

APPROVED
TOWN OF PELHAM
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
January 23, 2014

The Chairman Peter McNamara called the meeting to order at approximately 7pm.

Mr. McNamara called roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paddy Culbert, Jason Croteau, Selectmen Representative Robert Haverty, Alternate Mike Sherman, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Paul Dadak, Tim Doherty, Alternate Joseph Passamonte

Mr. McNamara appointed Mr. Sherman to vote in Mr. Doherty's absence.

OLD BUSINESS

PB Case #PL2013-00026

Map 14 Lot 3-81 - 61A NASHUA ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC c/o Robert Peterson – 61A Nashua Road – Applicant is seeking Site Plan Review from the Planning Board to permit the construction of a proposed 40-unit Senior Housing Development.

Mr. McNamara reminded the Board that a joint meeting with the Zoning Board of Adjustment during which the Zoning Board denied the variance request. Subsequently, there was a rehearing conducted with the Zoning Board and the variance request has been approved (Case #ZO2013-00028). The applicant has now come before the Planning Board seeking Site Plan review.

Mr. Gowan commented although the Board may have accepted the plan for consideration as part of the joint hearing, he suggested it may be appropriate to accept the plan for consideration at the present meeting.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To accept the plan for consideration.

VOTE: (5-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Croteau arrived.

Mr. Karl Dubay of Dubay Group, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the proposal. Also present was Bob Peterson property owner of Map 14 Lot 3-81 located at 61A Nashua Road. Mr. Dubay said the development (Maglio Village) would be an elderly development with approximately 40-detached two-bedroom cottages situated on over ten acres. The project would have water service from the street and on-site septic. A layout of the site plan was displayed for the viewing. Also displayed was a representation of the small cottages. Each cottage will have American Disability Act ('ADA') accessibility or adaptability as well as a garage (either single or double-width door). Mr. Dubay said they heard the Board's comments from the previous meeting and would integrate those comments into the

plan. Some of those comments were in regard to landscaping, buffering, spacing between the units etc. Each unit will have its own driveway and pervious pavers. They are working with Steve Keach (of Keach Nordstrom – Board’s engineering review firm) with respect to the overall drainage package and design. That design will be a hybrid by having all the drainage go into the ground and do a full recharge. The development will have a private road with sidewalk allocation. Mr. Dubay recalled the Board questioning how the units behaved in terms of access, the main entrance and how the living areas worked. In response he said he was working with Mr. Peterson to keep the units as elderly performance friendly as possible. The project will be privately managed.

Mr. Montbleau asked Mr. Dubay to better explain the proposed drainage. Mr. Dubay explained with the curved topography and center road feature extending into two cul-de-sacs, they were reviewing pervious pavers for the driveways and regular pavement for the road. They were working with a landscape designer to create a landscape/hardscape system for both sides of the road that would absorb water and get it into the ground. The proposal was for an eco-friendly mixture of river rock and higher end landscape that would accept the drainage water. This type of system was used in resort-style developments that wanted a higher end look versus having grass and catch basins. Mr. Dubay said he and Mr. Peterson were currently working on the floor plans and accessibility aspects of the project to ensure they meet the ADA criteria and have the appropriate bedroom / main living area concept package. The target market is fifty-five years of age and older; specifically for the very active age group. He commented that they were finishing up on two similar projects in neighboring towns and their phones had been ringing; people liked the proposed form of ownership.

Mr. Dubay told the Board they would be working with Mr. Gowan and Mr. Keach to come back with a more detailed plan.

Mr. Montbleau said he wasn’t privy to the information from the Zoning Board and questioned their reasons for granting the variance for building separation. Mr. Gowan said the applicant was originally denied the variance and requested a rehearing. That rehearing was granted and the Zoning Board granted the applicant’s variance request. He said the applicant was allowed to have a 20-foot separation between structures. Mr. Montbleau asked what conditions changed to make the Zoning Board vote differently from the first hearing. Mr. McNamara noted he wasn’t present for the Zoning Board hearing, but had reviewed the meeting minutes. He said the applicant presented further evidence, such as diminution of surrounding property values. There were three or four letters submitted by realtors, bankers etc. who suggested that the proposed form of development was much more salable and be filled up quicker than what was currently allowed in the Town’s Zoning. He believed there was also further development of the hardship criteria. It was the judgment of the Board members present for the meeting that the conditions had been met. Mr. Montbleau recalled the Zoning Board having an initial problem with the building separation, but didn’t have that problem when voting. Mr. McNamara said the applicant was seeking a variance from the required 30-foot separation and at the second meeting the Zoning Board felt the variance criteria had been met. Mr. Gowan added that the rehearing of the Zoning Board was considered de novo; a new hearing with a new application. He said any former opinions couldn’t matter. Mr. Dubay commented from a planning standpoint, they could have had duplexes on site with 30ft density. He believed the decision was made also for planning and what would look and perform best on the parcel other than a duplex community. He said in having the de novo hearing, they covered all aspects more thoroughly by submitting more information.

