

Unofficial

**HOOKSETT ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
Tuesday, February 16, 2010
HOOKSETT MUNICIPAL BUILDING
35 Main Street**

CALL TO ORDER

C. Pearson called the meeting to order at 7:04 pm.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BOARD

Chairman C. Pearson, R. Duhaime, J. Levesque, R. Bairam, G. Hyde, and Town Council Rep. J. Gorton

Excused: D. Pare and P. Denbow.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 12, 2010

***R. Bairam motioned to accept the minutes as presented. Seconded by G. Hyde.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

RE HEARING OF ZONING BOARD DECISION

CROWN COMMUNICATION, 210 Whitehall Road

A rehearing on the application for a Special Exception as specified in Article 11, Section B.2 to install a wireless communication facility in the Industrial Zone and a Variance from Article 28, Section O.5:a which requires a front, side and rear yard setback equal to the height of the tower. The proposal is to construct a 150-foot monopole tower. The center of the tower is a greater distance than the height of the tower from the front and rear yards, but is 113.67 feet from the side yard to the east property line.

D. Klasnick, Attorney representing the applicant:

D. Klasnick distributed a power point presentation and thanked the Board for the opportunity to rehear the application.

D. Klasnick: While I think AT&T and Crown put together a compelling application, we appreciate the opportunity to clarify the facts. Understanding the limitations of the hearing, it was felt important to review some of the evidence, which was presented.

1. The application was submitted on June 23, 2009.
2. A second balloon test was done in July and a request to move the site down and this was done with alternative photos supplied.
3. A Real Estate Study and RF Coverage Study were both submitted into the record.
4. In 2009, a denial was made, and the applicant moved for a rehearing which was granted in January of 2010

The Special Exception Criteria:

The Board voted unanimously that the applicant meets the criteria of items 1-4.

The Board decided that the applicant did not meet the requirements of criteria 5 which was the basis for their denial of the Special Exception.

While I appreciate that the applicant is required to meet each criteria, it is a progression. If it is an appropriate location, it becomes more difficult to say it will affect the integrity. The study said no diminution in value and therefore it is hard to see how the integrity and character will be impacted. This Board said there was no hazard or nuisance and the Planning Board did say this applicant met all the criteria for Special Exception. Most of the comments in the negative were subjective; mostly not in my backyard. No evidence has been submitted showing that this will so greatly

impact the area that it will diminish the character and integrity. I didn't see where character and integrity is defined. In the dictionary, they have a number of definitions. Character is defined as, "*The aggregate of features and traits that form the individual nature of some person or thing.*" Integrity is defined as "*The state of being whole, entire or undiminished.*"

The applicants have proposed a 150 foot tower in an area where a 190 foot tower is allowed. It has to get over the trees and we presented evidence for the need for the site. No alternative site was feasible as proposed by the applicant and the Alternative Site Study done by the town. I don't see how putting up a telecommunication tower that meets all 4 criteria will so disrupt the area's character or integrity. Everyone will still be able to maintain their use and will still be able to develop any further plans. There have been transfers of properties in other areas in town which was evidence presented. This is an allowed use in the Industrial Zone.

The Variance request from the Hooksett Ordinance says there shall be a setback equal to the height of the tower. We satisfy all setbacks of 150 from the residential zone, except for 132 feet from the industrial zone.

R. Duhaime: Character of the town is a general issue. This use to be farming area, which has been lost. We are looking for integrity or character changes. How will it change the neighborhood?

D. Klasnick: I feel it won't change the character or integrity if you consider what else is allowed in the Industrial Zone like a freight company. That could change the integrity but it is an allowed use. This Board felt the first 4 criteria were met. You must look back at the previous 4 to arrive at the 5th criteria. If it is the right location with no nuisance, then what is the impact of the character? You will still utilize that as a residential district. Public Utilities are allowed in residential areas. We must consider infrastructure needs. One goal in NH is building up its broadband. Everyone realizes there is an evolution of a necessity of a cell phone. In some areas, towns will be requesting towers for wireless service. We are taking into consideration the concerns by reducing the size to 150 feet and moving the location. I looked at the definition and considered what it meant and it will not fundamentally change the setting.

C. Pearson: It is a nice neighborhood with a scenic pond setting. I struggled with that aspect. Every other criteria is objective. Because we haven't defined character or integrity, it is difficult.

