

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
268B MAMMOTH ROAD
LONDONDERRY, NH 03053

1
2
3
4
5 DATE: JUNE 18, 2014
6
7 CASE NOS.: 3/19/2014-4, 5, AND 6 AND 5/21/2014-2 (CONTINUED FROM MAY 21,
8 2014)
9
10 APPLICANT: TEAM BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
11 C/O CHARLIE KULCH
12 491 AMHERST STREET
13 NASHUA, NH 03063
14
15 LOCATION: 5 BUTTON DRIVE, 4 GOLEN DRIVE, 6 GOLEN DRIVE, 8 GOLEN DRIVE, 7
16 GOLEN DRIVE, 9 GOLEN DRIVE, 11 GOLEN DRIVE, 12 GOLEN DRIVE, 1
17 REED STREET & 3 REED STREET; 7-132-8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18,
18 19, AND 20; C-I, WITHIN THE RTE. 102 PERFORMANCE OVERLAY DISTRICT.
19
20 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: NEIL DUNN, ACTING CHAIR
21 JIM TIRABASSI, VOTING MEMBER
22 JACQUELINE BENARD, VOTING MEMBER
23 DAVID PAQUETTE, CLERK
24
25 ORIGINAL REQUESTS: CASE NO. 3/19/2014-4: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN ELDERLY HOUSING
26 DEVELOPMENT ON A 7.96 ACRE PARCEL WHERE 15 ACRES IS REQUIRED
27 BY SECTION 3.6.4.1; AND TO ALLOW AN ELDERLY HOUSING
28 DEVELOPMENT WITH 56% OPEN SPACE WHERE 70% IS REQUIRED
29 UNDER SECTION 3.6.4.8.1.
30
31 CASE NO. 3/19/2014-5: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN THE
32 NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS IN A SINGLE BUILDING OF AN ELDERLY
33 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT TO 36 UNITS AND 42 UNITS WHERE 16 IS THE
34 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED BY SECTION 3.6.4.7; AND TO
35 ALLOW AN INCREASE IN DENSITY IN AN ELDERLY HOUSING
36 DEVELOPMENT TO 15.8 UNITS PER ACRE WHERE ONLY 6 UNITS PER
37 ACRE IS ALLOWED BY SECTION 3.6.4.14.2.1.
38
39 CASE NO. 3/19/2014-6: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN ELDERLY HOUSING
40 DEVELOPMENT WITH SEPARATION BETWEEN BUILDINGS OF 20 FEET
41 WHERE 60 FEET IS REQUIRED BY SECTION 3.6.4.2; AND TO ALLOW AN
42 ELDERLY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITH A MIX OF 1-BEDROOM AND 2-
43 BEDROOM UNITS WHERE THE STANDARD 2-BEDROOM UNIT IS
44 REQUIRED BY SECTION 3.6.4.7.1.

45
46 CASE NO. 5/21/2014-2: VARIANCE TO ALLOW .95 PARKING SPACES PER
47 DWELLING UNIT WHERE 1.2 SPACES IS REQUIRED PER BEDROOM IN EACH
48 UNIT BY SECTION 3.6.4.5.
49

50 AMENDED REQUESTS:

51 CASE NO. 3/19/2014-4: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN ELDERLY HOUSING
52 DEVELOPMENT ON A 12.72 ACRE PARCEL WHERE 15 ACRES IS REQUIRED
53 BY SECTION 3.6.4.1

54 CASE NO. 3/19/2014-5: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN INCREASE IN THE
55 NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS IN A SINGLE BUILDING OF AN ELDERLY
56 HOUSING DEVELOPMENT TO 32, 36 AND 42 UNITS WHERE 16 IS THE
57 MAXIMUM NUMBER OF UNITS ALLOWED BY SECTION 3.6.4.7; AND TO
58 ALLOW AN INCREASE IN DENSITY IN AN ELDERLY HOUSING
59 DEVELOPMENT TO 8.6 UNITS PER ACRE WHERE ONLY 6 UNITS PER ACRE
60 IS ALLOWED BY SECTION 3.6.4.14.2.1.
61

