

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
Town of Auburn
Planning Board
PUBLIC HEARING
September 19, 2018**

Present: Ron Poltak, Chairman. Steve Grillo, Vice-Chairman. Michael Rolfe & Jeff Porter, Members. Tom LaCroix, Paula Marzloff & Jess Edwards, Alternates. Keith Leclair, Selectmen's Representative. Minutes recorded by Denise Royce.

Absent: No one.

Mr. Poltak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked the Board members to introduce themselves to everyone present tonight.

MINUTES

Mr. Porter moved to approve the minutes for August 15th, 2018 as written, Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. A vote was taken; all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

GENERAL BUSINESS

***Ara Tamzarian
Tanglewood Estates
Release of Tanglewood Drive
2-year Maintenance Surety***

Mr. Poltak began by saying that, the first item on the agenda is the release of surety and explained to the Board the letter from Mr. Tatem of Stantec stating that a site walk was conducted on August 21st and that everything that was recommended has been completed. Mr. Tatem has recommended the release of the 2-year maintenance surety being held by the Town of Auburn in the amount of \$13,164.48. With that said, Mr. Poltak is recommending that the Board release the surety based on the recommendation from Stantec.

Mr. Rolfe asked about the culvert that was all landscaped around it if it would be okay as it is. Mr. Tatem informed Mr. Rolfe that it was not a roadway construction issue and that Mrs. Rouleau-Cote has addressed that from the Building Department. Mr. Poltak also stated that it was not an issue with Mr. Tamarian. Mr. Rolfe explained that, he had driven by and that it was working but that there were no leaves in it now but once it fills with leaves that it would be a different story. Mr. Rolfe explained the issue to everyone that,

a homeowner after moving in has done serious site changes including grassing in the runoff areas and all of the like. It looks pretty but is very dysfunctional. The discussion ended and a motion to release the surety was made.

Mr. Grillo made a motion to recommend the release of the 2-year maintenance surety being held by the Town of Auburn in the amount of \$13,164.48 for Tanglewood Estates'/Tanglewood Drive (Matam), Station 0+00 to 17+80 (end). Mr. Porter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

***254 Rockingham Auburn, LLC
254 Rockingham Road, Tax Map 25, Lot 45
Major Site Plan Review
Zoned Industrial
(6,000 sq. ft. Industrial Building)***

Mr. Poltak began by saying that Ms. McCourt was present and turned the discussion over to Ms. McCourt. Mr. Poltak asked if there were any abutters present. It was noted that, Mr. Lacey was the only abutter present. Ms. McCourt asked Mr. Poltak how much detail did he want her to go into tonight. Mr. Poltak asked her, how deep did she want them to go relative to approvals tonight. Ms. McCourt asked if they wanted her to go through everything before they accept it. Mr. Poltak explained that Mr. Tatem has reviewed the proposal and asked Ms. McCourt to give the Board the concept and to address where they are after her discussions with Mr. Tatem and then following her presentation he will turn to abutters for comments and then to the Board.

Ms. McCourt began by explaining where the project is located which was 254 Rockingham Road. Ms. McCourt stated that the property was zoned Industrial and that previously existing on site was a residential home with a detached garage which has since been removed. Ms. McCourt pointed out that, prior to coming before the Planning Board that the project was taken before the Zoning Board of Adjustment by Joe Wichert for a Variance. The Zoning Board of Adjustment granted a Variance for them to be no closer than 40 feet from a wetland as a condition and that they go before the Planning Board process. Ms. McCourt went on to say that, to achieve that the building would be no closer than 40 feet from the wetland that they are proposing the building to be 10 feet from the easterly property line but they do meet the front setback. Ms. McCourt went on to say that, the proposal is for a 6,000 square foot building to house Erwin Precision which is now located in Manchester and are now looking to move to Auburn. Ms. McCourt pointed out that they took a lot that was used as residential but now would be conforming being used as Industrial. Ms. McCourt stated that it was a difficult site as it is very narrow. Ms. McCourt showed the Board members what the front of the building would look like and the location of parking, dumpster location and a turnaround for the fire truck. Ms. McCourt explained that she has met with the Fire Department and has gone through NFPA1 with

them and as long as the fire lane was within 150 feet of the corners of the building that she did not have to provide a turnaround inside which is why there is 20 feet of fire lane area. Ms. McCourt talked about the trash pickup and where the dumpster was location which was to the front of the property. Ms. McCourt talked about the one distance that was missing from the site plan was to the north western corner of the building which is 22.5 feet from the property line. Ms. McCourt went on to say that, since it was a 6,000 square foot building and would only be used as a machine shop that sprinklers were not required so they are just looking for a domestic use for the water system and they will go through Manchester Water Works to get that approval. The project has an on-site septic system which is located at the back of the property.

