

**Official
As of 12/20/10**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
Monday, December 6, 2010**

CALLED TO ORDER

Chair J. Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:00pm

ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD

Chair J. Gryval, Vice-Chair R. Duhaime, Town Administrator, C. Granfield, M. Cannata, D. Hemeon, Town Council Rep. N. VanScoy, T. Walsh, and F. Kotowski.

Excused: J. Mudge, B. Perry, and D. Marshall.

Absent: Y. Nahikian.

REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy.

J. Gryval: Alternate T. Walsh will be voting tonight in place of D. Marshall.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 11/01/10, 11/08/10 & 11/29/10

M. Cannata motioned to approve the minutes of 11/01/10. Seconded by C. Granfield. Vote in favor. D. Hemeon abstains.

M. Cannata motioned to approve the minutes of 11/08/10. Seconded by C. Granfield. Vote in favor. R. Duhaime abstains.

J. Gryval: We will move the approval of the minutes of 11/29/10 to the December 20, 2010 Planning Board meeting.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION RSA 91-A:3 II (e)

J. Duffy: The non-public session is no longer needed as it was completed at the last Planning Board meeting on November 29, 2010.

DISCUSSION

- 1. MANCHESTER SAND, GRAVEL & CEMENT CO. (#07-05 & 07-42)
HEAD's POND, Map 3, Lots 1 through 11, 17, 19 through 24, 26 AND
Map 14, Lots 2 through 5
DAVID CAMPBELL, ATTORNEY
➤ vesting agreement**

- DOT meeting – offsite improvements
- donation of land

David Campbell, MS&G Atty., Peter Holden, Holden Engineering, and Ron Corriveau, MS&G Operations Mgr.

D. Campbell: We are still going ahead with this project when the time is right; economy is better. We are very close to completion of the plan. At first we were going to phase the project. What we ended up doing is the project all up front and stretched out engineering review for a very long time. There are 22 topics that I will have Peter Holden provide an overview.

P. Holden: Distributed topic list to Board members and staff:

- 1) Reports – environmental impact (migration of turtles, etc.); final report requiring approval.
- 2) Existing Conditions – approved March 2008
- 3) 3 & 3A Alignment – approved May 2008
- 4) Plan and Profiles – approved July 2008
- 4a) Heads Point – approved July 2008
- 4b) Rte 3 Mitigation - We should be getting our driveway permit tomorrow morning (12/7/10). We had meetings with the State, utilities, and Stantec.
- 5) Subdivision Plans – approved September 2008
- 6,6a) Grading and Guardrails – approved June 2009
- 7) Utility Plans – approved March 2009
- 8) Intersection Site Distance – approved February 2009
- 9) Box Culverts and Walls – resubmitted to Stantec 12/2/10
- 10) Road Cross Sections – approved March 2009
- 11) Sewer Plans and Profiles – awaiting approval on details of pump station due 12/13/10
- 12) Water Plans – awaiting approval due 12/13/10
- 13) Drainage Plans Profiles – approved February 2010
- 14) Erosion Control – approved
- 15) Sewer Pump Stations – 12-15 sheets, awaiting approval due 12/13/10
- 16) Road Signing, Striping & Landscaping and Lighting – Submitted 12/2/10; we will change lighting a bit.
- 17) Recording of Plans – submitted 12/2/10
- 18) Ledge Profiles, Existing Ground Profile – approved April 2009
- 19) Design of Common – submitted 12/2/10
- 20) Construction Details – submitted 12/2/10
- 21) Title Sheet – need to add driveway permit #
- 22) Overview of Project – to be done

D. Campbell: The Development Agreement was worked on with Bart Mayer. I think I have a way to simplify this agreement. All is contained in the plan to include footnotes and phasing. I don't see it will pay off to have an agreement. We can't give the Town park area until it is blasted out. When that phase happens, then we can give it to the Town. The 270 acres includes the 27-acre pond. We could give that to the Town sooner than later. The

wetlands permits expire in 2 yrs. We will be giving a separate 278 acres to the Audubon. You don't have to wait 10 yrs for our project to start, before the Town receives donations. We could give you the 270 acres now, and if we do that then we want to vest. Everything is then locked in for what is being discussed with you tonight. The only thing outstanding is the plow truck and we can add that into a Development Agreement and can discuss further with Dale. The mutual purpose is we get vested for the project and you get the 270 acres of land and the Audubon gets the 278 acres.

