras reminded the Board members there will be a workshop next week to discuss the open space ordinance and to review the 30 Year CIP. He and Mr. MacEachern will work on the CIP.

Mr. Sioras invited any abutters to the McDonald's property to review the plan prior to the hearing in an adjacent room.

### **Public Hearing**

#### **The Goddard School PID 08079-006, 12 Tsienneto Road Acceptance/Regional Impact/Review, Site Plan Continued from January 16, 2008**

Mr. MacEachern inquired if the Board would hear the entire application again, or would the applicant just answer the questions posed at the last hearing? The questions would be answered.

Todd Connors, of Sublime Civil Consultants represented the applicant, The Goddard School. Several representatives of the landowner, and the School were present in the audience. Mr. Connors advised he would like to update the information provided at the last meeting and address the issues and concerns raised by the Board.

They prepared revised plans and submitted them last week to Keach-Nordstrom for review. They received a new review letter and there are no design matters outstanding. The second item is the analysis prepared by Sublime for parking. They took a look at the Nashua location and put together a summary graph

which shows peak requirements for parking. They utilized information from the staff schedule; the sign in/out log for the children; the occupancy on the day recorded, and made several adjustments. They adjusted the number of students present on that day to what would be considered full capacity; adjusted the rate for siblings, which in the Nashua location is 14% - Sublime used a rate of 10% , reduced from the number of students to the number of cars. They assumed it would take 15 minutes to complete the drop off of each child. 'Drop off' consists of entering the site, parking, removing the child or children from the vehicle, walking them into the facility, signing them in to the classroom and then leaving the site. The Goddard School reports this typically takes between 5 to 10 minutes per child, but Sublime used the higher number. The conclusions were tabulated for the peak AM, noon, and peak PM. Goddard School literature suggests that 30-40% of the students leave at noon. In Nashua, that number is 17%, so in this study, they used 17%. This would suggest an increased demand for parking at the end of the day. The high point in the morning drop off requires 36 spaces. Derry's requirements are 10% higher than that, and Sublime feels that 40 parking spaces can satisfy the regulation. They feel they can back up what is required by the regulations with the results of this study.

Mr. Nelson inquired with regard to the time increments on the graph. Mr. Connors explained they broke the 15 minute drop off period into 3, five minute segments and the overlap is appearing on the graph.

With regard to the traffic analysis, Mr. Connors reported that after the last Planning Board meeting, they met with Planning staff and the DPW Director to determine the scope of the update to the traffic report. Sublime directed the traffic engineer to do additional field work. He performed a car count and a speed survey. The spot speed survey is important in that speed will play a factor with regard to traffic light warrants. The warrants are different if the speed on the road is greater or less than 40 MPH. Tsienneto is posted at 40 MPH. It was discovered that the speed was 36 MPH on the east bound lane and 38 MPH on the west bound lane. They averaged using the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile which brings the speed on Tsienneto Road to 41-42 MPH. Given the use of standard engineering techniques, that reduces the warrants by 70%. They took the Board's comments to heart with regard to the traffic being different in this location.

The analysis added potential development on the south side of the road. Trip generations on the Goddard School side of the road are consistent. They used an office project as an example on the lot next to them (eastern), rather than the previously discussed retail space. Across the street, they posited a retail building, a gas station, and potential parking for Pinkerton to the rear, because that is what they had been told is conceptual for those lots. Retail is a possibility for the lot to the east of the Goddard School, but they are currently pursuing an office concept. They were also told the only other lot across from the Goddard lot abuts Sunview Condominiums to the east, and has a right of way to the lot located across from Goddard. All parcels have access to the middle parcel

across the street from Goddard and that parcel lines up with the proposed street access for the Goddard lot. Sublime did not include information with regard to Pinkerton traffic entering onto Tsienneto in the analysis. It had been suggested there may be future access to Tsienneto from Pinkerton Academy, but it is not slated for the near future. Any incorporation of the Pinkerton traffic information would necessitate performing a traffic study of Pinkerton's traffic. The exclusion of Pinkerton Academy is irrelevant when all of the south side properties are developed because a traffic signal would be warranted with or without Pinkerton traffic entering there. They did not include Pinkerton in the fair share analysis, which made their contribution higher, but they determined that was outweighed by the cost of performing an analysis of Pinkerton Academy's traffic.