Ms. McCourt pointed out the detention pond/retention pond out front and pointed out the trees that would be planted out front as well as the other plantings and the stockade fence around the dumpster. Ms. McCourt indicated that there was a small retaining wall to the left of the building to allow access around the building. Ms. McCourt talked about the detention/retention pond and about the peak flow/outflow from the site and with the pitch and grading to be done that it would decrease the peak flow out to the road and also decreasing the volume out to the road. Ms. McCourt also mentioned that Stantec wanted the fire lane illuminated so they will add that in as well.

Ms. McCourt moved on to inform the Board that they are asking for two (2) waivers tonight and moved on to the first waiver request which was regarding the driveway, Section 10.08(3) of the site plan regulations which specifies that the slope away from the town roadway be at a grade of 2% for 70 feet from the edge of pavement which they are looking at a grade of 25 to be carried for 20 feet which transitions to 4.0%. Ms. McCourt pointed out that it is a tight site and the grading was extremely tight on it and that's why they are looking at this waiver.

Ms. McCourt went on to talk about the second waiver request which was regarding having a one-foot freeboard for the 100-year storm for the detention/retention pond and basically, it's 10 inches instead of one foot of which they just ran out of room to be able to get all the turnarounds in. Ms. McCourt again reiterated that it was a very tight site to work with and believed the difference was very minimal and given the restrictions of this site she believes it's warranted. Mr. Poltak asked Ms. McCourt to again explain what this waiver was for and Ms. McCourt reiterated what was said previously which can be found in our Subdivision Regulations under Article 10 – Stormwater Management, Section 10.07(9) and (37).

Next, Ms. McCourt went through Stantec's comments and commented on each one individually as follows:

GENERAL

#1 Ms. McCourt's been working with the Fire Department and will make sure that she gets a letter from the Fire Department and that they send one to Ms. Royce as well.

#2 Ms. McCourt explained that Stantec does not review municipal water supply designs and will obtain approval from Manchester Water Works.

#3 The hours of operation will be 7:00am until 4:30pm but sometimes they end up working a little bit later to finish something up. Mr. Poltak asked if it was 5 days a week. Mr. Erwin responded by saying that sometimes it's necessary to work a Saturday but that basically it would be 7:00am until 4:30pm Monday through Friday.

#4 With regard to the septic design plan that they would work with the Building Inspector and NHDES.

#5 Pertaining to the historic drainage issue existing along the frontage of the subject property and noted that there were drainage and icing problems and believed that they would be reducing the peak flow and reducing the volume going down to the road and this also goes with the waiver request as well.

#6 A truck turning template must be added to the plans and reiterated that they are working with the Fire Department and using NFPA1 believes that they do not need a turnaround for the fire truck as they do not meet the criteria.

COVER SHEET

#7 With regard to the cover sheet, they will need a signature location of which they will add it on.

#8 With regard to the acreage of the lot listed being different which is just a clerical error which will be corrected.

EXISTING CONDITIONS (2 of 8)

#9 Ms. McCourt explained that the existing septic system must be shown and with that turned this question over to Mr. Wichert for response. Mr. Wichert stated that they checked with DES and they did not have anything on file.

#10 Mr. Wichert also commented that they would label the abutting lots with the actual uses.

#11 Mr. Wichert pointed out the tree line shown at the northwest end of the property appears to be incorrectly shown will be corrected.

SITE PLAN (3 of 8)

#12 Ms. McCourt indicated that they would add the dimension from the northwest corner of the building to the closest property line which was 22.5 feet which they will add to the plan.

#13 Per building code, outdoor light fixtures will be added above the two exit doors.

#14 The concrete pad for the two western doors must be labeled and they will be added to the plan.

#15 Proposed granite bound must be shown at the southeast property corner will be added.