62 CASE NO. 3/19/2014-6: VARIANCE TO ALLOW AN ELDERLY HOUSING
63 DEVELOPMENT WITH SEPARATION BETWEEN BUILDINGS OF 26 AND 30
64 FEET WHERE 60 FEET IS REQUIRED BY SECTION 3.6.4.2; AND TO ALLOW
65 AN ELDERLY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WITH A MIX OF 1-BEDROOM AND
66 2-BEDROOM UNITS WHERE THE STANDARD 2-BEDROOM UNIT IS
67 REQUIRED BY SECTION 3.6.4.7.1.
68

69 CASE NO. 5/21/2014-2: VARIANCE TO ALLOW 1.0 PARKING SPACES PER
70 BEDROOM WHERE 1.2 SPACES ARE REQUIRED PER BEDROOM IN EACH
71 UNIT BY SECTION 3.6.4.5.
72

73 PRESENTATION:

74
75 NEIL DUNN: I am probably going to ask Richard for some help with this case because we went into deliberation
76 and continued it...so...
77

78 DAVID PAQUETTE: We tabled one of them right?
79

80 RICHARD CANUEL: Yeah...
81

82 NEIL DUNN: So...ok so we tabled the one we were discussing...
83

84 DAVID PAQUETTE: The acreage...
85

86 NEIL DUNN: The acreage and the...the density I believe and so by tabling it can you please clarify to the board
87 we have left it so they can revisit that and...we can...we don't...we have to reopen that because we were in
88 deliberation or by tabling it we closed the deliberations...

89

90 RICHARD CANUEL: All you need to do it reopen the hearing and continue.

91

92 NEIL DUNN: Thank you...[chuckling]...

93

94 [Laughter]

95

96 NEIL DUNN: So...I guess what is on the agenda here...we have the next case...and...we have them...they are all
97 really continuations...do we have any new information that...I am trying to help...keep them from having to
98 read this back in...because we have already read these in so I think we probably can...I just want to make sure
99 there is nothing in the revised...

100

101 DAVID PAQUETTE: There is new maps...and...do we need to read the case numbers back in for the record?

102

103 NEIL DUNN: Yeah...yeah. Dave, I think we will read the case numbers in and...we...we will open these before
104 with the original readings of any letters and all that stuff, I just wanted to verify that we didn't have any new
105 letters other than...

106

107 DAVID PAQUETTE; It looks like there is some changes to...to...according to this summary of amendments...this
108 one if getting busy...no change...15.88 acres...ok...alright so there are some changes here that we should
109 probably read into the record based on this...

110

111 NEIL DUNN: Ok so are those filled up clearly in the...alright so if you read the case and the...the headings I
112 guess yeah just as they are. I don't think we need to go into all of the previous cases because they were
113 probably fewer...

114

115 DAVID PAQUETTE: Yeah there's...there's previous cases for all of these properties.

116

117 NEIL DUNN: Ok well...you seem to have a handle on it so Mr. Clerk...we might as well...

118

119 DAVID PAQUETTE: Ok...

120

121 NEIL DUNN: Keep them grouped...well...

122

123 DAVID PAQUETTE: Case number 3/19/2014-4...two variances requested...originally one being...the...to allow
124 an elderly housing development on a seven point nine six acre parcel where fifteen acres is required by
125 section 3.6.4.1...an amendment to that is that...eight acres has been increased to twelve point seven two
126 acres...as the original variance request was to build it on seven on...seven point nine six acres where it looks
127 like there has been a...a site plan change...to...building it on twelve point seven two acres. And the second of
128 this...ordinance requirement has been withdrawn as being where fifty six...they were requesting fifty six
129 percent open spaces where seventy percent is required. It looks like that variance request has been
130 withdrawn. Case 3/19/2014-5...to allow an increase in the number of dwelling units...there is...are sixteen...to
131 allow an increase in the number of dwelling units in a single building of an elderly housing development to
132 thirty six units and forty two units where sixteen is the maximum number of units allowed by section 3.6.4.7

133 and there is no change to their variance request. To allow an increase in density in an elderly housing
134 development to fifteen point eight units per acre where only six units per acre are allowed by section
135 3.6.4.14.2.1 and it looks like they have amended that to fifteen point eight units per acre...reduced to eight
136 point six rather than six.

137
138 NEIL DUNN: One...one more time on that...so the fifteen eight is...

139
140 DAVID PAQUETTE: The original request is to...to grant a variance to allow fifteen point eight units per acre...

141
142 NEIL DUNN: Mm-hmm.

143
144 DAVID PAQUETTE: Where the amendment to this has been changed to...eight point six units per acre.

