

**MINUTES OF  
REGULAR MEETING  
PLANNING BOARD  
PORTSMOUTH, NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**EILEEN DONDERO FOLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
CITY HALL, MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, 1 JUNKINS AVENUE**

**7:00 P.M.**

**OCTOBER 18, 2007**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Ricci, Chairman; M. Christine Dwyer, City Council Representative; Jerry Hejtmanek, Vice-Chairman; Donald Coker; Anthony Coviello; John Rice; Paige Roberts; Cindy Hayden, Deputy City Manager; Richard A. Hopley, Building Inspector; and MaryLiz Geffert, Alternate

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** Timothy Fortier, Alternate

**ALSO PRESENT:** David M. Holden, Planning Director; and, Lucy E. Tillman, Planner I  
Peter Britz, Environmental Planner

.....  
6:30 – 7:30 pm – NON MEETING WITH COUNCIL  
.....

**I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. Minutes from the September 6, 2007 Planning Board Meeting - Unanimously approved.  
.....

**Chairman Ricci introduced the Board's newest member, John Rice.**

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

A. The Planning Board is conducting a Public Meeting in conjunction with the City's Emergency Operations Center in order to solicit public comment for consideration of changing duplicate street names of the following streets: Market Street and Market Street Extension;

Mr. Holden explained that the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) has identified a series of street names that have posed considerable problems in dispatching emergency services and they have produced a master list that the Planning Board will be going through. The Planning Board will make a recommendation to the City Council on streets that may need to be changed. The process is somewhat emotional as people are very protective of their street names. The Police Department and the Planning Department will be posting a series of names that will be available for new street names. To get this process underway, they have chosen to do Market Street and Market Street extension first. They will conduct a public meeting including a presentation by the EOC. The Planning Department is taking a very active role in this and are coordinating this on behalf of the Planning Board. This will probably be a series of meetings that will be every Planning Board meeting for several months. They are hoping to hear from the public, have them understand what the issues are and have them assist in any way they can. He turned the presentation over to Deputy Police Chief Len DiSesa.

Present with Deputy Police Chief DiSesa was Communications Supervisor Gil Emery. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa was present to speak to the safety issue regarding duplicate sounding street names. They have identified 36 streets or roads that can be easily misunderstood by police or fire units. He understands the complication of changing a street name but going to a wrong address in an emergency has obvious legal ramifications as well as safety issues.

The first five that they will be doing are:

- 1) Market Street & Market Street Extension;
- 2) Monroe and Monroe Street Extension;
- 3) Elwyn Avenue, Elwyn Road and Elwyn Road Extension;
- 4) Ledgewood Drive, Edgewood Road, Ledgewood Road; and
- 5) Sherburne Road, Sherburne Avenue and Sherburne Street.

There were two separate incidents involving the Wedgewood and Ledgewood addresses where fire and police were sent to the wrong address. Most recently in July a house fire was called in and the caller clearly stated Middle Road as the address. As the fire apparatus drove by Middle Street they were able to identify that the fire was on Middle Street and not on Middle Road.

It was the joint recommendation of the Fire Department and Police Department that the Planning Board begin a process to of reviewing and changing street names to avoid further liability and safety issues.

Mr. Coker agreed that public safety is obviously the highest consideration. He asked if enhanced 911 was able to identify where the calls were being called in from? Deputy Police Chief DiSesa stated that cell phones have a GPS capability or component and they can locate them through triangulation with some degree of accuracy and, if a person uses a cell phone to call in that might be a consideration. However that takes time and, if they use a house phone or land line, dispatch may not have that capability.

Chairman Ricci asked if the suggestion was to eliminate the extension off of Market Street and make it all just Market Street? Deputy Police Chief DiSesa agreed that was one way to go. This is a particularly easy one. As they go down the list of 36 names they will see how confusing it can be.

Chairman Ricci opened up the public comment session.