#16 Per the Zoning Ordinance, the 10-foot side setback needs to be determined by the Planning Board if acceptable.

#17 Considering this sheet will be recorded, the variances and waivers granted must be listed on the sheet and will be included on the plan.

#18 Stantec recommends that the dumpster pad be relocated to the end of the fire lane. Ms. McCourt stated that if the Planning Board wants the dumpster pad relocated to the end of the fire lane that they will relocate the dumpster.

GRADING SITE PLAN (4 of 8)

#19 Considering the paved area has little grade change, they will add that to the plan.

#20 A cut off swale should be included which will be added to the plan.

#21 Proposed grading should be revised to redirect the stormwater from flowing over the top of the proposed boulder retaining wall. Can make the change.

#22 Proposed spot grades at the bottom of the detention basin are not correct and must be revised and they can fix that on the plan.

#23 Utility pole relocation note should be revised to include a leader pointing to the pole to be removed. Can add the other leader.

#24 Driveway profile does not meet the minimum, commercial driveway grades, regulations and must be revised, or a waiver request submitted. Waiver request has been submitted.

#25 Note #2 under the Typical Pavement Section should be expanded to describe where the "Granular Backfill" is to be utilized. Can expand that note.

#26 Existing retaining wall, along the eastern property line, is showing significant signs of failure. Ms. McCourt answered by saying that, the major problem with this wall is that it is directly on the property line and a lot of it is located on the abutters property and if it does become a problem that they will address it at that time with the abutter.

LANDSCAPING & LIGHTING PLAN (5 of 8)

#27 Landscaping requirements. Ms. McCourt stated that it was a small area and has

included a few trees on the plan.

#28 The plan must be stamped by a licensed Landscape Architect. This is not a problem.

#29 Site lighting design must provide at least 0.2-foot candles of lighting. Ms. McCourt indicated that they can add the extra lighting to the side, turnaround and fire lane and will make sure that it meets all the requirements.

#32 Note to be added to the plans, specifying what hours of the day the lighting levels are to be reduced to "security lighting". Ms. McCourt and Mr. Erwin said they would do whatever's normal. Mr. Tatem commented that the regulations say one hour after they would close. The applicant was fine with that.

CONSTRUCTION DETAILS PLAN (7 & 8 of 8)

#34 Relative to the Detention Outlet Structure Detail. Ms. McCourt indicated that she has gone through these items with Mr. Tatem today.

#35 Retaining Wall Detail. Ms. McCourt indicated that she has gone through these items with Mr. Tatem today.

#36 Ms. McCourt stated that they would fix the fabric as specified.

#37 Light pole base detail. Ms. McCourt will fix this item.

#38 Bituminous Curb Detail. Ms. McCourt will fix this item.

#40 Driveway sight distance off the edge of the travel way. Ms. McCourt will fix this item and will do the sight line for AASHTO as it is not a problem.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT

Ms. McCourt pointed out that the stormwater calculations that she did not think there was any problems there and that she would work with Mr. Tatem with all of these items.

Ms. McCourt informed the Board that, this was all she had right now and turned the discussion back over to the Mr. Poltak, Chairman.

Mr. Poltak did not have anything to add at this time and asked Mr. Lacey, who is an abutter of the property being discussed tonight and asked him if he had anything to add. Mr. Lacey began by discussing the wall and that it's been there for about 50 years. Mr. Lacey went on to say that, he has no objection to what they are proposing but that he just doesn't want it to impact him. Mr. Lacey also pointed out that everyone that was around him was commercial and that he was basically the only residential house in that area. Mr. Lacey understands the regulations and understands that it's the Planning Board that

decides the setback in the Industrial zone and asked if the reason for the 10-foot setback was because they had no room. Mr. Poltak commented that, the lot is pretty tight. Mr. Lacey again reiterated that he has no objection but just wants to make sure that it doesn't impact him. Mr. Lacey talked about the area and the abutters property and how wet the area is and that his concern was with the 10-foot side setback. Mr. Erwin commented that with the side setback that they tried to be considerate of the neighbor and angled the building so it would not impact Mr. Lacey's backyard at all. Mr. Lacey asked if it was possible to put up a fence or something. Mr. Poltak said that they could discuss that. Mr. Edwards asked where the house was located and how close Mr. Lacey would be to the building. Mr. Lacey showed Mr. Edwards where his property was located and the location of the proposed building.

