

Official
As of 2/04/08

HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, January 7, 2008

CALLED TO ORDER

Vice Chair R. Guay called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

ATTENDANCE

Vice-Chair R. Guay, D. Hemeon, J. Gryval, R. Duhaime, D. Dreffs, P. Rueppel, J. McHugh Y. Nahikian and B. Ehlers.

Excused: D. Marshall. R. Sullivan and D. Jodoin

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 12/10/07 and 12/17/07

J. Gryval motioned to approve the minutes of December 10, 2007 as submitted.

Seconded by B. Ehlers

Correction page1: J. McHugh excused.

Vote unanimously in favor. Abstain R. Duhaime, J. McHugh, D. Hemeon, and P. Rueppel.

J. McHugh motioned to approve the minutes of December 17, 2007 as submitted.

Seconded by D. Dreffs.

Vote unanimously in favor.

DISCUSSION

FRANK KOTOWSKI & FRED BISHOP

Update on Trail Initiative and Grant Application with DRED

F. Kotowski: Information – In September, the Town Council voted to delegate the responsibility of maintaining the Town’s nature trails to the Kiwanis Club. The Hooksett Kiwanis Club is eight (8) years old and takes on projects that will benefit children and residents in the community. The Kiwanis Club worked with MS&G to dedicate the new trail at Heads Pond. That trail is a small part of what we would like to develop. The Heritage Trail would come from Bow and cross the Lilac Bridge and go behind the Holy Rosary Church and Donati and hook up with Manchester. Our goal is to get that trail from MS&G – Heads Pond to Pleasant Street. From there, possibly go behind the Head Cemetery, and connect to the back edge of Country View Estates, and then to Webster Woods (which is an obstacle), to the extension of Bernice Street and the gas line. There is a paper street to Granite Street to get to the Village. This would provide an opportunity to do the Heritage Trail.

We went to a trail seminar and learned about grants available for trails. We've done a great deal of work and we would like to hear that the Planning Board is in support of these efforts.

We already have the support of Park and Rec. and the Conservation Commission. We are awaiting MS&G saying they are on board. We need to make sure there are no endangered habitats as well.

D. Hemeon asked for a plan to be presented to the Planning Department so that we can assist, when we see future development coming in, we can make requests.

***D. Hemeon motioned to have the Planning Board send a letter of support to DRED.
Seconded by P. Rueppel
Vote unanimously in favor***

BRUCE MAYBERRY

School Impact Study Report

Bruce Mayberry: I was hired by the Hooksett School District to update the School Impact Fee System, which dates back to 2001 based on 2000 data, which makes the current fee system seven (7) years old. At that time, grades K-8 were at 120% capacity.

The study looked at existing need and new development. There were major changes made in the district in 2003-2004 by adding a new middle school and renovating the existing middle school. Conditions were more than satisfied.

We made changes to the variable in the fee calculations, which were enrollments.

We updated the sf per pupil.

The costs and credit allowances were updated for 2007.

The result for single family is 4978.

Multi family goes up based on the enrollment per unit for construction Town houses were down.

The single family increased 1200 over 6 years.

The ordinance allows the PB to adopt a report and then must be recommended to the Council for the implementation of a new fee schedule.

Did some speculative work and have developed a model for a H.S impact fee.

J. McHugh: When we spoke about this it was the PB suggested that if there was an update on the impact fee, the School should pay. The School did that. It is important to have a current fee schedule and we now have addressed the H.S. issue if needed in the future.

Schedule A is being recommended.

***J. Gryval motion to accept and recommend that the Council implement schedule A of the impact fee schedule. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

COMPLETENESS AND PUBLIC HEARING

WEBSTER WOODS PHASE II

Hooksett Road, Map 6, Lot 114

Site Plan for 46 Duplex units and 7 single units, 55 & older person housing

Staff recommends completeness.

***D. Hemeon motioned to find the plan complete. Seconded by J. McHugh
Vote unanimously in favor***

Public Hearing

Peter Godzik:

Mike Gospodarek Edward Herbert Assoc., Inc.: This is for the second phase of a two-phase project off of Route 3. The second phase will be consistent with phase I.

Zoning issues – This area is surrounded by LDR and Mixed Use.