R. Duhaime: It does provide some tax revenue, but what else will it help?

C. Pearson: You offered up painting to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

D. Klasnick: That is a matter of opinion. When denied, we looked at what was proposed and we looked at what else we could propose and unfortunately you need a 150-foot tower. If you look at the location, we could agree to a provision for paint and regular inspection to maintain the paint, which might help to blend this better.

C. Pearson: Have you worked with towns for ideas on what works best?

D. Klasnick: What is best is the public forum, but all we heard was we don't want the tower, not here. Put it in someone else's back yard which makes it more difficult to address.

Open to Public – Abutters:

Doris Duhamel-Labbe: I am speaking for all the neighbors in opposition to this tower. The one thing that irks me is how the property values can't go down. We, as abutters, didn't have enough time to hire our own appraisers. The study didn't evaluate the proper impact. You voted correctly with relation to the character and integrity of the area. I submitted a letter from a listing broker and her experience with selling property with the proposed tower. Mr. Lins said he had an experience with difficulty selling his property in light of the proposed tower. We have spent more than a decade building our homes and we will be here long after they are gone.

C. Pearson: We are not real estate experts. We asked for an independent report and we can only go by the evidence that was presented.

D. Labbe: We did present some evidence and that wasn't considered because it was from other towns. We will appeal if this goes forward.

C. Pearson: You are next to an Industrial Zone and something far more offensive than a cell tower could be proposed without the need for a Special Exception.

R. Duhaime: I'm concerned with the character of this town and I don't want to hurt any neighborhood. Are you aware that 500 acres got put into conservation by your neighborhood and will never be developed? There are a lot of things coming to town and the town will change. If you have any input on how we can change the character, we will take that into consideration.

D. Labbe: The cell tower can go to 150 feet? Why did it only have to go to 150 at the water tower. It shouldn't overlook our neighborhood.

J. Levesque: With regard to property value, that industrial property will be a hot topic. Why didn't the people in that neighborhood have a concern with the industrial property abutting the neighborhood before?

D. Labbe: That is in future and we should only be worried about the cell tower.

D. Klasnick: With regard to the comment about the cell tower in other areas, as I recall, these are all in residential areas which are not even an allowed use. We would just push the problem to another neighborhood.

Dan Goulet: Engineer rep. AT&T: A map was presented showing the alternative sites in Hooksett. We look at a 190-foot tower, which is allowed in the town. I ran the analysis in the town at 190 feet. We did Campbell Hill, Berry Hill, Oak Hill, Whitehall, and the proposed Daigle site at 190 feet. The photo showed the tower at Berry Hill, Campbell Hill, and the road trying to get coverage disappears on the photo and then goes behind Campbell Hill. This is a view of the Berry Hill water tank and the residents to the north. This is all the residents that would look at 190-foot tower. Campbell Hill is a view of the neighborhood to the south and the highest point on the hill where I ran the analysis.

The green represents the plan coverage without the Daigle tower. The site proposed for additional coverage is white.

Berry Hill, at 190 feet would cover most but is not zoned for a tower and impact more homes. I ran the water tower at 190 feet and there was a significant gap on Route 27. It can't get over the hill. The Oak Hill guard tower which is not in use; even if you could replace that with what is being proposed at 150 feet is still the same coverage which you have now. This would accomplish nothing. The McDonald's location also does nothing to increase coverage. Campbell Hill at 190 feet at the scale of miles is still ½ mile of gap coverage. The Whitehall Road location doesn't do anything at 190 feet. That site was looked at originally because the topo showed a water tower there.

The Daigle property at the 150 feet completely covers the road. At 150 there is marginal coverage that we wouldn't have at 190 but we are getting in-vehicle coverage. We did look at 190 at all the alternate locations that were brought up and more. The only site that I didn't talk about is in southern Hooksett, which is 3 miles away at the Verizon Tower and this is out of the search area and is at a much lower elevation.

D. Labbe: You said you wanted to connect to Candia. How will you connect to Candia if you were denied?

Engineer: Candia is now in litigation.

Phil Martin, 27 Farrwood Drive: There are times in engineering where the answer is based on how you ask the question. Were you asked to look at Hooksett from a neutral viewpoint and come up with a plan or were you asked to do a comprehensive plan of this tower?