At this time, Mr. Poltak indicated that, he would like to turn this discussion over to the Board members and then he would have Mr. Tatem respond and that he would save his comments for last. Mr. Rolfe pointed out that, he had a problem with #5 on the list of comments from Stantec because he's been out there with the Road Agent and that something has to be done because there is a serious ice problem in that area every year. Mr. Rolfe stated that it comes off the wall and right into the road. Mr. Poltak wanted to reinforce what Mr. Rolfe was saying that, this has been an age-old problem since the beginning of that lot being occupied and it's going to be, from his perspective, a condition of approval that, Ms. McCourt, the applicant and Mr. Tatem, the Town of Auburn's Engineer and our Road Agent will have to get together and come to some resolve. The reason why they could not move on this in the past was because it was a grandfathered piece of property that was occupied residentially and is now changing to Industrial. The point is, the lot is tight and wet and that we need to keep the drainage off the street. Mr. Poltak pointed out that, the use that is proposed is a legitimate use of the property and we need to work on that drainage problem and would like to make it happen.

Mr. Rolfe stated that he may have an idea of where the septic system is on this piece of property and informed the owner and Ms. McCourt that he believed that the septic system was placed in the left hand corner of the lot if you were looking at the lot from the street.

Also, Mr. Rolfe asked if they were planning on putting up a sign. Ms. McCourt pointed out that they were only looking at putting a sign on the building itself. Mr. Porter asked about the lighting design. Ms. McCourt showed the lighting design which was page 5 of 8 and pointed out the location of the lights. Mr. Tatem asked what the height of the light fixture. Ms. McCourt stated that it was 12-feet.

Mr. Lacroix asked about the retaining wall. Ms. McCourt stated that it was right on the lot line. Mr. Wichert answered this question by saying that, the wall kind a bows out onto our property and believes that the wall is on the abutter's property.

Mrs. Marzloff asked Ms. McCourt to add a tax map locus to the plan as well. Ms. McCourt acknowledged what Mrs. Marzloff was asking. Mrs. Marzloff also mentioned that the southeast corner of the property does not show any monumentation. Ms. McCourt indicated that Mr. Wichert did not find one. Mrs. Marzloff suggested that they put one in.

Mr. Wichert commented that, typically they do not show setting lot corners on a site plan and believed it was only when creating a subdivision. Mr. Tatem pointed out that Ms. McCourt stated that they would set it during her presentation earlier. Mr. Wichert understood and agreed. Mrs. Marzloff talked about the water runoff and that Ms. McCourt has stated that they would be decreasing water runoff but also believed that something else needs to be done because the water runoff in that area and there's no place for the water to go. Mr. Rolfe agreed and added that the road is taking a beating.

Mr. Poltak asked if there were any further questions for the Board members at this point. Mr. Grillo suggested sending the waiver request for the detention pond over for review with Stantec. Mr. Tatem discussed the detention/retention pond with Ms. McCourt and indicated that, if all of the items when he does the review for the revised drainage works that he did not have an issue with 10 inches versus 12 inches as the state only requires 6 inches. Mr. Tatem believed the towns regulations was a little more conservative than the state and it's a small site and a very small detention pond. Mr. Poltak understood.

Mr. Grillo indicated that it would be the same thing on the driveway waiver that is being asked. Mr. Tatem stated that he would not grant that driveway waiver. He would recommend the waiver to the requirement because the commercial driveway requirement is designed for a tractor trailer truck. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the waiver request. Mr. Grillo thanked Mr. Tatem for his response.

Mr. Poltak asked Mr. Tatem that, from an engineering perspective, how far would be a reasonable amount to extend the side yard setback to 10 feet or anything other than 10 feet. Mr. Tatem pointed out that there was a force main under there and typically is 4 feet so it does not freeze and believed by having a building right there at 10 feet would be difficult to get an excavator out there. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Poltak asked Ms. McCourt to react to what Mr. Tatem had said. Ms. McCourt began by saying that, her problem with that is that, she either has to reduce the size of the building or go back to the Zoning Board of Adjustment because the ZBA granted relief to be no closer than 40 feet from that side. Mr. Poltak asked if they were at 40 feet on that side of the building. Ms. McCourt said yes. Mr. Tatem also stated that, what he's seen in the past is some sort of wall or some sort of screening of which the Town of Auburn's regulations already requires some sort of screening for the parking lot so there could be some landscaping components that could satisfy the abutter.

