

**Official  
As of 05/16/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD,  
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT, CONSERVATION  
COMMISSION, AND TOWN COUNCIL**

**LAND USE WORKSHOP  
(HOSTED BY THE PLANNING BOARD)**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**HOOKSETT PUBLIC LIBRARY  
1701-B Hooksett Road (main room #2)  
Thursday, April 21, 2011**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair John Gryval called the meeting to order at 6:15pm

**ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD**

Chair John Gryval, Vice-Chair Robert Duhaime, Martin Cannata, Jack Mudge, and Frank Kotowski.

Excused: Dick Marshall, Town Administrator, Carol Granfield, Doug Urquhart, Brendan Perry, and Tom Walsh.

Absent: Yervant Nahikian.

**ATTENDANCE – TOWN COUNCIL**

Councilor Nancy Van Scoy, Councilor James Levesque, and Councilor Vincent Lembo.

**ATTENDANCE – ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT (ZBA)**

Chair Chris Pearson, Vice-Chair Roger Duhaime, Tim Lanphear, and Phil Denbow.

**ATTENDANCE – CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

John Turbyne.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy, Code Enforcement Officer, Peter Rowell, Building Dept. Administrative Assistant, Lee Ann Moynihan, Planning Coordinator, Donna Fitzpatrick, and Dan Tatem, Stantec.

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE**

Kathie Northrup, Heritage Commission, Lisa Lally, resident, Bruce & Nancy Fillmore, Austin Woods project. And Marc Miville, Budget Committee (arrived 8:10pm).

J. Gryval: Introduce members of the Boards, Commission, and Council

J. Duffy: Thank you for all those attending; would like to have an annual land use workshop for open communication between the Boards, Commission, and Council. If there are any recommendations for changing our regulations, we would like to hear from you.

**I. Discussion facilitated by Planning Board Chair and Town Planner:**

**a. Bonds v Letters of Credits - pg I-71 Section 18– Heritage V**

J. Duffy: November 2010 the Planning Board adopted new Development Regulations. Prior to the new regulations, either bonds or LOCs were accepted. The previous DPW Director stated it was difficult to collect on bonds. Now the new regulations allow only LOCs; however the Planning Board could waive this requirement if the applicant/ developer is unable to get the LOC and allow a bond in its place.

D. Tatem: Heritage V subdivision - Town attorney is stating the developer complete the roadway or the bond gets pulled. This was also a requirement of Nancy Lane; however they completed their roadway appropriately. On the Heritage V project there has been no response from the bonding company, therefore there may be a lawsuit. A LOC is with a bank vs. a bonding company. The previous DPW Director stated that calling bonds would only get .50 cents on the dollar vs. a LOC you get the full amount.

J. Duffy: Another roadway issue in Town is Garden Song Rd. The roadwork was to be completed 6 yrs ago; today no final coat, no guardrail, and no stop signs. A resident came in to my office today stating a child was injured on that road; a guardrail would have prevented injury. We would like a consensus from the Board to go forward with a law suit for Heritage V. We can discuss this further at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Board meeting.

J. Turbyne: LOCs are better than bonds. I would suggest the Planning Board not waive LOC for a bond.

P. Denbow: Was Nancy Lane bonded?

D. Tatem: Yes.

Robert Duhaime: Bedford roadway issues don't happen; now developers are saying Hooksett has too many rules.

M. Cannata: If applicant/developer is unable to get LOC, do we turn them down?

J. Duffy: The State statute allows bonds or LOC; our new regulations allow LOC.

D. Tatem: Road to binder – as bonds keep getting renewed we should increase the value to today's prices; Town 15% escalation factor (ENR index 3 ½% per year for a total of

5 yrs).

M. Cannata: Do we have an interim DPW Director to monitor the roadway bonds?

J. Duffy: Doug Urquhart has been assigned to attend Planning Board meetings. As for sureties, we receive notification from the bonding company when the bond is coming due and Jodi @ DPW monitors them.

**b. Bonding of private sites – pg I-74 Section 18.09 reduction of what is currently required**

J. Duffy: Developers find it difficult for a 30% site bond or new regulations LOC. Their argument is that their site is private and the Town shouldn't be concerned. From an engineering standpoint, what if the retaining wall is only half-built, or the drainage not completed, etc. It is for the safety of the residents of the Town of Hooksett.