Mr. Dubay believed the Board had a warrant article that would be considered by voters that was in line with the proposal (separation of structures). Mr. McNamara said the Planning Board recommended a couple changes to those articles. At this time they were required to follow the existing rules. Based on the Site Plan Regulations, the Board could address specific items about the plan. Mr. McNamara said if there were concerns it would be important to tell the applicant so they could discuss those concerns with Mr. Gowan and/or Mr. Keach. Mr. Gowan noted that the Subdivision Regulations covered senior housing, not the Site Plan Regulations.

Mr. Culbert asked where Mr. Dubay's other subdivisions were located. Mr. Dubay said there was a similar project being done in Salem, NH that contained a lot of wetlands and wetland buffers. Mr. Culbert read a news article that indicated the project was located on a half-acre parcel. Mr. Dubay said the density was the same with a 20-foot separation between the forty-six units. He noted that the units were bigger and the overall size of the parcel was approximately twenty-seven acres but taken up with wetlands. Mr. Culbert asked if it would be improper for him to ask Salem to see the subdivision. Mr. Dubay said he would give the Board a copy of the plans. He said they also had a similar project in Methuen, MA. He told the Board that there is a State planning package that spoke about the guidelines for villages that contained aspects such as what was being presented to the Board. He said he provided more information on the project and would be happy to share that with the Board and Mr. Gowan. Mr. Culbert said he would like the names/types of each building labeled on the plan. Mr. Peterson said trying to identify a particular building to a particular lot would be difficult since they may be built to the buyer's specifications. He said the plan showed the type of building that could be located based on the size of the footprint. Mr. Culbert didn't want a group of identical buildings. He asked if any gazebos were being proposed. Mr. Peterson said they were seeking input from the Board regarding what amenities they may want. He understood that the Regulations required amenities that were conducive to the project. He said they were open to a discussion. Mr. Culbert said he would like to see a club house, but didn't feel it would fit. Mr. Peterson said a club house might not ever get used. He was also trying to keep condo fees down, and felt a gazebo may be a nice addition. Mr. Culbert asked if the proposed homes would still be upscale homes. Mr. Peterson answered yes; they were trying to create something that would target a different clientele. Mr. Culbert said he would like to see to see gazebos or a club house. Mr. Peterson felt gazebos would be a good fit for the development.

Mr. Culbert questioned if there would be sidewalks. Mr. Dubay said they would be trying a new type of pavement that had grindings on it. He said a similar material was used at a development in Hudson. He would like to discuss the options with Mr. Gowan and Mr. Keach. Initially the development didn't have sidewalks or any walkway allocation and they requested a variance for such; however, since the joint meeting between the Board and the Zoning Board, the applicant withdrew the variance and understood they would integrate something. Mr. Peterson said they were widening the roadway and creating a designated sidewalk area that would run along one side of the road.

Mr. Montbleau wanted to know the required road width. Mr. Dubay said they would work with Mr. Gowan, Mr. Keach and the Fire Department for the actual lane width allocations. He promised the Boards that they would meet National Fire Protection Association ('NFPA') criteria. He said they had SFC (fire protection engineer) review the plan. They were working on the road width component in an effort to reduce the amount of pavement wherever possible, but still have everything comply with the regulations and codes. Mr. Montbleau believed the regulations call for a road width to be 24ft. Mr. Gowan stated that the Board had the ability, and regularly waived the road width requirement. He noted that the proposed road wouldn't ever be a Town road; it would be a private drive. He couldn't recall any road within a senior project exceeding a 20ft.-22ft width. Mr. Montbleau confirmed there were forty units being proposed. Mr. Dubay answered yes. Each unit would have a garage and the ability to have two additional vehicles park in front. Each parking area would be designated to a specific building to reduce pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Montbleau said there were forty units proposed in a relatively small space. The Boards voiced concern during the joint meeting about the building separation, which would have ended in a reduction of units had the regulations been followed. He said the new proposal would allow for parking on the street. The concern was having vehicles park on a reduced width street which would make it extremely difficult for first responders to access homes in the event of an