Mr. Poltak asked about the building itself and if it would be a butler building. Mr. Erwin explained that the building would be wood framed with metal outside except or the front of the building would be vinyl sided to dress it up a bit. Mr. Poltak informed the Board that any time they wanted to add something to go right ahead. Mrs. Marzloff asked about the only sign that would be placed on the building and if it would be illuminated. Mr. Erwin said no. Mr. Poltak addressed Ms. McCourt that, he has not poled the Board yet but that he much rather have the dumpster on the side of the building rather than out front. The Board member all agreed. Ms. McCourt stated that, she did not have a problem with that.

Mr. Poltak wanted to paraphrase where he was coming from and then he was going to let everybody respond to it. With regard to the 10-foot side setback, if in fact that the abutter, Mr. Lacey was willing to have some screening done and the like associated therewith, that he believes it would be acceptable to the Board rather than trying to move the building with respect to wetlands. Mr. Poltak commented that with regard to the building itself and the construction of it that, they would not find anybody here that would object to what they are proposing to do and they can work that through in time with our site engineer. Mr. Poltak wanted to talk a little more about the existing retaining wall and asked Mr. Lacey who built the wall. Mr. Poltak believed it may have been his uncle. Mr. Lacey believed it was Mr. Poltak's uncle as well and that he believed that the wall has been there for at least 55 years. A brief discussion ensued with regard to the retaining wall and the water flow over that wall. Mr. Wichert informed the Board that, at the angle the line was shot when he surveyed the property that, the wall was on Mr. Lacey's property. At this time, Mr. Poltak asked the Board members if they were okay with the 10-foot side setback if Mr. Lacey and the applicant can come up with the appropriate screening. Mr. Lacey commented that he just wants something that is appropriate.

Mr. Poltak moved on to discuss the landscaping and the fact that it's only 6 trees so he is requesting a landscaping plan for the front and one to the side that will provide screening. Mr. Poltak indicated that the biggest issue of all is going to be water, drainage and runoff and that there was no way that they would move forward with final approval until there is an adequate drainage plan in place pursuant to what both, you the applicant and we, the Board members understand that there is a lingering water issue on that site. With that said, Mr. Poltak wanted to turn back to the Board to see if they want to take up the two (2) waivers and if they want to put any further conditions to the conditions of approval. Mr. Poltak wanted the applicant to leave tonight knowing that this is an approvable project but that we have some work to do.

Mr. Tatem informed the Board that, before they act on the waivers that they should accept the application as complete first and then deal with the waivers. Mr. Poltak understood. Mr. Rolfe asked Mr. Tatem about the driveway and what he would consider as appropriate for the driveway. Mr. Tatem talked about the waivers and a brief discussion ensued about drainage.

Mr. Poltak asked for a motion to accept the application.

Mr. Grillo made a motion to accept the application for Major Site Plan Review for Tax Map 25, Lot 45, 254 Rockingham Road. Mr. Leclair seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Grillo asked about the two (2) waivers. Mr. Poltak indicated that he would only be willing to take up the detention pond waiver. Mr. Tatem suggested that, if they were not going to take up both waivers that he would suggest that they hold off on both waivers as there may be some changes and if changes are made to one waiver that may affect the other waiver. Ms. McCourt also agreed. With that said, Mr. Poltak indicated that he was hesitant to give conditional approval tonight because he did not believe we were there yet. Mr. Poltak explained where the Board was and went on to state that, the two (2)

major issues from his perspective was the drainage and the combination of retaining the 10-foot setback which was screening which tied into a landscaping plan. With that in mind, Mr. Poltak suggested that they continue the hearing until such time that the applicant and our engineer have resolved the drainage and that our engineer and the abutter, Mr. Lacey have resolved the screening. Mr. Erwin was concerned that they had to wait another month. Mr. Poltak stated that, if they could get it done in two (2) weeks that they could come back in two (2) weeks. The Board informed the applicant that the Planning Board meets twice a month which was the first and third Wednesday of the month. Mr. Erwin indicated that, he would like to get the foundation in the ground sooner rather than later. Mr. Tatem also added that, the applicant could consider doing stuff on his property to make the abutter happy with regard to landscaping and screening.