R. Corriveau: For the school land, you drive up into the land from College Park Drive. For the University Heights approval they had an easement that allowed to traverse for passage of a future road. There is a hook road into the top part of the plato. We added more land and an opening for a second means of access. The school land is 84+ acres. We need to get the easement changed with the State to be able to access the road.

D. Campbell: DES will cooperate to change the easement. We also need to work with Fish & Game and DES to exchange another triangle of land to them for conservation. They are worried about the school expanding in the endangered species area. It is a steep slope from the school land to the conservation land. Referred to SAU letter 12/1/10 to D. Fitzpatrick on school land; school is on board with the land. We owe a deed for a 120 ft easement for the parkway on the north side and would like this done before recording of the plans.

D. Campbell: Referred to 4/15/02 letter to Mark Bourque to include but not limited to:

- donate 105 ft easement
- donate 3 acre village green with gazebo style bandstand –
R. Corriveau: discussed the area where it drops off 6:1 slope. The slope is so people can see what is going on at the bandstand and there is also a large flat area with 2% grade (like soccer field). There will be brick pavers that can be engraved via donations. The common lighting will have multiple bollards on either side and the corners will have tall lights. The lights will be on controls to adjust what the needs are for low level lighting (can be LED for cost savings). They will be powder coated black with trash receptacles. Benches can be donated with engravings. The gazebo section is 26 ft across, Aztec white with pvc on the trim and columns, architectural roof, and recessed lighting.
- donate wetlands mitigation 120 acres and adjacent 27 acre pond
- donate 6.58 acres for public recreation
- work with school board for mutual site
- rehabilitate Head's Pond dam – We didn't do this, because the State didn't want us to do it.

R. Corriveau: The dam was tied with the golf course and when the golf course was no longer, there was not a dam issue. 2006-2007 dam didn't pond and the water only went a couple feet to the top. 2007 –2008 it was a class A low risk dam and DES wanted it maintained. They wanted the dam to be fit for a class A operational dam. For sensitivity for the site DES said we could take the dam out. We went through the historic society, DES, Conservation Commission, and Kathie Northrup. North and South spill way to the mill site, we took out a temporary road north spillway, 280 ft dam, and 48 ft. Historic said there is still value there.

- Roadway – We designed 102 ft easement. There is a gravel road now to access two ponds that the Town is getting. Environmentalists want to leave the Beaver Dam to “leave it up to nature”. Great Marsh to Head’s Pond there is a 120 ft Beaver Dam
- Open space wildlife corridor will be to the State park
- No buildings with 100 ft of wetlands
- Fiscal impact and environmental impact

D. Campbell: All the above items in the 4/15/02 letter were in the Development Agreement. The only items outstanding are the vesting, plowing truck, and a deed for a 120 ft easement for the parkway. We expire 12/20/10 and we are planning to come back to the next Board meeting on that date.

J. Duffy: Development Agreement, we still need something in writing on vesting for our attorney to review. We all attended a meeting recently at DOT with potential changes to offsite improvements. David said the traffic light will be installed during one of the phases.

D. Campbell: We told the Board that at the end of each phase we would do a traffic count update and when the traffic warrants a light, it will be installed.

J. Duffy: We need a deadline for the traffic light install. Traffic in that section of roadway is very fast. Depending on the time of day, you really need to head north and then turn back to make a left turn. Parcels on your plan in yellow are to be donated to either Town or School. Dark pink, who is that going to?

D. Campbell: Audubon (conservation land) gets dark pink.

J. Duffy: Did they agree to take it?

D. Campbell: They did agree to take it.

J. Duffy: Crosswalks, Board talked about if painted? I am not sure the end result.

R. Corriveau: Crosswalks are shown on the plan from this meeting per highway at the time.

J. Duffy: There are 30 crosswalks; 6 at school bus stops.

R. Corriveau: All crosswalks are shown per previous discussion with the Board.

J. Duffy: I heard some negative comments from the Town Council on the Town Common area. I would suggest MS&G should speak with Town Council to get their support.

D. Hemeon: Previous Administrator Jodoin was against the Common, but I don’t know how this present Council is.

J. Duffy: The Council is only looking at what this is going to cost the Town to maintain, but they need to see the big picture.