Ash Street is the main entrance. The utility easement has gas and water lines. There are wetlands on the west side of the property. There is a Sewer Easement from Beaver Way. We are trying to keep the development centered in our land project. The closest we come to the property line is 100 feet. This is serviced by three (3) road systems. Emergency access coming off Bernice St. and another emergency access off Otterson Street. The Otterson access is currently gated and they are proposing to gate Bernice as well. This is on Town sewer and we are proposing to mitigate the environmental issues with a tree box. There is a proposal for a detention area for a bio-detention area.

J. Duffy: Currently, there is an emergency gated access from Otterson, and a proposed gated access on Bernice. Dale Hemeon, needs to have input on a turnaround.

D. Hemeon stated they are working with P. Locchiatto on that.

J. Duffy: Does the Planning Board want another access other than gated access?

We will need an amended declaration of condo docs for our attorney.

There is a question on whether they need a waiver on the 1200-foot cul de sac.

D. Tatem: It doesn't extend beyond the 1200 but it does based on interpretation. The intent of the limited length of the road is for safety, and the gate will reduce that. These are private roads and therefore not required to meet the town specs. Cul de sac length applies to public and private road because of safety.

J. Duffy: The trail: I discussed this with S. Couture; historically there was a hiking trail heading north and south and we would like to request an easement for that trail through that back land. I recommend further discussion with the Trail Committee.

P. Godzak: I don't believe that trail would be problem. We can add something to the plan. We already have the easement.

R. Duhaime: Phase I was approved without traffic studies?

J. Duffy: It was approved in the 80's.

D. Tatem: They have new traffic studies.

J. Duffy: They received approval from the Zoning Board for a variance to build Phase II.

J. McHugh: Will there be a phase III?

P. Godzak: No, this is the end of our development and there will not be any other phases.

J. McHugh: We would like to see the traffic study prior to any approvals.

Y. Nahikian: I see you did a lot of design but you are only offering one layout. It is confusing to have all the same look of roads and housing.

P. Godzak: I would invite the board to come for a site walk.

R. Duhaime: There are a lot of steep elevations and the buffer is down in the valley. The neighbors will see this neighborhood. Is there a community building?

P. Godzak: There is a clubhouse large enough to accommodate this second phase. The covenant states it will be shared with all phases.

We are in support of the trails

D. Hemeon: Have you spoken with the State to put an additional access off of Route 3?

Open Public Hearing

R. Duhaime motioned to continue to Feb. 4. Seconded by J. McHugh.

Vote unanimously in favor

AV HOOKSETT, LLC

Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lot 19

Non-residential Site Plan for a 2 Floor, 56,000 S.F. Medical Office Building
Completeness

Staff:

Dan Tatem and Jo Ann Duffy both find the plan complete.

D. Dreffs motioned to find the plan complete. J. Gryval seconded.

J. McHugh asked about J. Duffy's comments about concerns with the wetland permit which was administratively incomplete. They are however complete for this process because it has been submitted.

Vote unanimously in favor.

Public Hearing

J. Duffy: The condo documents are pending. On sheet 5 of 18, under notes, it refers to a "residential condo" which is incorrect, it should also be Performance Zone not Commercial.

They have provided 9'x18' parking and they should be 10 x 20 based on patients length of stay.

Dan Tatem stated that the board would decide the parking once the data with regard to length of stay is provided by the applicant.

B. Ehlers: Will this ever be Ambulatory Health care and open 23 hours?

Wayne Morrill, Jones and Beach: There are no plans for that. It will be strictly doctor's offices.

J. Duffy: That would require an amendment. The Conservation Commission has serious concerns with the amount of wetland fill being proposed by this development.

A waiver is required for the requirement is 1" scale for 40 and they have 1" scale for 50. They must have Performance Zone referenced in a number of areas.

D. Tatem: The idea of the amount of time in a space, most NFPA requires 9 x 18 and Hooksett says 10 x 20 for bigger cars and movement. It is easier to come and go with wider width isles.