emergency. Mr. Dubay noted that the requirement was for the units to each have two parking spaces; they were proposing three spaces at the units. Mr. Peterson said the units would have a one or two car garage along with a wide width driveway with pavers to accommodate the additional parking. Mr. Montbleau raised the concern of vehicles parking in the walkway area during certain times during a year that families typically gathered. This would create a safety concern for pedestrians.

Mr. McNamara invited Mr. Keach to come forward and comment on the plan as a whole.

Mr. Keach came forward and provided comments to the Board. He said he was introduced to the proposal last fall through a discussion with the engineer, developer and Mr. Gowan. From that time the plan went on hiatus to go through the Zoning Board process. He stated that the current proposal was a slightly different iteration and was a bit more curved and linear. The thing that caught his eye was the fact that the lot was a decent piece of land in terms of terrain and quality of soils. He spoke about the soils character, which was well drained. When he first saw the project of the apparent density he questioned how it would be drained. Now that he's seen the quality of soils he felt the drainage as it was continuing to be developed would work well at the location. The test pit data showed there was ample depth to bedrock. Mr. Keach told the Board that he felt the proposed low impact development technique would work. He said one of the approaches was to minimize impervious surfaces. He encouraged Mr. Dubay to review capturing the water runoff of the roof buildings and disposing of it in the vicinity of each unit. He believed this would be taken further as the detail of the design developed. With regard to the impervious pavers Mr. Keach said he had known Mr. Dubay for approximately fifteen years and was familiar with work he'd done in Windham using impervious pavers that had been successful. He noted he hadn't seen details yet for the proposed plan, but looked forward to reviewing them.

Mr. Keach explained to the Board that each unit location had a building envelope that was sized to accommodate any one of the building designs. He said in a compact development there were some micro-grading around the units that had to work correctly from unit to unit for purposes of access and storm water control etc. He believed this would be a challenge for Mr. Dubay because they didn't know which unit would end up in each footprint. Mr. Keach felt Mr. Montbleau raised a good point relative to fire lanes, which the Town's Highway Safety Committee may discuss. He said the panel design was to control storm water management. He encouraged the project to advance itself from the engineering standpoint and pursue the low impact design alternatives; based on the geology of the land he believed it was a candidate for such.

Mr. Keach said he attended the meeting to be able to hear the Board's dialog regarding the proposal and learn what they felt was important. He said the plan would be a bit different from the typical plan that comes through the process. He discussed the pervious pavement, which he felt was still in the Beta test mode in New Hampshire because there were no locations that those pavers had been laid in place (successfully) for over ten years. They had yet to see it last a life cycle. Mr. Keach expected the lifecycle of impervious pavement to be approximately 22-25 years at a minimum, but had little faith of it to remain impervious through that lifecycle. Because of the fact they will have infrastructure at the entrance of the development, he was convinced that the pour space wouldn't be impervious after the last house was built because of the amount of construction vehicles accessing the site with dirt/debris on their tires. Mr. Keach discouraged the development from travelling on the actual paved surface during construction because of the way the land slopes toward Nashua Road and a handful of privately owned

houses. He said if the impervious surface failed to work the drainage would end up exactly where it shouldn't be. Mr. Keach looked forward to watching the project unfold. He felt Mr. Dubay was the person to engineer the proposed development. He said the only thing different between the proposed development and civil engineering was the method of storm water management.

Mr. Keach said he developed a similar project in Merrimack approximately ten years ago that was in a bungalow style. That development also had similar density and intensity of development. He said there were times he drove through the development and found parking to be a little scant; they park on the street. Mr. Keach said as the proposed development progresses he didn't know if there would be an opportunity to create pockets of parking for one or two vehicles. Not having a 'magic' number per unit, but having an accommodation.

