

**Official  
As of 11/07/11**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
Monday, October 3, 2011**

**CALLED TO ORDER**

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

**ATTENDANCE – PLANNING BOARD**

Chair John Gryval, Vice-Chair Dick Marshall, Town Administrator,  
Dr. Dean E. Shankle, Jr., Jack Mudge, Frank Kotowski, Town Council Rep.  
Nancy VanScoy (arrived 6:10pm), Town Administration Rep. Leo Lessard (DPW  
Director), Tom Walsh, and Martin Cannata (arrived 6:10pm).  
Excused: Brendan Perry.  
Absent: Y. Nahikian.

**REPRESENTING TOWN OF HOOKSETT**

Town Planner, Jo Ann Duffy and Dan Tatem, Stantec.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 09/12/11**

*N. VanScoy motioned to approve the non-public minutes of 09/12/11. Seconded by  
J. Mudge.*

*Vote in favor. D. Marshall abstains.*

*N. VanScoy motioned to approve the public minutes of 09/12/11. Seconded by  
J. Mudge.*

*Vote in favor. D. Marshall abstains.*

**COMPLETENESS**

- 1. BETTE L. BLAKE TRUSTEE/EXECUTOR OF ELWIN BLAKE ESTATE  
(#11-08)  
26 Londonderry Tpke., Map 49, Lot 47  
Site plan for the proposed construction of a 3-story 48' x 80' office building.**

D. Marshall: I will recuse myself from this application.

J. Duffy: Staff recommends application be found complete. The Public Hearing is  
scheduled for November 7, 2011.

*F. Kotowski motioned to find the application complete. Seconded by J. Mudge. Vote unanimously in favor.*

***PUBLIC HEARING NOVEMBER 7, 2011.***

**PUBLIC HEARING - WAIVER REQUEST**

**2. McDONALD'S (#11-09)**

**1254 Hooksett Rd., Map 30, Lot 26**

- Amendment to landscaping plan
- Waiver request s to Zoning Ordinance: 1) Article 10-A.H.3(c) Front Landscape Area Planting Requirement – to allow a reduction of 1 tree, 2) Article 10-A.H.3(d) Perimeter Landscape Area Planting Requirement – to allow a reduction of 6 trees, and 3) Article 10-A.H.6(d) Screening of Unsightly Features – to allow a reduction of 7 shrubs behind the proposed dumpster pad and retaining all.

Chris Rice, TF Moran: Emile Haddad is with me tonight and has owned the McDonald's site at 1254 Hooksett Road since 1988. The site is under construction slated to open end of October 2011. In March 2011 we received our Board approval. We are before the Board tonight with a slight reduction to the approved landscape plan.

- 1) Waiver #1 Article 10-A.H.3(c) Front Landscape Area Planting Requirement = remove one tree from street tree requirement. **YELLOW** AREA ON LANDSCAPE PLAN.
- 2) Waiver #2 Article 10-A.H.3(d) Perimeter Landscape Area Planting Requirement = remove 6 trees directly behind/west of the retaining wall. The retaining wall was blasted out for ledge and the trees may not survive. – **BLUE** AREA ON LANDSCAPE PLAN.
- 3) Waiver #3 Article 10-A.H.6(d) Screening of Unsightly Features = Buffer requirement for residential use – corner lot in PZ but residential use 80 ft away. That parcel is 15 ft higher than the subject site. **ORANGE** AREA ON LANDSCAPE PLAN.

C. Rice: Overall landscaping on site for shrubs = 75 required, March 2011 plan approved for 280, and we are now asking for 180. This is still 105 in excess of the requirement of 75. The Maple on the Martin's Ferry Road side is per the regulation for the street tree requirement, however based on the neighboring PSNH site work it may not survive and would need to be replaced.

J. Gryval: We can only grant waivers at a public hearing.

J. Duffy: We have notified the abutters.

J. Mudge: Instead of the blue (perimeter) and orange (buffer) areas, what is the replacement?

C. Rice: Loam and seed.

F. Kotowski: What is the deciduous percent of trees there now?

C. Rice: 50/50. The evergreens are tall. The vegetation back there is tall and full. In winter we will lose roughly 50%.

E. Haddad: I have owned the site since 1988. The back area is always full with leaves. I didn't know there was a house back there.

N. VanScoy: Why are we now removing plantings from the approved plan? Why were they in the original plan, if you now chose not to put them there?

C. Rice: My landscape designers went above and beyond requirements (i.e. 280 vs.180). There are a lot of insignificant plantings (day lilies).

