

**LONDONDERRY, NH PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 2018 AT THE MOOSE  
HILL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Members Present: Art Rugg, Chair; Mary Wing Soares, Vice Chair; Rick Brideau, Ex-Officio – Town Employee; Chris Davies, Secretary; Giovanni Verani, Ex-Officio – Town Manager; Leitha Reilly, member; Jim Butler, Town Council Ex-Officio; Peter Commerford (alternate member); Ann Chiampa (alternate member) and Roger Fillio (alternate member)

Also Present: John R. Trottier, P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works and Engineering; Colleen Mailloux, Town Planner; Laura Gandia, Associate Planner and Beth Morrison, Recording Secretary

Chairman Rugg called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM, explained the exit and emergency procedures, and began with the Pledge of Allegiance. He appointed A. Chiampa to vote for A. Sypek, R. Fillio to vote for S. Benson and P. Commerford to vote for M. Soares until she arrives. M. Soares arrived at 7:05 along with J. Butler.

**II. ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD WORK**

**A. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**Member C. Davies made a motion to approve the minutes of October 3, 2018, as presented.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted 8-0-1, with C. Davies abstaining. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

**Member C. Davies made a motion to approve the minutes of October 10, 2018, as presented.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

**B. REGIONAL IMPACT DETERMINATIONS: Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that she had three projects for their consideration.**

1. Application for design review of a condominium conversion of 63 Hardy Road, Map 12 Lot 43-1, Zoned AR-1, Bonneau Construction Company, LLC (Owners & Applicants)

2. Application for design review of a subdivision plan for a lot line adjustment between 75 Litchfield Road, Map 11 Lot 89, Zoned AR-1 and 278 High Range Road, Map 11 Lot 81-4, Zoned AR-1, Jonathan Paul and Deborah A. & John O'Connell (Owners & Applicants)
3. Application for design review of a subdivision plan to subdivide 75 Litchfield Road, Map 11 Lot 89, Zoned AR-1 into eight residential lots, Jonathan Paul (Owner & Applicant)

Town Planner Mailloux recommended that the Board find that these projects are not developments of regional impact as they do not meet the criteria set forth by the Southern New Hampshire Regional Planning Commission.

**C. Davies made a motion to find that these projects are not of regional impact.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

C. DISCUSSIONS WITH TOWN STAFF: N/A

**III. OLD BUSINESS - N/A**

**IV. New Plans/Non-Binding Conceptual Discussions**

A. Application for formal review of a site plan for the redevelopment of a retail site to replace an existing bank with a 3,200 SF bank, 5,100 SF urgent care facility, 4,000 SF retail space, and associated site improvements 42 Nashua Road and Garden Lane, Map 7 Lot 68-1, Zoned C-I, NH Six Realty Trust (Owner & Applicant)

Chairman Rugg read the case into record noting the applicant has requested to have the case continued until December 12, 2018.

**C. Davies made a motion to continue the case until December 12, 2018.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

Chairman Rugg stated that this is the only formal public notice for the case being continued until December 12, 2018.

B. Application for formal review of a condominium conversion, One Bridal Path and Perkins Road, Map 16 Lot 3, Zoned AR-1, Wallace Farm, LLC (Owner) & Thomas J. Leonard, Esq. (Applicant)

Chairman Rugg read the case into record. J. Trottier stated there are no outstanding checklist items and staff recommends the application be accepted as complete.

**C. Davies made a motion to accept the application as complete per Staff's Recommendation Memorandum dated November 7, 2018**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

Chairman Rugg noted that the 65-day time clock had started.