Wayne Morrill, Jones Beach: In 1996, this came before the board with the design for a bank, the restaurant and 70,000 sf of office. The permit for the traffic was based on 70,000 of retail. The adjustment was done to Route 3 in 1998 based on that. In 1995, a Special Exception was granted for the wetland and the impacts. There is a large wetland behind Wendy's. DES and the Conservation Commission approved 36,800 sf of wetland. In 1998, they did some fill but didn't fill the entire wetland. With this proposal we are adjusting that down to less than 10,000 sf of wetland. We submitted that to DES and the permit is moving forward. The proposal is to use the existing sign. This will be done in two (2) phases, the first being 35,000 sf and the second phase being 26,000 sf. The parking spaces are 9' x 18' spaces.

There will be 76 office employees in the facility and the average visit is 1 to 1 ½ hour per visit. We calculated the parking for all medical office with labs and storage and we are showing parking for the entire building. We have provided for 214 parking spaces. We want to build the entire loop around the building and the parking will go in a phase two or when needed. The parking in front and on the sides will be part of phase I. The entrance will go up by the Wendy/Bank entrance. We will remove five (5) parking spaces, which are currently being used by the bank. There will vertical granite curbing, sidewalks, dumpsters on the south side and retaining walls. There is a 10-foot grade difference from the front to the back. The drainage is a closed drainage system and goes to a pipe to a treatment swale. We exceed the 100-year storm event. We will bring

utilities into the site. We have letters from water and sewer for capacity. Knowles landscape design meets the requirements of the Performance Zone. From the conservation land to the residential neighbors is 200 feet of natural trees. There is conservation land around the back of the site that provides the abutters will a buffer. The closest building to building is 300 feet. To the top of the hill, if you could see through the hill, you'd be above the ridgeline. Reno Engineering did the lighting plan too conform to the Performance Zone.

Adam Wagner: Architecture of the building

This previously was a retail building, which typically would not be attractive in the back. We have designed a four-sided building with an entrance on the upper level.

This is a single story building on the backside and two stories in the front, which will be built in two phases of 34,000 and 2nd, is 22,000 feet.

We tried to use a mix of residential scale windows and larger windows only at the entrance. We select materials to last. The Hardy siding has a 50-year warrantee on the paint. Proposing a natural stone base, which ties in with the architecture in the area.

In regard to the square footage of the parking lot, we have designed parking of 9' x 18' and will feel this will work with this building.

J. McHugh: Are you going to take space used by the bank. This bank is very busy, particularly at noon.

D. Tatem: The traffic study has not been submitted. We need the original study to verify that the updates have been done.

Will removing the five (5) spots from the bank make the bank substandard?

A. Vailas: Those five (5) spaces were added and are not on the original approved plans for the bank.

J. McHugh: If you remove those spaces, there will be accidents.

D. Hemeon: I would like to see the original plan for Lindsay's detention pond. The State doesn't know which way it is suppose to run and how it is designed? I believe it should flow across the road.

D. Tatem: We made a comment that it must be functioning properly.

D. Hemeon: You need to design the lighting so that it is not a nuisance for the neighbors.

D. Tatem: There may be a restriction for security lighting level after hours.

D. Dreffs: Phase I will have a completed building but it will not have all the windows. You should do the base and maybe do some siding.

Dan asked for a plan

D. Tatem: Is the lower parking at phase II new since TRC?

W. Morrill: Yes that is new. We will grade it and stabilize it and just have the loop around building. We will show that as a phasing plan.

D. Tatem: I think the board should discuss doing all the paving at once rather than in phases.

A. Vailas: In Londonderry, they wanted more green space so they deferred one third and it was less than 3 to 1 but we are trying to be more aesthetically pleasing but if required we will build it. Need 210 parking spaces by code and we are showing 214 parking spaces.

J. Gryval: 87,000 sf of parking area. Where will all the snow go?

D. Tatem: Note #17 references Snow storage.

D. Hemeon: If you went from 9' to 10' parking spaces. How many spaces would be lost?

W. Morrill: 20 spaces would be lost. You'd have 194 instead of 214.

J. McHugh: I would opt for bigger spaces because cars are bigger now. It seems in a number of locations in the community, you have areas that started out as retail and lead into residential areas. Is there any zoning ordinance with regard to what degree the depth can be?

J. Duffy: In commercial zones abutting residential you must have 25 foot buffer but this isn't commercial. This actually has 200-foot buffer.

W. Morrill: We need to preserve a 5-acre conservation area. We have wetland on either side and we tried to fit this in the middle for the least impact.