N. VanScoy: When I looked at the original plan with the plantings proposed it was a whole plan and that may have been why I voted on the plan the way I did. To come in after the fact (after we approved the plan), we are not looking at a whole plan but a little piece of it (landscape only). That is my concern. It is written up as all one waiver or are we able to vote on each individual article.

D. Shankle: I would like to discuss amending the landscape plan. Looking at pictures of the screening, are those trees on land you own? Who owns those trees? If whoever owned those trees cut them down, what kind of buffer will there be?

C. Rice: I can't dictate if an abutter will keep his buffer.

D. Shankle: You are assuming he will keep his buffer.

C. Rice: Yes, and it is 20 ft to the property line.

D. Marshall: 20 ft is the buffer and you are responsible for that. Outside of that on someone else's property doesn't concern us. You need to provide the screening for the buffer. From the photos you are depending on the neighbor to provide the buffer. The responsibility rests with you. I can't vote to eliminate the blue (perimeter) area on your plan.

C. Rice: Commercial use to residential use is when the buffer is needed.

J. Duffy: The abutters are PZ commercial. If you are looking at the aerial on the Town Planner comments, the structure closest is a barn 80 ft away that is used for residential; owned by Merchants. If the residential use goes away for more than a year, then it is no longer residential use.

C. Rice: We have the north abutter easement to access behind our site.

F. Kotowski: The plantings are above the wall. Is it unlikely trees would make it there anyway? I would like to hear from our engineer. What if the plantings are in an area where they can't grow?

C. Rice: There is a potential they (plantings) may not survive.

D. Tatem: The smaller trees are in front of the area that was disturbed. There is a larger free draining backflow. There is a potential to slide back the plantings to achieve the same goal.

D. Shankle: What is the difference between the perimeter landscape planting area vs. buffer area?

J. Gryval: A buffer area is required between different uses. This is perimeter landscaping, because the uses are the same.

N. VanScoy: I believe it is to maintain a nice looking PZ.

D. Marshall: It is an aesthetic issue. If it is not considered a true buffer and if all of these requests tonight are granted, does the developer/owner still meet the regulations or at what point do they fail?

C. Rice: For shrubs (green area) the requirement is 75 and we propose 180, trees require 56 down to 39 (7 of those screen the dumpster from the abutting use and there is a 15 ft grade change).

F. Kotowski: Down the road if Merchants does build their access road, then what would you do to make that area look like the other two sides for landscaping?

C. Rice: I don't know how Merchants will do it.

F. Kotowski: But then there is no screening on the backside.

C. Rice: Except what we have left on our site.

M. Cannata: Do the applicant's landscape requests compromise what we require?

D. Tatem: The orange (buffer) area in the upper right on the landscape plan, there is a 20 ft residential buffer. The lot line has an iron pin. During plan review, the blue (perimeter) plantings was commercial use.

> Article 10-A H 3 (3) Perimeter landscape areas: "those areas of a site commencing at the interior limit of the front landscape area, running generally parallel with the side and rear site boundaries situated between any building or impervious surface and the boundaries of the site. The minimum width of the perimeter landscape area shall be one-half the building height of that portion of a structure facing any side or rear property boundary, but shall not be less than 10-feet."

> Article 10-A H 3 (f) Screening and Buffering Requirements for Adjoining Residential Properties (a) – (g) " . . .where any commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district, screening and buffering shall be required . . .

D. Tatem: Plantings on top of the retaining wall are ornamental.

D. Shankle: When the land is cleared, the regulations require trees on the plan.

T. Walsh: Orange (buffer) area has trees for the buffer (PZ use to residential use). You could put in those trees, however if Merchants wants to come and put in an access way they could take out those trees?

C. Rice: Yes.

N. VanScoy: I would like to clarify the access easement. McDonald's asked for a waiver for Merchants to have a conditional ROW access through a small portion of McDonalds back north corner abutting Merchants "pancake house" Map 30, Lot 25 for them to further access Martin's Ferry Road via Merchants Map 30, Lot 24. This waiver was granted so that it would not require direct cross-access from McDonald's site to Martin's Ferry Road

for Map 30, Lot 25 and would not hinder McDonald's drive-thru operations due to stacking.

C. Rice: For waiver #1, there is a retaining wall with ledge and the tree possibly wouldn't survive.

D. Marshall: If don't grant waiver #1, then we require they plant the tree and when it dies, they have to plant it again, and again . . .