Tom Leonard, Esq. from Welts White & Fontaine PC., 29 Factory St, Nashua, NH addressed the Board. T. Leonard stated the application was for a condominium conversion to allow for financing. He explained that the original project, a 240 unit, 10 building development with workforce housing, will not change whatsoever. He noted that the proposal is for each of the large buildings to be broken up for ownership to allow for financing. He said that it has been difficult to get financing that includes both existing buildings and future buildings. He stated that they are working with the New Hampshire Housing Financing Authority (NHHFA) and have a commitment for financing the existing units and a very optimistic discussion regarding the financing for the future construction. He pointed out that NHHFA requires there be separate ownership in order to finance the future construction. He concluded by reiterating that there is no change to the plans that were approved by this Board years ago and welcomed questions from the Board.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to questions from the Board. J. Trottier stated that the applicant is requesting one waiver request from Sections 4.01.C of the Subdivision Regulations to allow a plan scale of 1"=60' for the plan where only a maximum of 1"=40' is allowed. He stated that staff supports granting the waiver because the plans are legible at the scale presented. He reviewed the design review items with the Board. Town Planner Mailloux informed the Board that this application has been reviewed by the Town Attorney to make sure the condominium documents are consistent with the town regulations and ordinances. A. Chiampa asked if there could be up to ten owners. T. Leonard stated there could be up to ten owners. A. Chiampa asked whom the town would deal with if there were ten separate owners. T. Leonard stated the town would deal with the condominium association. C. Davies pointed out that he has been on a board for condominium associations and sometimes the board cannot come to an agreement. He asked in the event of this happening, what would the town do. T. Leonard stated that he did not think it was an issue, but appreciated the question. He stated that once the structures are all completed, the town would have the enforcement issues against the association if there is a problem. He said that the association has a statutory mandate to manage the common areas. He stated

that right now the plan is for the existing four buildings to be owned by the present owner and the next six future buildings would be owned by another owner, for the ultimate plan of two owners for the ten buildings. M. Soares asked if the four buildings are occupied. T. Leonard stated they were. M. Soares asked if this would change the structure of the current rent. T. Leonard stated it would not. M. Soares asked if he knew the workforce housing rental cost. T. Leonard stated he did not. Town Planner Mailloux stated that right now the rental price is \$1440 and is adjusted every year by the NHHFA. L. Reilly asked if it would be the same makeup of workforce housing and market housing in each building. T. Leonard stated that it would, consisting of 50% workforce housing and 50% market. J. Butler asked what the investors would be receiving because of this change. T. Leonard stated that the investors will get nothing for this. He said that this will only afford for financing, it does not make anyone any more money or reduce the cost in any way. He said the particular financing they are seeking is public financing that supports workforce housing and there are tax credits associated with it for investors. J. Butler asked if T. Leonard had been involved in this type of a conversion before. T. Leonard stated that he had not personally and is working with another lawyer who is very well versed in this. J. Butler asked what benefit this has for the town. M. Soares said the benefit to the town would be that this project get completed. A. Chiampa asked if he recently had a case before the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA). T. Leonard stated that he had and the variance was granted. He stated that because of this particular financing, the investors are demanding that all the building permits would be immediately available and now the ZBA granted permission for all 144 building permits to be available.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the public.

Mike Byerly, One King Charles Drive, addressed the Board. He asked if the Board does not grant this tonight, would he say that this project could not be financed. T. Leonard stated that is not true. He stated that if this falls apart, they will continue to seek financing. C. Davies stated that he thinks they should have had financing all lined up with phase one of the project. T. Leonard stated that they did have financing lined up for phase one, but not for the other phases, and have not been able to get financing.

There being no further public input, Chairman Rugg brought it back to the Board.

**C. Davies made a motion a motion to approve the Applicant's request for the above waiver as outlined in Staff's recommendation memorandum dated November 7, 2018.**

**M. Soares seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

**C. Davies made a motion to grant conditional approval of the Condominium Conversion Plan for 1 Bridal Path, Map 16, Lot 3, Wallace Farm, LLC (Owner) and Thomas J. Leonard, Esq. (Applicant), in accordance with plans prepared by The Dubay Group, Inc., dated**

**September 17, 2018, last revised October 17, 2018, with the precedent conditions to be fulfilled within two years and prior to plan signature and general and subsequent conditions of approval to be fulfilled as noted in the Staff Recommendation Memorandum, dated November 7, 2018.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

"Applicant", herein, refers to the property owner, business owner, or organization submitting this application and to his/its agents, successors, and assigns.

### **PRECEDENT CONDITIONS**

All of the precedent conditions below must be met by the Applicant, at the expense of the Applicant, prior to certification of the plans by the Planning Board. Certification of the plans is required prior to commencement of any site work, any construction on the site or issuance of a building permit.