In terms of traffic impact on Nashua Road, Mr. McNamara questioned if some sort of traffic study was needed. At a minimum, Mr. Keach would like to see a trip generation memorandum. He said under the Institute of Transportation Engineers ('ITE') manual will have its own land use code. He doubted the volume of traffic generated would make a measurable difference, but he would like to see the numbers from the memorandum. He noted senior housing had approximately 60%-70% of what average single-family housing generated. He'd seen in other location as the population ages within the development, the a.m. ad p.m. traffic volumes diminish. He was sure Mr. Dubay would put realistic numbers together for the traffic count. The technical review committee will have the opportunity to review those numbers and reserve judgment whether or not they want to expand the scope. Mr. Dubay believed he understood what Mr. Keach wanted to review. He said they could draft a trip generator memo based on the population being between 'elderly' and an active population.

Mr. Montbleau asked if there was a standard number used for vehicle trips in similar developments. Mr. Keach replied there was number in the ITE; however the number was taken from data collected in other parts of the country. He said because of the nature of the development being active he believed in the early years of occupancy the trip numbers would probably be lower than what's listed in the ITE. He's suggesting that Mr. Dubay gather information from a comparable finished project (i.e. Salem, NH) and develop another rate. Mr. Dubay said there was current data being collected that they've used for other developments that seems to always push them into a higher trip number. He agreed that the ITE numbers were too low. Mr. Keach agreed.

Mr. Culbert questioned if the trip number could be decreased down from four trips per day. He said the project was labeled as age fifty-five and older; he didn't know many people that age who were retired. Mr. Dubay said that was Mr. Keach's point; there are possibly more trips that would be generated out of the development than the normal elderly development. Mr. Keach said the trip numbers would diminish over time. He was interested in having the Board understand what the trip generated traffic would be the day the last unit was sold. He felt the average range per unit at first would be 7-8 trips per day.

Mr. Gowan spoke about amenities and felt a clubhouse building would bring tremendous value. A clubhouse can accommodate a gathering area for a large number of the residents within the home owner's association. He believed unit #5 would be a good location for such given it was centrally located and could accommodate additional parking.

Mr. Culbert asked for the driveway length of unit #30. Mr. Dubay said the driveways would be at least 20ft. long, with a target of 25ft. in length. He said the driveway for unit #30 was one of the shorter lengths. He noted they had room to push that unit back and create a longer driveway. Mr. Culbert saw there were several units he believed should be pushed back. Mr. Dubay said they would look at the units; they had room to push them back and still meet setback criteria.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion for public input. There was no public input, written or otherwise.

Mr. Sherman questioned how many units would need to be eliminated if the applicant had to adhere to the 30ft. separation rule. Mr. Dubay believed it would have been approximately 12-13; however, they wouldn't have eliminated units, they would have proposed duplexes with a total of 44 units. He said they demonstrated reducing the number of units wouldn't have been viable because the cost of the infrastructure would have remained the same. Instead they would have come forward with a multi-family package. Mr. Peterson believed they would have been able to have 46 units if they constructed larger units. He preferred to have a different style development and noted with developments the cost numbers have to work.

Mr. Montbleau agreed with Mr. Gowan that consideration had to be given to including a recreation/meeting area. He said the development was categorized as 'elderly', but they usually go to assisted living. He felt those persons age 55 and over classify more as senior living; they're usually empty nesters who were seeking a scaled down version of how they previously lived in their homes. He commented that density was an issue. The residents needed an area to meet in or socialize in. He suggested having a passive recreation area for tennis, bocce etc. Mr. Peterson understood the suggestion but didn't feel he could build a structure that could accommodate 80 people within the development. In the past he built similar communities and when residents wanted to gather they did so at places such as the local library. He said he could build passive recreation such as a basketball court or gazebo. He didn't feel a clubhouse of that size could be accommodated in the development given that the building footprints were roughly 1600SF on the bottom floor. He heard what was being suggested but stated he was also trying to be practical. Mr. Montbleau replied he had been president of a condominium association that was approximately double the size of the propose development. They had a meeting area and recreation area within the complex. He said he may agree that an annual meeting would possibly be held off location, but felt having accommodations for passive recreation was important. He wasn't comfortable having the proposed infrastructure without giving people areas to 'stretch their legs'. Mr. Peterson said he would like the opportunity to work with Mr. Keach and Mr. Gowan to think 'outside the box' and return to the Board with some ideas.

Mr. Culbert said he would like gazebos or a meeting house. Mr. Peterson understood; he simply wanted to put the right amenities within the development in the correct location. He wasn't against building a clubhouse. He said he was trying to put himself in the thought process of someone that would reside in the community and envision what amenities they may prefer and utilize.

