

Official

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING
HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)
35 Main Street
Monday, July 20, 2015**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

PRESENT: D. Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman), F. Kotowski (arrived at 6:08 pm), T. Prasol, P. Scarpetti, and D. Winterton (Town Council Rep.)

ALTERNATES: Michael DiBitetto and Denise Grafton.

EXCUSED: Muamer Durakovic

STAFF: JoAnn Duffy (Town Planner), Jim Donison (Assistant Director of Public Works/Town Engineer), Dan Tatem (Stantec)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 6/15/15 & 6/29/15

June 15, 2015 Regular Meeting – *D. Winterton motioned to approve the minutes of the June 1, 2015 meeting. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Tom Walsh and T. Prasol abstained due to not being in attendance at the June 15, 2015 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.*

June 29, 2015 Regular Meeting – *T. Prasol motioned to approve the minutes of the June 29, 2015 meeting, with amendments. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.*

ELECTION OF CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR

P. Scarpetti motioned to nominate D. Marshall to the position of Chair. Seconded by T. Walsh. Motion carried unanimously.

T. Prasol motioned to nominate T. Walsh to the position of Vice-Chair. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION

DAVID MCCURDY

5 Cross Rd., Map 17, Lot 37
Storage of equipment.

Matthew Peterson (Hillside Design Group, LLC): I was asked to come on behalf of the owners, Louie

Pichette and David McCurdy, who are also here, to get input from the Planning Board on this property which is similar to another property that Mr. Pichette owns in Hooksett. We are here to talk about the piece on Cross Road that was approved for a self-storage facility about four years ago. I was involved with the permitting for that. Last Friday in Boston, I had one of my representatives at the ICSC try to push this in front of some people again but no one seems to be interested. He is also looking to do something commercial at the other site in town. There about eight or nine pieces of equipment that have been on the property. Louie Pichette owns multiple different businesses, including construction businesses. He owns this property and Dave is the tenant next to it. Mr. Pichette and Mr. McCurdy worked it so that he would over-see the property. They put this equipment on the property to sell on Craigslist. It is not a commercial site like the other site. The Planning Board asked us to come and talk about what we could do to continue to do that type of use. There is also an existing home on the property that we rented for many years. They are getting some push-back that they can't rent that as a single family home anymore. We would like to be able to rent that house. It pays the taxes. We are trying to market it as a commercial property and do something with it. The other thing is the equipment. We are here to find out from you what you would like us to do such as coming back to ask for a site plan waiver showing an area where the vehicles would be stored until they were sold, or to hear if you are against this. We had submitted full site plans for this project and there is a lot of information on file.

Dave McCurdy: I want to be clear there are two separate pieces and we are here for Cross Road.

D. Marshall: Are there any comments from staff?

J. Duffy: Originally, he received a letter from the Code Enforcement Officer saying that he could not park the equipment there because there was no site plan, and also something with regard to signage. We are concerned about the groundwater protection area and there is no pavement, only dirt and grass. He has moved the vehicles. If he does this temporarily, how would the groundwater portion of the regulation be overcome? He asked to do a change-of- use. The Board said it doesn't qualify as a change-of-use and that you wanted to speak with him. He is here to have a conversation about what his potential options could be between doing this and going to a full site-plan. The plan for the self-storage has expired. He is trying to use the property for something in between site plan approval.

P. Scarpetti: JoAnn what were the feelings as far as not being able to rent the house?

J. Duffy: As far as the house on Cross Road, I am not sure if someone is renting it. When I spoke with the owner he was questioning whether he could rent house on Pleasant Street. It has been vacant for over a year and it says in our zoning that if it is vacant you lose the grandfathering because that site is zoned commercial. I advised him to go and see the Zoning Board if he wants to turn it back to residential. He put a lot of work into that house when he turned it into the antique store and if he wanted to go back and just keep the house as residential he would need to return to the Zoning Board.

P. Scarpetti: There are no problems with Cross Road?

J. Duffy: Not that I am aware of, unless Matt has said otherwise.

D. Marshall: So the only issue in front of the Board is whether or not he can move the equipment back in and store it there?

J. Duffy: Correct.

T. Walsh: You mentioned craigslist. Are you just trying to sell the equipment or is it a staging area for an on-going business?

D. McCurdy: It would be ongoing, but more of a temporary thing because eventually the site will be developed. This is an intermediate thing, just to store them. We sell them on craigslist, but no one goes to the site.

L. Pichette: This is where Mr. Pichette has the equipment and some of it gets to an age where he sells it. It could get up to eight or nine pieces that he has for sale.

T. Walsh: I was just wondering how temporary it was. It is liquidating and when it is gone it is gone?

M. DiBietto: Do we have a copy of the provision that is cited that requires the pavement? Is it automobile and equipment sales that is a provision of the zoning ordinance? JoAnn, if you have that citation could you read it to us?

D. Marshall: What did the Code Enforcement Officer site?

J. Duffy: The Code Enforcement Officer is saying he doesn't have a site plan, so he needs to remove the heavy equipment, or have an approved site plan. The problem is if he has an approved site plan, it has to be paved because we don't allow parking of vehicles on an unpaved area.

M. DiBietto: So the thought is that the equipment could be there to develop the site, but to have a retail establishment of equipment sales or auto sales, there is a requirement of paving it?

J. Duffy: For any sort of commercial type parking it is a requirement.

M. DiBietto: The zoning says that in the case of a sales facility of equipment it needs to be paved or have a pad?

J. Duffy: I am going to check that because parking used to be in the zoning regulations but it has been moved to the development regulations.

M. DiBietto: If it is then the Board has certain authority to waive it, as I understand.

J. Duffy: What complicates this is that it is in the groundwater protection district.

T. Walsh: Isn't there something in the development regulations that would allow us, with our own discretion, to go with something other than pavement, so long as it would comply and won't be crumbled by the machines?

J. Duffy read from the development regulations: “Every parking space and access driveway shall be surfaced with a durable and dustless material which shall meet the approval of the Planning Board and shall be graded and drained so as to dispose of all surface water accumulation in an approved manner. The words durable and dustless are defined as bituminous asphalt blacktop paving or concrete paving. The Planning Board may establish alternative surface materials on a case by case basis.” That is what was done as part of the site plan for Ritchie Brothers.

D. Winterton: Dan, didn't they use ground up old pavement?

D. Tatem: Yes. They installed six or seven monitoring wells down stream of the parking area to make sure there were no issues, and they put in a foot of reclaimed stabilized base or asphalt, which, when it compacts, is almost like asphalt. They also had to do a drainage study to demonstrate they could capture all of the flow into a detention pond. One of those ponds had the monitoring well in it. They were required to do a lot of studies and improvements to have that waiver granted.

T. Walsh: It was a lot of square footage compared to what they are looking for.

M. Peterson: For site plan approval, we are going to need parking spaces and an access road. We do not have people coming to park so we do not want to do a site plan with an access road and have parking spaces. I was talking with staff to discuss that maybe there is a way to ask for a site plan waiver, but we understand the groundwater where the vehicles would be parked is a concern of the Board. This is not a retail site. It is just a place to store these vehicles. Maybe there is an in-between that we can work with the Board or staff on.

D. Marshall: What you are asking us to do is approve a partial site plan. You have to come to us and show that you can put something down in this portion of that lot that will protect the groundwater from the equipment. We don't normally do half site plans, but that is up to the pleasure of the Board because there is provision to use alternate materials. You will still have to present us with some sort of plan.

M. Peterson: On this site, all of the engineering has been done. We have a lot of information to start with. It is just a matter of going through the site plan steps for a 30 x 50 area.

T. Prasol: If this was a virgin piece of property I would agree with the Chair, but because there is an existing building, site work has been done, and he is looking for an improvement, in my opinion I would work with this applicant as far as waiving the full site plan requirements as long as the groundwater is addressed.

D. Marshall: Even if it is a lot that is being used, it is technically being used as a residential property, not as a commercial establishment.

D. Winterton: Would the applicant be willing to do something along the lines of what Mr. Walsh suggested of having a time limit on it. I understand you are trying to market the property and make some value out of it, in the interim, but I don't think this is something this Board would like to approve on a permanent basis without some sort of change in site plan. I would lean toward working with the

town and our engineering department. My concern is the groundwater, and we have a groundwater protection area for a reason. What you are doing does not fit what the groundwater protection area should have. I understand you are trying to do your best to maximize your property, but there must be a gray area.

M. Peterson: This is not a lot that we did anything on. This lot was flattened and set when the building was built, as part of the site plan TF Moran did and Dan did the inspections on. He did put the equipment on there but I do not want to give the impression we are doing anything illegally on the property. We can go back and take a look and try to put something together.

D. Marshall: Should we put this in the hands of the town engineer and let him come back to us to let us know if he is satisfied that the groundwater will be protected?

J. Donison: If the Board requests I could get some ideas about the site, familiarize myself with it, talk to applicant and his representative, come up with some ideas and present them to you.

T. Walsh motioned to allow the town engineer to meet with the developers and owners to work out a plan that satisfies the protection of the groundwater for David McCurdy, 5 Cross Rd., Map 17, Lot 37. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING UPDATE

SNHU Baseball Press Box and Stadium Seating

Jeff Kevan (TFMoran, Inc.): Here with me are representatives from Operations Development at Southern New Hampshire University. In January the Board did not feel we needed an approval so we are here to update you. The project is moving ahead. At their current baseball field, there is currently a wall about 42” tall and a back stop. There is no press box. There are bleachers off to the side, some seating, and a hillside where most of the students sit. The proposal is to leave that wall in place, go in behind it, construct a slab, and put bleachers for 179 seats. It will be picked up to be able to see over the wall. They also want to add a press box that has two bathrooms in the lower floor and a utility room. There would be a set of stairs off to side to go into the press box. The press box would be for announcing and would have a flat roof for cameras to video the games. The architecture will match the other buildings that are there. The sewer is 10' to 15' away. We have been in front of the Sewer Commission. An application has been filed with them to tie in and we would bring a water service from the former central receiving building. The water line in the street is aged and the water precinct requested that we not tap into the street. They have had a couple of great seasons and have hosted a couple of tournaments, so they would like to update the field.

D. Winterton: Is there screening from foul balls and flying bats?

J. Kevan: The wall is 42” tall and there is a back stop on top of the wall which is another 16' above the fence. The rest of the facility is not changing except for bringing a sidewalk up from the existing pavement. The parking lot is staying the same.

F. Kotowski: In the interest of helping to put Hooksett on the map, SNHU carries the name Hooksett

with it. I hope you continue doing the things you are doing to make that college what it is today. We are proud of it. I do think it is prudent to put screening in from one end of where people are seated to the other.

J. Kevan: There is already screening there.

COMPLETENESS

ESTATE OF JOYCE ASHLEY EMERSON (plan #15-11)

20 Main St., Map 11, Lot 1

Subdivision of Lot 1 (3.056 acres) into two lots (1.002 and 2.054 acres).

- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist items #39 & 42 – Wetlands
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist items #37 & 46 – Topography

J. Duffy: You have a letter from Stantec dated last Friday that had some outstanding items. We have worked with Don this morning. He has submitted two additional waiver forms, which will be discussed at the next meeting at the public hearing, and added the dimensions for the old foundation. The application is complete.

D. Marshall: No action needs to be taken on the waiver request until the public hearing?

J. Duffy: Correct. That is scheduled for August 3.

D. Marshall: The plan is complete as far as you are concerned?

J. Duffy: Yes.

D. Marshall: Please tell us briefly what you are proposing.

Don Duval: This is a two lot sub-division. We are proposing one additional lot. The driveway will come off of College Park. We are in process with the state. I spoke with them Friday and they are hoping to get me an approval this week. The lot will be serviced by town sewer and water.

T. Prasol motioned to find the plan complete for the Estate of Joyce Ashley Emerson (plan #15-11), 20 Main St., Map 11, Lot 1. Seconded by F. Kotowski. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

WESTRIVER REALTY (plan #13-11)

90 West River Rd., Map 29, Lot 72

Site plan for an 8,000 square foot commercial building (6,000 sf retail and 2,000 sf restaurant) with associated parking and septic system.

- **Waiver Request** from Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Part III, Section 3.04, (4)(d)1.a. Landscaped Parking Areas.
- **Waiver Request** from Completeness Checklist.

Chris Rice (TF Moran): The owner of the property is here with me. This is off of Rt. 93, Exit 10 and is

a 3.65 acre lot. Currently on site is an existing Dunkin Donuts of 2,600 sq. ft. We came before this Board, conceptually, in April and came for completeness in June. This plan was part of a master plan development in 2003 which called for the Dunkin Donuts and another fast food restaurant. At the time Dunkin Donuts was built and the drainage facilities were constructed, but given tenant interest and the economy the second restaurant pad was never constructed. We are proposing an 8,000 sq. ft. building, 6,000 sq. feet of retail and 2,000 sq. feet for an eat-in restaurant. We have 40 parking spaces which meets the zoning requirement. The site will be serviced by municipal water, and on-site septic system, and there is existing gas at the site from Liberty Utilities. We are also putting in a dry sewer line in case municipal sewer is brought up to the frontage of the property. We have gotten correspondence from Bruce Kudrick, which I forwarded to Dan and JoAnn, saying the design looks good. I have met with the Fire Department and worked around the turn-around issue. We submitted a letter to staff and Stantec from the Fire Department stating they were satisfied with the access requirement. Relative to the entrance/exit into the property, we met with DOT a number of times and what we are showing is keeping the existing island and bump out a two inch raised cobblestone surface. It can be driven over by trucks, but should help direct the traffic to not take an illegal left. I have not received the state permit yet, but they seemed to like what we have shown. They did state to me that if they continue to witness illegal lefts they would look at extending the median. I will be getting a driveway permit from NH DOT which is required as well as a NH DES septic permit. We received the latest round of Stantec's comments. They are all minor items we can address easily. There was one that references the 16' isle width. That is the surface not the rumble strip. If you include the rumble strip it is 20 ½' at its maximum width. One of the waivers we are requesting has to deal with site specific soils. We have updated the plans to be NRCS soils and have done a number of ledge probes on the property. The site is predominately ledge and there are steep slopes. We thought it was a reasonable request to ask for a waiver for that because it won't give us any valuable information that we do not already know. The second waiver we are requesting is for internal landscaping of parking areas. We are required to have 5% internal landscaping. We have 2.9%. If that waiver is denied I would have to put in an island in the middle parking area and add employee spaces in the back of the building. The third waiver is to not provide a minimum of 2' per second pipe velocity for 2-year storm event. Most of our pipes meet that requirement. I believe Dan is in agreement with that waiver request. The fourth one is to not provide 1' of freeboard for the 100-year storm. Due to the fact this was a master plan, they got a site specific permit in 2003 which covered the full development of the property. All of the ponds were built per that plan, however, some of the regulations have changed and the rainfall intensities have increased. We have reduced the amount of impervious area for our project from what was originally approved by 14,400 sq. ft. and the peak rate of run-off has also been reduced. We still do not have the 1' of freeboard for the 100-year storm or the 50-year, because the original design did not have it. We have bettered the situation, but do not meet the requirement. I could look at putting in a sub-surface chamber system in the parking lot to help the flow to get the 1' of freeboard and the 50-year, but for the 100-year there would be a lot of site changes, possibly redoing that entire detention basin.

D. Marshall: Are there any objections to the waivers?

D. Tatem: The only request in our letter that we did not take exception to was the free-board for the 50-year. Your regulations require the 1' of freeboard for the 100-year. State standard is for the 50-year. I think 1' for the 50-year would be a reasonable waiver to grant, however, I would not waive that all together. We are fine with the others.

J. Duffy: In the area with the gravel turn-around for the fire truck, is it possible to put no parking signs there?

C. Rice: Yes. Do you want one, or on either side.

J. Duffy: One on either side saying fire lane or something similar.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

D. Winterton motioned to approve the waiver to not provide 1' of freeboard in the detention basin for the 100-year storm event, with the condition that the developer agrees that he will supply 1' of freeboard for the 50-year storm event. Seconded T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

F. Kotowski motioned to grant the remaining three waivers for landscaping, site specific soils, and minimum pipe velocity. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously.

T. Walsh motioned to approve site plan subject to the states approval of the driveway permit. Seconded by D. Winterton.

P. Scarpetti: Are they going to extend the island or would they require you to extend the island if this become a problem?

C. Rice: It wasn't stated one way or the other. They just said they would look at doing it. I would have to ask them that specific question.

P. Scarpetti: Is the dumpster that is currently there going to be used by both Dunkin Donuts and you?

C. Rice: No. One is for the retail side and one is for the restaurant tenant.

Motion carried unanimously.

EXTENSION REQUEST & PUBLIC HEARING

MANCHESTER WATER WORKS

700 Quality Dr., Map 29, Lot 64-2

Site Plan for a proposed radial well, 24-foot by 26-foot pump building, and gravel driveway. (Building will contain the well and house equipment, including pumps, emergency generator, etc.) Application conditionally approved on 3/3/2014 and expired on 3/3/2015. Applicant is requesting a 1 yr. extension.

- **Extension Request** – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions.

Dave Miller (Deputy Director at Manchester Water Works): We went before the ZBA about a year and a half ago requesting a special exception to allow us to put a water supply at the subject property. We

also went before this Board and were granted a site plan approval subject to a number of conditions. The project proceeded slower than expected and the site plan approval expired on March. I am here to request that we be granted a one-year extension. We are ready at this point. We have been working with NH DES to get approval of the radio collector well design. We are close to signing an agreement with the contractor and setting up a pre-construction meeting with a representative from Hooksett as required in your Board decision.

Open public hearing.

No public comments.

Close public hearing.

F. Kotowski motioned to grant the extension request – Development Regulations (6/4/2012) Section 10.03, 2) Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions for Manchester Water Works, 700 Quality Dr., Map 29, Lot 64-2 until March, 2016. Seconded by T. Prasol. Motion carried unanimously.

CHANGE OF USE

1. Turn One Graphics, 1313 Hooksett Road, Map 25, lot 56-1. Existing use is Retail; proposed use is office space for Turn One Graphics. The building is 912 sf. Zone is PZ. The site is owned by John Kelly. It is the former gas station building adjacent to Auto Wholesalers.

2. Hooksett Sub Shop, Inc./Moe's Sandwich Shop, 1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18, lot 49-C. Former use was a tattoo shop. Zone is PZ. Applicant proposes to lease two units consisting of 1,450 sf. There will be no frialator. The only outstanding question was whether a grease trap may be needed, approval conditional on sewer approval.

J. Duffy: The only outstanding question was whether he would need a grease trap. Even though he will not have a frialator he needed to speak with the Sewer Commission about whether they would require one.

F. Kotowski: He was due to come in today, however, because of an illness of one of the developers he did not, so we have not spoken with him. Bruce Kudrick of the Wastewater Treatment Plant told us that, as long as they are not installing frialators or anything that utilizes fat, oils, grease, etc., we could waive that requirement with the notation on the waiver that in the event they do start using that type of equipment, they would need to put a grease trap in.

J. Duffy: The owner of the property won't allow frialators.

3. BrandIt/Scott Chalifour, 15 Zapora Drive, Map 31, lot 32-2. The owner is a Hooksett Resident. Existing use is Delta Mechanical. Delta is being bought out by another company. Proposed use is headquarters for BrandIt. The building is 3,520 sf. The site is zoned Commercial. Company is relocating from Millyard in Manchester.

4. Auburn Heights, LLC, 5 Sutton Circle, Map 49, lot 3-2. People know this as Profile Self Storage. The Board approved them going for a change-of-use at the last meeting. Existing use is

outdoor construction material storage. Proposed use is outdoor vehicle storage, for boats and rv's. The applicant proposes to install metal fencing, new light poles with cameras and fencing around the perimeter of the property. The area will be used for RV and boat storage, as an auxiliary site to Profile Self Storage.

T. Walsh: Has anyone came down to the office to talk about Terios Auto Body?

J. Duffy: We met with someone recently who wants to move his current audio sounds business there. His wife has a dance studio by Supreme Pizza and they were looking at the possibility of moving the dance studio into that building as well into the second floor. He was planning on going through the purchase and sale shortly.

BOARD DISCUSSION

D. Marshall: Has any more been heard about Aroma Joes?

J. Duffy: No. They got their approval and were supposed to meet with me about the entrance way. I have not heard anything since.

D. Marshall: This is an example of providing quick approvals. I caution the Board that as much pressure as these developers put on you, to take the time to make a good decision. Has anything more been heard on University Heights?

J. Donison: One week ago we had a pre-construction meeting with the developer on University Heights Phase IIa. Phase II had approximately 30 lots and they were proposing to sub-divide Phase II into two phases Phase IIa and Phase IIb. Phase IIa was the construction of 1,600 linear feet of roadway, drainage, curbing, sewer, sidewalks, water, gas, underground electric, cable, and television. One question was regarding a performance bond. They said that it was precedent, as part of the previous phase, where they did not have to post a performance bond for the project. They proposed that they only provide a landscape bond which is \$5,000 per acre and that it be conditioned upon and specified in this agreement. I estimate there are 10 acres of disturbed area plus the roadway. They presented the town with a letter that we passed by the town attorney. The applicant would prefer to not provide as-built plans until final construction is complete rather than at the substantial completion phase. My concern is that at the substantial completion phase you allow them to start building houses and they could go bankrupt and you will never have as-built plans or monuments. My recommendation is to include documentation for each one of the lots and as-built plans. Just last week the Sewer Commission asked where the sewer service was tied into, and there were not any plans for Phase Ib because that was not a requirement as part of the approval. JoAnn and I worked together and talked to the town attorney, Christine Fillmore with Hage and Hodes Law Firm and this language was reviewed by them.

J. Duffy: The attorney has not gotten back to me yet.

J. Donison: This was an agreement similar in scope to the previous agreement in 2011.

J. Duffy: The development regulations say at least one right-of-way shall be designated as a bench mark, and prior to issuance of a CO, or prior to issuance of the last remaining CO in the case of multiple units, all monumentation must be verified through the use of an as-built. This is different because you are signing an agreement and not going by exactly what the regulations say. Today's regulations require they post the surety immediately. We are using the old regulations from when the plan was first approved saying the project is grandfathered.

P. Scarpetti: They are not going to build any houses, only the road, and when there is substantial completion on the road is when they submit the as-built, and when that is all set they can move on?

J. Duffy: They will provide a reclamation bond up front.

P. Scarpetti: At that point they will put up an additional bond?

J. Donison: Yes. They would put up a 10% bond for a 2-year period.

J. Duffy: That would be after the road is accepted.

J. Donison: No building permits will be issued until they follow all of the items that are specified in paragraph 1 in the letter, which includes completion of all utilities, roadway, curbing, monuments, and providing an as-built plan of the project.

D. Winterton motioned to authorize the Chairman to sign the agreement provided the town attorney approves it. Seconded by T. Walsh. T. Prasol abstained due to living in the neighborhood. Motion carried unanimously.

J. Duffy: Moving forward who will do the reviews?

J. Donison: One item tasked to me was to be involved with plan review with the Planning Board as well as construction inspections when things go through the construction phase, if that suits the Planning Board. There could be times when a large sub-division comes in and it is too overwhelming for my time, so I may have to ask for assistance from a consultant such as Stantec.

D. Marshall: Is your area of expertise civil engineering?

J. Donison: I have been in the civil engineering industry for 34 years. I have worked for consulting engineering firms and municipalities. I have done consulting and municipality reviews and inspections, design reviews on sub-divisions, and site plans.

D. Marshall: I assume your role will be to do plan reviews and I assume there will be times you need to call on other expertise like traffic engineering, hydraulics, geotech, etc.

F. Kotowski: Welcome aboard and it is nice to know we have an engineer on staff to be able to contact. It is nice to know you recognize the fact that there may be times you may need extra help.

OTHER BUSINESS

➤ **Approval of Stantec Invoices**

*D. Winterton motioned to approve the Stantec Invoices. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

➤ **Approval of Keach-Nordstrom Invoices**

*D. Winterton motioned to approve the Keach-Nordstrom Invoices. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously.***

Marcel Croteau voiced concerns about land he believes he owns along Springer Road. He believes Don Duval did the survey incorrectly. The Board advised him to seek legal counsel.

ADJOURNMENT

*M. DiBietto motioned to adjourn. Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously.***

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted by,

**AnnMarie White
Recording Clerk**