

Official
As of 02/13/07

HOOKSETT
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Minutes
January 09, 2007

Tracy Murphy-Roche called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

Attendance:

Tracy Murphy-Roche, Chris Pearson, Dick Johnston, David Boutin, Roger Duhaime, Ron Savoie, James Levesque, and James Gorton (non-voting Council Rep.)

Also present, Michelle Bonsteel

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

ANN LAMBERT

18 Morrill Road, Map 39 Lot 12

Variance from Article 5 Section C.1.B to permit two lot subdivision, each lot having 154.01 feet frontage where 175 is required.

Attorney Emile Bussiere: A site walk was conducted and since then I have talked to two of the people that live on Autumn Run that were against this proposal, Mrs. Torres and Mrs. Lebow. We have since reached agreement with them to the effect, if board grant variance, when the two lots are developed there will be a restriction in the deed that would prohibit removal of healthy trees or erection of any structures on the 100 ft portion of this property that abuts Autumn Run. That was satisfactory to these people and they told me that they would withdraw their objection. I am hoping that they will show at some point to tell you that. I spoke to them yesterday and I put it in writing, read it to them, and it was agreeable. Those two people support the request. There was some discussion last time that was somewhat erroneous, in terms of the hardship that we have to prove in this case, according to case law, the applicant needs to show that the zoning interferes with the reasonable use to the property. Someone was saying that it was a little different and we had to show that we didn't have any reasonable use left of the property.

There is a major difference in saying that the zoning restriction in question restricts us from making a reasonable use and having a unique setting in its environment. I think we meet that qualification very easily. One thing we are asking you to vary is one line of 4 lines on lot. One line would be 154 ft rather than the 175. To compensate for that in this unique setting, we go from a requirement of the zoning laws that there be one acre for one of the properties which will have sewer and water to 1.83, almost double the requirement in size. We feel we meet that easily, met objections of the two neighbors and I am here to answer any questions you may have.

R. Savoie: You said you talked to abutters and they agreed that the piece of property that comes down from Autumn Run will have a buffer, how deep is it?

E. Bussiere: 100-foot buffer

R. Savoie: If that was put in as approval, that wouldn't be a problem?

E. Bussiere: No and I have letters that I will be glad to read to you that defines the property and the 100-ft buffer towards Autumn Run. We won't cut down any healthy trees or put up structures without the consent of these people. That restriction would last for 20 years, not forever.

D. Boutin: The 100 ft buffer, did I understand that you said it would only last 20 years?

E. Bussiere: I can make it more; I thought it was satisfactory to them. I will not make that an obstacle. There is no reason to cut any trees.

D. Boutin: I understand but the people who live there 20 years down the road would want the same protection.

E. Bussiere: If you feel that way, we can change it. We don't need it for development there is a strong slope over there. I just thought it was a reasonable thing to do.

D. Boutin: In terms of the buffer area, I would want to see two things happen, one, I would like to see it in the deed and two, I would like to see it on the subdivision plan with a note indicating that if this board decides to approve this that the zoning board approve it with this restriction offered by you on this date and obviously that the subdivision be recorded.

E. Bussiere: I will read the letter to you that I wrote to the abutters. The conveyance of these two lots would be subject to restrictions that would apply a portion of the land which is 100 feet which is described as follows, the deed will say that and this letter promises that will happen.

D. Boutin: Just to further insure this, the deed should be reviewed by our counsel and the variance, if we approve the variance, would not take effect until we had a plan recorded by the planning board.

E. Bussiere: The most convenient thing to do is make it a condition at planning board level and recorded at the registry

T. Murphy-Roche: Can't the deed be prepared without the name of the buyer on file? This way it would be presented to the buyer or owner so that they would know what the deed looks like at the sale.

E. Bussiere: I can prepare it and make it part of this record if you want and make it a condition of approval.

T. Murphy-Roche: At least we can have it on record with the deed.

E. Bussiere: Would it be sufficient if I attached it as part of the record as a condition?

T. Murphy-Roche: I was not here last month; I would like the people that were present at the site walk to vote. I assume we went through the application already.