1. All outstanding DRC comments shall be addressed.
2. The Owner's signature shall be provided on the plans.
3. An executed copy of the condominium declaration shall be provided to be recorded at the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds, concurrent with the recording of the plans.
4. The Applicant shall provide a digital copy of the complete final plan to the Town prior to plan signature by the Planning Board in accordance with Section 2.05.n of the Subdivision Regulations.
5. The Applicant shall provide checks for LCHIP and recording fees, made payable to the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds.
6. The Applicant shall note all general and subsequent conditions on the plan sheet to be recorded.
7. Final planning review.

**PLEASE NOTE** – If these conditions are not met within two (2) years of the meeting at which the Planning Board grants approval, the Board's approval will be considered to have lapsed and re-submission of the application will be required. See RSA 674:39 on vesting.

### **GENERAL AND SUBSEQUENT CONDITIONS**

All of the conditions below are attached to this approval.

1. All of the documentation submitted in the application package by the applicant and any requirements imposed by other agencies are part of this approval unless otherwise updated, revised, clarified in some manner, or superseded in full or in part. In the case of conflicting information between documents, the most recent documentation and this notice herein shall generally be determining.

2. It is the responsibility of the applicant to obtain all other local, state, and federal permits, licenses, and approvals which may be required as part of this project (that were not received prior to certification of the plans). Contact the Building Division at extension 115 regarding building permits.

C. Application for formal review of a site plan for Phase 2 of the Cross Farm Development, an elderly housing development with 86 additional dwelling units, clubhouse and associated site improvements, 200 Nashua Road, Adams Road and Cross Road, Map 6, Lot 59-1, Zoned AR-1, Cross Farm Development, LLC (Owner & Applicant)

Chairman Rugg read the case into record. L. Reilly recused herself from this case. Chairman Rugg appointed P. Commerford to vote for L. Reilly. J. Trottier stated there was one outstanding checklist item, which the applicant has requested for acceptance purposes only and staff recommends the application be accepted as complete. He stated it was from Section 3.06.b regarding septic system design.

**C. Davies made a motion to waive the outstanding checklist item for acceptance purposes only as outlined in Staff's recommendation memorandum dated November 7, 2018**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

**C. Davies made a motion to accept the application as complete per Staff's Recommendation Memorandum dated November 7, 2018**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

Chairman Rugg noted that the 65-day time clock had started.

Joe Maynard, Engineer with Benchmark Engineering in Londonderry addressed the Board. He noted that tonight they are here to discuss Phases 2 and 3, which will include 86 detached homes, a clubhouse, 5800 linear feet of roadway and off-site improvement to Route 102 (a roadway that is under the jurisdiction of the New Hampshire Department of Transportation). He stated the off-site improvements to Route 102 will include a full left turn lane into the site and a right turn lane into the site. He stated the road they will be building will connect out to Adams Road. He