Engineer: We first looked at all existing structures, towers and then water tanks. As far as a comprehensive plan, we look at the town, we look at where they are zoned. If I didn't have to consider the zone or what is constructable, it would be easier. We are making serious concessions because we are not getting the coverage we want that we could get at 190 feet.

Phil Martin: There could be two inconsequential towers that would have no impact. Is it conceivable that there could be two towers in two different locations.

Engineer: Showed a map depicting a 3-D view of the terrain in Hooksett. The black stars are existing, the blue are the proposed and the pink are the alternates. We analyzed all of these. If you have a site here, we are working from what is built to fill in the rest. Campbell Hill and Berry Hill are shadowing the road we are trying to cover, so we are trying to locate a site that will overcome that terrain.

Phil Martin: So you are saying there would not be two less intrusive towers that would have less impact and has it been looked at from that perspective. Are there two locations, less intrusive that would solve this problem?

Engineer: We would want this one, which is a smaller tower and put another one further north.

Steve Labbe, 31 Farrwood: On the zoning of the industrial building, what is the highest it can go?

Peter Rowell, CEO: 75 feet is the maximum per the current zoning ordinance.

Steve Labbe: That is half of what is being proposed. Why do we have to have that area covered. Are there other areas in NH that are not covered?

C. Pearson: We have already reviewed the need for coverage and will not revisit this in the rehearing. You can review the record for that answer.

D. Labbe: I was wondering if you did any studies that if there was tower on the water tower and the other water tower at the same time, what the reception would be?

Engineer: I showed you the coverage for both water tanks and neither covered the proposed area. They don't amplify each other.

G. Hyde: The technology of towers, under 1 gig, is there the technology for a louder signal that would cover more area with less towers with higher amplification power?

Engineer: When I do these plots, the bay stations are at full power. AT&T is licensed for 1900, so the attenuation through the foliage is greater than at 800. The only thing you can do to booster is to put on the receive to balance the up and the downlink. They have some amplification for the receiver to balance the link. They can't do anything to make that footprint larger and are limited by their license.

Close Public

C. Pearson: When we went through the criteria, we did approve all the criteria except for #5 which was the character and integrity.

R. Duhaime: The issue is the character. There are no telephone poles in my neighborhood because underground is required. I have a telephone poll in front of my house, but that is the nature of the utility. Zoning is to protect the town and cell coverage is needed in the town.

R. Bairam: I still think it destroys the character of the community.

J. Levesque: That industrial property was there before that property was developed. After reading this and reading information on the Internet, it is allowed by Special Exception.

J. Gorton: I agree with Jim Levesque. The zoning existed prior to the neighborhood and it is an allowed use. They are not trying to put it in Farrwood: With respect to the integrity of the neighborhood, I have a cell tower in my backyard on Gosselin Avenue and it is huge. You can see it coming across Route 93 and from my backyard. I do get use to it.

5 Criteria

1. The specific site is an appropriate location for such a use –
Vote 5:0 in the affirmative
2. No factual evidence is found that property values in the District will be reduced due to incompatible land use, by such use –
Vote 5:0 in the affirmative
3. No nuisance or hazard will be created by the proposed use –
Vote 5:0 in the affirmative
4. Adequate and appropriate facilities will be provided for the proper operation of the proposed use –
Vote 5:0 in the affirmative
5. The requested use will not impair the integrity or character of the District or adjoining zones nor be detrimental to the health, morals or welfare of the community.
Vote 3:2 in the affirmative

J. Levesque motioned to grant the Special Exception as specified in Article 11, Section B.2 to install a wireless communication facility in the Industrial Zone. Seconded by R.

Duhaime

Vote 3:2 Motion carries.

Variance from Article 28, Section O.5:a which requires a front, side and rear yard setback equal to the height of the tower. The proposal is to construct a 150-foot monopole tower. The center of the tower is a greater distance than the height of the tower from the front and rear yards, but is 113.67 feet from the side yard to the east property line.

D. Klasnick: As indicated in the prior hearing and in the memorandum, the tower height meets all the setbacks to the residential areas and one side is 113 feet to the east which is the industrial property. We indicated it is designed to fall within the confines of the existing lot. The tower itself is designed to hinge and fall at that particular height. The foundation is designed so that it is impossible for 150 to topple over. This one is designed from the manufacturer and will be submitted as part of the building permit application with that 120-foot break point.