145
146 NEIL DUNN: Ok...thank you...

147
148 DAVID PAQUETTE: So it looks like their site plan changes increase the acreage which allows the units per acre
149 change...in Case 319/2014-6...two variance requests to allow an elderly housing development with separation
150 between buildings of twenty feet where sixty feet is required by section 3.6.4.2...no change in that...in that
151 request. And no change 'to allow an elderly housing development with a mix of one and two bedroom units
152 where a standard two bedroom unit is required by section 3.6.4.7.1.' And...Case 5/121/2014-2...to allow point
153 nine five parking spaces per dwelling unit where one point two space is required per bedroom...in each until
154 by section 3.6.4.5 with their...looks like with their plan change. The variance amendment is moving from one
155 point two spaces...I'm sorry...moving from point nine five parking spaces per dwelling unit to one parking
156 spaces per bedroom are shown...including garage spaces. So their request is to go from point nine five spaces
157 per dwelling unit to one parking space per bedroom where one point two space is required per bedroom.
158 That's a good...good verbiage change to that one.

159
160 JACKIE BERNARD: Mm-hmm.

161
162 DAVID PQUETTE: The total track size has been increased by four point seven five acres to two point
163 twelve...point seven two acres. There is no paved access to Reed Street which will be limited to emergency
164 access only. Golden drive will be discontinued and the parking is shown as in the new plan map that you have
165 on the screen behind you and in print form behind you.

166
167 NEIL DUNN: Ok so...Hello all...you want to one by one or do you want to do a general discussion to all of these
168 amendments...how would you like to...

169
170 PAT PANCIOCCO: Well...

171
172 NEIL DUNN: ...go forward...?

173
174 PAT PANCIOCCO: ...Is the public hearing reopened?

175
176 NEIL DUNN: It is reopened because the unit was...because it was tabled and we just reread them in.

177
178 PAT PANCIOCCO: Ok
179
180 NEIL DUNN: Richard...so public hearing is back open...yes...
181
182 PAT PANCIOCCO: Ok so...we would like the applications we previously submitted to reflect the changed area
183 that this...project is proposed on...tonight we know there is a lot of abutters here but we feel very strongly that
184 we do really need a full board due to how complicated this has been and how many hearings have been held...
185
186 NEIL DUNN: Absolutely...
187
188 PAT PANCIOCCO: But...in fairness to those who have been here at whatever the board would like us to do, we
189 can have the...Bob can take the board through the plan changes and answer any questions for the public and
190 then we would like to request that we be allowed to continue to next month if we could and then when we
191 have a full board, hopefully go through a capsulized version of the criteria and just go to a vote...
192
193 NEIL DUNN: I...I think that is very fair to everyone here. Anyone here have any thoughts on that?
194
195 DAVID PAQUETTE: I agree.
196
197 NEIL DUNN: Fine...absolutely.
198
199 JOCELYN BOS: George is doing it, I think...
200
201 PAT PANCIOCCO: Sorry...George Chadwick.
202
203 NEIL DUNN: I am just going to go over here so I can see...
204
205 PAT PANCIOCCO: The same plan that was attached to the summary is just a reduced plan of what you have up
206 behind you.
207
208 JACKIER BERNARD: Thank you.
209
210 PAT PANCIOCCO: Whatever you would prefer...they are the same.
211
212 RICHARD CANUEL: Mr. Chairman if I may, just as a point of order. Beings that the applicant is going to be
213 requesting a continuance so that a full board is present, I think maybe the applicants presentation tonight
214 should be very brief so that full complement of the Board has you know the...opportunity to hear the full case.
215
216 NEIL DUNN: So...to Richard's point and it looks like you are in agreement, we do want to allow everyone who
217 has come back out here again...
218
219 PAT PANCIOCCO: Right...
220

221 NEIL DUNN: To kind of see where this has shifted from before to now. We are not going to go into much
222 discussion. We will do maybe some quick questions and answers if we keep the presentation short. It has
223 changed dramatically and it will be continued to next month for the final vote but at least we will all be getting
224 a little better up to speed and be able to digest it by next month. Thank you very much, Richard, for that.
225

