

**APPROVED**  
**TOWN OF PELHAM**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**April 21, 2014**

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

The Secretary Paul Dadak called roll:

PRESENT: Peter McNamara, Roger Montbleau, Paul Dadak, Paddy Culbert, Tim Doherty, Jason Croteau, Selectmen Representative Robert Haverty (was called away from the meeting prior to adjournment), Alternate Joseph Passamonte, Planning Director Jeff Gowan

ABSENT: Alternate Mike Sherman

**OLD BUSINESS**

**PB Case#PL2013-00026**

**Map 17 Lot 3-81 - 61ANASHUA ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC c/o Robert Peterson – 61A Nashua Road – Applicant is seeking Site Plan Review to permit to the construction of a proposed 40 Unit Senior Housing Development**

Mr. McNamara informed that the applicant's engineer requested a continuance to the Board's meeting of May 19, 2014. The plan was date specified to the May 19, 2014 meeting.

**PB Case#PL2014-00005**

**Map 17 Lot 12-180 - EAH REALTY TRUST – 956 Bridge Street – Proposed 8-Lot Conservation Subdivision and Seeking a Special Permit to construct a road through the Wetland Conservation District**

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the proposed subdivision and request for special permit. After the last meeting, Mr. Maynard told the Board that his client decided to rethink the subdivision plan. His client asked that the existing three-family dwelling remain. He realized any progress with this concept would technically require a variance to request relief on the size of the lot. Mr. Maynard said the property currently had a variance for a three-family and didn't find that there were any restrictions regarding the lot size; however, under the Town's Ordinance for multi-families, the lot wouldn't meet the requirements. Mr. Maynard said the applicant was looking to reduce the overall yield to a four lot conservation subdivision and retain the existing three-family dwelling on approximately 1.35 acres. A preliminary calculation was done to see how the parcel would appease the State septic and sewer loading regulations. Mr. Maynard believed the acreage was just about what would be necessary in order for it to stand alone according to State Regulations. Also, by reducing the number of lots the open space would be increased from approximately 4.3 acres to a little over 5 acres at the rear of the site. This would put the development at

approximately 50% open space. Mr. Maynard told the Board that the applicant would like to have private road access versus public road access and would therefore be requesting waivers for the dimensional standards. He said the next step would be to request zoning relief for the existing three-family dwelling and also to have discussions with the Fire Department regarding roadway width and turn-arounds.

Mr. Maynard explained that the proposed concept would reduce the overall road structure to approximately 500ft. to the cul-de-sac and there would be no Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') impacts associated with the project. He reiterated that the proposal would be reduced to a 4-lot conservation subdivision providing they could achieve relief through variance to maintain the existing 3-family dwelling.

Mr. McNamara read aloud an e-mail correspondence dated April 12, 2014 from Mr. Dadak (who is a member of the Conservation Commission) to Mr. Gowan indicating that a modified conceptual subdivision layout was presented to the Conservation Commission. The e-mail indicated that the modified plan was considered more favorable by the Conservation Commission as it would have little to no wetland or WCD affected, more open space, fewer lots and less impervious surface.

Mr. Gowan said Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) provided comment in response to the yield plan. Mr. Maynard told the Board they had seven lots associated with their yield plan. In the plan being presented, the applicant was seeking five lots. He noted they needed Zoning Board relief prior to proceeding. He asked for the Board's direction.

Mr. Culbert asked if the Zoning Board would need to hear the case. Mr. McNamara believed the applicant was trying to get a sense from the Board for which plan was preferred. Mr. Maynard said the yield plan was relevant for both because it contained more lots than was being requested in either of proposed plans. He told the Board that the applicant's preference was to move forward with the proposed five lots.

Mr. Doherty understood the applicant was looking to retain the existing house, and in the original plan they weren't. He wanted Mr. Maynard to understand if the existing house and parcel was included in the yield plan it would also need to be kept within the conservation subdivision and included in the house association. Mr. Maynard said the lot would to one extent, but it had its own driveway. He said the association could have exemptions as part of their document, such as the road maintenance since the existing parcel wouldn't utilize the road.

Mr. Culbert asked if Zoning Board approval was needed for the seven lots. Mr. Maynard answered no.