D. Klasnick read the criteria for the Variance into the record

The courts have tried to bring the variance hardship for towers in line with the Federal Law.

C. Pearson: Peter, with regard to the drop zone; are you comfortable with these monopoles?

Peter Rowell, CEO: I will require something from the engineer that it will collapse rather than fall . If this is not satisfactory, I will not issue a permit.

Open public hearing

D. Labbe: I wasn't prepared to do a lot tonight because I think we are being bombarded and we are just going to appeal anyway.

C. Pearson: We originally saw this in June and here we are in February. If you have questions to the drop zone, we will address them. We do rely on the building inspector for his opinion.

Close Public Session

***R. Duhaime motioned to grant a variance from Article 28, Section O.5:a to allow the construction of the proposed 150 foot cell tower which requires a front, side and rear yard setback equal to the height of the tower. The center of the tower is a greater distance than the height of the tower from the front and rear yards, but is 113.67 feet from the side yard to the east property line with the following conditions:
That an engineer stamp is provided to the building inspector ensuring the structural collapse of the tower. Seconded by J. Levesques.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

PETERBROOK MOTEL

1373-1375 HOOKSETT ROAD
Map 18A, Lot 34 and 33

A request for a Variance from Article 10-A:Section E to redevelop the property using a mixed-use approach consisting of general office and retail space along the Route 3 corridor, along with twelve (12) apartment-style residential units (located in three (3) relocated and reconfigured buildings) to the rear of the parcel.

C. Pearson: We, the Board, requested information on Marketing, the buildings, and the timeline.

Attorney Ari Pollak, representing the applicant

Also present Paul Morin and owner Jim Tenn.

A letter and 2 site plans requested by the Board were provided and distributed.

P. Morin: It came down to two issues. One issue was marketability. My client spoke to people and agents who reviewed the property. Mr. Reed reviewed the property and is a member of the EDC and his opinion is there for your review. Mixed Use has a value and the residential provides some ability to get some income while the commercial piece matures.

C. Pearson: Is Mike Reed associated with the development?

P. Morin: No, he was simply asked his opinion.

Dimensions of the commercial and residential components.

P. Morin: This plan shows three (3) four (4) unit apartments in the rear of the property and a commercial component in the front. We are requesting 12 units in the rear and preserve the commercial component in the front. We tried to explain that whatever gets built is part of the Planning Board process and what the Planning Board will be concerned with. This is one (1) possible scenario. We developed a second scenario, which shows four (4) townhouse style units. The dimensions of the commercial unit is predicated on the use. The commercial is 2064 s.f. but if it is a motel for example, it would be double that square footage. The townhomes are a larger sq. footage but increases the rent and would attract more young professionals. We are looking for relief to do 12 units with the flexibility to build what is best feasible.

C. Pearson: Do you have any examples where residential and commercial are mixed on the same site?

P. Morin: There is some next door. They may not share the parking lot but parking is under the discretion of the Planning Board.

R. Duhaime: You are looking for a blank check. If you put 12 units, you will have enough space for a motel with the adequate parking? This would meet all the criteria?

P. Morin: Yes, that was engineered for that.

R. Bairam: How many units are grandfathered?

Ari Pollack: Peter Rowell, the Code Enforcement Officer will tell you eight (8) but at one time there were more than 20. We say there are more than 8 but we understand Peter's view is only 8 units.

Peter Rowell: My letter stated eight (8) units with 6 in one building and 2 units in a second building. The owner did not appeal that.

P. Morin: When the property was purchased, there were 23 units. We reviewed the property and we learned there were eight (8) units that could be rehabilitated and we did not go down that road. We spoke to everyone including water and sewer as well as the Economic Development Committee and tried to focus on improving this site. I have run a number of scenarios that are workable. We have left the rehabilitation aside and moved on.

R. Bairam: What about the buffer zone between the residential and commercial?

Peter Rowell: The Planning Board will have to review this for the buffer and because of the nature of this proposal, the buffer can vary.

Timeline for the development of the commercial piece

P. Morin: The reason for the need for a variance is because the commercial part is not viable at this time and to know when this could come along is difficult to predict. I appreciate Mr. Levesque's request on how to tie this into the development of the commercial but this so unpredictable that you would be tying our hands. You would have to reclaim the entire site and re run water and sewer and the numbers would not make sense. We are hoping that we are addressing the hardship and once phase one is done, you would have a desirable commercial development and I can't make representations that I cannot guarantee or bring about.

C. Pearson: In my view, I am not opposed to this development. My problem is that if you put a number on it of 12, then it is more difficult. I would be more comfortable if you just wanted us to allow Mixed Use with no numbers associated with the decision and allow you to work out the numbers with the Planning Board.

P. Morin: I ran the numbers and 12 is the liberal cut off and if this Board allowed no more than 12 or a limit on square footage, I can do that. But if you send us with an open variance, we will just end up back here. If they start negotiating with us on the number of units we will end up back here.

Peter Rowell: There is a four (4) year vesting period and if they are not doing anything, the plan goes away after that. The Planning Board can set those limits as well.

P. Morin: I would ask this Board to consider granting us 12 units, up to 7500 s.f. of footprint for residential and 1000 s.f. per unit. That would be reasonable with the amount of commercial proposed in the future.

J. Levesque: 6900 sf was defined as grandfathered.

Ari Pollack: We moved away from that and moved toward redeveloping which is why I'm here.

J. Levesque: I'm comfortable with granting a non-conforming use but I'm not comfortable with 12 units at 1000 sf and we don't know the commercial piece. I'm for maybe two buildings and when the commercial is built, allow the third building to protect the town that the commercial will be built.

R. Duhaime: What is the spirit of the ordinance? We don't have anything to answer that question.

Ari Pollack: We did give that question considerable thought. The proposal includes our compromise. If we were going to come with a new plan, we would have no commercial component. We came with a compromise on the front end. When we look at what the town wants and what is reasonable and what was there in the past, you get to this 12 unit threshold. We are saying we need 12 units and the commercial to make this viable.

R. Duhaime; If you were going to do the 12 units and build the commercial, we would have no problem, but you are saying 12 units and maybe someday commercial.

Ari Pollack: We intend to do the commercial; we will advertise and once someone commits, we will build it.

Peter Rowell: Did you consider residential on the second floor and commercial on the first floor?

P. Morin: We did look at a few different options but you need to know what your user will be and it is not matured at this point.

C. Pearson: I agree with the approach, anything is better than what is there now. That is my opinion. But this is Performance Zone for a reason. The Planning Board and Zoning Board have tried to work in concert. I can say up to 12 units, but to pinpoint 12 is difficult. If you are going to stick us to 12, I want dimensions but up to 12 and let you work it out with the Planning Board.

P. Morin: If you don't, how does the Planning Board know what was approved?

Peter Rowell: A lot of impervious area will tie in to that area which will limit the use.

P. Morin: We have looked at the soils and the infiltration and we know what the impervious nature is and what we have to do. I was hired to come up with the numbers, and if approved, to build it out. I said 12 units was viable and put the residential as far back as possible and try and use the front for commercial.

J. Gorton read the closing statement from our attorney: The owner can seek a use variance from the performance zone for mixed commercial use. If the board agrees that yes the owner should be able to maintain the mixed use of the property, anything else goes beyond this board's obligation. The impervious, drainage, etc, this board has no expertise in this area. To say we will allow 12 or so much square footage is beyond this Board.

R. Duahime: Planning Board has no residential in the Commercial. That is why we need to put some limits on this.

J. Gorton: We would only allow a mixed use variance.

R. Duhaime: If the Planning Board says you can only build so many and they want more, they will come back to zoning.

J. Gorton: Then they would come back with information from the Planning Board to say why they are limiting the number due to engineering or drainage. It isn't up to this board to set the amount.

A year ago we had an application to haul sand and we tried to put limitation that was beyond the expertise of this group. He was just here for authorization to haul. He wasn't here for police limitations and monitoring.

This applicant wants a variance to allow mixed use period.

Peter Rowell: The development regulations cover the impervious and parking, while residential is not allowed in the Performance Zone, it speaks to parking for residential use, if you say it must meet all the regulations for the Performance Zone, the Planning Board could come to a conclusion.

C. Pearson: Because the applicant came to use with 12 units, we would need to see exactly what we are approving with stamped drawings just like every other applicant.

R. Duhaime: He keeps saying this is viable for 12 units. That is his opinion. I haven't seen any proof. If I meet the spirit of the ordinance with the commercial, nothing else matters.

Ari Pollack: I trying to figure out the scope of the problem.

1. Is the Board comfortable with mixed use and are you going to give the Planning Board enough information to allow them to make the decisions. How much is the appropriate density. If you get to the Planning Board with something that says Mixed Use is ok, the two sides are going to be opposite. One will say there is no minimum and one is ok and there is no maximum because this is not governing density. It makes sense to put a number because it gives us comfort and gives some comfort to the town that there isn't so much residential that the commercial isn't forced out.

P. Morin: The acreage is 2.5 acres. The residential buildings will be in the rear third. The location of the property, with 1/3 residential and 2/3 commercial.

R. Duhaime: Will you do any improvements to make the commercial viable?

P. Morin: That would make sense and the promise is that it makes sense to do that.

Ari Pollack: Our 12 units is our compromise. We don't think the property can sustain itself with just 12 units and we will do whatever is necessary to plug that use in quickly.

J. Levesque: The dimensions of the proposed residential buildings, I was hoping for something I could read beyond what was presented. We don't have anything saying what will be residential and what will be commercial. We didn't get that.

P.Morin: We suggest 7500 s.f. is the maximum footprint for residential with the rest for commercial. The smaller are 51wide x 30 deep. The larger units are 72 wide by 32 deep. We don't know what the Planning Board will require for landscaping or dimensional restrictions. The graphic is meant to show impression on what you will see.

C. Pearson: Would you be comfortable with up to 12 with no square footage?

P. Morin: If I were on the Planning Board, I would want to know what that means.

C. Pearson: I want you to work that out with the Planning Board. If this wasn't Performance Zone, I would have a totally different discussion.

P. Morin: This site is unique because of the blithe that is there now and previous owners that have not kept the property up.

C. Pearson: We are struggling to give something to Planning that is agreeable and because this is the first one to come to us, we are concerned with the decision.

P. Morin: If you simply approve the mixed use, and if they require it be built at the same time, we have no plan.
The rear dimensions are 401.72

Open Public

L. Moynihan, 4 Short Avenue: I am concerned with what is allowed for the commercial piece. There are a number of allowed uses which will not fit with a residential use. How will this be protected?

Ari Pollack: It is more than just what is allowed in this district. The market is not going to allow what is intrusive the abutters. The process will natural select an appropriate use.

Close the Public session

C. Pearson: The timetable is important and I don't hear any opposition to the mixed use, but what we are hearing is a variance request that would be best for the town and the best for the performance. I would like to further discuss with out attorneys what we should be handing over to the Planning Board. This is the first one we have seen in the Performance Zone and unfortunately you have to suffer through this. We have never granted relief in the Performance Zone and we must insure that we get this right.

P. Morin: Would we be a part of those discussions with the attorney?

C. Pearson: We would like to personally meet with the attorney.

P. Morin: It goes to the spirit of the ordinance even if we never build the commercial that we encourage improvement of the area. We are asking for the degree of relief that we feel is necessary.

Peter Rowell: What guidance are you looking for? Limitations or number of units, or just mixed use alone. If you say they must meet all the development regulation and can build up to a number, I don't know if an attorney will tell you how to do that?
I don't think you need to direct the Planning Board, they have all the regulations to do that. Density may be handled by you because there is nothing specific.
I think we already heard from Planning Board and they don't want residential.

C. Pearson: I think we should have Planning present.

P. Morin: We would object at that point because then we violate the public meeting forum.

Ari Pollack: What you would normal see is a variance for a use which is not normally allowed in that district. We understand that we are bound by the table in that zone. Because of the interplay between the Planning Board and the Zoning Board, and the opinions the Planning Board has shared and opening up without any criteria will make it possible for them to limit what is not viable.

C. Pearson: I agree, but I want to make sure that we do this correctly.

P. Morin: You got the footprint with a maximum and the back third as a limitation.

The Board requested a meeting with the town's attorney to address some questions and concerns.

Ari Pollack: We are interested in getting relief and we are interested in getting it in a form that is usable to us.

***G. Hyde motioned to continue the public hearing to March 9, 2010. Seconded by R. Duhaime.
Vote unanimously in favor.***

ADJOURNMENT

The chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 9:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee Ann Moynihan