Mr. McNamara believed Mr. Peterson and Mr. Dubay had been reasonable with their proposal. He asked what timeline they envisioned before coming back in front of the Board. There was a brief discussion as to when the applicant could be date specified. Mr. Dubay believed they would be ready to return by March 17, 2014.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Culbert why he'd like the building pushed back. He felt a resident may want more space for a back yard. Mr. Culbert didn't want to have a 20ft. driveway for two cars to park. Mr. Peterson noted that the driveways would be wider than single vehicle spaces. Mr. Culbert asked him to do what he could because it was a safety issue. Mr. Dubay said he would measure the driveways, but believed most were 25ft. in length and had walkway isles. He said they would work with those that were a little tighter.

The plan was date specified to the March 17, 2014 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

PB Case #2014-00001

Map 35 Lot 6-117 - WAGSTAFF, Michael - 63 Bridge Street - Site Plan Review for a Change of Use to permit the sale of automobiles

Mr. McNamara read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present who asserted standing in the case, who did not have their name read, or who had difficulty with notification.

The applicant Michael Wagstaff came forward to discuss his proposal. He said he recently purchased the proposed, which for the past forty-two years had a repair garage and auto sales business. He planned to use the location for the same purpose.

Mr. Gowan provided the Board with background information regarding the businesses that had been conducted on site. He said he met with the applicant and the Building Inspector on site to provide a frank analysis of things that would have to be done to the structure. The applicant would be doing one thing at a time to make the property attractive. Mr. Gowan said he couldn't find any record or Planning Board decision regarding where vehicles are allowed to be displayed for sale. He said the Fire Department will have to review the site to ensure they have good access to the site. He felt the submitted sketch included the salient points needed for the Board. Mr. Gowan explained that the review wasn't an actual change of use, but he wanted the Board to have the opportunity to review the site and ask questions as they typically did with site plan review applications and to get to know the new property owner.

MOTION: (Culbert/Sherman) To accept the plan for consideration.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Wagstaff discussed his proposal with the Board. He planned to begin his operation at the first of the month. He's already spoken with Mr. Gowan, the Building Inspector and the Fire Chief about upgrades that were required before occupancy could occur. He told the Board he had already complied with those upgrades.

Mr. McNamara questioned how many cars would initially be displayed. Mr. Wagstaff said the plan showed thirty-two cars; he wasn't intending to have that number but didn't want to be limited. The hours of operation will be from 8am to 5pm on Monday thru Friday and possibly Saturday from 8am to noon. Mr. McNamara asked if there would be employees. Mr. Wagstaff said there may be a couple employees, but would start off slow.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Gowan if he knew what the previous scope of sales at the location had been. Mr. Gowan said there were no records that describe specifics. There was no previous Planning Board review. He recalled there had been a request to have a second car dealership that was denied, which was taken as evidence that the first one was present. It was his suggestion that the Board determine a maximum number of cars that would be accepted. Mr. Wagstaff was agreeable to whatever the Board stipulated and noted he would keep plenty of room for emergency apparatus to access the site.

Mr. Culbert understood that Mr. Wagstaff would be requesting a used car license and questioned how many vehicles he would be submitting it for. Mr. Gowan had never seen a specific number of cars listed on license requests. Mr. Culbert recalled when One Stop submitted their application they requested a license for fifty cars. As Zoning Administrator, Mr. Gowan signs off on new or reissues of auto permits etc. and didn't recall there being a stipulation for a number of cars. Mr. Croteau stated there was no number limit on a used car license with the State; it went along with local zoning. Mr. Gowan said the Planning Board could create a limit. He said the Town was very restrictive and worked closely with the State. They kept vehicles out of the road right-of-way, which by nature kept them back behind the business sign. This will ensure that the vehicle displays don't constrict the movement on the site. Mr. Montbleau said he would have to see the site to be able to determine a number of vehicles that could be displayed on the site. He asked if the area was paved. Mr. Gowan believed the area was a combination of hard pack and pavement.

Mr. Croteau asked Mr. Gowan how many vehicles would be allowed on the site if it was a business that would have associated parking. He wanted to know how many parking spots would be allowed per regulations for employees. Mr. Gowan said the number of parking spaces was dependent on the plan for the total property. In reviewing Town records, Mr. Wagstaff saw that the previous owner requested eighty cars and was told no; the previous owner then requested thirty-two vehicles and was approved that number. He said the site plan (and number of cars) given to the Board came from the previous owner's submission. He noted he would have a very small operation. Mr. Montbleau questioned when that original site plan was approved. Mr. Wagstaff didn't have a date.