E. Bussiere: Yes, we can do it again if you like.

Open to Public
None
Closed Public

R. Duhaime: The 100-ft buffer was just for the neighbors in the back right? Not for the people on the sides.

E. Bussiere: That is correct. It is for the neighbors on Autumn Run.

R. Duhaime: So the neighbors are in agreement with this letter?

C. Pierson: We don't know if they are in agreement or not.

E. Bussiere: I spoke to them yesterday and they said they wanted these letters so I prepared them and they were suppose to pick them up today and they didn't. I brought them here tonight and I expected to see them here and they didn't show up.

R. Duhaime: Wasn't there a daughter on one side that was against this?

E. Bussiere: Yes, and she stood up and said she was against having two houses there

R. Duhaime: So there is no buffer on that side?

D. Johnston motioned to grant the variance from Article 5 Section C.1.B to permit two lot subdivision, each lot having 154.01 feet frontage where 175 is required. Motion seconded by R. Savoie motion carries 3 in favor 2 opposed.

RICHARD BOISVERT

1554 Hooksett Road Map 18 Lot 2

Variance from Article 3 Section p to allow a filling station less than 1,000 feet away from another filling station. Variance from Article 18 Section D.8 to allow for a gas station in the groundwater resource conservation district.

Attorney B. Hantz: We went through this application for 2 variances, first one an area variance where we need 1000 feet from another filling

station. We have 750 feet to the edge of property, and 850 to gas pumps. The second variance which is a use variance, which is the amendment to the ground water conservation district (GRCD) which prohibits filling stations in this designated area. We went through the 5 criteria. There are two plans; one with the existing building on the site and one that is set for the planning board. The old one was for 7-11 and the new one is set up for Cumberland Farms. Stantec gave letter with regards to the boards comments last meeting, see file. I sent it to Michelle and have an original letter for the record with additional information. I tried to summarize the information from last meeting. The issue was from the school Department because of potential emergency planning and it sits at the end of Memorial Drive that services the middle school students. The fire dept. gave their input to Mr. Boisvert, he put it into a letter, he can speak of that. There was a letter submitted from the Norwood Group and we have a supplement to that letter for that use and the property. There were many questions last time and it is a reasonable use. Going to that issue that was raised by the board, Norwood indicated that

some of the suggested uses for this property that were market feasible were market chains, such as drug stores. This site is not near a mall or major intersection. There was some discussion on the impact of this proposal on the surrounding property value and there is no diminishing to the property value surrounding this property. We asked Peter Stanhope to take a look on the issue here, one being 1000-foot separation. He looked at other gas stations that were less than 1000 feet. He found 5 or 6 locations that were that close together and there were no issues.

Further in his report he indication the issue on the ground water protection zone and there is no impact. Further in his report he did some research on the ground water protection zone and it has no bearing on market value.

Last time there was some testimony from Mr. Hebert from the Village Water Precinct. In terms of the utility of the aquifer, Mr. Hebert testified that he has no interest in using that as his groundwater. There are a number of factors as to why. We have a letter from Geosphere which is the consulting engineering group for the Village Water Precinct which confirms that there is no content and there is no basis for pursuing water resources in this area. They have no interest in developing ground water protection there. It isn't intended for use by the water dept. Mr.

Talkington is the one who prepared this report from Geosphere. I have asked Mr. Palva from Cumberland Farms to be here, he has contacted each of the underlying engineering firms for their response to these comments. We got them yesterday and he was able to have each of the underlying engineering firms Dubois & King who did the site plan and Bohler Engineering who is handling the DES permitting.

I will submit this packet for the record. We have the TRC set up for Thursday at which time I will get into the more detail. The plans will be reviewed for compliance of state and local codes. Which is one of Stantecs comments.

C. Pearson: The issue I have with this and it is more a timing thing, I have not had a chance to look at this packet. Personally, with this being in the GRCD, it is a sensitive issue. I would like TRC to look at this and get their recommendations. It is a lot of pressure to be put on us to get this packet right before the meeting.

T. Murphy-Roche: The packet you are going to submit to us is something that we have not seen.

B. Hantz: These are follow up issues that we addressed.

C. Pearson: I don't know how the board feels but I would like the board to review this and for it to go to TRC for comment. It is a lot of late information and I do not feel comfortable. I want the letter that is being introduced with regards to the fire dept. to be verified.

R. Duhaime: When we have a large amount of information like we had at the last meeting, we need time to review it. I don't have the information to be able to make a decision.

M. Bonsteel: Maybe of those items that are being raised are Planning Board items for site plan issues. You are defining your concerns with the GRCD and what is being done to mitigate any complications that may arise. The letter from Stantec is a broad letter for the planning board and you.