Mr. Connors advised the updated analysis concludes there is no traffic light warranted for their project or for an office building for the next lot. Any development of two lots across the street would trigger the warrant for a traffic signal. The previous study did not look at the south side of Tsienneto for traffic flow rates. Trip generation projections revealed that side would have more traffic and will trip the signal warrant. At the end of the day, three lots on the north side will eventually connect to a traffic signal, as will three lots to the south side, and possibly, a connection to Pinkerton Academy.

Mr. Connors stated he agreed that his client should pony up for their portion of the fair share contribution. The traffic engineer based the fair share contributions on trip generations based on the average in the AM and PM peaks. The fair share contribution for The Goddard School would be 20%. He pointed out the note by the traffic engineer that The Center for Life Management (CLM) is already built. CLM driveway traffic counts hit what it was estimated for it back in 2006, so they feel the current analysis will prove accurate.

With regard to the driveway alignment discussion, he prepared an exhibit that gives a look at that. He provided copies for the Board members and a copy was retained for the file. He explained the top of the plan shows CLM, Goddard, and the next lot. Along the bottom is depicted a portion of Sunview Condominiums, a large space, another lot and then the Tire Warehouse lot. The first plan shows what was proposed in 2006, with the darker driveway lines indicating the current driveway alignment. The original driveway for the Goddard School lot was pushed back to allow for queuing length when a light was installed. The bottom shows where the southern development would need to go in order to line up with the Goddard intersection. This does not affect the potential building size on the southern lot.

The second page of the exhibit plan shows an office concept next to the Goddard School and they have also designed parking for potential retail across the street which would have a one way in/out, and also picks up additional parking. They were also able to add about 500 square feet to the building when they reconfigured the parking area.

Mr. Connors explained that the use next to The Goddard School has changed from a retail facility to an office development because the retail use would not work with the driveway alignment.

Mr. Nelson inquired if Public Works has seen this conceptual alignment, and have they rendered an opinion on it? Mr. Connors advised this plan was prepared for this evening's hearing and was not in the member packets that were prepared in advance, nor was a copy submitted to DPW. This conceptual drawing is based on their discussions in 2006. Mr. Nelson inquired if DPW wanted to weigh in on the plan and asked Mr. L'Heureux for his opinion.

Mr. L'Heureux advised DPW has seen similar conceptual plans in the past. At first glance, this plan looks similar as it has a central entrance location. He has not looked at the packet of information containing the traffic analysis prepared for this evening, nor has Mr. Fowler had a chance to review the information as a result of his tight schedule this week. Mr. L'Heureux stated he could not offer comment on the traffic analysis or other information prepared for the Board.

Mr. Nelson wondered if the Planning Board could state that the driveway locations are okay based on this plan, and make it binding on future site plan submittals. Mr. L'Heureux pointed out that once the plan in front of the Board is approved with its driveway location, all other properties would be forced to line up with it. Mrs. Roach inquired if this alignment was acceptable to DPW? Mr. Connors did not believe the Board could make this binding upon the property across the street. Mr. Nelson wanted to make it binding on this plan, and then the others will follow. Mr. Connors advised that this location is what was presented to the Board.

Mr. MacEachern suggested implementing some type of tickler file so that any future development across the street line up with this intersection. This plan will essentially lock in future driveway locations.

There was no public comment on this plan.

Mr. Nelson asked if there was an actual number to go with the percentages of the fair share contribution? Mr. Connors said at this time there is not a dollar value. They would like to see the number approved at 20%, and a dollar value established for that percentage prior to the signing of the plan.