226 GEORGE CHADWICK: Good evening, my name is George Chadwick with Bedford Design...what I would like to
227 do is just give you a quick synopsis of what transpired since the last meeting. When we left...we approached
228 the land owner...Calamar approached the land owner and looked to obtain additional land area. It appeared
229 the board was concerned with...the size of...the size of the project...so we did...we purchased or we obtained
230 three additional lots. Lot 132-10, 11, and 12. Those are the three lots that make up the bottom left hand
231 corner of the plan that is in front of you as well as on the...one the overhead. By doing that we increased the
232 parcel size to twelve point seven two acres and that also not only affects the parcel size but affected the open
233 space and enabled us to withdraw our open space request and also change the density of the parcel. And the
234 three additional zoning requests haven't changed as a result of land area because they really didn't have
235 anything to do with land area. We also since that time, our company Bedford Design, has been...hired by a
236 company called Kaplan Land Development. What they are doing is proposing an assisted living facility on the
237 remaining lots that teamed...our Team Business Development owns. That is made up of the five lots of the
238 bottom right hand corner of the plan in front of you. So what you see in front of you or what we are able to do
239 was...obtain as much possible land as we could. There is no more land that could be obtained so...in this
240 area...the...parcel size has been increased to largest extent possible...the...like I said the open space has been
241 withdrawn. The parking that is proposed you will also notice that we have increased the amount of parking
242 spaces. We have actually increased it to one parking space per bedroom. There is one hundred and eighty
243 eight parking spaces on the site, so one hundred and eighty eight bedrooms...as part of the project. We also
244 have the ability to add the additional thirty seven...additional parking spaces if needed. So...as we proceed
245 through the process here I think we would like to ask that the board grant the parking variance knowing that
246 in the future...if required, you know we can add those additional thirty seven spaces. The reason I say that is it
247 affects the open space. As you know we put down more pavements, it is going to affect our open space. For
248 that reason we believe we only need one hundred and eighty eight. Actually one hundred and eighty eight is
249 well more than what Calamar usually builds in their project, so there is plenty of room for...visitors and so on
250 and so forth. In their mind, not according to the zoning or the ordinance. So to summarize you know we have
251 obtained as much land as possible...we have increased all of the...variance or decreased all of the variances to
252 the ability we could. And...just again...just to let you know that there is another...developer in the wings
253 coming in. we do have a July 9th meeting in front of the Planning Board conceptually. Introduce the project
254 and discuss it with them and get their impute and...so on and so forth so...I think the fit...the assisted living fit
255 would be good for the area or good for the mixture of what is out there. So with that there is only one other
256 thing I just want to read and...we can restate it at the next hearing...but in...in the first paragraph of section
257 three point six one of the ordinance, it states that quote; "The elderly housing standards are designed to
258 permit an increased residential density above that allowed in the AR1 and R3 districts. To set criteria that
259 assures a project for elderly will be addressed the needs of the elderly as opposed to any residential use". So
260 the...the ordinance does not stated that the standards should be more restrictive or less flexible than any
261 other residential use or just consider elderly housing criteria in other zones. So comparatively just real quick, if
262 we compare this to a commercial, I mean a multifamily project...it appears that, and I can go through each
263 individual item next time but it appears that the multifamily ordinances are less restrictive in your zoning than
264 what the elderly ordinance is. So I just wanted to leave you with that when we leave. It is something to think

265 about because I am sure you sleep this day and night like I do...so...[laughter]....if I...if I could just pass it back
266 to Pat...I guess.

267
268 PAT PANCIOCCO: Do you want to mention the cul-de-sac with the emergency too?

269
270 GEORGE CHADWICK: Yup I can...at the...at the last hearing we had access points onto Reed Street...we have
271 illuminated those. There will be an emergency access out to Reed but there will be no paved...connection for
272 daily traffic out to Reed Street. And I know that was a...one of the concerns of the abutters.

273
274 PAT PANCIOCCO: Ok...I think what we did do early on and I am not going to go into the details...we...I did point
275 out to you when we discussed the origins in the ordinance and how we got here...there were several, and you
276 will see it in the minutes if you are so inclined to look...there are specific things in the multifamily that are far
277 more...flexible for multifamily for everyone versus multifamily style construction for the elderly. George is
278 exactly right on that one. And I think largely that has to do with...there has been more updates to the
279 multifamily ordinance than there has been for the elderly and we talked about that too. So I am not going to
280 bore you with that but...you know back to...the core issue. The property is in the commercial one
281 zone...and...there's a number of uses and what we would like to at least point out to you is...retail office, civic
282 institutional...all of those are also expressly permitted as is elderly housing. All of those developments
283 have...are far more intense...have much higher traffic volumes and they wouldn't act as a buffer to the
284 residential housing that is located to the east of this property and that is why we feel so strongly that this is a
285 good fit. So to get this project approved and George has been dealing with this far more than I have been. You
286 first needed to comply with the C-I zoning and we are pretty ok there. The performance than gets stacked on
287 top of that and then on top of that is the elderly housing and that is where we ran into all types of difficulty.
288 Although I guess I would like to suggest to you that this would probably be the best outcome for everyone
289 especially now that we have this synergy being created between the assisted housing development people
290 who are very anxious to come into the town and this it is just total compatibility as far as where concern has a
291 nice little concise senior village right in the heart of town where it is a short ride or if they are so inclined to
292 walk to the conveniences that the seniors would need. It also files a hole that was identified in the recent
293 Master Plan rewrite. So...with that said...any questions you may have...any additional information you would
294 like or any questions form anyone else we are happy to answer.

295
296 NEIL DUNN: I...I don't particularly have any specific questions...do you have any more handouts or literature
297 that is available for anyone in the audience that might want it?

298
299 PAT PANCIOCCO: The ones that I gave to the board, Richard has some extra ones I brought I think another
300 dozen or so that there is a little plan and a summary of the changes for that application...

301
302 NEIL DUNN: I think I don't know if we have enough for everybody, maybe you can share them...

303
304 PAT PANCIOCCO: Mm-hmm.

305
306 NEIL DUNN: But...I...I do think it's...worth looking at it. It is quite a bit different it does change it all. Again we
307 are going to be continuing the case until next month because of the shortage...

309 PAT PANCIOCCO: Yes.
310
311 NEIL DUNN: Hopefully...I guess if there is...I don't want to open this up for a long prolong discussion because it
312 is not really going to do much good if there is going to be other board members here...I am not opposed to a
313 couple questions but I would defiantly put the time cutoff at nine o'clock with you guys are with that...alright
314 with that.
315
316 PAT PANCIOCCO: That's fine.
317
318 NEIL DUNN: Just so that because folks they come out maybe they can get some more clarification to help
319 prepare them for next month so...if nobody else here on the board disagrees...?
320
321 JIM TIRABASSI: No...
322
323 DAVID PAQUETTE: I do not.
324
325 NEIL DUNN: So anybody out in the audience that would have a question again, the rest will be discussed next
326 month, this is to help us all better understand and help you prepare for next month when the...real....meat of
327 the meeting is so...anybody out in the audience that would like to...maybe get some clarification or have any
328 questions that might be able to help them later on...or are you good for now? [Pause]...Mr. Speltz, please
329 identify yourself.
330
331 MIKE SPELTZ: Thank you Mr. Chairman...Mike Speltz...18 Sugar Plum Lane...I think it will be important at our
332 next meeting to understand and...in considerable detail...how advanced the...I think it was a continuing care
333 retirement community...project is...and I think it would be very difficult for the board to allow that to make...to
334 influence their decision since it is at this point a very hypothetical...situation...so I hope the applicant can bring
335 some very firm information on...on what that is. So that the board can consider it or any alternative may not
336 be able to.
337
338 NEIL DUNN: I...I...to be honest with you we hear the case by case and that is not in front of us...people can talk
339 about all kinds of things and great fits...
340
341 PAT PANCIOCCO: Mm-hmm.
342
343 NEIL DUNN: But as far as I can see that...that really has no pertinence to this discussion. It is what we have
344 here for facts and figures. It is nice to know that because it does help get a better understanding of where the
345 neighborhood might be going but...I mean technically we are doing the five points of law on each of the cases
346 we are not...we are not looking at that but I do appreciate that and I do appreciate the fact that they bring
347 that out because it does help round it out but it is really the five points of law that we are after.
348
349 MIKE SPELTZ: I...I would like to just express my...appreciation to the applicant for a...at least going part way to
350 resolving some of the concerns that I raised last time. I would ask is there...is there...anything that would
351 preclude...subdividing one or two of the remaining lots I guess to the south of the ones that were added...to
352 get closer to the fifteen acres...since it is under common ownership I assume that is not the case but...you

353 know maybe I don't know everything. I...I understand there is an agreement with the continuing retirement
354 community and you know who knows...what that agreement is but...it would be useful to continue this march
355 of...toward progress...