Mr. Tatem made a few suggestions to the applicant and his engineer to double check with the Fire Department to make sure they could turn around if they were to put the dumpster by the side of the building. Also, when they come back in that they should have a landscape plan. Ms. McCourt said yes and asked Mr. Poltak exactly what he was looking for. Mr. Poltak talked about the previous project and how that plan was not acceptable and wants to make sure that this one was adequate.

Mr. Grillo made a motion to continue the Public Hearing until October 3, 2018 for Tax Map 25, Lot 45, 254 Rockingham Road. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. A vote was taken, all were in favor, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lacey asked for a copy of the proposed plan and a copy was given to him.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Poltak had a few things he wanted to discuss with the Board members tonight and started to say that, the Master Plan is now complete and wanted to get an idea from the Board members of what direction they wanted to take. Mr. Poltak informed the Board members that he would be going before the Budget Committee with the budget for 2019. Mr. Poltak went over a number of areas that they've talked about and wanted the Board members to prioritize them in the order of most important. The list is as follows:

1. Village District – and the elimination of the Village District.
2. 55+ Housing – how they would accommodate the needs of many of the residents.
3. Water Resource Protection Ordinance – regarding the water resources in our town.
4. Architectural Design for Commercial and Industrial Buildings.
5. Landscaping Plan – Landscape Architect - Commercial and Industrial Buildings.

Mr. Poltak went on to point out a few areas within the Subdivision Regulations and the list is as follows:

1. Staging Areas – No staging areas at the beginning of roads.
2. Lighting Standards – Lighting plans for Commercial and Industrial.

Mr. Poltak talked about the condominium units and now having to have the minimum acreage for the number of units. Mr. Poltak talked about the cost in having someone prepare a condominium Regulation. With all this in mind, Mr. Poltak asked the Board members where they wanted to go from here and what the Board's priorities are with each area above.

Mr. Lyford and Mr. Lamontagne were present tonight to listen in on the meeting to here what the Board had to say. Mr. Lamontagne began by saying that, they own 118 acres here in Auburn and another 240 acres in Londonderry that is currently a sand and gravel pit called Brook Hollow. Basically, what they are looking for is input from the Board members. Discussion ensued with regard to development of this property with the Board members. This right now was just for discussion purposes only. Mr. Poltak commented that the Board's discussions to date was that, they should be more receptive of the concept of providing elderly housing in the community and the issue is, how do we go about it.

With that said, Mr. Poltak stated that, what he wants to do on October 3rd is to settle on the two (2) directions that he is going to work on getting the money. Mr. Poltak wanted to get the consensus of the Board of where they wanted to go. Discussion ensued with regard to 55+ housing.

A brief discussion ensued with regard to a solar ordinance and the Board members believed that they could touch this one. Mr. Poltak asked about eliminating the Village District and converting it back to 2 acres. The Board all agreed. The Board members moved on to discuss putting 55+ community and mixed used areas at the end of the by-pass.

In conclusion, Mr. Poltak indicated that \$10,000 was budgeted and therefore what they have decided by straw man proposal to come to a tentative agreement that inclusion in their priorities is already 55+ housing community with a multiuse footnote to it as well. Mr. Poltak explained that Mr. Porter was talking about placing these communities where water and sewer would be available.

Mr. Poltak reiterated that they would be looking at the following:

- Village District - we're going to get it to 2 acres
- Solar – don't think we can touch that
- Landscaping & Staging – reinforcing our regulations in that regard

What's left is the following:

- Water Resource Protection
- Sign Ordinance
- Architect & Building Standards
- Affordable Housing or Multiuse Housing
- Lighting Ordinance

Mr. Poltak wanted the Board members to think about anything that they may have missed. Mr. Poltak believed the priorities are as follows:

- Landscaping & Staging
- 55+ Housing Community
- Village District change from 1 acre to 2 acres
- Multiuse consideration

ADJOURN

Mr. Porter moved to adjourn the Hearing. Mr. Rolfe seconded the motion. All were in favor, the motion passed unanimously and the meeting stood adjourned at 9:15p.m.

The next Planning Board meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 3rd, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Hall, 47 Chester Road unless otherwise noted.