Mr. McNamara asked what acreage the lot had. Mr. Wagstaff said he purchased two lots that abutted each other; the total acreage is 3.29 acres. Mr. Gowan questioned if the residential lot was separate from the proposed car lot. Mr. Wagstaff answered yes. Mr. Gowan confirmed that the residential lot would remain as such. Mr. Wagstaff answered yes. Mr. Sherman wanted to know if the repair shop would remain; if so if it would also have an inspection station. Mr. Wagstaff answered yes.

Mr. Montbleau questioned if Mr. Wagstaff was moving a business from another location. Mr. Wagstaff said he had a 2-man shop in Wilmington, MA; his help would be moving the shop from that location and eventually to Town. He said he'd been in business for approximately thirty-six years.

Mr. Culbert asked if there was an outcropping of ledge in front of the property. Mr. Wagstaff said the outcropping was farther up the road in front of the house. Mr. Gowan believed he was referring to the rock outcropping that often had an 'A' frame sign located on it. Mr. Culbert asked where the vehicles would be parked. Mr. Wagstaff said some would be parked on top of

the lot and some would be parked behind. He said the plan showed twelve vehicles in the front, but he didn't plan to have that number there. He believed he would have two or three in that area to draw customers in.

Mr. Culbert wanted to know what the landscaping would be. Mr. Wagstaff said he would have landscaping in time. Mr. Haverty felt the Board should keep landscaping requests in line with what the Regulations contained. He didn't want to place onerous requirements for landscaping specifics on someone starting a small business. Mr. Culbert asked Mr. Wagstaff to have plantings in the location of the rock outcropping near the front of the lot. Mr. Wagstaff said he planned to 'spruce' things up in time.

Mr. McNamara opened the discussion to public input. There was no public input, written or otherwise.

Mr. McNamara asked the Board if they would like place a limit on the number of vehicles. Mr. Montbleau felt the Board should place a stipulation for a reasonable number of vehicles. Mr. Haverty was familiar with the property and felt the Board could determine a vehicle count. Mr. Croteau suggested 20-25 vehicles. Mr. Wagstaff didn't plan on having a large number of vehicles, but would be agreeable to twenty five. The Board was in agreement.

The Board placed a stipulation for a maximum of twenty-five vehicles on the lot. Mr. Gowan clarified that the stipulation was for the number of vehicles being displayed for sale. There may be additional vehicles waiting for repair. Mr. Wagstaff told the Board he would not create an attractive nuisance. He said at his business in Wilmington they had at most three vehicles outside.

Mr. McNamara confirmed that the business hours would be 8am-5pm. Mr. Wagstaff said that was correct. Mr. McNamara asked if there would be any additional lighting on the site. Mr. Wagstaff said there was currently 24-hour lighting on the site. Mr. Gowan said any existing lighting could remain; if lighting is added it will need to be dark sky compliant. He said he could discuss lighting directly with him.

Mr. Montbleau wanted to know if any of the signage would be changed. Mr. Wagstaff told the Board he would keep the existing signage, except for changing the name.

MOTION: (Croteau/Montbleau) To approve the limited site plan review with the conditions as stipulated.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

ADMINISTRATIVE

Map 1 Lot 5-104 - Lawrence Corner Estates – Request for Bond Reduction

Mr. McNamara said the proposed bond reduction was discussed at the last meeting, but there were some questions regarding the calculations. Mr. Steve Chabot of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) made a recommendation to reduce the bond. There are two bonds, one for on-site work, the other is for off-site work.

The bond in place for on-site work is \$188,388.50. The recommended release is \$96,782.

The bond for off-site work is \$24,134. The recommended release is \$14,565.10

The recommended total release is: \$111,347.25. The amount to be retained is \$101,175.25.

MOTION: (Culbert/Montbleau) To approve a bond reduction of \$111,347.25.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S) – March 17, 2014

PB Case #PL2013-00026 - Map 14 Lot 3-81 - 61A NASHUA ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC c/o Robert Peterson – 61A Nashua Road

MINUTES

January 6, 2014 – deferred

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Croteau/Haverty) To adjourn the meeting.

VOTE: (6-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary