

**DOVER PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
MAY 15, 2002**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Margaret Stevenson, David Landry, Pete Lavoie, Joyce El Kouarti, Tony McManus, Frank Torr, Beth Thompson, Parks Christenbury and Dennis Ciotti

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ron Cole, Chuck Maglaras

STAFF PRESENT: Steven Stancel, Planning Director and Jacqueline Freeman, Recording Secretary

In the absence of the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, Tony McManus chaired the meeting.

Acting Chairman Tony McManus called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

ITEM #1: Citizen's Forum

No one spoke.

ITEM #2: Approval of minutes.

Beth Thompson made the motion to approve.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #3: Consideration and acceptance of an application of a Conditional Use Permit for Northam Builders, Inc. Assessor's Map M, Lot 52-12, zoned R-20, located on Ivan's Lane. * (P02-20)

Frank Torr recused himself because he is an abutter of the property.

Jim Schulte represented the applicant, Northam Builders. He said that he is addressing Lot #12 in the subdivision that was approved and is seeking a Conditional Use Permit because a portion of the land has a slope that is slightly greater than 20%, which puts it in the Conservation District. He said that the Conservation Commission voted to recommend approval with the request that the Planning Board impose the condition that there be no construction within 75 feet of the Wetlands Protection District unless a permit is obtained from the City of Dover. He said that the access of the lot is provided by way of a 20 foot wide access easement between lots 10 and 11.

Peg Stevenson asked if it was an approved lot? Peg Stevenson said that she didn't remember that lot when the subdivision was approved.

Jim Schulte said yes but they have a customer that would like a particular sized house. He said that the slope is 22% and if it were 19% they wouldn't have to come here. He said that the concern is erosion. Mr. Schulte said that the approved plan does show that lot. He said that it is about 1.6 acres and a good portion of the northerly end of it is in a Wetlands Protection District. That is quite a distance away from where the house will be situated.

Mr Schulte explained that the process is set up for the Board to approve the general layout, and then once they know where they are going to put the house they come to the Board with the information to assure the City that it will be done correctly so there won't be an erosion problem. He said that it would have been premature to present that to the Board at the time of the original subdivision.

Pete Lavoie said that he has gone to the site and that there are two houses with a driveway going down to both of them and one is 3 feet lower than the other. He asked if this driveway would be going between the two.

Doug LaRosa explained that this driveway is a common drive with the lower driveway.

Pete Lavoie asked if the potential buyer knows that there's a driveway going down through there.

Doug LaRosa stated that it is recorded in the deed.

David Landry said that he felt that this item should be tabled because there is so much confusion with regard to the original subdivision and the siting of this driveway.

Steve Stancel stated that the driveway was placed there to make sure that the access did not come off of Dover Point Road.

Tony McManus called a five-minute recess so the Board members could review the original approved subdivision plan.

Tony McManus called the meeting back to order.

David Landry made the motion to accept the application.

Peg Stevenson seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that this went before the Conservation Commission on May 6th. The minutes are not available, but they did speak to the Chairman and their recommendations are included in the staff recommendations.

Parks Christenbury made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Erosion control measures required for this lot shall be installed prior to the issuance of a building permit.
2. The deed for this lot shall contain language outlining the development restrictions imposed by the Wetlands Protection District Ordinance (Chapter 170-27.1)

Dennis Ciotti seconded.

VOTE U/A

Frank Torr took his seat.

ITEM #4: Consideration and acceptance of an application for a minor subdivision of land for Lionel & Doris Chenard, Assessor's Map G, Lot 31, zoned I-2, located on Littleworth/Crosby Roads*(P02-21)

Beth Thompson recused herself.

Bob Stowell, Trittech Engineering, represented the applicant and explained that this is a minor subdivision of 11 ½ acres of industrial land. There are no specific plans for development at this point, this will just make the land available for sale. There are nine acres that will stay with the house.

Peg Stevenson made the motion to accept the application.

David Landry seconded.

VOTE U/A

The public hearing was opened.

There were no comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Peg Stevenson made the motion to approve with the following conditions:

1. Add the owner's signature to the plat.
2. Revise the plat by adding the surveyor's stamp and signature.
3. Revise the plat to add Common Subdivision Plan #25 regarding providing a digital version of the plat.

David Landry seconded.