D. Campbell: I am happy to present to the Council. I would hope to get support from the Town.

C. Granfield: It would helpful if Dale could provide what the cost would be to maintain the Common.

D. Campbell: The common is planned for phase III, and at that time there will be a lot of new revenue.

R. Corriveau: The Common is in phase 2A. We ran the cost of lighting for the Common and which intersections need streetlights. The streetlights are per your ordinance. Crosswalks with this Board?

J. Gryval: We had a lot of discussion on cross walks; brick or paint.

D. Hemeon: The Town hasn't painted any crosswalks.

J. Duffy: The yellow area on your plan is for land donations for the Town Council to accept. This project shows sidewalks throughout per the ordinance. Now the Council's decision is to not encourage sidewalks. Does the Planning Board want them to build sidewalks for the entire area or in certain areas?

D. Campbell: I suggest we leave all the sidewalks in the plans. We designed per your ordinance and spent a lot of engineering time to do so. You can't change the condition of the plan; we comply with your ordinance. We can add a note on the plan if the Board agrees.

Board consensus: Add a note to the plan.

J. Duffy: School land?

D. Campbell: We are just working with finalizing with the State.

J. Duffy: University Heights has a new entity.

D. Campbell: I will make the new entity at University Heights aware that school buses will be going through College Park Dr.

R. Corriveau: Easement on the Audubon (conservation) land?

J. Duffy: The Board and Conservation Commission should send a letter of support to DES.

D. Campbell: I can work with Jo Ann on the wording if the Board is OK with that.

Board consensus: Work with Jo Ann on wording.

J. Duffy: 2002 letter to Mark Bourque, I just wanted to take another look to assure we addressed all these concerns.

D. Campbell: The yellow and purple areas on the plan can be donated at the same time.

J. Duffy: Some areas within their project are multi-family uses and they would need to come back to the Board for a site plan approval. If you agree to the Development Agreement, you would be locked into the previous standards.

F. Kotowski: In 2 yrs if Council accepts, everything that would be transferred would be donated?

D. Campbell: Within 2 yrs donations would be completed. The wetland work triggers the donations.

F. Kotowski: You want to vest the project, so when the time comes to move forward (economy improves) your project will be based on regulations today. If we were not to vest you, what then?

D. Campbell: The plan approval is good for 4 yrs. This way if vested, we will make this project happen.

D. Hemeon: Where line ends at the railroad bed, that line will continue to the Great Pond. People are walking now on your land.

F. Kotowski: Originally our assumption was the trail and plan went to the pond. When it came to our attention \$45,000 to resurface the trail, we found out the pond had already been turned over. Yes you are right that is a large segment. It is not just people from Hooksett using the trails but people from all over.

D. Hemeon: The reality is we should post your private property.

D. Campbell: The only way to make it work is to donate it. Even that could be accelerated sooner within the 2 yrs, but vesting would have to happen. We have 4 yrs anyway, but I want the wetlands permits vested for all time.

D. Hemeon: Within a 2 yr. period we would have access to the road area in red on the plan?

D. Campbell: You would own the areas in red, yellow, and purple, but you would have to get access from Rte 3.

D. Hemeon: Dark pink conservation land is Audubon, not local Town conservation. The yellow area will go to the Town of Hooksett not the Conservation Commission?

D. Campbell: Yes. Dark pink Audubon or something; not Town responsibility.

D. Hemeon: You are asking the State to move your easement for the school. The old Portsmouth railroad bed is a walking trail, but not for vehicles.

J. Duffy: What is the timing issue for donating land to Audubon?

D. Campbell: It is conditional on the wetlands permit. Prior to the 20,000 sq ft dredge and fill, we need to donate it.

R. Corriveau: 6 culverts then out of wetland = 20,000 sq ft.

J. Duffy: Would you phase Head's Pond Blvd.?

R. Corriveau: Yes. We are mindful for looping traffic. The lines of the perimeter of phasing, we just need to make sure they are numbered properly. The unit numbers are accurate.

D. Campbell: If the Board approves, I could draft a Development Agreement and show it to Jo Ann to assure it satisfies the 2002 letter to Mark Bourque and includes: 1) Donation of land, 2) Access to Head's Pond, and 3) Plow truck. Do you want me to start drafting something like that?