T. Timbrell (Stantec): That is true, this report that we provided was a review of the set of plans that didn't include the drainage report and a couple of other items that are in progress or maybe isn't available on this level. We pointed out some items that will be addressed by the applicant. This is what the planning process would uncover. The comments were general drainage, we listed items that will be listed by the applicant, completeness and in attempt to give an overview, we provided this document to the board. BMPS or a spill or release of something into the GRCD

R. Savoie: One of the comments are that the monitoring wells are not located in the right place as oppose to the fuel tanks in the ground.

T. Timbrell: They show that they are right in front of the convenient store access doors, which did appear to be in the location where the buried tanks were. We think that in the course of the progress of plans we will get the observation and monitoring wells in the spot that they belong, the final grades of the site and where the best place for them to be located.

Where they are located now didn't appear to be right but that was just a general comment.

Hanz: On one particular point, Bohler engineering's comment was he didn't understand the discrepancy in the plans but ultimately the wells are proposed for all four corners. I think that is what they were looking for.

R. Savoie: The box culvert that you mention for the storm drainage, where is that going?

T. Timbrell: I believe it is headed towards the pond.

R. Savoie: Has it been noted that all the drainage from Route 3 and Granite Hill goes into the pond

T. Timbrell We didn't have a drainage report so we had to limit our review to what we could see on the plan. The drainage report will address the flows from the site and the existing structures around the site.

T. Murphy-Roche: In the report from Peter Stanhope, are there any gas stations from Hooksett with regards to the 1000 foot?

B. Hantz: One is in Goffstown, one is Route 3 south of the intersection of I-93 at the Hooksett/Manchester line. One is in Durham, Dover, Lee, Epping, and Route 101A and 101 in Milford. He looked at seven locations. In the minutes when this ordinance was passed, there was some questions as to if there was enough signatures. There were only 27 signatures at the time this was introduced and that is being reviewed by Town Counsel

J. Levesque: Was there a variance for the Mobile on the Run on Alice Ave with the Exxon across the street.

T. Murphy-Roche: Yes

Open to the abutters:

Joanne McHugh representing the school district. I am here with regards to the report from Stantec, we have not seen it at all. With regards to the 1000 feet, my comment is it is an ordinance that the town put in for a reason. My main concern is traffic. It is an elementary school not a middle school. There is heavy traffic in the morning and late afternoon. On the weekends there is all kinds of sports being played there and it is busy. My greatest concern is traffic going and coming from there and my fear is someone will meet their maker. Secondly, my other concern has to do with the fact of being able to get out of the site if there is an emergency or spill. In the past we have used the Sewer dept as a holding area when there is a emergency but I don't know how long we can keep students down there or how we would get them down there in the winter. Basically that is the concern that the school district has. I can't comment on the other issues, I have not seen the Stantec report.

General Public

Richard Boisvert: Mr. Talkington from Geosphere is here; he can give a summary on that report.

T. Murphy-Roche: What plans are in effect if there is a spill at the gas station down the street from the school, Granite Hill Market?

M. Bonsteel: The fire department has plans on all of the commercial properties in town. We can request that the fire department give us comments.

T. Murphy-Roche: My concern is if there is a spill at this site, there has to be a concern with the school.

M. Bonsteel: With my informal discussion with Mike Hoisington he said they would hold them there at the school. That is something you need from the fire department. I know what we have in plan for something like this. On a specific site, you would need to talk to the fire department.

T. Murphy-Roche: If there are plans in place for this property or for the gas station down the road, the same is put into place, how is this different?

M. Bonsteel: It isn't different, the plan is the same.

C. Pearson: Isn't Emergency Management part of TRC? So if there are concerns at TRC, they will be raised.

R. Savoie: They should connect Greatwoods Landing and Egawes Dr. Secondly I think the traffic impact would be less of a concern that that intersection. The gas station/convenience store is not a major problem as is the traffic on Route 3.

R. Talkington: Took enlargement of figure one of letter submitted to record, see file.

Is this a location that would be looked at by the precinct for a future water supply well? Based on the discussion we have no desire and we don't want to go down that road. It is a poor water supply. People from precinct were there at the dredge of that water and it is all silt and clay. There are other areas in the northeastern parts that are being looked at for water right now. In addition to that, for permitting, we need 400 gallons per

minute. The state wants 12 acres of land. There is no area to the west of Route 3/28 that has 12 acres of land because it is so dense. The water treatment plant is down there and we want to stay away from there. It is not favorable at all. Pinnacle pond is on the west side; we are looking at the east side of the river.