VOTE U/A

Beth Thompson took her seat.

ITEM #5: Old business

- a. **Discussion and possible vote on a major subdivision of land for Leslie Mollerur, located on Back Road. (6 lots) (P02-09)**

Peg Stevenson made the motion to take this item off the table.

Dennis Ciotti seconded.

VOTE U/A

Bob Stowell, Trittech Engineering, stated that since the last meeting they have had a site walk with the Planning Board and with the Conservation Commission. He said they made a final submission to the Planning Department which they felt addressed the majority of the issues that were outstanding. They are still waiting for the Dredge Fill Application, as well as, a State Subdivision application. They provided the forestry report to the Planning Department relative to the conservation easement along the Cochecho River. He said that there is one outstanding issue with the possible reconfiguration of an abutting parcel, the Neill's property, where they are trying to incorporate some frontage along the proposed Mallard Lane for the Neill's. He said that they have been unable to resolve that but are getting fairly close to a resolution. He said that they would like to have this tabled again so they can come back in a couple weeks and present the final plan.

Tony McManus asked if there was anyone here tonight that might want to address the Board as part of a public hearing.

Atty. Malcolm McNeill said that he concurred with the postponement.

Dennis Ciotti made the motion to table the application.

Beth Thompson seconded.

VOTE U/A

b. Discussion and possible vote on a major subdivision of land for Dupere, located on Washington St. (19 lots) (P01-65).

Beth Thompson made the motion to remove this item from the table.

Frank Torr seconded.

VOTE U/A

Henry Boyd from Millenium Engineering, said that the plans have been reworked to address the concerns of the Planning Board and Conservation. He said that one of the things that has been suggested to them to explore was connectivity to abutting parcels.

There was discussion on the placement of a connecting road. He said that placing the road in a different position meant loosing a lot. There was concern expressed that Lot 18, would be very difficult to build on and though they met the letter of the law and the setbacks from the property lines and the wetlands, there wasn't a very large building envelope. He said that in looking at what Mr. Stancel and the City Engineer had to say, they chose to give up one of the lots on the right hand side of the road and bring the road extension up to where it is now, between lots 14 and 15. The reason that they chose that spot was that it is about the only place that the topo of the property really lends itself to bringing a road to the abutting property. He said that the topography runs along the road in a parallel manner. This location would provide a better opportunity for the abutters to

have some access to the back lands. He said that through multiple discussions and meetings and revisions to the plans, the City Engineer has come up with six final comments.

Mr. Boyd stated that the City Engineer had asked them to provide more separation on lot number 14's gas and sewer services from catch basin No. 10, which they have addressed. Also to provide a sidewalk tipdown at Washington St. intersection and they have done that. They have finished the design of the water main extension on Washington St. He said that he wanted to mention that he asked Mr. Dupere to come tonight because there are several issues that dealt with the TRC and fees. He said that Mr. Dupere has agreed to pay the three fees that were brought up at the last TRC meeting, but he has also agreed to extend the water main. He pointed to where the water main ends just shy of Mr. Lundborn's place. Mr. Boyd, stated that at this point it could be made a condition of approval to connect into his parcel and then provide that it can be extended further by the City at some future point. He said that although it's outside of the scope of this, he is willing to do that and pay for the design of the water main. He said that with regard to the Taylor Road Extension, he felt that a perpendicular intersection would be preferable but the contours that we intersect make it impossible for them to come off of that exactly square. He said that the regs say that it would be preferred, but that under no circumstances the road be at an angle of less than 60 degrees. This road comes off at about 74 degrees so it is compliant with the regulations. There is no cul-de-sac at the end of the street and it's quite obvious in the plan that it doesn't intend to show one, as this would simply be for two houses. He said that it was their understanding that the purpose of this was to provide access rights to the connecting abutters. In that case, the turnaround would be the responsibility of the connecting abutter and they felt that their task was complete by bringing it to the abutting parcel. With that, they feel that they have completed all of the tasks that were given to them.

Dennis Ciotti asked about looping the water system to Washington Highlands.

Mr. Boyd answered that the Fowlers were here and they want to speak on that issue. He said that they were reluctant to write a letter saying that they would grant an easement to the City and he said that they should address those concerns.

The public hearing was re opened.

Edwin Fowler introduced himself and his wife Elizabeth. He said that he noticed that they are providing access to back land that was isolated from previous sales. They have not accessed their back land, which is not accessible from Washington St., because of a gorge with a brook running through it. He said that he would like to have a driveway access because he has enough land for two house lots.

Elizabeth Fowler said that they were the previous owners of this land. They are not trying to dissuade any one from development. They did protect somewhere near 17 acres of land for 20 years, however, there's a bunch of land that was inaccessible until Taylor Extension became available. The Nadeaus had inaccessible land for a lot of years. They

don't want to interfere with the process of the development, but they don't understand how giving a water easement to the City might affect their land.

Steve Stancel explained that they didn't require an access easement through the Fowlers land because the lot itself is long and narrow and they did not see it as being developable. The concept of extending of future roads is to eventually loop them, it's not to allow additional building lots. He said though he would like to help the Fowlers, it doesn't make sense from a Planning Perspective to extend the right-of-way unless there was going to be some benefit to eventually connecting it back onto Washington Street, which is the case with the Nadeau piece. He said that they asked the applicant to look into extending the utilities into the Washington Highlands project so that the water line would be looped.

Mrs. Fowler asked how allowing an easement through their land would affect them when they go to sell their property.

Steve Stancel stated that he's not prepared to totally commit on how that would affect their property. He said that it's a utility running underground. He said that they merely recommended that the applicant approach the subject. If you say "no", then that's it.

Mrs. Fowler said that there are people who are doing a wonderful job planning because she said that she knows that they have worked hard on this project. She said that her land will become an area of open space between two big developments and the City might want to think about that. There is some open space that could become a park or something because it is going to be a nice piece of property.

Richard Lundborn, 340 Washington Street, directly abutts the project downstream. He apologized to Mrs. Freeman for being gruff and wanted to thank her for faxing letters in a timely manner. He said that he has located a major error in the drainage analysis and spoke to David White about it. He said that he was skeptical that a 13 acre field could be developed and a wetland complex with a cul-de-sac road that was 1200 feet long and an additional 18 houses, collect all the water into catch basins and put it into a couple of 100 foot long treatment swales right adjacent to the stream and expect a reduction of flow to adjacent property. He said that he did a site walk and found where all the water came across and based on this information he gathered, he did his own analysis. It concluded that if you include the offsite watershed area with the onsite development you'd have a 3.6 cubic foot per second increase of flow at the property line stream location. He said that he also concluded that if you didn't include the offsite flow and just apples to apples, compared the state that the 13 acres are in now and the state that it will be in in two years if they build the subdivision, you come up with a 5.1 CFS increase in flow.

Mr. Lundborn expressed that he is not against the development and understands that Mr. Arnold has invested his money in that land and Mr. Dupere has invested his money in the design. He said that he is asking that they respect his investment in his property and all the other downstream abutters. He said that just looking at the development he could see that this project probably needed a Site Specific approval. He said that he brought home

a devise called a planimeter from his office. He said that the site-specific trigger for the State of New Hampshire is 100,000 sq. feet of disturbance and this plan shows on Option 2 175,974 sq. ft. of disturbance, and on Option 1, shows 172,308 sq. ft. He said that there could be a degree of error with his planimeter and even if that degree of error is 10% you are still 70,000 sq. ft. of disturbance over the trigger number for a Site Specific Permit being necessary. He said that the design has been going on for 5 months and that the engineering firm should have realized that they needed a Site Specific Permit.

Mr. Lundborn stated that he was not notified for the Wetlands Crossing for the project. He said that he isn't sure what that does for the permit but it might render it null and void. He said that now they have no wetlands permit and they have to go to Site Specific which they have not done 5 months into the project. He said that he spoke with Ridge Mauck at Site Specific and was assured that generally, he doesn't just, off hand, without seeing a plan say that a permit is not needed if it looks close. He said that he finds it interesting that Engineering never suggested to Millenium Engineering to get a Site Specific. He said that he was under the impression that it was the City Engineer's job to review the plans for technical readiness to be constructed and to help the developer along through the permitting process with the State and the City. He said that it took him 20 minutes to prepare the plan and do the math. He said that he is still skeptical of the drainage design. He said that he will give his analysis to the City Engineers and will forward to Site Specific for them to compare if they would like. As an abutter he is for development of the property but not at the expense of his and his wife's investment and his neighbors' investments. It concerns him that up until the site walk and when he voiced his concerns, he had heard that it was going to be suggested that this would be considered for approval.