Board consensus: Yes draft it.

R. Duhaime: We had Webster Woods in here recently for vesting. You are looking for permanent vesting, do your phasing, and not to have to come back to this Board. It would only make sense you would ask for that Development Agreement.

D. Campbell: I will also work with Jo Ann on the State letters for access.

N. VanScoy: Field decisions such as cross walks being painted or not, lighting, sidewalks or not; decisions that don't get made are a moving target. Those things should be noted on the plan.

D. Campbell: We will give the Board a list of those field notes and add notes on the plans.

J. Gryval: Crosswalk through the Common was for someone with a wheelchair to have safer access to the Common.

N. VanScoy: Decisions to be made in the future? I don't necessarily agree with making decisions in the future; make them now. Traffic always worries me in this Town. We are the true experts on traffic, because we drive these roads everyday. The reality of where we live determines if we are allowed to make a left turn during certain hours. Expert opinion (studies) is what we have to base our decision on, however you can take into account the expert of the people who are there everyday road users. I like studies, but that concerns me how it will be addressed.

D. Campbell: We are making many roadway improvements prior to the traffic light going in to include acceleration and deceleration lanes.

R. Corriveau: Showed roadway system on plan; Rte 3 heading north "Head's Pond Blvd." to the north "Kingwood" to a few 100 ft off the Allenstown property line. Intersections were discussed with DOT. We will phase the traffic light. Initially we will widen the roadway, fix shoulders, and put in turn lanes instead of just using the dual turn lane there now. This is an elaborate plan for traffic. DOT was initially worried about vacant pavement and why do it, however the pavement is needed

R. Duhaime: For Webster Woods Steve Pernauf did a traffic study. When the traffic light went in for Head's Pond, he was asked if that would that help Webster Woods and he said no. The traffic light may make it more difficult down the road for stacking.

J. Gryval: I can understand Nancy's point.

N. VanScoy: If you wait too long to safely exit, then you take a chance and that causes accidents in roadways.

D. Campbell: We will be back at the Dec 20th meeting for the extension to the 65-day deadline and provide a project update.

R. Corriveau: Crosswalks?

J. Gryval: The Board was happy with crosswalks.

R. Corriveau: Should they be called out selectively?

D. Hemeon: Leave them on the plan as is now.

R. Duhaime: You will be back in here for your site plan approval.

D. Campbell: Yes.

2. BROX INDUSTRIES, INC.

Hooksett Rd (Rte 3) and end of Lehoux Dr., Map 18, Lot 7 (Brox site) AND
Map 18, Lot 48 (former Dolly Dimple property) AND Map 24, Lot 36-1 (former
Manchester Sand, Gravel and Cement Co. property)

PETER HOLDEN, HOLDEN ENGINEERING

Master plan for Brox site.

Peter Holden, Holden Engineering, here with George Hall from Brox Industries Inc..

P. Holden: The site is at the end of Lehoux Dr. in the Huttig business area. Brox has been a gravel pit and asphalt plant since 1987, when they bought their it. They go to the ZBA and renew their permit all the time. The lower area on the site is sand and gravel

and has utilities poles. They use rock on their site to make asphalt pavement. Long term plan after the site is not a quarry and asphalt will be a cliff to Rte 3. They bought land from Dolly Dimple, did a boundary line adjustment with Dieseland, and bought land from MS&G. We created a grading plan and lot layout. The site is zoned industrial and performance zone (PZ). To the left is an access road. We want to create other access to the lots. The blue parcel on the plan will stay PZ (retail or commercial). What they are looking to try and do is go through this Board and have you approve their master plan. MUD zones end up with a master plan. They are trying to propose a master plan. Jo Ann and I talked about this. There is nothing in zoning for these areas to create a master plan and get the Board to approve it. The end result is not a specific approval for a specific lot. They are just trying to preserve a master plan "goal for the future".

J. Duffy: I don't know of a mechanism for allowing approval of a master plan when it is not required in these zones. Maybe the Planning Board could approve a master plan. The other master plans require a public hearing process. I don't know what harm it would be to approve their master plan. For other master plans you have approved, they can amend them by coming back to the Board.

M. Cannata: It is a conceptual master plan vs. a concrete master plan to a future project, but neither you nor the Town feel locked in.