Mr. Gowan told the Board that there was adjacent land to the applicant's parcel on Ledge Road (Map 17 Lot 12-184) that it may be wise, in terms of interconnectivity, to require a right-of-way in a place where a road could eventually be built. He said it may not be practical, but it shouldn't be dismissed. Mr. Maynard said their intention was to make the access a private road/driveway situation. He said if a public right-of-way connection was made to a neighboring property there would have to be something in the association's documents that the developer (of the abutting parcel) would have to upgrade the connecting road to Town standards. He said that type of burden shouldn't be on the homeowners within the applicant's subdivision. Mr. Gowan said the

Board would have to weigh the possibility and potential value. He said it was worth considering. Mr. McNamara suggested finding out if the applicant would be going in front of the Zoning Board. Depending upon that outcome, the Board could revisit the topic. Mr. Maynard reiterated they were looking to have a private road and didn't feel it would be fair to have the four or five owners maintain it for a large number of lots past it. Mr. McNamara understood the concern and commented that the situation could be addressed in the association documents.

Mr. Doherty said the road might have to become a Town road. He said when the Board reviewed plans they had to make decisions when there were situations where connectivity outweighed having private roads. Mr. Maynard asked that the Board provide direction at this time whether they preferred a public or private road, rather than waiting until after he sought zoning relief. Mr. Doherty reviewed a portion of the Planning Board's Standards for Approval contained under Section 307-103,C. That section directs the Board to consider aspects of the surrounding area, such as transportation, access of emergency vehicles, and the capacity of nearby intersections and transportation corridors. Mr. Doherty felt the Board should discuss the situation prior to the applicant going in front of the Zoning board.

Mr. McNamara said he somewhat disagreed because the discussion was about a 'potential' development, not something in existence. He took the applicant's point of it not being fair for them to be burdened if the back lot was developed in the future, unless it could be addressed in the association documents for bringing the road up to public standards.

Mr. Culbert wanted to know the difference between private and public road construction. Mr. Gowan replied there was no difference except in width. He noted there was a big difference in cost between building a road 20ft. wide versus 26ft. wide.

The owner of the abutting parcel being discussed had a family name of Croteau. Mr. Gowan told the Board that it was not Mr. Croteau that suggested a discussion regarding connection; it was another Board member that brought it forward.

Mr. McNamara felt the Board may be putting the cart before the horse without knowing if the applicant will receive variance relief from the Zoning Board. Mr. Maynard said if he knew the road had to be built to Town standard (i.e. for connectivity and full width) he wouldn't be doing his client justice.

Mr. McNamara asked for the Board's input. He said if the Zoning board grants the request for a five-lot subdivision it would be in effect a reduced roadway, less impervious surface, no disruption to the wetland or WCD.

Mr. Croteau recalled the Board granting waivers for road width. Mr. Gowan recalled the Board granting waivers for road widths of 20ft. and 22ft. He said he was in the process of setting up a Highway Safety Committee ('HSC') meeting for Mr. Maynard to hear feedback. He said unless the Board had a strong feeling about the interconnectivity issue, it would be important to iron out the Zoning question.

Mr. Culbert said if the only difference was in the road width, he would be amenable to allow a reduction, but not to 20ft.

In reviewing he proposal, Mr. Doherty didn't see that all the lots had access to the open space, which would make the abutting parcel (Map 17 Lot 12-184) closed off to connectivity. He said if the Zoning Board was to grant a variance off the plan presented, the future connectivity and open space access for all the lots would be gone. Mr. Maynard noted they had left a provision for an existing trail system (through lot 4), which is how the rear of the property had been accessed. Mr. Doherty asked what possibility there was to have interconnectivity with the abutting parcel. Mr. Maynard said there would probably be a paper right-of-way that would be approximately 600ft-700ft. long that would cross the wetland to get to the property. He said they would only build as much road as was needed to obtain what they had. He explained how the road would possibly be situated.

Mr. McNamara said the proposed seemed like a good plan that was less intense than the first submission.

Mr. Maynard asked that the Board date specify the plan for approximately two months out, which would allow him to go through the zoning process.