N. VanScoy: Landscape plans are to make the site look nice. I see these waiver requests tonight that they are just trying to save some money.

**Open public hearing**

No comments.

**Close public hearing**

**WAIVERS**

*N. VanScoy motioned to grant Waiver #1 Article 10-A.H.3(c) Front Landscape Area Planting Requirement = remove one tree from street tree requirement (yellow area on landscape plan). Seconded by J. Mudge.*

*Vote 4 in favor, 5 opposed. MOTION NOT CARRIED.*

*D. Marshall motioned to grant Waiver #2 Article 10-A.H.3(d) Perimeter Landscape Area Planting Requirement = remove 6 trees directly behind/west of the retaining wall (blue area on landscape plan). Seconded by N. VanScoy.*

*Vote 2 in favor, 7 opposed. MOTION NOT CARRIED.*

T. Walsh: Is waiver #3 critical? What is the height of the retaining wall?

C. Rice: 3-4 ft high. The dumpster is lower.

*T. Walsh motioned to grant Waiver #3 Article 10-A.H.6(d) Screening of Unsightly Features = Buffer requirement PZ use to residential use (orange area on landscape plan). Seconded by D. Marshall.*

*Vote 5 in favor, 4 opposed. MOTION CARRIED.*

**WAIVERS ABOVE PER RSA 674:44 (III) (E)**

**AMENDMENT TO LANDSCAPE PLAN**

*N. VanScoy motioned not to amend the landscape plan with the orange (buffer) area.*

C. Rice: For the orange area, could we wait until winter for the buffer status and come back to the Board?

*No second motion to above.*

D. Marshall: Is it better to leave the plan as originally approved for the orange (buffer) area?

*N. VanScoy amended motion above to leave the orange (buffer) area on the landscape plan as originally approved by the Planning Board on March 7, 2011. Seconded by D. Marshall.*

C. Rice: The buffer requirement is between commercial and residential use. If there is an existing buffer, you don't need to plant a new buffer. The existing buffer is on my property.

T. Walsh: There is an existing buffer in an access easement and the house is 80 ft away. You are asking them to plant trees in the access easement that could be knocked down by the abutter. I don't understand that.

*Vote 3 in favor, 6 opposed. MOTION NOT CARRIED – no plantings required.*

*F. Kotowski motioned to approve the amended landscape plan for the green (shrub) area to reduce the number of shrubs from the originally approved landscape plan of 280 shrubs to the 180 shrubs (this will still exceed the requirement of 75 shrubs by 105 shrubs). Seconded by M. Cannata.*

F. Kotowski: There will still be clusters of vegetation?

C. Rice: Yes, we are only taking out the shrubs in red.

F. Kotowski: We could have approved the landscape plan originally with far less plantings.

M. Cannata: In reducing them, is it to improve business and traffic flow? What is the reason to reduce?

C. Rice: It won't help traffic or visibility to the site.

E. Haddad: As we complete construction, it will be the best looking landscaped area on Rte 3 in Hooksett. The reason we are proposing a reduction is that our landscaper thinks it is too much and will look better with less landscaping. Less is better for growth and flowering.

N. VanScoy: Originally when we looked at the plans, the plantings were good from Spring thru Fall. Did your landscaper make any comments for continuation of good looks (i.e. daylilies bloom for only a short time).

E. Haddad: We will have a fresh nice look all the time. As they (NHDOT) develop Rte 3 in front of us, whatever funds, material, and easements, the State will reimburse us (i.e. sod costs a lot of money. If the State tears up the sod and they want to replace it with seed). We want to create what the Town of Hooksett will be proud of throughout the seasons.

D. Shankle: On the record, the idea of bait and switch is something that bothers me. They shouldn't bring in a Cadillac landscape plan for their original approval and then come back with a request to reduce.

E. Haddad: I agree if I was sitting in your seat it looks that way. The last thing I looked at was landscaping. It wasn't bait and switch. I don't do that and will never do that.

*Vote unanimously in favor.*

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING**

3. **CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 7, 2011**  
**CRANTON VERNON, LLC (#11-03)**  
**Thames Rd. & Avon Rd., Map 14, Lot 14-3**  
Minor 3-lot residential subdivision plan.

***PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO NOVEMBER 7, 2011.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

4. **ALL OR NOTHING, LLC (#09-12)**  
**254 West River Rd., Map 17, Lot 36**  
Compliance with excavation/grading plan(s) and status of geo-tech grading plan(s) to be submitted

Marty Coronis: We didn't meet the September 26<sup>th</sup> deadline. Jo Ann and I talked. I apologize to Jo Ann, because I was supposed to get back to her.

MJ Coronis: Jo Ann's nasty gram letter of September 13, 2011 worked perfectly. We now have a plan we can get a mortgage on. We have a commitment letter. I forgot to bring the letter tonight. I can bring it in tomorrow to Jo Ann. CRVC is on board. We will steal money from our pockets for the October 28, 2011 deadline, because our mortgage won't close until January 2012. This money is our "don't touch until retirement" money. Wednesday Marty going to the Town and water district to start the process. It probably won't be done by October 28<sup>th</sup>, but it will be started.

D. Marshall: Who is doing your retaining wall plan?

MJ Coronis: The one already approved by the Board about 1 ½ years ago.

J. Duffy: That is the plan that was too expensive to build.

N. VanScoy: I don't remember seeing plans on a wall.

J. Gryval: The plan is from another engineer and our engineer still needs to review it.

D. Marshall: Staff was advised by you on Monday September 26<sup>th</sup> that your bank will fund and your contractor will present at tonight's meeting. Where is your contractor?

M. Coronis: I am the contractor.

D. Marshall: You bring your bank commitment letter to staff. Staff will check the status of what approved plan we do have on hand. At the Joint Land Use Workshop Meeting on October 17<sup>th</sup>, we will add an item for staff to update the Board on the status of this site.

J. Duffy: In August 2011 the dance studio pulled out of this site. The retaining wall was too expensive to build. Northpoint wanted to do matting. They thought there was no need for a Geotech and came back with a plan from Terracon. That plan won't work either and they were looking at the wall again. Now they want to go back to the original retaining wall design and that has not been reviewed by Stantec. As more time goes on, they hope to get the wall done before winter to stabilize the slope and also remove the stumps.

J. Gryval: At the last Board meeting (Sept 12<sup>th</sup>), they were supposed to have something positive for tonight. This is just another delay. If the wall plan is not approved by the Town engineer, then it still won't fly.

D. Marshall: Are we back to the Woodland design?

D. Tatem: Clarification, are you still planning to build the whole site or just the wall and stabilize the back site? Are you constructing the building at a later time?

MJ Coronis: We will build the retaining wall, have the water from across the street, and take out the stumps. I don't know why you aren't saying this is a positive step tonight. This is a huge positive step. We didn't have a deal in last 3 yrs. Jo Ann's letter woke up our financing. He dropped the price by \$100,000 on a property I already own. Everything was always fake up until now.

J. Gryval: I still don't see you have the money.

MJ Coronis: Our commitment letter is sitting at the Pizza man. I forgot to bring it tonight.

M. Cannata: At our next meeting on October 17<sup>th</sup>, we should be able to clarify the positive steps you are alluding to, that we don't have a firm grasp except what you are telling us tonight.

J. Gryval: I expected to get something positive in our hands tonight.

F. Kotowski: Bring the necessary documentation to the Town Planner's office and the Planner can advise us if the bank letter and plan are acceptable. Then at this next meeting, I will be able to vote.

D. Shankle: What I thought I heard, you are ready to do the wall soon per the completed and approved plan? They can do the wall with Stantec saying OK?

J. Duffy: They need to: 1) have Stantec review the retaining wall plan, 2) provide their SPC escrow, 3) provide their surety, and 4) have a pre-construction meeting on the wall. Fees and surety reduced for wall.

D. Shankle: All this can be done without them coming back to the Board?



M. Cannata: And include removal of the stumps.

M. Coronis: Yes, and the stumps at the same time.

Tom Cote, south abutter: From last week's rain storm, there was considerable erosion on the banking. All I can do is take their word and that this Board will hold them to it. To clarify the buffer zone, Article 10 Commercial Zone I. Buffer Zones: "Whenever a commercial or industrial use abuts a residential use, zone or district, a buffer shall be provided subject to the approval of the Planning Board. The buffer shall be not less than twenty-five (25) feet in width and shall be planted with a dense screen of shrubbery and trees not less than six (6) feet in height at the time of planting. The screen shall be at least fifteen (15) feet in width and shall be maintained suitably by the owner. In order to maintain dense screen year round, at least fifty (50) percent of the plantings shall be evergreens. Existing natural growth may be included as part of the screen. No penetration of this buffer zone shall be allowed. With the approval of the Planning Board, a suitable combination of other elements may be incorporated within the buffer."