P. Holden: They will be spending an enormous amount of money and time gnawing away at their site, and don't want to get caught in technicality in the end. The reason for the master plan is somewhat binding. We may want to change it, but the goal is for an industrial subdivision with commercial in the front.

R. Duhaime: CIP plan has a feasibility study for the parkway (road). My fellow CIP members are here tonight. MS&G and Brox would benefit from that road. We don't have a tied in plan with the feasibility study. Getting locked into this master plan, if it is a loop road, this way you can do this but we haven't looked at this. If Lehoux Dr. looped that would help MS&G. Now Lehoux is a dead end; picture it an access road.

D. Hemeon: In the proposed master plan, the road goes all the way out to the traffic light?

P. Holden: Yes, and what I am presenting tonight is showing circulation all the way through.

D. Hemeon: We looked at tying two roads together. MS&G & Brox must have talked at some point. An industrial park with access in and out is ideal.

P. Holden: This is what we all talked about 20 yrs ago.

D. Hemeon: It makes sense as long as it loops to the traffic light.

R. Duhaime: You have a lighted intersection and that is easier access to this site. If Brox slowly develops this property, MS&G would be more apt to develop their property.

George Hall, Brox: The lot in green on the plan is an isolated situation with a vertical drop. We may not dig as deep here. We would have to come with a site plan approval. 100-200 ft of vertical face is a huge volume. A developer doesn't want to take 10 yrs to move the rocks. We want to grade all three lots for usable land and make them fit together. It needs to make sense to the Town and the abutting lots we just purchased. It all has to work together. Our master plan is a long-range plan and how they all will work together. We want to go back to the ZBA for excavation.

R. Duhaime: Will you raise the height of the tower?

G. Hall: We will relocate the tower at end of the lease in 10 yrs. By putting this master plan together, we know where they want to be and where we are going.

R. Duhaime: Why would we approve this master plan?

G. Hall: It is a concept plan so that we can bring it to the ZBA, and it makes sense planning wise. We don't want to get locked in and the Town doesn't want to get locked in. There is 150 vertical ft. between both properties.

R. Duhaime: I am glad you are being proactive by coming here tonight.

P. Holden: If we submit a subdivision application on the three pieces, we would be asking for waivers on almost everything on the checklist.

J. Gryval: I think it is premature to do this master plan.

G. Hall: Right now we are governed by ZBA for excavation. Do you give us approval for a subdivision or how do we make this work?

R. Duhaime: Have a joint meeting with the ZBA? I am not sure. Does it all tie in for vesting of the mining operation to continue?

G. Hall: We stay under the jurisdiction of the ZBA, but again we would have to have some continuity between ZBA and Planning Board. That is up to you whether that makes sense.

F. Kotowski: Conceptually the Planning Board agrees with your long-term (40-50 yrs) project presented tonight.

G. Hall: I think that is what we are looking for, approval of a conceptual master plan. We are not ready for a site plan or subdivision plan. We would like to have something for the ZBA.

J. Gryval: Does the Board feel this concept is viable?

M. Cannata: The vertical rock you are excavating, will that interfere with the abutters?

G. Hall: We own all three parcels. We are approved for excavation on the green area on the plan only. The Dolly Dimple Motel and house will be torn down. We want the same elevation as Rte 3 for development.

R. Duhaime: Every so many years you redo your permit with ZBA?

G. Hall: Yes, every 5 yrs.

R. Duhaime: You don't want to over blast. You just want to change your permit for less of a cliff.

G. Hall: The vertical face at the top of the slope was overburden from rock and we made a slope out of it. It hasn't taken very long for that slope do grow in.

J. Gryval: We could let the ZBA know your conceptual master plan is a viable plan, but it is premature for the Board to make a decision on it.

***M. Cannata motioned to send a memo to the ZBA that the Board was presented and reviewed a concept master plan for the Brox Industries, Inc. 3-lot site and have no objection to the concept. Seconded by F. Kotowski.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

CIP PRESENTATION

3. Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Committee 2011-2012 CIP plan presentation.

CIP Committee 2011-2012 members present tonight are Robert Duhaime, Chair, Marc Miville, Vice-Chair, Steed Celio, Dana Argo, and Nancy VanScoy.