Mr. Nelson noted that CLM has been assessed a fair share contribution of 16%. He did not feel it was fair to spread that 16% out over this and future applicant's portions just because the Board did not collect the funds when the CLM plan was before it. The 16% may need to come from the town. Mr. Picillo suggested allocating the 16% over the south side development and the remaining lot on the north side. He did not feel the town should have to pay the 16%. Mr.

MacEachern commented he was not sure what impact CLM would have on the light. Mr. Connors explained they will use the light because of the cross easements granted as part of the 2006 subdivision.

Mr. Connors noted the fair share contribution is similar to an impact fee and he has reviewed the statutes. This is not an impact fee because it is not in the CIP. It is an exaction, which is within the rights of the Board to impose. Whatever proportionate share not attributed to those that benefit from a signal would be the town's portion. CLM has direct access to this light. He suggests that money will be in a fund and the light for this intersection will need to be placed in the CIP.

Mrs. Roach noted that two different trip generation counts could be assigned to the remaining northern lot based on the use. If the use reverts to retail, then the trip generation peaks will increase in the PM. That would cause the fair share contribution for that lot to increase. Mr. Connors agreed. He said the Goddard School contribution will be affected by any site plan for the remaining lots that is different than what has been suggested. The traffic study will need to be reconfigured each time a lot is developed. If at the end of the day, the Goddard School contribution is 10% rather than 20%, they know they won't get the other 10% back.

Mr. Nelson inquired how the town came up with the fair share contributions for the light when Victory was built? Mr. Sioras advised that when the Victory Supermarket (now Hannaford) study was performed, the impact was based upon the impact to Ross's Corner. When Applebee's came in, the state contributed to the traffic light. At that time, the town asked for a contribution from Hadco, Dial-A-Drug, the 7-11 and Clearbrook Center. The amount came to about \$7500.00 per; and the town worked out the contribution. There is precedent to go back and ask for a contribution from existing lots who will benefit from the traffic light.

Mr. MacEachern felt the issue before the Board this evening was whether 20% is the figure that The Goddard School should contribute. As part of the motion, it would need to be clear that their portion is 20%, and there would need to be a discussion with DPW to determine the cost of a traffic light. Funds would have to be set in an interest bearing account. Would the 20% be at today's costs? The town may end up having to make up any difference. The town could decide to put in the light next year, and then recoup from lots as they develop later. That has also been done before.

Mr. Picillo wondered if any consideration could be given to adding a CPI index to the 20% so that they bear the fair share of any future increase in costs. Mr. MacEachern felt this should be turned over to the Engineering Department to determine what the escalation would be. Mr. Picillo noted that prices can change in five years as exhibited by oil costs. He suggested if the 16% allocated originally for CLM was spread over the other lots, that would make the Goddard School portion about 30%. Ms. Evans agreed CLM should be taken out of the

equation. Mr. Nelson did not feel it was equitable to up the cost because the town did not collect the money previously. He thought if there was a shortfall, it was possible to ask CLM to contribute.

Mr. Connors stated the Board does not know what will be built on the other four properties or if Pinkerton will ever connect to Tsienneto. The contribution will need to be re-evaluated each time a plan comes before the Board. The Goddard School proportionate share would not include CLM. The funds have to be placed in an interest bearing account, per the statute, so that takes care of the escalation factor. The fair share contribution amount needs to be set at today's dollar value. If their share drops to 10%, then they lose 10% because their assessment was made during Planning Board approval as 20%. The exaction statute states that if the funds are not used within six years; they need to be given back to the developer.