D. Tatem: We had the Starbucks' foundation at Hooksett Landing; \$60,420 surety (30%). A reclamation bond would be \$5 or \$6 a square yard. This is an example to get the work done then release the bond. The majority of towns request more than just a reclamation bond. Both Town Attorney Mayer and Attorney Buckley stated the RSA allows Towns to go on private sites to make them safe.

J. Duffy: We are here to protect the Town and sometimes the developers believe we are too restrictive. You adopt the regulations; we are here to carry them out.

M. Cannata: If you (workshop attendees) are hearing concerns from developers, you need to let us know because our regulations may need to be changed.

**c. Sprinkler Requirement- pg I-28 Section 11.12 – Status & Letter from Mr. Winterton's Atty.**

J. Duffy: Referenced letter dated 4-19-11 from Mr. Winterton's attorney W. John Deachman re: fire sprinkler requirement for Map 48, Lot 19-4. The Bieliznas (parent lot) built a new replacement home with no fire sprinkler system and then demolished their old home. Mr. Winterton purchased two lots from the Bieliznas and does not want to put a fire sprinkler system in his home now on hold for construction. The Planning Board did not grant a waiver for Mr. Winterton at the 4/4/11 Board meeting as HB109 & SB91 were still pending. One bill has retroactive language. The two bills are not adopted and will eventually merge into one bill. I checked with the Deputy Fire Chief yesterday and he hadn't heard of an update. Fire sprinklers are not a condition of approval, but an actual requirement and therefore not noted within the approval letter but noted on the plan.

F. Kotowski: Nothing will happen with the bill(s) until it is at the Governor's desk.

J. Duffy: There is a deadline for the Planning Board appeal by Mr. Winterton. If you don't grant the waiver, then it may go to court.

V. Lembo: Why wasn't the replacement new home required to put in a sprinkler?

P. Rowell: The Planning Board approval states proposed houses. There is nothing on the plans for a new home. They (Bieliznas) came in after the fact to build a replacement home.

V. Lembo: It happened after fact. If Mr. Winterton is required to have a sprinkler system when he built his house, why wasn't the other permit (Bieliznas) required to have the same?

P. Rowell: It was not presented and approved for a new house by the Planning Board.

D. Tatem: In the regulations if you knock down an old house and build a new one in place of it, then no fire sprinkler system is needed.

V. Lembo: I see Mr. Winterton's point-of-view. If the replacement house was on the same spot they get an exception, but their (Bieliznas) replacement was in a different area and they should have needed a sprinkler too.

Robert Duhaime: The lot with an existing home is grandfathered. It costs \$5,000 to install a sprinkler system in a single-family residential home.

J. Duffy: The Planning Board told Mr. Winterton that if the bill is adopted, he can come back to the Planning Board for the waiver request. He has a deadline; appeal timeframe expires on May 4<sup>th</sup>. The Deputy Fire Chief has stated in writing he is not in favor of the Planning Board waiving the sprinkler system requirement for Mr. Winterton's lot (Map 48, Lot 19-4).

V. Lembo: What is this going to cost the Town in court fees?

F. Kotowski: The Planning Board was following the letter of the law as it exists today. If bill(s) doesn't pass and we grant the waiver, future applicants would want the same.

J. Duffy: Hooksett's State Senator Boutin sponsored the bill.

<b>d. Procedure for demolition regulation – pg I-69 Section 17– Kathie Northrup</b>
---

K. Northrup: There is a time period for an alternative to demolishing a building of sustenance. The Heritage Commission will hear from Peter Rowell if a building meets the criteria per the regulations pg I-69 section 17. Then we (Heritage Commission) determine if the building is of historical significance. Not every historic building is worthy of being saved. Hooksett barns are important to save. The Townwide survey of historic buildings doesn't include a lot of homes. We had the first application last month; Everett house on Coaker Ave.

P. Rowell: The Planning Board site plan would show if a building is to be demoed prior to getting a demo permit through the Building Dept.

J. Turbyne: Can a building demo be determined at the TRC meeting?

J. Duffy: We won't know for sure of a building demo until they submit for a Planning Board application.

K. Northrup: Bielizna house historic?

D. Tatem: If Bielizna house was historic, they own it and wanted to tear it down. Is the Heritage Commission advisory only?

K. Northrup: Yes only advisory. If the building owner still wants to demo, then we could at least ask them if the Heritage Commission can go into the building and take pictures for historical records.

Robert Duhaime: The ZBA when granting a variance can have conditions.

<b>e. LEED Certification – pg III-14 Section 3.19</b>
---

J. Duffy: In May 2007 we implemented Development Regulations to address the concern for large apartment buildings. Within these regulations the LEED certification is an item to meet. We have had projects approved since then, but not built. As soon as developers see this LEED item, they don't want to do it because of the costs involved. The average cost for LEED is an extra \$2.43 per square foot. NH ranks 4<sup>th</sup> in the nation for LEED buildings. Do you want to leave LEED in the regulations and if someone disputes it take it up at that point? Peter let me know what the other LEED options are.

P. Rowell: LEED is proactive energy efficiency. We should have an incentive (i.e. reduction in fees) if LEED built.

F. Kotowski: For a 2,000 sq ft residential home LEED would cost \$5,000. I encourage the use of energy efficiency and offering credits, but it is difficult to do in this economy.

D. Tatem: LEED is for 9+ unit multi-family.

P. Denbow: Jo Ann is referring to LEED to discourage large buildings and Peter is referring to LEED as an incentive to build.

M. Cannata: Where do we want to go on this; offer incentives (i.e. fast track process) or don't offer any incentives?

V. Lembo: Does LEED apply to residential or commercial?

J. Duffy: Multi-unit (9+ units) residential.

T. Lanphear: There is a development in Concord off Loudon Rd that is LEED platinum; they capture & reuse rain water.

F. Kotowski: PSNH has an energy applications department and they find savings in schools and businesses by doing energy audits. I wonder if they have a program that they can attend a Board meeting to educate the Board on multi-family 9+unit energy efficiencies..

J. Turbyne: For energy costs and efficiencies, we look at the economy and providing incentives. For commercial sites they build and own for a while. For residential the builders sell off.

## **II. Review of new items**

### **a. Logging Procedure - pg I-76 Section 19**

D. Tatem: We work for the Town of Auburn as well. The Intent to Cut and RSA governs logging. We have a new requirement in the November 2010 Development Regulations for an Intent to Cut applicant to come before the Planning Board. At first we were going to be more restrictive, but loggers and landowners in Town stated we needed to be less restrictive. There is a section in this regulation for the DPW Director to determine the bond for roadway repairs and swales. Per the law, the Assessor has to approve and issue the Intent to Cut permit within 30 days. During that time the Assessing Dept. will inform the Planning Board of the application and the Board will add to their agenda for the applicant to appear before them.

P. Denbow: Was the 50 ft buffer specific to the site at By-pass 28 & Hooksett Rd.?

D. Tatem: It is a State law and they are clear on logging. We won't be more restrictive. The biggest key is the Assessing Dept. needs to discuss the Intent to Cut application with the Community Development and DPW prior to issuing the permit.

### **b. Demolition Regulation – pg I-69 Section 17 - Kathie Northrup**

K. Northrup: Refer to hand-out tonight for timeline and actions. The hearing could be to relocate the building or incorporate it into the new project. An example, Riverside Street has an old Victorian, however it may get neglected and need to be demoed.

### **c. Architectural Design – pg III-9 Section 3.05**

J. Duffy: The November 2010 Development Regulations were revised to take away the Aesthetic Committee and in place add design criteria. The architectural component hasn't changed. It is still in the regulations, but without a separate committee. We did consult with Yervant to create the new design criteria.

M. Cannata: The design appears on the plan so Peter is aware.

D. Tatem: Example is McDonalds, the HVAC is on top of roof but won't be seen from the roadway due to the design.

**d. Stonewall Provision – pg I-11 Section 6.13 - Kathie Northrup**

K. Northrup: The stone walls regulations is for those walls that border a public roadway and not interior borders. We want to know what action the developer will take with the stone wall. It may be suggested they relocate if the wall is a sight distance issue. DPW deals with a lot of stone walls in Town.

P. Rowell: For subdivision plans the surveyor lays out the lot 10 ft from the stone wall. Why not have them follow the lot line to protect the walls?

D. Tatem: There are some developers who take pride of the stone walls on their sites and try to incorporate them in their projects (i.e. Austin Woods project).

**III. Other items of interest**

**a. Hourglass Project – Dan Tatem**

D. Tatem: The project is to add an extra couple of lanes at the light at Walmart North to where it goes down to one lane and also realign Goonan Rd. There is also the possibility of a future traffic signal for Central Park Dr. We have \$750,000 in impact fees for that project. If Town waits for the State to widen, we may not see it. We are working directly with the Town Administrator on this project. We have submitted plans to the Planning Board, DPW, and Carol. Next is to meet with the State in 2 weeks. The Town would pay 1/3. This is a great way to use impact fees to benefit businesses. The total project is \$3.2 million to include oversight, design, and permitting. It will cost \$2.7 million with the Town's 1/3 contribution from developers money vs. taxpayers money. The project is planned for 2012.

F. Kotowski: If impact fees are not used in a certain timeframe we lose it.

J. Gryval: Correct, impact fees must be used within 6 yrs.

M. Cannata: Exit 11 area?

D. Tatem: Exit 11 is not part of the hourglass. There is also the Market Basket bridge and ramps.

M. Cannata: Tombs, the abutter to the Market Basket project, have they been informed?

D. Tatem: There is no restrictive median for the Tombs site. There will be a 15 ft. acquisition from the front of the Irving gas station lot. George Loiselle's lot would also need to be purchased.

J. Turbyne: Will you extend the multi-lane project to Hackett Hill?

D. Tatem: No that is not within the hourglass project. The Planning Board asked Walmart to put up a \$17,000 bond for sidewalks from the Central Park Dr. Irving Station to Hackett Hill Rd.

## **b. Update on Ravenwood, Austin Woods, and University Heights Apartments**

### **Ravenwood**

J. Duffy: 45-lot subdivision. It has been over a year since they have been before the Planning Board. No one showed at their last scheduled meeting at the Planning Board, therefore the Board denied the project. It went to court and the applicant won the case; the court determined the Board should have allowed the applicant to come back. The applicant is now working out studies, and they met recently with the Conservation Commission. Parks & Recreation (John Pieroni) are looking to add to the trail system. There are two cul-de-sacs and a ROW to nowhere. We spoke with the engineer and there can be 20 ft easements from the cul-de-sac for a parking area. The engineer is favorable to do this.

### **Austin Woods**

J. Duffy: 43-lot subdivision + 2 open space. Applicant Bruce Fillmore is here tonight. He is now using a new engineer at Eric Mitchell's office. They were denied their AOT permit, they appealed, and were denied again. They had to redo plans and have dropped them off to AOT.

B. Fillmore: We have met with Dan @ Stantec a couple of times and are moving the project ahead behind the scenes.

### **University Heights Apartments**

J. Duffy: 204 apartments. The owner went bankrupt and sold to Duke Pointer. He has since found a buyer for the apartments. The plans are pending signing and recording due to an outstanding approval letter from Village Water (previous developer owes money for a water tank).

### **Beaver Brook Development**

J. Duffy: 87-lot subdivision. The Beaver Brook developer came in the office the other day and Donna went over their list of conditions to have the plans signed and recorded.

J. Turbyne: For trails discussed in project, Mike Horne has worked on a town-wide trails design for long-term planning. The Kiwanis trail is a great example.

F. Kotowski: Mike Horne leading the generation of a map showing the existing pathways and sidewalk systems in Town with the goal to connect the different places; cobweb of future development. I would like to give credit to the Hooksett Garden Club who just gave us a \$500 check. Money from the Kiwanis and grants allow us to polish the trails. When the Planning Board looks at developments, please look at easements and ROWs to connect the different places.

J. Turbyne: Build into the TRC process; discuss the long-term planning piece.

K. Northrup: Are the walking trails only for a specific community in Town or for the entire Town?

J. Duffy: For the entire Town unless restricted somehow.

J. Turbyne: There are no easements by Manchester Water Works.

### **Head's Pond and Webster Woods II**

P. Rowell: What is the status of Head's Pond and Webster Woods II?

J. Duffy: Head's Pond has not addressed planning issues related to land donations and development agreement. We are waiting to hear from their Atty. David Campbell. Webster Woods needs to address erosion in phase I once the dry weather comes.

### **c. New GIS Site**

J. Duffy: The Town contracted with Cartographics and the new GIS website is in draft mode at this time. I would be happy to show you how to temporarily access this system. Information has been taken from the tax maps. They are adding layers for sewer lines, Manchester Water Works, and utilities. They should be finished shortly. Once up and running there will be a link from our Town website [www.hooksett.org](http://www.hooksett.org).

P. Rowell: Will the picture and maps line up?

J. Duffy: Not at this time. In order to fix it the cost to the Town is \$100,000.

M. Cannata: Will house numbers be on the GIS?

P. Rowell: E911 has their own mapping crew for house numbers. Any information they collect is not available to add to this type of GIS system. Periodically they send their crew out for updates. The Fire Dept. is dispatched by street #s. The GPS in their trucks is used for backup.

J. Gryval: My street number was changed and it was not a problem.

#### **d. Granite Hill II North**

J. Duffy: We had a meeting a few weeks ago. This is a plan from the 1980's. The developer who took over in 2007, Steve Blum, went bankrupt. He built 80+ townhouse units. Someone else then came in and the project is in two separate phases and partially purchased. In the near future something may happen up there. Brady Sullivan & California Properties are interested in purchasing portions of the project. We are seeing more and more projects that were sitting around coming back to life.

P. Rowell: What does the Planning Board do if projects sit there and nothing is done?

J. Duffy: Also, it depends when the project was approved and what the requirements are. Some projects expire in 3 yrs and some have no requirement. It is what was in affect at the time. Other projects have conditional approvals that have not been met yet.

J. Gryval: Under our new regulations, the applicant has 6 months from the approval date to get the conditions of approval met for plans to be signed and recorded. They may ask for a one time extension.

N. VanScoy: Things change over time and may have different requirements based on age of the project.

M. Cannata: When State permits lapse that can be a window for the applicant to meet the new regulations.

#### **e. Upcoming Training**

J. Duffy: OEP Spring Planning and Zoning Conference 6/11/11. The information handed out tonight is the same information Donna sent you weeks ago. Just a reminder to contact her by June 2<sup>nd</sup> to register. The Town pays for Planning Board training.

#### **f. Change of Use**

J. Duffy: This process helps developers opening a new business in an existing building (no construction involved other than façade of building) without going through the Planning Board process. Peter's office handles the process.

P. Rowell: Change of use still needs to go through the permitting process. It is a chance to update sites without a full Planning Board review process.

J. Duffy: The process keeps business owner costs down and allows them to open quicker.

L. Moynihan: It also keeps us informed of business changes in Town.

**g. Townwide Traffic Study – Dan Tatem**

D. Tatem: We were asked several years ago to do a Townwide traffic study of all major Town intersections with State roads. There are 30-35 intersections and we analyzed turn lanes, curbing, etc. to address efficiencies and capacities of intersections in Town. We just got approved for two more years to do this. There are 7 priority intersections – Cross Rd & Rte 3A (add a left turn lane onto Cross Rd), Clough & Rte 3/By-pass 28 (widen Clough, this road is across from Benton Rd and looks more like a narrow driveway than a roadway). Impact fees expire in 6 yrs and we can use those funds for design work. The RSA restricts that impact fee money cannot be used on State roads. We have an impact fee spending procedure document that you can run by your Town Atty.

V. Lembo: Is the document done? What will prevent us from spending the fees?

D. Tatem: The document will be done in a month or two. Refer to your Town Atty. Impact fees you collect in a corridor must be used in same corridor (i.e. Rte 3 corridor).

J. Duffy: Carol signed the Townwide traffic study contract to use the money, but the Council has to approve it.

M. Cannata: Are sidewalks factored into any of this money?

D. Tatem: No, sidewalks decrease vehicle trips.

J. Turbyne: Has anyone recommended a traffic light on the north side of Hackett Hill that meets Rte 3A?

Robert Duhaime: I agree a light should be there, however there have been no fatalities just lots of accidents. It is up to the DOT because it intersects on a State road (Rte 3A).