R. Duhaime: Nancy is our Council rep., Marc is the Budget rep., and Dana is the School Board rep. We would have liked to have an EDC rep. What is presented to you tonight is the 6 yr CIP Plan.

D. Hemeon: I commend you all for a nice plan.

M. Miville: The total CIP Plan for fiscal year 2011-2012 is \$875,550 or .54 cents increase in taxes.

N. VanScoy: It is .54 cents "roughly" in tax increase. Christine gave .11cents per \$150,000.

C. Granfield: There are 16 warrant articles from the CIP Plan for fiscal year 2011-2012.

R. Duhaime: There are a lot more reserve funds (i.e. DPW backhoe and loader and FIRE engine and tanker). The reserve funds leave it up to the department's discretion to fund what they need.

M. Miville: Tanker #3 is exclusive with a 7 yr lease. Replacement tankers with the capital reserve for the potential new station down the road and 1953 dodge forestry vehicle.

M. Cannata: For the years involved, I don't see any real dollar spikes.

M. Miville: that is the idea of the CIP Plan.

M. Cannata: Were there any specific areas or items that created a problem that you thought you had to compromise on?

M. Miville: Yes, we had some discussions on many of these lines to create the 6 yr CIP Plan. The entire committee was in agreement as to whether each line was worthy to be on the CIP Plan and how to spread it out. Everything on the CIP Plan presented tonight was worthy.

N. VanScoy: We ask ourselves: 1) does it belong on the plan, 2) does it need to be funded this year, and 3) how do we incorporate it into a 6 yr plan. The bottom lines are quite stable.

M. Miville: We had an initial discussion and examined the CIP handbook for proper procedure prior to voting that day. We are here to create a plan whether implemented or voted down the road. We took great care to create it. Whether the Council or voters will go for it, we (CIP Committee) were not tainted.

R. Duhaime: The last CIP Committee meeting the Town Administrator was at, we discussed that the CIP is suppose to reflect part of the master plan. Departmental priorities and justifying items is one area we still need to get more information to back up factual CIP requests. We will look at this further during our CIP self-audit January 11, 2011.

N. VanScoy: The master plan amount in the CIP Plan, we could update in more of a phased approach vs. one big lump.

T. Walsh: Everyone who went through this, you did a nice job. I don't understand one item "reconfigure 2 kindergarten classrooms".

D. Argo: We want to change Underhill and Memorial schools to be two K-5 elementary schools. To do this, we need to reconfigure the kindergarten classrooms, because they have different square footage. The reason for the two K-5 schools is to have less transition for the students. Now the transition is K-2, then 3-5, and then 6-8. Statistics show too many student transitions tend to drop student education down. Two classrooms

need to be turned into one Kindergarten classroom.

N. VanScoy: The bottom line greatly changed because of the addition of school requests, as well as conservation requests. The schools did request -0- funding this fiscal year 2011-2012. The schools worked well with the CIP Committee.

D. Argo: The schools did not request funding for fiscal year 2011-2012, because there are two bargaining unit contracts for the ballot. We didn't want to jeopardize those contracts.

N. VanScoy: Conservation is a new line.

R. Duhaime: As Planning Board rep. to the Conservation Commission I informed them that land purchases must go through the CIP Plan process. The master plan has a section about conserving land and lowering the tax rate.

C. Granfield: The CIP Committee did a great job. They recommended and streamlined even more so than what I had done. Anticipating the Planning Board will adopt the plan as presented, I will present it to the Council and Rob will be there on behalf of the CIP (Chair) and Planning Board (Vice-Chair).

D. Hemeon motioned to adopt the CIP Plan FY ending 2012 thru 2017 as presented. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Vote unanimously in favor.

J. Gryval: Thank you to the CIP Committee.

N. VanScoy: We need the CIP Committee and Planning Board members support for the Council to not keep cutting the CIP Plan.

D. Hemeon: The CIP Plan is one of most important things in a community to save funding in the future.

OTHER BUSINESS

Hadley 6-lot merger

J. Gryval: I have signed the Mark & Claire Hadley 6-lot merger for Map 41, Lots 38, 39, 41, 42-1, 43 & 44 and will have recorded at the M.C.R.D.

N. VanScoy motioned to adjourn at 8:05pm. Seconded by C. Granfield. Vote unanimously in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:05pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna J. Fitzpatrick, Planning Coordinator