Motion by MacEachern to accept jurisdiction of the plan, seconded by Ochs. The motion passed in the affirmative with Chase recused.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the plan pursuant to RSA 676:4, I, *Completed Application*, subject to the following conditions: Comply with the KNA report dated February 18, 2008, subject to onsite inspection by the Town's engineer; establish escrow for the setting of bounds or certify the bounds have been set; establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project; the establishment of a fair share contribution for a future light, setting the Goddard School's amount at 20%. The exact dollar amount of that contribution will be set at a future meeting to be held between The Goddard School and the DPW. The driveways will be aligned as presented this evening and placed in the plan set, and the conditions of approval shall be met within six months. Second by Ochs. Discussion followed.

Mr. Nelson inquired if this is a revised set of plans? Have there been changes to the lighting? Mr. Connors noted they added lights in two locations to get rid of dark spots near CLM and one was added on the common driveway to the northeasterly side.

Picillo: This is a good project and a good plan and he would like to see the school built, but the 20% contribution is too low. No.

Ferrante: Yes

MacEachern: Yes

Ochs: When the applicant came before the Board they were told this was the wrong place to put this use. Day Care was left out of this zone when the zone was created. He believes the ZBA stretched its authority but this Board can't take that decision back. Because of the location of CLM and their co-use of the

parking lot, a school in this location is not in the best interests of health, safety and welfare of the citizens and taxpayers, and the children that will be going through that parking lot. He believes there is a safety issue and he will vote no.

Evans: No. For the same reasons as Ochs stated. There are safety concerns. This is a poor location for all the traffic generated at peak hours and that causes a safety hazard. She does not feel the 20% is a high enough for a fair share contribution.

Chase: Abstained.

Nelson: Yes. This is a good project and the applicant has met all the objections of the Board. The variance granted by the ZBA took the use issue out of the hands of the Planning Board.

Granese: No. There is not enough parking on the site. There is an issue with the overflow of traffic from CLM which causes a concern for the safety of the students and the percentage for the traffic light should be more.

Roach: No. There is not enough parking and she has a concern over the amount of traffic and also believes there is a safety issue.

The motion was denied by a vote of 3-5-1.

**McDonald's USA, LLC/Bohler Engineering  
PID 36020-001, 45 Crystal Avenue  
Acceptance/Review, Site Plan  
Demolition/reconstruction of building**

Mr. Sioras provided the following staff report. The lot is located on Crystal Avenue in the General Commercial zone. The project involves the demolition of the existing 6200 square foot building and the construction of a new 4920 square foot restaurant with play-space. All town departments have reviewed and signed the plan. Bohler Engineering has prepared several waiver requests which were revised today; the letter is included in the member packets. The waiver requests are supported by Keach-Nordstrom. There are no state permits required. Mr. Sioras is recommending approval of the waiver requests and the site plan. He felt the engineer did a great job working with staff to address concerns and mitigate wetland concerns on the abutting property.

Stefan Toth of Bohler Engineering presented for the applicant. Also in attendance were John Kucich, of Bohler Engineering, Lynn Misiashak of McDonald's Corporation; Attorney Gregory Michael of Wiggin & Nourie; and Emil Haddad, owner of the Derry McDonald's.



Mr. Toth explained the existing location of the new building and traffic circulation. The original building was constructed in the late 1960's early 1970's. It was rebuilt in kind when it was destroyed by fire in 1980. In 1995, McDonald's added the play-place and expanded the parking. The current site is considered existing, non-conforming, and they are keeping the same setbacks or making improvements to them with this plan. There is a wetland to the rear of the lot. The wetland is culverted through the McDonald's site and leads to town drainage.

The intent is to keep the driveway locations, resurface and stripe the existing parking lot. They will push the building back from the street and the wetland, so have gained some green/open space. They will add a dual order window which will help with site circulation, and decrease wait time for the customers. The number of parking spaces will remain the same, but the parking area will move back from the property line on the left side of the property.

There are several waiver requests. They will keep the existing sign location, but will replace the directional signs at the entrance.

Mr. Granese inquired if the new building will look like the one just reconstructed in Lynn, Massachusetts? Mr. Kucich confirmed it will, although the materials may be different. Mr. Toth noted it is similar to the one just reconstructed in Epping, New Hampshire and will look like the one in Enfield, Connecticut. There are not many built in this style.

Mr. Picillo inquired what will be the width of the outermost passing lane? Mr. Toth advised it will be 20 feet wide. One car will be able to go around the order lanes. Mr. Toth presented a facsimile of the Enfield, Connecticut store; a copy was retained for the records. The rendering is the same architectural design, but the signage will be different along the sides of the building.

Mr. MacEachern inquired if the sign will remain out front? Mr. Toth stated the main identification sign will remain unchanged.

Mr. Nelson had a question with regard to the architecture. The material appears to be split block and he is not keen on that. Derry is trying to get away from that. He does not feel this material is what the architectural regulations are encouraging. Mr. Toth explained they looked at the neighborhood and thought this style would be a better fit. Mr. Nelson said the buildings that have been constructed more recently, since the architectural regulations were put in place, look different. Mr. Toth thought this design was more in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. They met with staff and the Planner during TRC and this style got the most votes out of the several presented. They would like it to fit the area, and not stand out.

Mrs. Choiniere inquired as to the time line between demolition and re-opening. Mr. Toth stated McDonald's typically re-opens within 60 to 90 days; the longest might be 120 days. They have a vested interest in getting the new building constructed quickly as they will not make money from this location during that time frame. Mrs. Choiniere noted it will need to be completed within a year because of the non-conformities.

Mr. Ochs respectfully disagreed with regard to the architectural rendering. He likes this and feels it will fit in. He does not find this design offensive. Mr. MacEachern inquired if this facility will have less seats? It will.

Mr. MacEachern said he looked at the waiver requests. With regard to parking, there are currently 79 spaces on site. The new building will be smaller, with less seating, but they can increase the parking to 83 spaces. Have all 79 spots ever been filled? He would like to keep the number of spaces at 79 and in turn, have better landscaping and more green space. He understands the intent of the regulations, but does not see the parking spaces all filled at sites around town. He would rather see less parking and more landscaping and not have a waiver from the landscaping.

Attorney Michael stated they could keep the parking at 79 spaces and add landscaping; the plan for which could be acceptable to staff to negate the need to come back to the Planning Board for an additional hearing, just to review landscaping. He agrees that parking regulations don't always make sense, but wanted to stress that they have made an effort to comply with Derry's regulations and to make this lot more conforming. Mr. MacEachern agreed and cited the example of Flagship Cinema parking. There is a lot of pavement on that site and the spaces are never completely full, with the exception of a few weeks around the holidays. He would rather see more landscaping.

Attorney Michael advised, after consultation with his client, that some days are busy and the lot is full, but they would like to keep the parking at 79 spaces. Mr. Toth noted that even if they do keep the number of spaces at 79, they will still need to request the landscaping waiver.

Mr. Granese stated he liked the plan. The building will make Crystal Avenue stand out. He asked if the material around the door is EFIS? Mr. Toth confirmed the material is EFIS and the color scheme will be white, brick and yellow.

Mr. Picillo inquired if anything had been done with the design that will help the environment? Is there anything in this building that could be considered "green" with regard to design, lighting or heating? Mr. Toth stated the newer style windows have better windows and appliances. Ms. Misiaszek advised the building will be more efficient than in the past with regard to energy, and HVAC systems, and will be more cost effective. The lighting will all be high energy efficiency lighting. They do take care to reduce utility usage.

Mr. Nelson inquired if the materials to be used to construct the building are called out in the plan set? Mr. Toth advised the elevation plans are to the rear of the plan set; the details are on those plans. Mr. Nelson commented the regulations ask for an essay format from the applicant that explained how they have complied with the architectural design requirements. Thus far, only one applicant has done that.