Y. Nahikian: I don't think the length of parking is as important as the width if we made it 10' x 18'. There should be a time frame for the second phase. For example, if there is no second phase in two years, there should be some plantings in that area and some work on the backside where the residents will be looking.

R. Duhaime: I like the building and the use, but I don't like the site. As a TD Bank user, we added the access to Autorium and now they exit through the bank lot. I'm not a traffic expert but this will be a problem. We need to have traffic engineer address these concerns.

Open Public Hearing

Victory Silver, 29 Virginia Court: I want to make sure this won't connect to Lindsay

Dennis Pinelle, 13 Virginia Court: Over the last weeks, we discussed this project. We object to this project without any studies. Will there be late night emergency service? We have a letter to submit with the following issues:

- Environmental impact – we found the original plans and there are wetland impacts there. Has there been an environmental impact study?
- Will this impact the value of our homes with lighting?
- Flooding issues along Route 3 now. With adding 200 spaces and 80,000 sf of asphalt, what problems will that create?
- Traffic: I have concerns with the Wendy's, Bank, Monroe and the Pizza and Video shop cut through.
- Wetlands, we are unsure, it sounds like a nice building but we don't like the site.
- The area businesses don't like the idea: is there a vehicle for their input?

Cheryl Favreau, 11 Virginia Court: I moved here for the peace and quiet. I previously lived on Mammoth Road. There are turkeys living in the trees where they want to build. There is an Oncology Building that is in Hooksett now. What will happen to the environment with this building? Campbell Hill is an excellent place and I hate to see this at this site. If you move it further down Route 3, it won't bother anyone.

William Bovaird, 15 Virginia Court: First you said you can't see the building and then the second guy said when you look down you see the building. What about the glass in that building? People in the building will be looking up at us sitting on our decks. Will there be any blasting? We felt blasting from the Dunkin Donuts. Resale, I will be looking at a downhill slope in my backyard. That will be dangerous for families. Commercially zoned, we were told no one would be able to build back there.

John Hanna Jr., 7 Burbank Way: When was the original plan submitted, in 1996? Campbell was built in 1998. That shouldn't be allowed.

Denise Levesque, 41 Lindsay Road: I'm glad it's not coming onto Lindsay.

Cheryl Favreau, 11 Virginia Court: I understand the need for the medical park, but it's the location that I object to. I counted the vacant lots along Route 3 and there are a number of vacant lots for sale that have been sitting unused. Why put it where you will disturb the wetlands. I came to Hooksett because it's a town. I came from Manchester. It's going crazy. We will be a city soon.

D. Hemeon: Without changing the zoning, there isn't a lot you can do. So, as residents, you need to change the zoning..

R. Guay: This applicant owns this site, and we have no legal right to stop them.

Cheryl Favreau, 11 Virginia: If we have no say, why do we come here?

R. Guay: So that we can make sure they meet the regulations. They must meet the regulations that are on the books now.

Victoria Silver, 29 Virginia Court: We are stuck, I understand that. Now that we are here, it is a given, they will get their permits. Can you mandate them to plant tall evergreens, thick and dense, so that eventually, it will be so high, we won't have to look at all those businesses?

D. Hemeon: That is why it's important to put your concerns in writing to the planner so that we can address these issues.

Dennis Pinelle, 13 Virginia Court: I came here thinking that the Planning Board had to review traffic and that is a concern. The lights are now all backed up. The traffic study has not been done. Can you explain to the residents what the process is ?

D. Hemeon: This will be continued for another hearing.

J. Duffy: They did submit the traffic report and Dan Tatem would like a copy of the initial study, which was done in 1995, submitted for comparison.

D. Tatem: The initial study was done for a considerably larger building, but we still will review it.

R. Guay: Stantec is the Town's engineering firm. They work for the town and give us a recommendation. We rely heavily on them. That information is public record and is in the file.

J. Duffy: This land was initially zoned commercial and was zoned for 70,000 sf retail, which would have had a greater impact. This is a better use of the site and the restrictions for the Performance Zone will help. I'd like to recommend that the board make a decision on the size of the parking spaces so that the changes can be made.