Steve Fortune, 339 Washington St. stated that they were concerned with the main easement of Taylor Road being directly in front of his house. He was concerned with the latest plan for the easement and the level of the road. He said that it was his understanding that the Dupere Brothers would work with him in providing a buffer from the noise and light from the roadway directly in front of his home. He submitted estimates under the recommendation of Council members the landscaping company's estimates are on file with the Planning Department. They will have to invest in upgrading their home security because they feel that they will be on display now with a 19 home development and the new traffic because they are very close to the road. And also light block shades for 10 windows and 1 door. He said that he needs to hear what the developer plans to do for them and for that to be included in the Master Plan. He said that without being included in the plan, they face paying tens of thousands of dollars to protect themselves from the impact of this new traffic coming into their home. He said that they are asking the City to stand by their side otherwise they feel like they have no support and they'll have to move on. He said that he's sure there is common ground that they can all stand on. He wants to be included with some buffering and landscaping from car's headlights because the whole length of road comes directly at his home.

Henry Boyd said that Steve York from his office did speak to Mr. Mauck and was told that Mr. Mauck felt that there was no need for a Site Specific Permit. He said that he takes offence that someone would suggest that they don't know what they are doing and

that they would not want to follow the rules. He stated that he has a letter from Mr. Mauck where he obviously says that he didn't take a telephone log of the conversation but the tone of letter admits that he does remember discussing it. Henry said that he does agree with Mr. Lundborn that he should not have made a decision about whether it needed a Permit. He said that it is clear that this site certainly needs a Site Specific Permit and it has been filed and has been overnighed to Mr. Mauck. Mr. Mauck has express his desire to expedite the issuing of the permit. Mr. Dupere isn't at fault and any blame to be put on anybody should fall squarely on his shoulders because he originally believed that it needed one, but based on the advice of Mr. Mauck they decided not to put it through. Mr. Boyd stated that the permit shouldn't hold up the approval of the plan but it needs to be in place before construction can begin on the roadway. As far as the drainage issue, they have looked at this drainage several times. He said that he believes that the City Engineer is very qualified and has been very responsive. He said that they have always considered Mr. Lundborn's position as an abutter and they have always forwarded him any revisions to the drainage analysis and any new plans that would impact the drainage flow in any way. He said that on the flip side of that, it would have been nice to have that correspondence back so that they could address his concerns more directly. He said that he thinks that there is a letter from Paul Vlasich that suggests that he is in agreement with their drainage analysis. Mr. Boyd said that they met at Mr. Vlasich's office and came to the conclusion that they were in support of their findings. He said that based on the site walk they will be providing arborvitae or other shrubs to Mr. Fortune, the abutter across the street. He said that his concern with planting is that they are planted to be low enough and pushed far enough away from the right of way so that they would not obscure the line of sight and cause a safety issue.

Steve Stancel asked Mr. Boyd to explain why he feels the light situation coming off cars is not going to be a problem and can be handled with just shrubs.

Henry Boyd explained that the end of the road, as it ties into Washington Street, is actually the best position with regard to the direction of the lights. He said that the beginning of the road is substantially elevated from the existing edge of pavement at Washington St. Those cars that coming out will not be on grade as it exists now, they will be 3 feet lower. He said that there is about a 3-foot difference from the edge of the pavement to the banking at his house and then there is about another 2-foot change in elevation to the bottom of the windowsill so you have about a 5 foot vertical change. He said that the lights will be about 18 inches off the ground, but they will be pointed directly into the banking. He said that there would be some light and that is why they suggested the plantings at Mr. Fortune's request. His only concern is they don't want to have them obscure anything for safety reasons. What light pollution there is won't be from a direct light beam and he believes that these shrubs will mitigate that.

Steve Stancel asked about the abutters concern with the cars coming down the road.

Henry Boyd stated that end of the road is not the worst spot, the worst spot is probably around station 250 and up to about station 150. For about 100 feet what is happening is the lights are tilting up and towards the window.

The public hearing was closed.