asked the Board if they had a preference in category for him to start talking about. The consensus of the Board was the traffic study. Kim Hazarvartian traffic engineer with TEPP LLC out of Salem, NH addressed the Board. K. Hazarvartian stated he looked at 200 senior adult detached housing units with two different accesses. He said the first access is through Route 102 only and the second was an access point at Route 102 and to Adams Road. He explained that they analyzed the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under existing conditions, one year from now with a 1% growth rate and ten years from now with a 12% growth rate and Woodmont Commons data. He noted that for the existing conditions, he adjusted to a peak month, which increased the volumes by about 8%. He said the trip generations were done by the book, The Institute of Transportation Engineers, which is a standard tool to use. He stated the a.m. peak had 69 vehicles trips, 23 in and 46 out, and the p.m. peak had 82 trips, 50 in and 32 out. He explained that if it was single family detached housing the numbers would be higher, but since this was 55+ housing there is not as much commuter traffic. M. Soares said in her opinion, she thought the data was a little flawed for the 55+ housing, and she would like to know what the numbers would be if the people were all working every single day. K. Hazarvartian said that if he could recollect correctly, the trip generation numbers would be in the two hundred in and out. He said the numbers he used were from existing senior housing facilities and believed they were accurate. J. Maynard explained that the trip generation does take into account that people who are 55+ and over do work, but most likely less than residential homes. He pointed out that they conducted a turn lane warrant analysis and the results support the construction of turning lanes. The New Hampshire Department of Transportation (NH DOT) will allow them to put in a left turn lane on Route 102 going into the site and a right turn lane going into the site. He stated that a signal is not warranted at the Route 102 access point. He said they conducted a capacity analysis at the Route 102 access point, which pointed out that vehicles will be delayed, as Route 102 has 20,000 vehicles a day 1500 vehicles during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. He said that if the Adams Road access point is constructed it has low delays and good levels of service due to Adams Road not being a high volume street and not many vehicles will exit out to Adams Road. He reviewed the data stating the Adams Road access would have at a.m. peak hours 5 turning left out of the site, 9 vehicles turning right out of the site and 5 vehicles turning left into the site and 2 vehicles turning right into the site. He said for the p.m. peak hours it would be 3 vehicles turning left out of the site, 7 vehicles turning right out of the site, 10 vehicles turning left into the site and 5 vehicles turning right into the site. He said that the sight distance on Route 102 is ample and there would need to be some clearing on Adams Road to the west to meet town criteria.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to questions from the Board. A. Chiampa asked if the passing lanes would be eliminated on Route 102 with the access for this development on Route 102. K. Hazarvartian stated they would be eliminated. J. Maynard noted that the off-site improvement to Route 102 for this project is about 1000 feet in each direction from the entrance to the site. P. Commerford stated in his opinion, there could potentially be more people working than was used for the study, and thought the numbers presented are low. He stated that he is very concerned about traffic in this area already without the addition of this site. A. Chiampa asked K. Hazarvartian what he recommended for this site as a traffic engineer. K. Hazarvartian said in his

honest opinion that if the Adams Road access point is constructed and available it will alleviate some congestion with the Route 102 access point, but noted the site will work without the Adams Road access. He said his preference would be to have both access points for traffic. P. Commerford said that he felt traffic would be dumped out onto another intersection at Adams Road and would make that road less safe than it is now. C. Davies echoed P. Commerford's statement and he said he would like staff to review the numbers that were presented tonight before making a decision. M. Soares also echoed P. Commerford and C. Davies statements. G. Verani asked for further clarification on the signal study. K. Hazarvartian stated that the study he conducted concluded that a signal would not be warranted and if it were put up, it would become a liability issue. Both M. Soares and R. Fillio asked if the speed limit could be changed on Route 102. J. Maynard said they did a speed analysis on site and the speeds ranged from 59 mph to 64 mph. K. Hazarvartian said that it would be NHDOT's call on changing the speed limit, but in his opinion, he thought it would be futile as people will drive the speed they feel like driving, unless there was enforcement. He said that they could put up warning signs and feedback signs to help drive the speed limit. J. Butler said that he thought having a signal that would be tripped when needed might work. C. Davies asked if the council worked with the state on issues like this. J. Butler said he would be happy to work with the state on the council. He also suggested taking out the access to Adams Road in phase 2 and let them build everything else. J. Trottier said that would require feedback from the Fire Department. David Dubay, from Stantec, addressed the Board. He stated that he was working with K. Hazarvartian to make sure the best possible outcome is obtained. He reviewed the trip generation numbers with the Board. He also stated that the numbers for a signal warrant are not even close to what NHDOT would be looking for. R. Fillio asked if a blinking light would be warranted. D. Dubay stated a blinking light would slow people down and get their attention. J. Butler asked D. Dubay if he reviewed the traffic studies performed by the applicant. D. Dubay said he is in the process of reviewing them and a couple of design review comments had not been addressed. J. Butler asked K. Hazarvartian when he would be finished addressing the design review comments. K. Hazarvartian said he wanted to see what came of this meeting tonight before he finished the comments. J. Butler said in his opinion, he would like Stantec to fully review and receive all the comments back before making a decision.

Chairman Rugg opened it up to the public.

Mike Byerly, One King Charles Drive, addressed the Board. M. Byerly said he was trying to come up with other places in town where this would be happening and he gave a suggestion to look at Mountain Home Road estates, although a younger crowd. He also suggested looking at Parmenter Road as well for more traffic numbers and statistics.