Mr. Nelson recalled that Mr. Keach, in his review letter, recommended obtaining an opinion from the Zoning Administrator with regard to signage. If the directional signs have a corporate logo, they might be able to be counted toward total lot signage and that would increase the nonconformity. Mr. Toth reported he spoke with the Code Enforcement Officer and Mr. Keach with regard to the directional signs. What is in existence today is similar to what they are proposing. The directional signs will be close to the entrance and they are proposing the same type, an "M" with an arrow (see Sheet D1 of the plan set). Mr. Keach had inquired if the "M" component would be considered marketing, and therefore need to be placed within the 10 foot setback. Mr. Toth advised that Mr. Mackey indicated at TRC that it could be left as it is; CVS has something similar and he felt it was allowable. The Board could ask him for a formal opinion. Mrs. Roach felt they were replacing the signs with like kind. Mr. MacEachern suggested any approval motion state 'compliance with KNA review, less Item 2 under Zoning Matters'. Mr. Toth noted the Code Enforcement Officer did not feel that directional signs fell under the site signage package.

Mrs. Choiniere inquired if the exit door in the play area would be alarmed? Is that a fire exit only? It is. There is an alarm on the door.

Mr. MacEachern asked if the picnic table in the front will remain? It will not. Ms. Evans inquired if the operating hours would change? Mr. Haddad stated they currently operate the drive thru 24 hours a day. The dining area closes at 11:00 p.m. or midnight, he was not certain which. The operating hours will not change.

There were no abutters present who wished to speak on this application.

Motion by MacEachern, seconded by Picillo to accept jurisdiction of the plan. The motion passed unanimously.
--

*Motion by MacEachern to approve the application under RSA 676:4, I, Completed Application, with the following conditions: comply with the KNA report dated February 15, 2008, less Zoning Matters, number 2; subject to onsite inspection by the town's engineer, establish escrow for the setting of bounds or provide certification the bounds have been set; establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project; and the above conditions be met within six months.*

*Mr. Picillo's second was removed so that the Board could discuss the waiver requests prior to voting on the application.*

Motion by MacEachern to approve the waiver requests for McDonald's USA, LLC, 45 Crystal Avenue, PID 36020-001, from the following sections of the LDCR: Section 170-63, Parking Requirements, A.2, to maintain the existing parking space distance from the setback; Section 170-64, Landscape Standards, A.3, to allow 26.1% green space; Section 170-63, Parking Requirements, A.6 to allow a 9 foot wide island near the parking spaces closest to the street; Section 170-64, Landscape Standards, B.1, to allow 4 trees along the street frontage; Section 170-67, General Requirements, B.1, to allow the dumpster enclosure to be 9.8 feet from the property line, and Section 170-63, Parking Requirements, B.4.1, to allow 79 spaces (Mr. Toth added that even at 79 spaces, they are still under the required minimum). Mr. Ochs seconded the motion.

Picillo, Ferrante, MacEachern, Ochs, Evans, Chase, Nelson, Granese and Roach all voted to grant the waivers.

Motion by MacEachern to approve the application under RSA 676:4,I, *Completed Application*, with the following conditions: comply with the KNA report dated February 15, 2008, less Zoning Matters, section 2; subject to onsite inspection by the town's engineer, establish escrow for the setting of bounds or provide certification the bounds have been set; establish appropriate escrow as required to complete the project; subject to the waivers already granted, that the waivers be noted on the plan and the above conditions be met within six months. Mr. Ochs seconded the motion.

Picillo, Ferrante, MacEachern, Ochs, Evans, Chase, Granese and Roach all voted to approve the plan; with Granese and Roach adding this was a good plan the building will be an asset to Crystal Avenue.

Nelson: No. The burden of proof with regard to the architectural regulations has not been met. Split block and EFIS are not appropriate New England traditional materials for this type of project.

The motion passed with a vote of 8 -1.

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn. The motion passed and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:34 p.m.

Minutes recorded by Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning Clerk.