Mr. Culbert said he was in favor of interconnectivity whenever possible. Mr. Doherty said he reviewed the Wellesley Drive area during and after the last rain event to review the swales between the lots that the abutters had spoken about. He said one was flowing to the point that it couldn't take any additional water there were several others could perhaps. He wanted the Board members to know a less intense impact would be good for the parcel.

Mr. McNamara opened discussion for public input. He told the audience anyone within 200ft. of the parcel would receive notification of the Zoning Board meeting.

The plan was date specified to June 16, 2014.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **PB Case#2014-00007**

#### **Map 8 Lot 9-100 - BREVA PROPERTIES – 319 Windham Road – Proposed 2-Lot Subdivision**

Mr. Dadak 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.

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the proposed subdivision. He told the Board that the parcel contained approximately nine acres and had an existing single-family dwelling on the property. He said they had gone in front of the Zoning Board to allow a duplex lot with approximately 80ft. of frontage. All wetlands have been flagged on site. The State of New Hampshire has approved the subdivision. Upon request of the Department of Transportation an application has been submitted to relocate the existing house driveway to provide better sight distance. Test pits were conducted with the Town's Deputy Health Officer throughout the site and were found to be good. Mr. Maynard said they were proposing to leave 2.7 acres with the existing house. The remaining 6.12 acres would be with the duplex lot. He ended by telling the Board they agreed with the Zoning Board's condition of having no further subdivision.

Mr. Gowan said the matter was complete for acceptance and recommended the Board do so.

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

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. McNamara opened the hearing to public input.

Mr. Joel Hone, 295 Windham Road told the Board there was a creek behind the property that drained in the spring. He asked if it would remain open, or if it would be destroyed or covered up. He was concerned about having additional water on his lot or the abutter's lot if that creek was destroyed. Mr. Maynard said the creek was identified as a wetland that bisected the lot and had a 50ft. Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') associated with it. They had no work proposed at the rear of the property where the creek was located. Mr. Gowan showed Mr. Hone a copy of the plan and pointed out the location of the creek. Mr. McNamara said the creek seemed to be several hundred feet away from the home.

Mr. Dadak saw that Mr. Gowan had made note that if the subdivision was approved WCD signs will be installed along the edge of the wetland. He said it wouldn't guarantee that people wouldn't go in, but at least there would be a warning that they shouldn't be in there. Mr. Gowan said even if the Board didn't make it a condition, any building permit for a lot with a WCD had to show him evidence that the signs had been erected as part of that building permit approval.

Mr. Culbert asked if there was problem sight distance. Mr. Maynard said there wouldn't be once the existing driveway was relocated as proposed in the project.

Mr. Doherty asked about the 30ft. no cut buffer. Mr. Maynard said that buffer was voluntary. The abutting fence was over the lot line and they felt it would be prudent to leave it as a no-disturb area so any future purchases of the applicant's property would know that it was there.

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Doherty) To approve the subdivision.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**PB Case#2014-00008**

**Map 41 Lot 10-279 - ACE DISCOUNT CIGARETTES - 12 Tiger Avenue – Site Plan review for change of use from a craft shop to a cigarette/convenience store**

Mr. Dadak 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.

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the site plan. He said the applicant was in the process of purchasing the property being proposed, which contains a single-family dwelling and a structure at the front of the property that at one time was a craft store. He noted that Ace Discount Cigarettes was currently in the plaza directly to the north of the location. As part of the project the applicant has plans to redevelop the front of the property. Artist renderings were shown to the Board. As part of the proposal

they were requesting a waiver to reduce the number of parking spaces from the required 14, down to 9 as shown on the plan.

**MOTION:** (Croteau/Dadak) To accept the plan for consideration.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. McNamara read aloud the waiver request to Section 248-32 regarding the number of required parking spaces.

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Dadak) To accept, for consideration, the waiver request to Section 248:32 to reduce the required parking spaces from 14 down to 9.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty didn't see an area for a dumpster on the plan. Mr. Maynard said it didn't warrant enough to have a full-size dumpster.

Mr. Culbert stated that the plan was void of landscaping. Mr. Maynard explained that he frontage of the property consisted of traffic islands that were located within the State's right-of-way. He said this limited the space where landscaping could be installed in that area. He showed that the site had quite a bit of landscaping along the fence line and existing trees behind the building.

Mr. McNamara confirmed that the artist rendition of the building provided to the Board was an accurate representation of how it would be rebuilt by the applicant. Mr. Maynard answered in the affirmative. Mr. McNamara incorporated the rendition and Mr. Maynard's acknowledgement into the record.

Mr. Doherty saw that there would be a farmer's porch. Mr. Maynard said the building currently had a farmer's porch. He said the problem with the building was it had a very low ceiling. The applicant was looking to re-build that aspect and add height together with the farmer porch design. Mr. Doherty felt doing so would be a big improvement over how the building currently looked. Mr. Maynard said the applicant had given a lot of consideration to the building's appearance. He said there may be small adjustments, such as the door or window placement or their size etc. Mr. Gowan confirmed there would be no increase in the building footprint. Mr. Maynard said there would be no increase in the footprint.

With regard to parking, Mr. Gowan said he had observed the business over many years and concurred with the waiver request to reduce the number of required parking spaces. He said the nature of the business was a quick stop. Mr. Maynard said the store sold mostly beer, soda, cigarettes and some convenient store items.

Mr. McNamara asked if there would be any chairs, tables or booths inside the store. Mr. Maynard answered no. Mr. McNamara asked for the operating hours. The store owner came forward and told the Board that his hours of operation would be from 8am to 8pm, seven days per week. Mr. McNamara questioned if there would be any change in lighting on the property. Mr. Maynard said nothing would change from currently exists. He said there were a couple

flood lights on the building and there would be down lighting underneath the covered porch to illuminate the entrance. Mr. McNamara asked for an explanation of the bathroom being plumbed into the existing septic. Mr. Maynard said there was an existing septic and well on the property that was primarily tied to the existing three-bedroom single-family dwelling. He said the proposed project would only need one bathroom (in the building) for occupants who work the store. In this type of situation they would plumb it to a tank and pump it. He said as a condition for approval they could do a septic design to show that it meets the State requirements for a replacement system. Mr. Maynard commented that the existing system appeared to be functioning properly, so they wouldn't want to replace it until such time that it failed.

Mr. Doherty pointed out that Note #11 on the plan indicated the lighting would be Dark Sky compliant. He saw there were two lights on the building. Mr. Maynard said they would probably replace the flood lights with a shielded light.

Mr. Montbleau wanted to know if the applicant proposed signage along Route 38. Mr. Maynard said at this time they were unsure what they'd have for signage. Mr. McNamara said signage would be handled by Mr. Gowan. Mr. Maynard said the applicant understood they'd have to submit to Mr. Gowan.

Mr. Culbert saw that there wasn't a lot of space in front of the building along Route 38, but felt possibly four bushes could be planted in the island. Mr. Maynard replied his client wouldn't have an issue with a condition of approval to plant four shrubs in the front islands. He asked that the shrubs be allowed to be low profile so as to not impair sight distance. Mr. Doherty agreed that any shrubs should be low profile so the sight distance of the neighboring road (Tiger Ave.) wouldn't be blocked. Mr. Gowan added that any planting would need to be salt tolerant. Mr. Maynard understood.

With regard to signage, Mr. Gowan told the Board he explained to the applicant what the zoning limitations were. He said he would work with them to ensure compliance. He asked if the 'lean-to' area would remain. Mr. Maynard said that area would remain for now. Currently it's a fenced in area. The applicant wasn't sure what the area would be until they moved in the building. Mr. Maynard said they understood if the 'lean-to' area changed, they would need to come back to the Board for an additional use on the property.

Mr. Montbleau questioned if the hours of operation would remain the same as they currently were. Mr. Maynard answered yes; operating hours would be 8am to 8pm every day. Mr. Montbleau asked what was in the islands along Route 38. Mr. Maynard said they contained crushed stone.

Mr. McNamara opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward to offer input.

**MOTION:** (Doherty/Dadak) To approve the waiver request to Section 248-32 to reduce the required parking spaces from 14 down to 9.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

-----

**MOTION:** (Doherty/Culbert) To approve the Change-of-Use, conditioned upon planting four shrubs (as discussed).

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

**PB Case#2014-00009**

**Map 29 Lot 7-27-1 - CROSSROADS BAPTIST CHURCH - 43 Atwood Road – Amend conditions of original approved site plan including: 1) Reducing the parking area; 2) Revising the previously approved drainage; 3) other changes involving the parking area; Also seeking a Special Permit for the construction of a Detention Pond to control site run-off.**

Although not a voting member, Mr. Passamonte stepped down for the case.

Mr. Dadak 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.

Mr. Joseph Maynard of Benchmark Engineering, representing the applicant, came forward to discuss the requested amended approval conditions. He stated that the property was approximately three acres in size and had a variance to allow the use (church, daycare and school) within the residential zone. The land itself drained toward Tony's Brook at the rear of the property and there were wetlands associated with such. There were minor flood plain areas that existed along the brook. The site is serviced by a State approved septic system and contained a drilled well. Mr. Maynard said the property was in front of the Board a couple years ago for an expansion project and drainage improvements. He said in figuring out the actual needs of the church they determined they didn't need the parking spaces originally requested and would like a waiver to reduce them down to 125. Because of the reduction of parking spaces, they were able to create a detention pond just off the edge of the parking lot. This will allow for sheet flow drainage across the parking lot area without the need for any underground catch basins or network of drainage pipes to get the water to the detention pond. The original design didn't have a lot of cover over the pipes that route the water through the parking area to the pond behind the building.

Mr. Maynard explained they tried to simplify the design by sheet flowing the runoff directly into the detention pond. As part of the detention pond construction, there will be two Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') impacts; each being approximately 500SF in size. The first impact allows for the side slope and WCD grading. The second impact is to allow the outlet of the pond to flow toward Tony's Brook. Another part of the waiver requests is to Section 248-34(D) – Surface run-off, Mr. Maynard said the Town's Ordinance caps overland flow to 200ft. without installing catch basins. He said they were showing the overland flow amount at approximately 210ft.-220ft., where 300ft. was an acceptable engineering practice. They felt it was a reasonable request because if they put catch basins in they would have limited cover. Mr. Maynard said they were requesting a waiver to Section 248-35(D) in three locations for planting strips. This would allow them to create a turnaround at the end of the parking aisles.

Mr. McNamara read aloud the letter from the Conservation Commission dated April 13, 2014. Mr. Gowan commented that during the original review the plan had gone through a number of iterations and quite a bit of review from Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm). Subsequently there was a bond requirement and plan compliance monitoring escrow requirement. He didn't know if finances played a part in the current situation, but he knew there were some issues in executing the plan. He said the Board would have to decide if they would like Keach Nordstrom to review the proposed plan and whether or not a bond will be required for plan compliance monitoring, which he felt would be important.

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

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Gowan felt the applicant should indicate where snow storage would be located. Mr. Maynard said he had dedicated areas in mind, but were not yet noted on the plan. He said when speaking with the Conservation Commission, he agreed to add a maintenance schedule to the plan set.

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Dadak) To accept, for consideration, the waiver to Section 248-32 – off street parking. To reduce the number of required parking spaces to allow 125.

**VOTE:** (7-0-0) The motion carried.

-----  
Mr. Haverty was called away from the meeting and did not return prior to adjournment.

**MOTION:** (Dadak/Doherty) To accept, for consideration, the waiver to Section 248-34(D) – Surface run-off. To allow an overland surface flow of 210ft-220ft.

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

-----  
**MOTION:** (Doherty/Montbleau) To accept, for consideration, the waiver to Section 248-35(D) – planting strips.

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

Mr. McNamara said given the sensitivity of Tony's Brook and the fact that the Board's engineer have provided a different recommendation, he would like Keach Nordstrom to review the current proposal on a limited/expedited basis. Mr. Maynard was confident that the proposed design would meet or exceed the Town's Regulations.

Mr. Doherty felt the proposed plan was a better plan in relation to the brook and the WCD. Mr. McNamara agreed.

Mr. McNamara opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward to provide input.

Mr. Gowan said he would attempt to have the plan reviewed quickly by Keach Nordstrom.