James Horrigan, of 35 Elwyn Avenue, indicated that people do have trouble finding their house. However, if the chinese restaurant can find his address from his telephone he would think the Police Department should be able to identify the Street location. He thinks the Police Department should rethink this and find a way to better train their personnel. He stated this was a change that was important and he felt people on the street would like to have a chance to speak to it.

Mr. Holden confirmed that everyone that lives on Market Street and Market Street Extension have been notified of this public hearing. He also indicated that this is required by State Law to make sure there are no name conflicts. The City has done this once and now they have to do it again. All communities are going through this as well.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public, wishing to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

Deputy Police Chief DiSesa indicated that they are behind other communities and they did some research and numerous towns have changed street names. Marlboro, New London, Hampstead, Fremont, and Ringe have all gone through. Portsmouth is behind in this process.

Chairman Ricci asked Deputy Police Chief DiSesa to explain how take out restaurants can identify the locations? Deputy Police Chief DiSesa pointed out that the call may not be coming from the house where the event is actually happening. Mr. Emery explained that when you call 911 it is answered in Concord first and they give the name to Portsmouth who turns around and gives it to the fire and police so it may go through up to three different people. There are many places where it may break down.

Mr. Coviello asked if it was state law that you can't have similar street names. Mr. Emery confirmed it was and they are not supposed to have it happen. And they should be going back and fixing the street names that are causing a problem. Deputy Police Chief DiSesa again indicated that the liability issues can be extreme.

Mr. Holden stated that the recommendation is that they drop the use of extension and the entire corridor will be named Market Street. In general, in the City, it has always been viewed as Market Street but the extension is part of a formal name.

Councilor Dwyer indicated that her business is at 1000 Market Street Extension but they have never used the extension on their address.

Mr. Coviello made a motion to recommend approval of dropping the use of extension and using Market Street for the entire corridor. Mr. Hopley seconded the motion.

The motion to recommend approval of the dropping of the use of extension and using Market Street for the entire corridor passed unanimously.

.....

B. The Planning Board is conducting a Public Hearing to consider preliminary approval for a Residential Density Incentive Planned Unit Development (RDI-PUD) for application of **Richard Bonhomme Realty, LLC, Owner**, and **The Housing Partnership, Applicant**, for property located **off Kearsarge Way and Bedford Way**, consisting of five buildings, totaling 30 affordable residential units, with a proposed private driveway connecting through to Kearsarge Way. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 212 as Lots 118, 119, and 122 and lie within a General Residence B District;

Vice Chairman Hejtmanek recused himself as he used to be on the Board of the Housing Partnership.

Conservation Commission members Steve Miller, Chairman; Eva Powers; Allison Turner; James Horrigan joined the Planning Board members for this hearing.

Mr. Holden advised the Board that this is the first time the Planning Board has handled a Residential Density Incentive Planned Unit Development (RDI PUD). This amendment was adopted following two years of work and this is the first project that incorporates it. As part of this process, at the preliminary stage the Conservation Commission has a role and will be assisting in this initial review. He suggested that if a Conservation Commission member or a Planning Board member has a question during the presentation phase they are free to ask it. The Conservation Commission was invited to join in the discussion with the Planning Board. At some point the Planning Board Chair will ask for a motion to dispose of it and at that time the Conservation Commission's role is done. They are only present in an advisory function but are being asked to participate.

Chairman Ricci welcomed the Conservation Commission members.

Attorney Sharon Somers, of Tucker, Donahue and Ciandella, was representing the interest of the Housing Partnership. She was happy to be present after the very successful passing of the ordinance in January. The project team is Dick Ingram, Executive Director of the Housing Partnership and John Chagnon of Ambit Engineering. They will be presenting the specifics of the project and indicate how the project complies with each of the ordinance requirements. She was happy to see the process they

have made from the Department Memorandum and Mr. Holden's explanation of the process. The next step will be Site Review where they will ultimately turn to this Board for a finding and as a final step they will hopefully grant the Site Review and Conditional Use Permit. They recognize substantive issues that need to be addressed and they can do so at the Site Review process. She acknowledged the need to finalize the easement for them to use City Property, the shared use of Bedford Way. They have made significant strides working with the Housing Authority. Secondly, they need to take care of obtaining approval to use Bedford Way as their access and lastly to acknowledge the appropriateness of all affordable units. She turned the presentation over to Mr. Ingram.