D. Tatem: We shouldn't make the developer wait until next month, if you will decide to require ten (10) feet.

Y. Nahikian: What I see wrong is they have to clear cut up to the property. I give the architect credit in doing this in two steps. I suggest, if you eliminate the first tier, you could move 80 feet away from the neighbors.

A. Vailas: We are bringing the parking closer to the other commercial uses and away from the wetlands. We don't think we need that many spaces but we gave you what the ordinance requires. It's not a high turn over. If you reduce the number of parking, we can move the whole building closer to the road. You are also asking us to widen the space.

Y. Nahikian: You should come with a few options, understanding the abutting residential neighborhood.

D. Hemeon: If I ask for wider spaces, I don't want more spaces.

R. Duhaime: You can't take someone's land away. They have rights.

A. Vailas: How do we get a reduction in parking?

R. Guay: If you show that the turnover is what you say, we can do that.

A. Vailas: Pediatrics and Geriatrics offices are anticipated.

D. Tatem: Without a waiver, the regulations allow 9'x18' for employee parking if it is designated. If you move the building down towards Wendy's, there appears there is room to the North to gain some spaces.

Letters of concerns can be submitted to the Planning Office.

Letter submitted to the board at the meeting, see file

***J. McHugh motioned to continue to Feb. 4. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor***

PUBLIC HEARING

EDGEWATER INVESTMENTS INC.
50-54 Edgewater Drive, Map 5, Lots 6, 7, & 8
Consolidation and 4 lots Subdivision

Continued Feb. 4th

JOAN ELLIOTT
39 Pine Street, Map 7, Lot 3
3 Lot Residential Subdivisions

D. Duval, representing RJM Builders: This is a 3-lot subdivision for 1.5 acres and we are proposing two (2) new house lots. The existing driveway will be shared. The reason for the shared drive is the slopes. There is sufficient frontage.

We've already been found complete. I asked for a waiver on showing the topography. There is a note on the plan; only the sheet going to the registry will show topo.

Waiver:

Contours

D. Tatem: I think this is a good idea

***D. Hemeon motioned to approve the waiver. Seconded by R. Duhaime
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Site Specific

There is a conflict between your checklist and regulations. The checklist calls for site-specific soils but following the regs, I don't need to show it.

D. Tatem recommends the waiver

***R. Duhaime motioned to recommend the waiver for site specific. J. McHugh
Vote unanimously in favor***

Soil scientist

D. Duval stated he has been all over the land and he doesn't feel it is necessary to hire a specialist.

Dan read from the response from Stantec

Don Duval: I've been doing this for 30 years, and I know what is wet and what is not and this is all sand. I would be wasting my money.

J. McHugh: We hire Stantec for their opinion. We must respect it.

D. Tatem: We recommend the front section mapped where there is proposed planned disturbance, where there is no disturbance, no mapping required.

***J. McHugh motioned to require mapping on the front section where there is proposed disturbance and waive the requirement in the rear where no disturbance is proposed.
Seconded by J. Grvyal
Vote unanimously in favor.***

One-foot trees

D. Tatem recommends the waiver for the one-foot trees.

***D. Hemeon motioned to waiver the requirement for showing the one-foot trees.
Seconded by B. Ehlers.
Vote unanimously in favor***

Well

D. Duval: We've researched the easement with R. Hebert and no one has it. We are willing to give the town the easement and bring the well into compliance. This will provide the well radius.

Mr. Hebert's only concern was when a septic is designed on these two lots that they slope away. When septic systems are designed, he asked that he review them.

Since then, I believe Stantec has met with them and now they have concerns and I must meet with the full board.

I don't have a problem meeting with the Water Commissioners. Someone proposed bringing the water. Mr. Hebert, however said they can't make you put water.

D. Hemeon: How far is the sewer line?

D. Duval: I don't know.

D. Tatem: We spoke with Roger, Joe and Uncle Joe and they said you need to meet with the commissioner because one commissioner can't render a decision. They can't force you to run the line but they will try and persuade you. The Easement on the parcel must be submitted, reviewed, and recorded. Any compliance with the Well Head Study must be reviewed. The well is called out at a sensitive area. They have asked that.

D Duval: We agree to grant them the easement.

D. Duval: Stantec wants us to widen the driveway. They want a benchmark shown, which I have at my office.

D. Tatem: The Benchmark must reference USGS.

D. Duval: That is done. My engineer delivered information on the dry culverts. I request an approval subject to the Water Commission approval.