Steve Stancel stated that the Planning staff was not prepared to recommend approval this evening. During this past week the applicant has come a long way and has met with the City Engineer. He said that Paul Vlasich, the City Engineer, has been on top of the drainage issue from the very beginning. They have asked for several additional information points and analyses. Currently, they are in agreement with the drainage report, however, Paul Vlasich is meeting with Mr. Lundborn tomorrow morning and that's another reason that he would like to see this put off for two weeks. In addition, he has spoken with Mr. Price of NH DES, and he will have the wetlands and drainage report passed on to some of his people to review so we will have a somewhat independent review which, hopefully, will make Mr. Lundborn feel comfortable. His basic issue along with Engineering, is with the Taylor Road Extension and that Lot 14 is using that Taylor Road Extension for road frontage which means that it has to be built up front. Dover regs don't allow a street to come to a dead end, there has to be a cul-de-sac or at a minimum a hammerhead at the end, so additional work needs to take place. He said that he would also like to see the applicant get together with Mr. Fortune and attempt to work out a compromise prior to the final approval and if that can't take place, then Planning staff will have a recommendation for the Planning Board.

Tony McManus asked if the information from the State would be available in two weeks.

Steve Stancel stated that it is not unusual to conditionally approve a project pending receipt of the Site Specific. He said that he would like to hear from DES in regards to the drainage analysis if for nothing else than to back up the City Engineer's report.

Steve Stancel stated that he would like to get some feedback from the Planning Board. He said that it's the staff's feeling that it's going to require a waiver for the length of the cul-de-sac. Traditionally the staff has only supported waivers if there has been a potential outlet for extension of the road and that is why it is very important that the extension can work off this parcel because, if it can't from the staff perspective, we would not be recommending the waiver. We would just like to see if the Planning Board is on the same level with this regard.

Parks Christenbury said that he doesn't think that it is unreasonable to go on a couple more weeks to satisfy Mr. Lundborn's concerns. He said that we are going down a slippery slope if we start allowing these long extensions with no where to go. He felt that this needs two more weeks to work out some of the issues to the satisfaction of the DES and the issues with the extension.

David Landry still expressed concerns with regard to the length of the cul-de-sac.

Steve Stancel used the Moelleur subdivision as an example and said that the cul-de-sac had to be longer than 1000 feet to avoid a wetland so there are situations where an

extension is justified. It has been the policy that some type of future extension has to be created.

David Landry asked if the property to the north had any access to any road? He said that he has a problem because the Board spends a significant amount of time talking about residential growth and how to manage it. In this case we are going to give somebody that doesn't have access, access to a lot through this road, so that at some point they can build some houses. He felt that this was odd for a Planning Board that's close to being fixated on residential growth.

Steve Stancel said that there is managed growth and then there is good planning. Growth is going to occur on adjacent lots to this property so the objective is to continue this road. Maybe the Nadeau lot will get developed because of that, but that 50 foot easement will get continued on to the next property and instead of having several cul-de-sacs shooting off of Washington Street, we are going to have connectivity. That's the good planning part.

Tony McManus said that he has a problem with the number of lots and the number of problems that he sees with wetlands and drainage. He would, at this point, be reluctant to vote in favor of the waiver of the cul-de-sac even with expansion into the other property. It seems that we are asking for trouble if we are approving a subdivision where we have to tell the developer that this lot is so bad that he can't build a basement on it and it has to be a slab. He said that he knows that almost anything can be done with engineering but because it can be done doesn't mean that it should be done by a planning standpoint. He said that previously he suggested that the City approach the developer and suggest fewer units and a clustered development to leave some of the wetland areas open. From his point of view, the Board is not in business to maximize a developer's return on the land if the land won't support it. He said that it is his personal feeling that there are all kinds of problems with this development. He said that he has seen the area flooded year after year along with the yards on Washington St. He said that what we are doing is increasing the amount of water into that area. He said that to approve it presently, we are creating problems and we shouldn't be doing that as a Planning Board.

Peg Stevenson said that along the same vein, we seem to be seeing a lot of projects that are coming before us that are going to have a dramatic impact on the abutters. Given that, she said that the Board should be approaching developers to post a bond so that when these developments are completed and people's basements are flooding and lights are shining in their windows and they are feeling the full impact of the development, they are not the one stuck trying to remedy it. In all fairness, it seems that if the developer is going to create this problem for them, something should be there in place to mitigate it for the residents.