Chairman Rugg brought it back to the Board. J. Trottier clarified that the Board would like to look at the possibility of NHDOT reducing the speed and putting in a blinking light. C. Davies asked if the town had any data on traffic and traffic incidents in that area. Town Planner Mailloux stated that the town did not have this type of



information, but the Board could ask the developer to do this. She noted that the town would most likely not be able to get to this until 2019.

Chairman Rugg went out the public again.

Leitha Reilly, addressed the Board. She said that NHDOT has a website with all the traffic counts at major intersections and she suggested the Board take a look at that information.

There being no further public input, Chairman Rugg brought it back to the Board. J. Trottier noted that the applicant is requesting two waivers to eliminate the sidewalk and eliminate the 75 foot setback requirement. J. Maynard said that similar to phase 1, they are asking for a sidewalk waiver again. He stated that because the project is in the Performance Overlay District they are asking to eliminate the 75 foot setback requirement. Chairman Rugg noted that the Performance Overlay District will be changing with the new zoning coming out in town. He read a letter from a resident at this point in the meeting (Exhibit 1).

**M. Soares made a motion to continue the application until December 12, 2018.**

**R. Brideau seconded the motion.**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0. The Chair voted in the affirmative.**

Chairman Rugg said that this is the only public notice regarding the continuing of the case.

- V. Other Business** - Chairman Rugg informed the Board that next meeting someone will be discussing the blasting requirements and procedures. He stated that L. Gandia will update the Board on zoning as well. P. Commerford asked for the town to address the possible need for public water and public sewer on a development like Cross Farm, as he is worried about all those individual septic systems crammed in the development. Town Planner Mailloux noted that the Board has requested to review the 55+ and older housing density bonuses, as the needs of the town are changing. She also pointed out that the water study will also be helpful to look what changes need to be made in town. L. Reilly pointed out that a Veteran's breakfast will be offered to veterans on Saturday at the Londonderry High School with a small parade to follow.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Member M. Soares made a motion to adjourn the meeting at approximately 9:15 p.m. Seconded by R. Brideau**

**The motion was granted, 9-0-0.**

**The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:15 PM.**

These minutes were prepared by Beth Morrison.

Respectfully Submitted,

Wayne Soares  
Title: Vice-Chair

These minutes were accepted and approved on December 5, 2018 by a motion made by M. Soares and seconded by R. Briedau.

PETER CURRO  
105 ADAMS ROAD  
LONDONDERRY, NH

ONCE AGAIN I AM HERE TO PLEAD WITH THE PLANNING BOARD TO LIMIT THE TOTAL BUILDOUT OF THIS DEVELOPMENT TO 125 UNITS.

TO MY KNOWLEDGE, THE TRAFFIC ISSUES RAISED WHEN DISCUSSING PHASE, I HAVE NOT BE ANSWERED. DURING THOSE DISCUSSIONS, IT WAS AGREED THAT ADAMS ROAD WOULD HAVE AN EMERGENCY GATE, AND THAT THE FLOW OF TRAFFIC WOULD RUN ONTO RTE102. THERE WAS SOME DISCUSSION THAT A RIGHT-TURN LANE WOULD BE PROVIDED ON RTE102. HOWEVER, YOUR ENGINEER STRONGLY DISAGREES WITH NH DOT IN THAT THE LONG STRAIGHT PATH ON RTE102 ACTUALLY HINDERS THE SAFETY OF TRAFFIC. HIS TESTIMONY SHOWED THAT PEOPLE WILL SPEED UP WHEN THE ROAD IS STRAIGHT AND NO DIPS, NEGATING THE ARGUMENT FROM NH DOT THAT THE STRAIGHT LINE POSES BETTER LINE OF SIGHT. YOU HEAR FROM THE PEOPLE IN APOLLO; ACROPOLIS ARGUE, IT IS NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR THEM TO GET OUT OF THEIR AREA NOW, IMAGINE WHEN 300 MORE CARS ARE ADDED. I WOULD SUBMIT THE INTERSECTION OF ADAMS / MAMMOTH IS ALREADY A SAFETY ISSUE, ESPECIALLY WITH CARS LOOKING TO MAKE A LEFT ONTO MAMMOTH. ALSO, THE INTERSECTION OF MAMMOTH AND RTE102 IS A DEAD INTERSECTION NOW, NOT TO MENTION WITH THE ALREADY APPROVED OTHER SUBDIVISIONS COME LIVE. WITH THAT, I THINK THE DESIGN AND CURRENT ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE CANNOT NOT SAFELY HANDLE MANY MORE VEHICLES. FINALLY, WHILE WE ARE ON ROADS, HAS ANYONE THOUGHT OF CREATING A WALKING / BIKE PATHWAY ALONG SIDE ADAMS / CROSS? EVERY OTHER TOWN I TRAVEL, HAVE RUNNING / BIKE PATHS ALONG SOME OF ITS ROADS. AFTER ALL, ADAMS IS A SCENIC BY WAY, ISN'T IT?