356
357 NEIL DUNN: Not to be here...[chuckling]...

358
359 MIKE SPELTZ: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

360
361 NEIL DUNN: Do you have any thoughts...?

362
363 GEORGE CHADWICK: If I may just, Mike...so I can understand...are you talking about the remaining five lots
364 there that...the...Team Business owns?

365
366 PAT PANCIOTTO: Yes...

367
368 NEIL DUNN: Over here...

369
370 PAT PANCIOTTO: To the right...yes.

371
372 GEORGE CHADWICK: Kaplan Land Development currently has under contract those five lots...for their
373 development so at this point unless that development was to fall through there is no ability for us to obtain
374 additional lands or subdivide more land off of those five lots to make this project larger.

375
376 NEIL DUNN: Ok...Thank you very much...anything else from the board at this point or...?

377
378 JIM TIRABASSI: No...

379
380 NEIL DUNN: Alright...yes sir?

381
382 DAVID COLGLAZIER: My name is David Colglazier, I live at 6 Moulton Drive...I listed to the last program about
383 this project where there was smaller area for open space and I...understood perhaps that there was an idea
384 that the elderly people didn't need quite as much open space. Maybe I am incorrect. I would like to see more
385 open space in this plan...because from personal experience with my mother living in a...elderly...facility...where
386 there is about one hundred and twenty acres and quite a few people, more than you have here...they...they
387 talked a lot about open space and what was happening outdoors. Now this is down in Maryland...more active
388 outdoors for a longer period of time but all of the people there were very interested. They didn't like being
389 cooped up in their somewhat significant apartments...units...so they like to get out and do things so I would
390 like to certainly support the idea of having plenty of open space for the people because I think from
391 my...seventeen years of experience with my mother and her neighbors they just liked being able to get
392 outdoors and...and...admire what is happening with nature and all of the things around them. Thank you.

393
394 DAVID PAQUETTE: Thank you, sir.

395

396 NEIL DUNN: And...and at this point you are not in need of the open...you are meeting the open space aren't
397 you?
398
399 GEORGE CHADWICK: Yes.
400
401 NEIL DUNN: Alrighty...anyone want to make a motion...?
402
403 [Laughter]
404
405 DAVID PAQUETTE: To...Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion to continue the following cases...case
406 number 3/19/2014-4, continued form May 21st, 2014...case number 3/19/2014-5, continued from May
407 21st...case number 3/19/2014-6, continued from May 21st and case number 5/21/2014-2, continued from May
408 21st.
409
410 NEIL DUNN: All those in favor...?
411
412 DAVID PAQUETTE: Aye.
413
414 JACKIE BERNARD: Aye.
415
416 JIM TIRABASSI: Aye.
417
418 NEIL DUNN: Oh, hold on, did I get a second...
419
420 DAVID PAQUETTE: No...[chuckling]...who's going to second it?
421
422 JACKIE BERNARD: I will second it...
423
424 NEIL DUNN: [Chuckling]...all those in favor...?
425
426 DAVID PAQUETTE: Aye.
427
428 JACKIE BERNARD: Aye.
429
430 JIM TIRABASSI: Aye.
431
432 NEIL DUNN: Aye...opposed? Case continued.
433
434 PAT PANCIOTTO: Mr. Chairman, could you stated the date...July 16th ...in case anyone wants to
435 return...please...?
436
437 NEIL DUNN: Is July 16th the next meeting?
438
439 PAT PANCIOTTO: Yes.

440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458

NEIL DUNN: Yes...yup...so...to anybody out there...thank you...the next meeting will be scheduled for July 16th, 2014.

PAT PANCIOTTO: Thank you.

RESULT: THE MOTION TO CONTINUE CASES 3/19/2014-4, 5, AND 6 AND 5/21/2014-2 TO THE JULY 16, 2014 MEETING WAS APPROVED, 4-0-0.



DAVID PAQUETTE, CLERK

TYPED AND TRANSCRIBED BY KIRBY WADE, EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT

APPROVED JULY 16, 2014 WITH A MOTION MADE BY DAVID PAQUETTE, SECONDED BY JACKIE BENARD AND APPROVED 4-0-1 WITH A. STOLLER ABSTAINING AS SHE HAD NOT ATTENDED THE MEETING.