In addition to that there is a back up well and it has certain requirements from DES. It can only be pumped certain times of the year. The red line is wellhead protection area.

R. Savoie: Basically what you are saying is it isn't aquifer material?

R. Talkington: No, there isn't anything there.

R. Duhaime: This is Village water, does Central have anything to do with it?

R. Talkington: All Central comes from Manchester. The wells are closed up they were all contaminated.

T. Murphy-Roche: In Stanhopes report is there an overview or final comments?

B. Hantz: Yes, page 2, impact of 750 ft distance instead of the 1000 ft. The uses within the visual and audible influences to the north are all equally or interior commercial uses to the proposed use including an automotive service garage.

All of these properties are exposed to equal or more intense uses. The variance he is addressing is the 1000 ft. Ground water is not market value to the study. He believes the redevelopment will increase value.

Tony Acorace, resident: There is only one way in and one way out, if there is an emergency at the intersection what would they do?

R. Savoie: If this place doesn't even open because something happens they are dead.

Richard Boisvert: When I talked to the fire chiefs and with today's technology and fire suppression systems, they said they would keep the kids in the school, keep them protected, and address the problem. By the soccer fields there is a path that goes down Route 3, they would treat it like it is any other business in town. It has no bearing.

B. Hantz: There is a turning lane that will be added.

Joann McHugh: With regards to the traffic and the enhancement, my concern lies in the fact of an accident. The entrance and the access coming out of it going north how are you going to enter? This may be more for the planning board.

T. Timbrell: We would require a traffic study by Planning Board

B. Hantz: There was a traffic study done

M. Paiva Cumberland Farms: The main road is approved by DOT and the state requested that we have an angled entrance and exit. The only town curb cut is 36' wide enter and exit along with improvements of Memorial Drive with regards to turning lane. The biggest truck is the transportation truck that enters. We also as a safety protocol, like the fueling operation, and this is to happen away from the pumps.

B. Hantz: The is only one way in and the out for the tanker.

J. McHugh: When they are coming out of the site, they are coming onto Memorial D? They will have to cross over several lanes if they come out on Route 3. It is easier and clearer for them.

There will be many vehicles coming onto Memorial Drive especially in the morning and afternoon.

R. Savoie: You would want them coming out of Memorial drive. They have timed deliveries.

D. Boisvert: I did my own traffic study, 15 busses, 75 automobiles, in a 25 minute period. There were no children walking. In terms of traffic, if we put a McDonalds there, there will still be traffic. I did the 25 minutes in morning and 25 in the afternoon.

Public Closed.

C. Pearson: I will go back to what I started with. I have had a long history in underground tanks etc. It is a sensitive area and I want the fire department to verify this letter and TRC Comments.

C. Pearson: I motion to table this to the next meeting February 13, 2007. I would like to receive the TRC and fire department comments.

D. Boutin: If this passes, the public hearing will remain open.

R. Duhaime I second the motion

Vote: 2 in favor 3 opposed, motion defeated

Motion doesn't carry

R. Savoie: I motion to grant the

Variance from Article 3 Section p to allow a filling station less than 1,000 feet away from another filling station. Also the variance from Article 18 Section D.8 to allow for a gas station in the groundwater resource conservation district.

D. Johnston second the motion

Motion carries 3 in favor 2 opposed

AUTO WHOLESALERS OF HOOKSETT- CONTINUED

1348 Hooksett Rd, Map 25, Lot 5

Special Exception from Article 11, Section B.2.a to allow a commercial use of selling vehicles in the industrial zone.

T. Murphy-Roche: No site walk will be done on Auto Wholesalers until they come into compliance with site.

R. Savoie: No action taken until it is brought into compliance

D. Boutin: If they are in poor compliance, I don't want to sit here and go through the motions, I would rather not have them come here.

MATTHEW GORDON

56 Farmer Road, Map 26, Lot 30

Variance from Article 5 Section C.1.b to permit the construction of a single-family residence compliant with yard setbacks on a non-conforming lot wherein said lot provides 150 feet of frontage where 175 feet is required.

M. Gordon: I was here for the variance for 56 Farmer Road last month

T. Murphy-Roche: I wasn't here last month but the land and the house didn't match right?

R. Duhaime: The notice wasn't properly notified and that was the issue.

Open to Public

None

Closed Public

D. Boutin I motion to approve the

Variance from Article 5 Section C.1.b to permit the construction of a single-family residence compliant with yard setbacks on a non-conforming lot wherein said lot provides 150 feet of frontage where 175 feet is required.

R. Savoie: I second the motion

All in favor none opposed motion carries

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

BROX INDUSTRIES

1500 Hooksett Road Map 18 Lot 7 Renew Excavation Permit, Permit G-01 expires on 01/2007

George Hall: I manage the real estate for Brox Industries. We were here last summer with the same plan and we requested some modifications and amendments to our existing excavation. The board took a site visit in July and we were approved in August. We are looking to renew the

excavation permit. The permit only last 5 years. We are asking for an extension to continue. We talked about the details of the plans this summer.

R. Savoie: What is the schedule for connection of roads down below.

G. Hall My understanding is if Manchester Sand sells the next couple of lots they have no frontage so they would have to extend to our property line. It would be in the future. We would have to finish excavation before we could connect the road to Lehoux Dr. It depends on marketing and how long it takes to sell the land.

M Bonsteel: We don't need to do a site walk and we were just there in July so we can waive it.

J. Gorton: When reading this, there are two differences in the total reclaimed acreage. One of them is greater back 2005 than in current application.

G. Hall: The board requested that this be done in phases so as we done phase we reclaim slopes. When you go into the next phase the slope abuts the next phase unreclaiming the slope that's between so it has been a constant effort between evolution of reclaiming slopes and then tearing them up and moving into the next phase. We have reclaimed approximately 20 to 25 acres which is what the bond covers.

D. Boutin: I am looking at the ordinance, it speaks to new applications, amendments, doesn't speak to renewal. I don't know if the renewal means it was only approved at a certain amount of time and at the end of that period you have to come in and get another approval or is this an amendment to the previous approval.

G. Hall When we were first permitted in 1987 the boards only request was we come back in every phase. About 10 years ago we implemented a form, the whole thing was approved and we

met conditions of the permit. The permit was good for 5 years. We were permitted for the entire site and the conditions were added in. We never had a problem so it was never discussed before.

D. Boutin: In the various phases, were they designed when you got the original approval or was it an understanding that you came back for each phase?

G. Hall: We broke it up into 20 acre sections, not knowing what the material was like, or how deep we would go. In some cases and what we have done over the years instead of asking to go into another 20 acre phase similar to what I did this summer I added 5 acres instead of asking the board to go into 20 acres. We added different pieces of sections. Mainly when we first started they asked us for 5 acres and now we are at 20 acres.

D. Boutin: The layout of excavation and when it is going to look like is all new to us.
When you stated out in 1987 did you lay the whole site out to show what it was going to look like.

G. Hall: We didn't know what it would look like unless we excavated rock or sand. How you get there is an evolving process.

D. Boutin: The reason I raise this is because the last time he was here, the conservation commission needs to be notified and they were notified.

R. Savoie: I have been dealing with Brox since day one and we have done a lot of renewals for different pits and I have never had a problem with Brox industries. I don't recall having to do a site walk for a renewal. If we do I say we were just there and no much has changed.

D. Boutin: There is nothing in the ordinance about a renewal.

R. Savoie: You can look at it as an amendment; I have no problem with voting on this tonight.

D. Johnston: I don't have a problem either

R. Duhaime: Is this done every 5 years to make sure they stay compliant.

R. Savoie: Yea that is what I think. The town dropped the ball on some other pit so now we do this.

T. Murphy-Roche: Do we have any other pits?

M. Bonsteel: Yes Pike, Thibeault, Plourde, etc

T. Murphy-Roche: Why don't we see them?

M. Bonsteel: We don't know what the condition of the approval was

Open public

D. Boutin: I move that we waive the site walk requirement, R. Savoie second it, all in favor none opposed

D. Boutin: I grant the renewal/amendment of the excavation permit, permit G-01

C. Pearson second all in favor, motion carries

JOANN BOUTOT

1099 Hooksett Road Map 41 Lot 73

Variance from Article 10-A, US Route 3 Corridor Performance

Zoning District, Section E. Permitted Uses to allow the expansion of a nonconforming residential use in the zone wherein residential uses are not permitted.