**h. NPDES Permit Update – Dan Tatem**

D. Tatem: Hooksett is an MS4 town Federal EPA designation. Hooksett has the responsibility for Walmart's drainage and other sites in Town if the site owner doesn't maintain them. All drainage infrastructures must be mapped. Aerial and on-site mapping has been completed for half of the Town and the rest will be completed at the end of this month. Then we will start doing educational sessions with the Planning Board, Conservation Commission, schools, etc. Walmart, Lowes, and Home Depot submitted their maintenance schedule. DPW does very well for maintenance, however private sites also need to do their own maintenance. K-Mart drainage is an example of a site that the private owner should maintain. Impact fees cannot pay for drainage. The bigger towns and cities are starting to do drainage impact fees; not governed by the State. I believe Manchester is doing it now. Impact fees could go for a study.

C. Pearson: The ZBA has Walmart doing a quarterly maintenance.

**i. CIP Self-Audit**

J. Gryval: The Planning Board at its meeting of 4/4/11 adopted the 2011-2012 CIP Committee Self-Audit Recommendation to the Planning Board. These recommendations have now been submitted to the Town Council for their review and vote to adopt.

**IV. Other business**

**Gravel Pits**

P. Rowell: Gravel pits in Town have not been monitored since 1999. It is under Other Ordinances that the ZBA monitor them. The Planning Board and Town Council should be aware the monitoring is not being done due to being understaffed.

M. Cannata: What can the Planning Board do to help?

P. Rowell: If the monitoring went from ZBA to Planning, they could have an engineering review completed. However, I don't see how going from one understaffed department to another understaffed one is going to help. It is the time to find out where we are at in Town with our gravel pits.

M. Cannata: Is there a checklist of what to ask for?

P. Rowell: We need to find out what the limit of excavation is. At some point there should have been a plan submitted to zoning. Also what is actively being excavated and what they reclaimed. Is their drainage correct? I am not saying the gravel pits have huge issues, but we don't have a good grasp on monitoring them.

D. Tatem: The Town of Fremont has four gravel pits. They have us do an inspection every year. We do a GPS walk of the disturbed area with the Planning Board and other members. We then print a map with the outcome. Gravel pits are regulated by the State 55E.

J. Duffy: The last time Hooksett Gravel Pits were monitored was when Ken Andrews was here. They had all different dates when they were expiring and the ZBA and Ken completed site walks and bonds.

C. Pearson: We went out to Brox once, and Pike twice.

**Land Purchases – CIP Process**

Marc Miville. Budget Committee Chair, CIP Committee Vice-Chair: I would like to address tonight's attendees from the Planning Board, Town Council and other boards/committees. The RSA & Town Charter state that land purchases by the Town must go through the CIP Committee process and not unilateral by the Conservation Commission.

Robert Duhaime: I have been the Planning Board rep. to the Conservation Commission for the last 3 yrs. The Master Plan reflects the CIP (capital improvement program) and that land purchase should go through that process. We should have started to fund Conservation Commission land purchases years ago. Instead of the CIP process, the Conservation Commission went directly to the Town Council; this is not the process. Charter always stated land purchases should have gone through the CIP process. In the Master Plan the residents of Hooksett said they want land conserved, however no plan has been submitted to the CIP for this. They can default through current land use funds, but that is not good planning to omit the CIP process.

M. Cannata: How do we correct this? Do we put money in next year's CIP plan for land purchases?

Robert Duhaime: We should get legal advice. It should go through the CIP process to justify it. Also Parks & Recreation land purchases have never gone through the CIP process.

J. Turbyne: For land purchases often times we are negotiating with private landowners and that doesn't allow for free and open discussion. It is a balance for the public need for information and the negotiation for the best price for the land. The Pinnacle and Clay Pond are different than purchasing Park & Recreation fields.

Roger Duhaime: I participate in the Salt Lakes Committee. At one point they wanted the current use out of the tax base, but then George Longfellow wanted it back in the tax base. The taxpayers voted on current use to go back into conservation for land purchase.

Marc Miville: We need to be following section 5.7 of the Town Charter and RSA that all land purchases must go through the CIP process. The only announcement I heard about a Conservation Commission land purchase was at a Town Council meeting whereby it was announced that land was recently purchased for \$340,000. I am concerned that every time we hit the front page of the newspaper is because we don't follow the process.

**J. Gryval: I thank you all for attending tonight's workshop.**

*F. Kotowski motioned to adjourn at 8:50pm. Seconded by M. Cannata.  
Vote unanimously in favor.*

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair John Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,  
Planning Coordinator