The plan was date specified to the May 19, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Passamonte returned to the Board.

**PB Case#2014-00010**

**Map 41 Lot 10-246 - OSTERMAN PROPANE LLC - 10 Bridge Street - Site review for the removal of three existing parking spaces for the installation of a 1,000 gallon fill station.**

Mr. Dadak 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.

Mr. Timothy Lovell of Osterman Propane came forward to discuss the site plan with the Board. He told the Board that three parking spaces would be removed so a 1,000 gallon propane fill station could be installed. He provided the Board with photograph examples of what the fill station would look like. He said the proposed location would meet the National Fire Protection Association 58 ('NFPA') and local authority requirements. He then also showed the Board an aerial view of where the fill station would be located on the property.

**MOTION:** (Dadak/Doherty) To accept the plan for consideration.

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

Mr. McNamara questioned if the plan would be subject to Fire Department review. Mr. Gowan answered yes. Mr. Lovell told the Board he met with Fire Inspector John Hodge at the site to determine the best location for the fill station.

Mr. Doherty recalled the original plan for the plaza was granted a waiver for parking spaces. He questioned if a new/amended waiver request for parking spaces should be submitted since the applicant was requesting a further reduction of three spaces. Mr. Gowan said an applicant could provide a hand-written waiver request at the meeting, or provide such in short order afterwards. He believed a joint board meeting was held with the Planning Board and Zoning Board because of a Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') encroachment. He stated he observed the site many times and had not seen any problems with the drainage system. He also had not seen the parking lot (in the area of the proposed fill station) at capacity. He felt it would be reasonable for additional striping in front of the proposed gate. He recommended that the Board make any approval subject to any direction provided by the Fire Department.

Mr. McNamara asked Mr. Lovell to hand write a waiver request to Article IV, Section 248-32 – off street parking.

Mr. Dadak asked if security and lighting was part of the industry standard. Mr. Lovell answered yes. He said there was currently a light post in the proposed location which would shine directly onto the fill station. They will also be able to pull electricity from the pole for the station. A bollard system will be set up in front of the station for protection from vehicles.

Mr. McNamara opened the hearing to public input. No one came forward to offer input.

Mr. Montbleau asked if the proposed location would be the only propane filling station in Town. Mr. Lovell said they previously had a filling station at Pelham Lumber, but lost the location to Suburban Propane.

Mr. Gowan wanted it clear that anything constructed at the site would be on top of existing pavement. Mr. Lovell understood. He said they would have 6-inch pad on top of the existing pavement. Mr. Gowan said any additional signage would need to be approved. Mr. Lovell noted there were signage requirements contained within NFPA58. He said any other signage would be a temporary set up.

Mr. Montbleau questioned if additional lighting would be needed for the fill station. Mr. Lovell answered no; under NFPA58, lighting is 'recommended' not required.

**MOTION:** (Doherty/Dadak) To accept, for consideration, the waiver request to Article IV, Section 248-32- parking.

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

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Doherty) To approve the waiver request to Article IV, Section 248-32- parking.

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

**MOTION:** (Doherty/Dadak) To approve the Site Plan, subject to Fire Department review and approval.

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

Mr. Lovell provided a handwritten waiver request to Article IV, Section 248-32 – parking for submission to the file.

**DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S)**

**May 19, 2014:**

**PB Case#PL2013-00026** - Map 17 Lot 3-81 - 61ANASHUA ROAD LANDHOLDINGS, LLC  
c/o Robert Peterson – 61A Nashua Road

**PB Case#2014-00009** - Map 29 Lot 7-27-1 - CROSSROADS BAPTIST CHURCH - 43  
Atwood Road

**June 16, 2014:**

**PB Case#PL2014-00005** - Map 17 Lot 12-180 - EAH REALTY TRUST – 956 Bridge Street

**MINUTES**

**January 6, 2014**

**MOTION:** (Croteau/Dadak) To approve the January 6, 2014 meeting minutes as written.

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

**April 7, 2014**

**MOTION:** (Culbert/Croteau) To approve the April 7, 2014 meeting minutes as amended.

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** (Montbleau/Culbert) To adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:34pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charity A. Landry  
Recording Secretary