Variance from Article 10-A, Section F. Dimensional Performance Standards1.(a) and (b), wherein the minimum lot size with municipal water and sewer is 1 acre and the existing lot is 11,775 square feet, and wherein the minimum frontage is 100' and 50' is provided and wherein the minimum side yard setback is 18' (based on building height) and 4.7' is provided.

Special Exception from Article 26, Nonconforming Uses and Buildings, Section A., wherein it is a residential use in the commercial zone and wherein the

existing residential structure is nonconforming as to setbacks and to obtain a special exception to permit the construction of an accessory garage structure on the premises having less than 50% of the existing building's square footage.

Sylvia Dupont representing Joann Boutot

D. Johnston: The little road is that Brace Ave?

S. Dupont: That is just a driveway.

S. Dupont: My mother uses it as a commercial use also, in that she has a nail salon.

D. Boutin: I would like to set up a site walk.

T. Murphy-Roche: What is this last thing on the agenda with Holden Engineering, discussion only.

J. Skorupski: They did not show up again

M. Bonsteel: Which is fine with me, they are scheduled for TRC on Thursday.

T. Murphy-Roche: I have a problem with them being on an agenda and this is the second time they have not shown up. How can that be? Why is it that he thinks he gets to do this? This is not acceptable

R. Savoie: That is terrible

J. Skorupski:

Holden had a meeting with Charles and Joann and they came upstairs and said that he needed to be on the agenda for the ZBA for discussion only and that he was going to bring maps in and let the board know what is going on with that site

T. Murphy-Roche: I want a letter sent to him from this board telling him that this is unacceptable that he puts himself on the agenda and has no respect for the board and the members in the community and simply doesn't show up, this is unacceptable. This is the second time that this has happened in the last six months. How disrespectful

C. Pearson: This has been posted on the agenda that goes onto the website right?

M. Bonsteel: Yes

C. Pearson: Why are we going to see Auto Wholesalers? We got this note from the Planning Board that states that they do not recommend any action be taken on this site until it is brought up to compliance.

R. Savoie: I will second that because he is totally doing just the opposite of what he told us when he was here the last time.

D. Johnston: He said all it was going to be is a front end alignment place and that is it.

R. Savoie: No commercial enterprise, no outside people no selling cars

J. Gorton: As I recall, it was going to be strictly for his own vehicles that he was trying to sell. He wasn't going to do outside business

R. Savoie: Now he wants to make a used car lot out of it. I am not going to do a site walk

T. Murphy-Roche: This means no one wants to do the site walk on Auto Wholesalers until they come into compliance.

M. Bonsteel: They can come here and we can tell them that until they become into compliance we will not hear them

D. Johnston: They can come and go through it and then we can say no

R. Savoie: I wouldn't even let them go through it. We can tell them we have a letter from the Planning Board and they don't want any action taken until this place is brought up to compliance.

D. Boutin: What are the violations?

T. Murphy-Roche: The landscaping is one, they were selling cars out there.

M. Bonsteel: They don't have any of the landscaping done that they were required to do. They had an open sign and they are not suppose to be open to the general public. They have this canopy tent thing in the back that he has his boat in that is not on the approved site plan.

C. Pearson: The sign with the phone number isn't suppose to be there.

M. Bonsteel: He put a sign up and it was not approved

D. Boutin: If they are in poor compliance, I really don't want to site here and go through the motions with him. Everyone is all frosted up about it and that is a confrontational situation to have and I just would rather not have them come.

T. Murphy-Roche: I don't think we can stop them

D. Boutin: How can he come in when he isn't even into compliance.

M. Bonsteel: He paid and he made an application

R. Savoie: If he pays his fee to come before the board and present his case then that is fine but all we have to do is tell him we don't have to listen to it. We can take out the letter and tell him we refuse to hear this until you are in full compliance and meet what the building inspector and the planning board want.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF – December 5, 2006

D. Boutin motioned to accept the minutes as presented.

Voted unanimously in the affirmative.

December 12, 2006 J. Levesque was misquoted on the Gravel application, I asked Michelle if there would be a structure review of the first floor before they issue a permit. That needs to be changed.

Voted unanimously in the affirmative with the changes.

ADJOURN

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Jessica Skorupski