J. Gryval: Yes, that is what is required for the buffer unless it is waived.

MJ Coronis: When Dan (Stantec) reviews the plan, he will check for the buffer. I want to remind you that we are taking our own funds out for this. We ask that Stantec be lenient with excess escrow funds. We have just enough funds to get the job done.

N. VanScoy: I just want to know what to expect on October 17<sup>th</sup>. Is the applicant coming back before the Board or are we just getting an update from staff?

J. Gryval: At the last Planning Board meeting (9/12/11), tonight we were supposed to have something concrete. Now she (MJ Coronis) tells us their letter from the bank is a commitment that they will get their loan, but on the other hand she is stating they are taking money out of their "old age fund".

MJ Coronis: We are getting a loan, but not until January 2012. Now we will take our own money and pay ourselves back when the loan comes in January. Wednesday we will talk to Stantec, and if he says OK then we will get the wall blocks delivered.

N. VanScoy: We are looking for a timeline from you on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

## **OTHER BUSINESS, CONTINUED**

### **SITE COMPLIANCE MONITORING & TRC PROCESS**

D. Shankle: I am new here, and we have a new DPW Director (Leo Lessard). We are looking at ways to streamline processes. We are looking at the work Stantec has been doing to bring that in house. We are not looking at plan reviews at this time, but are looking to do little steps in that direction. For site plan compliance (SPC) monitoring, Leo will start doing it in place of Stantec for what projects he feels he can do. Leo is not

taking over all of it. We are just looking at the system. In addition, Leo, Jo Ann & Peter, started looking at our regulations and who does what to try and clarify those. We are also looking at the role of the Technical Review Committee (TRC). Staff should have a last TRC, before it comes to the Planning Board. It seems like the Planning Board spends a lot of time doing work that the TRC could do up front to make sure the application is complete per our regulations. We will need to watch our timing, so it is not stretched out for the applicant and the Planning Board. This process will be better for everybody involved. I have done this in the past for other Towns I have worked at. We have fresh eyes with Leo and we can see where we can make things better.

M. Cannata: I have been on this Board for quite awhile. improve and refine each year. I remember the past and shutter in XX of communication. Not sure buying in unless I see specifically what highway is taking on for engineering mode.

D. Shankle: Leo can discuss the SPC monitoring in further detail.

L. Lessard: I have 30 yrs experience in road building and have an engineer degree. I want Stantec to stay on board for plan reviews. I want to do the site inspections and bring money into the Town instead of to Stantec. I also want to have better customer relationships. I have three guys that work for me who have pipe experience for roadways and drainage. What they don't know, I can teach them. I gave them a quiz to find out how much they know. I can teach and strengthen their weaknesses.

M. Cannata: If you are not an employee of the Town, you are less apt to be manipulated by applicants. Maybe not?

J. Gryval: The problem I see is Leo goes out to monitor and charges the taxpayer.

L. Lessard: I will be charging the applicant \$65-75 hr. This fee is based on surrounding Towns.

J. Gryval: I just don't want the taxpayer getting stuck with the bill.

T. Walsh: Leo will make less cost to do business, and be more customer friendly.

D. Marshall: Caution, no problem as long as Leo and staff are qualified and don't create an imbalance in funding. As times may get heavier, Leo can't perform all inspections and the Town can't afford to have two rates for on-site monitoring. Establish a fee fair and equitable regardless of who is doing the work. The funds collected for Stantec are private. For funds to Leo (Town), the Town should establish a revolving fund. It doesn't do good to put funds in the general fund. Funds should be expended and used for Planning purposes.

L. Lessard: When we get busier, we can hire another guy. It is self-funding.

F. Kotowski: We have two sets of new eyes (Dean Shankle and Leo Lessard). Some of us can't see the trees through the forest. I made it a point to talk to folks who have worked with Leo. They told me he did a wonderful job. The minute industrial development picks up, we will be more user friendly. We do a good job now and can make it even better. This is a way we can be more efficient with customers and a way we can put money in our coffers. Folks have mixed emotions on business in Hooksett. We need to give it a shot for this to happen and if it doesn't work, we tweak it. I feel very unprepared at times when I come here. I am not well prepared on State statutes, Planning regulations, and so forth. I would like to see our Planning staff look at these applications in advance and identify the pitfalls. I don't think we should take work away from Stantec.

D. Marshall: In reply to Frank's comments on unpreparedness, I hope all of you have taken advantage of one or more law lecture series and other training opportunities.

J. Duffy: Dean, will Leo start monitoring sites right away or will we put something in place first?

D. Shankle: I will work with staff and put something in place to bring back to the Planning Board. For the SNHU sidewalk, we (Town) are going to inspect it and I asked Leo to do that. Leo will charge less than Stantec if we can get away with that fee in the future. For now Leo will charge the same as Stantec. We will go through the regulations and the TRC process.

### **CHECKLIST**

J. Gryval: Modify the checklist attached to the Planning Board applications to include n/a or waiver requested. Provide Board members with the completed checklist.

J. Duffy: Prior to November 2010, we had yes, no, and n/a on the checklist. Then the Board decided to have yes and no. We can add a "waiver requested" column.

### **ALL OR NOTHING, CONTINUED FROM PG 9**

D. Shankle: The escrow for All or Nothing, I hate to give anyone a break, but right now they just need to build that wall. If they don't, we will have to.

J. Gryval: Tonight was the deadline for the bond decision, but we gave them until our next meeting on October 17<sup>th</sup>.

### **JOINT LAND USE WORKSHOP MEETING**

J. Duffy: Oct 17<sup>th</sup> was our regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting, however no new applications were received so we will have our semi-annual Joint Land Use Workshop Meeting instead.

N. VanScoy: This joint meeting would be a good time to start discussions on changes to zoning.

**GRANITE STATE WINERY**

J. Duffy: Jeff Larrabee will attend the joint meeting to discuss a hotel, winery, mini-golf & restaurant at the property owned by Heffron. He is looking for the Town's support.

**OLD MOBILE GAS STATION SITE HOOKSETT RD – BROOKS PROPERTIES**

D. Marshall: There is a sign at the old Mobile station on Hooksett Rd. stating coming soon?

J. Duffy: I will contact Brooks Properties on this.

**MAURAI – FALCON BROOK = ZBA REHEARING**

J. Gryval: The ZBA granted a rehearing for the Maurais Falcon Brook project.

N. VanScoy: I am going through refinancing based on my home being a condo with an association. I live at Contemporary Hollow Condominiums on Dale Rd., however I don't belong to an association and I don't pay fees. I cannot obtain a mortgage without proving there is no condo association. I have to go to a lawyer, have deeds changed, and get everyone on the street to do it. Because of this, a word of caution on the Falcon Brook project. Trees were planted between two condos in my development, however no one wants to take responsibility and upkeep them. An association is supposed to take care of our roadway and plantings. Without a condo association, our Town people are plowing our roads.

L. Lessard: I didn't know your development were condos.

D. Tatem: Dale Rd. is a private road. Dale confirmed this with me last year for the Mega X project.

D. Marshall: In the past the condos approved in Town were under the original owner/developer for the association. Now for recently built condos, the individual dwelling unit owners are the association.

**CRANTON VERNON 3-LOT SUBDIVISION**

J. Gryval: Did anyone go up and look at the site? Why can't we require street signs on private roads? I had a hard time finding the site, because there are no street signs up there. It is also for safety (ambulance and fire trucks).

J. Duffy: There are three associations near the site. I met with one of the associations and they said they assess fees to the other associations to access roads.

L. Lessard: The Planning Board can require street signs and require they be in a different color.

D. Tatem: Street signs have been required by the Planning Board on private sites, since I have been here.

J. Duffy: E911 may require they put up signs.

**NEIGHBORWORKS – WORKFORCE HOUSING PROJECT (Whitehall & by-pass 28)**

T. Walsh: The townhomes at Rte 27 and by-pass 28 are based on median income. Is it workforce housing or can it turn into subsidized housing?

J. Gryval: NeighborWorks look into income.

T. Walsh: Is the subsidy taken into income?

N. VanScoy: Rents will be an affordable housing number based on a percentage of the median income. Whether or not it is or could be section 8 housing, it could be. My area charges \$1,700 per month for rent.

J. Duffy: I can get information for you on NeighborWorks qualifications for renting.

J. Gryval: There does have to be a certain income.

N. VanScoy: The rent should be affordable to individuals just starting out.

T. Walsh: They encourage those in lesser paying services to apply.

N. VanScoy: The NeighborWorks program has a very good reputation.

J. Gryval: It was conditionally approved for 99 yrs as affordable housing.

***D. Marshall motioned to adjourn at 7:55pm. Seconded by J. Mudge.  
Vote unanimously in favor.***

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair J. Gryval declared the meeting adjourned at 7:55pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna J. Fitzpatrick,  
Planning Coordinator