J. Gryval: Who will maintain the driveway? We don't want to create anything that will be a problem in the future.

D. Duval: We submitted an easement for Stantec and the Planner's review.

R. Duhaime: Is there an issue with the turnaround?

D. Tatem: The house could go anywhere, and when they decide, then they will submit a turnaround, which will be shown prior to the issuance of a building permit.

J. McHugh motioned to continue to Feb. 4. Seconded by R. Duhaime.

Open Public Hearing

None

Vote unanimously in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

SAMCO HOLDINGS, LLC

Smyth Road and Londonderry Turnpike

Map 43, Lot 33-4

Non-Residential Site Plan to construct a 5,280 sf Professional Office Building

M. Vanson: Propane tank change was made and they have been placed underground. We haven't made a change to the lighting plan but we will have controls for the individual lights with timers. He doesn't do business at night and the only time there would be lights at night was for plowing. It's a 5 or 6 day per week business.

D. Tatem asked that a set time be added to the plan indicating that the lightning will be on and set.

Mark Vanson: There was mention of a waiver for two (2) curb cuts on Smyth Road which we think were done and approved. There was one (1) waiver for the detention distance set back from the right of way, which was not needed.

New waiver:

The detention basin is V shaped Bed rock is about two (2) feet below the detention basin. It does get snow water infiltration. We don't have the 4 feet vertical separation required. We are proposing a sand-filtering layer; take 18 inches of septic sand and plant it with warm weather plantings.

D. Tatem: When you do infiltration, the regulations require a 4-foot separation. Septic requires 2 feet because you have a sand filtering. The State says if you can't do 4, put a sand-filtering layer achieving the same goal. This is recommended

***R. Duhaime motioned to grant the wavier. Seconded by P. Rueppel.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

Y. Nahikian: I would like to ask the architect to make changes. This is a boxy design.

M. Vanson: We discussed false gables. I haven't discussed the hip roof. The gable idea is a budget concern. The business wants to be environmentally conscious and that is where he wants to put his money and doesn't have the budget to do both.

Y. Nahikian: This is too plain of a building. What is being asked won't be that much more money and this will be there a long time.
Hip roof is one suggestion and gets rid of the high ridge.

D. Tatem: When we reviewed the dimensions, as it sits now, it meets the code, so technically we made no comment. The code is designed for big buildings.

R. Duhaime: This is in a residential neighborhood.

Cliff Harris: If this meets the code, there shouldn't be an issue.

Linda White, 1297 Smyth Road: We talked about the landscaping; my property is wooded. That area is still zoned MDR and all those trees will stay?

M. Vanson: The triangle is not proposed to be disturbed. This property is all zoned commercial.

J. Duffy: The tax maps show it MDR, but we believe those are incorrect.

Linda White: Do you need to put it in writing that these trees will not be taken down?

M. Vanson: There is no note on the plan. We are not committing to no development, ever.

D. Tatem: If you approve this plan as is, they must come back to the board to develop that piece.

Y. Nahikian: If the building is more than 100 feet, you need a jog, but in addition, there are other requirements, even if it isn't a 100 foot building.

J. Duffy: This is commercial and not performance zone.

L. White: I am disturbed that the town's maps are wrong. It seems confused, on the commercial, they could build beside my house.

Stantec has 17 outstanding comments.

Cliff Harris: Since you have the staff that knows the plans, and you know they will address the 17 issues, why don't you approve this?

*J. Gryval motioned to continue to Feb. 4th. R. Duhaime seconded.
Vote 8:1 in favor.*

BROOKVIEW SR. HOUSING

1631 Hooksett Road, Map 14, lot 32
Non-Residential Site Plan for 60 Unit 55+ Housing Development

*J. McHugh motioned to extend for 65 days. Seconded by R. Duhaime
Vote unanimously in favor.
Continue Feb. 4th.*

BEAVER BROOK DEVELOPMENT Continued Feb. 4th

Bypass 28 and Jacob Avenue, Map 49, lots 49 and 58 and Map 48, lot 26
87 Lot Residential Cluster Housing Subdivisions

ADJOURNMENT

The chair declared the meeting adjourned at 10:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted
Lee Ann Moynihan