Steve Stancel stated that the concept is that if the plan is engineered and we do our job, that's not going to happen. He said that he has yet to see a legitimate screw up by this Board or the City Engineering Department from a previous subdivision plan. He said that we need to feel confident about that. Things change and there are fields across from

their houses and development will occur and we need to attempt to mitigate to the greatest extent possible the affects of the lights but it may not be possible to completely mitigate those lights and that he is not sure that that is reasonable.

Parks Christenbury stated that we are going down a slippery slope and he doesn't think that we can require developers to put up a bond. Where he lives on Cochecho St. is a perfect example. When he grew up there was nothing across the street but woods and now there is a real nice subdivision but now he has light pollution. He said that that is something that he has to live with and accept. We allow some development, and that development no matter where it is will impact somebody to some extent. We have to minimize it but we have to accept the fact that it will have an impact on somebody. He said that he agrees with Steve Stancel that the Planning Department has done an outstanding job. This is a perfect example, we are back again tonight on this project and everybody is willing to go back to the drawing board and make additional changes to minimize the impact. Tonight shows if nothing else, that the current process does work.

Frank Torr asked with regard to the Taylor Road Extension if this is a gratis situation to the Nadeau Trust. Do the Nadeaus have to buy into the extension, because in his knowledge the landlocked land was created by the Nadeaus. They subdivided and somehow landlocked the back portion.

Steve Stancel stated that until the Taylor Road Extension is actually accepted by the City, it doesn't become public. Nothing is going to occur on the Nadeau piece or any additional extension take place without contributing to this particular developer until such time as that road is turned over. He said that once the road is turned over then it does benefit Mr. Nadeau, however, it also does benefits the City in terms of allowing future extension. In taking a look at where the best location for that future extension is, that is the best location because of the topography and potential extensions in the future.

Frank Torr said that the bottom line is that it is not a free ride.

Steve Stancel said that it is only a free ride once the City accepts the street, which could be years down the road.

Frank Torr said that the present developer isn't going to ask for that to be developed. It will probably be done by the Nadeaus who will probably have buy that extension. That extension is still going to be owned by the present developer. Technically, he won't turn it over to the City if it lies as a vacant piece of land. He doesn't need to do that.

Steve Stance said that that is correct and if he were to hold off developing lot 14, he doesn't need road frontage, so that would just remain an easement until such time as that occurs.

Steve Stancel stated that they would have to provide additional easements to the next piece.

Tony McManus asked if there would be a provision for reimbursing this developer for at least a portion of the cost of the extension.

Frank Torr said that the cost of the property value has gained considerably. It's freeing up a piece of landlocked land generated by their own doing somewhere along the line.

Steve Stancel stated that the way it works is that the extension is still privately owned until such time as the City accepts it. Should Mr. Nadeau or anyone down the road want to develop their property, if this isn't constructed yet and accepted by the City, then they would have to negotiate with this developer for rights and probably if this developer were smart a percentage of his cost for infrastructure.

Steve Stancel stated that we have a similar situation with the subdivision next to Ezra Green because the road and utilities are not accepted by the City yet, so in order for him to develop the subdivision next door they are going to have to either buy in with this developer the cost for the infrastructure or wait for the time that it becomes city street, which could be years.

Beth Thompson made the motion to table
Frank seconded.

VOTE U/A

Henry Boyd said that the issue about the waiver is extremely important. He said that they are not extending this cul-de-sac to have more lots, the only reason is for the length of the road is because of the extreme wetlands crossing. He said there is 286 feet of road frontage and it's not to produce more lots. He said that he thinks that the Code clearly allows for the granting of that waiver.

C. Extension of approval for Southwest Equities, Plaza Drive and Webb Place.

In the Board packets there is a request from Southwest Equities for an extension of their approval for 30 days for their project on Plaza Drive and Webb Place. He said that last week they went before the Council for the approval of their 50 foot right-of-way extension .

Dennis Ciotti made the motion to approve.
David Landry seconded.

VOTE U/A

ITEM #6: New Business

a. Consideration and approval of a lot merger for Tod Trask, Map 33, lots 98 & 99, zoned R-12, located on Iona Avenue.

Beth Thompson made the motion to approve the Merger for Mr. Trask
Frank Torr seconded.
VOTE U/A

ITEM #7: Adjournment

Beth Thompson made the motion to adjourn.
Frank Torr seconded.
VOTE U/A