I SHOWED THE PLANNING BOARD A NUMBER OF POOLS OF WATER ON THIS PROPERTY. RECENTLY, TH PLANNING BOARD HEAR FRO THE CHAIR OF CONSERVATION THAT LONDONDERRY HAS NO ACTIVE AQUIFER TO SUPPLY ITS WELL WATER. THAT LONDONDERRY RELIES ON SURFACE GROUND WATER SEEPING INTO THE GROUND. I THINK WE CAN ALL AGREE, ROUGHLY 90% OF LONDONDERRY RESIDENTS RELY ON PRIVATE DUG WELLS FOR THEIR WATER. SO; HOW CAN THE DISAPPEARANCE OF MORE POOLS OF WATER [NOT TO MENTION ALL THE OTHER RECENT DEVELOPMENTS] ASSIST IN ASSURING LONDONDERRY RESIDENTS WILL MAINTAIN A SUPPLY OF QUALITY DRINKING WATER.? REMEMBER, MANY OF US STARTED TO SUCK SAND TOWARDS THE END OF THE MORE RECENT DROUGHT. WHAT HAPPENS IF WE ARE THEN AGAIN, AND ALL THESE POOLS OF WATER ARE GONE?

SPEAKING OF WATER, I BELIEVE THE CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ASKED THAT THE SW AREA BE PROTECTED, I WOULD EXPAND THAT TO THE WEST SIDE AS WELL. THE POND ON THE WEST SIDE DOUBLES IN GROWTH WHENEVER WE GET SIGNIFICANT RAIN. SO I ASK, WHEN DOES THE PROTECTION OF PUBLIC WELFARE TRUMP DEVELOPMENT PROFITS IN LONDONDERRY?

FINALLY, THE BOARD WILL RECALL, AN ELITE PANEL OF 91 SCIENTISTS GATHERED TO DISCUSS GLOBAL CLIMATE. THEIR CONCLUSIONS WERE ALARMING. THEY SAID, IF WE DON'T CHANGE OUR HABITS OR COURSE OF ACTION WITHIN 15 YEARS, THE HUMAN POPULATION IS IN TROUBLE. THEY STATED TWO ACTIONS:

- REDUCE POLLUTANTS IN THE AIR
- INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF TREE AND PLANT LIFE ON EARTH

PLEASE DON'T SAY OUR ISSUE IS SMALL ENOUGH TO BE IGNORED, NOTHING IS TOO SMALL AND IF WE DON'T; START SMALL, NOTHING EVER GETS DONE.

SO; I ASK YOU; DOES THIS DEVELOPMENT DO EITHER? YES, IT IS A SMALL PART IN THE SCHEME OF THINGS, BUT WE ALL NEED TO TAKE SMALL STEPS.

AGAIN, I ASK THAT THIS DEVELOPMENT AT 100% BUILDOUT BE 125. AGAIN, I ASK THE CHAIR'S OF THE PLANNING BOARD, CONSERVATION COMMITTEE AND THE DEVELOPER DISCUSS WAYS TO REDUCE THIS DEVELOPMENT AND PUT ADDITIONAL LAND INTO CONSERVATION. YES, I KNOW THAT IS NOT THE NORM, BUT IN MY BUSINESS WE ARE OFTEN ASKED TO "THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX", SO WHY CAN'T THESE PEOPLE. I'D EVEN TAKE A PERSONAL OR VACATION DAY TO SIT IN.

PETER CURRO