Dick Ingram, Executive Director of the Housing Partnership, which is a non profit organization. They have either rehabilitated or built 17 different properties in Portsmouth and the surrounding towns. People average 4 years in their projects and look out for each other. He recently realized that he has been driving by THP properties for 18 years and did not even know they were their properties. They do not develop to flip for a profit. It is to develop housing for everyone. This project has been designed to satisfy the goals of the Master Plan and the provisions of the new ordinance. They understand this will be the first project under this ordinance and the first of many discussions. This is their first project in Portsmouth. They propose to develop 30 affordable housing units in the Atlantic Heights neighborhood. According to the definition of affordability that is contained in the ordinance, they will be able to meet any scenario. The provisions of the ordinance describe affordability as limiting the incomes of the residents of these properties, whether rented or purchased to 120% of the area median income, or \$86,000 under the current HUD table. The financing sources that they are contemplating right now would further restrict the income levels to 50% – 60% of median incomes, or \$38,000 - \$43,000. The affordability as defined by this ordinance would more than be met by this project. The PHA property on Bedford Way is their immediate neighbor and they have met with them on numerous occasions. They have obtained permission from them for access over Bedford Way. Part of that discussion revolved around several factors that they agreed to partner with the PHA on and to accommodate their concerns. They agreed to pursue having THA staff be the manager of the property and they liked that idea, even though they have an excellent third party management company on all of their other projects, because of the proximity of their proposed project to THA site. They also agreed that they would do whatever they could to maximize the buffer between their buildings and other neighboring buildings. Lastly, they have agreed to limit the number of units to 30. In the materials the various calculations under the ordinance indicate that 35 units would be permissible but they have decided not to pursue the maximum. He will make the same commitment to the Board as he did to the neighborhood last night, that they will work with them on this project. They will acknowledge issues and concerns and he reiterated his commitment to work through those concerns with them.

John Chagnon, of Ambit Engineering, stated that this was the first application under Section 10-15-08 for a RDI PUD. As such the Conditional Use Permit has a layer of zoning and also the application must comply with all Site, Zoning and Site Review regulations. They will be requesting a wavier of the subdivision standards as they are proposing a private street with a 40' right of way with a cross section not configured in the same manner of a typical street to keep with the Atlantic Heights neighborhood. The travelway will have a 5' sidewalk, a 24' travelway and a 10' parallel parking bump out, totaling a 34' wide area. The property is zoned GBB which is an allowed area for a RDI PUD. Their plan set shows a number of things, including the dwelling units, location and size, building elevations, locations of physical features and the proposed infrastructure. He walked them through the plan set.

Mr. Chagnon stated that there are no wetlands on the subject parcel. There is a steep slope going from north to south. The first sheet is a boundary survey. They will be consolidating three lots into one. Bedford Way was a planned street and a dashed line shows where Bedford Way was platted but was never constructed and was formally undedicated by the City. Bedford Way was relocated and constructed as a driveway for the PHA, which used to be a school house. They show a proposed easement to access the site. They will come into the site on Bedford Way and then construct their driveway to intersect with that.

The Existing Conditions Plan shows the topography of the site. In order to assess the actual extent of ledge on the property, they completed a slope table which is on the sheet. The area of all the steep slope is calculated and is used later to calculate the base residential density.

The Layout and Landscaping Plan shows, in the upper left hand corner, typical dimension building. There are five six unit buildings with the same dimensions although one building has an additional bumpout for an additional bedroom in three of the units. The plan shows the 40' right of way and it shows set backs as required under the ordinance. They have 20' from the principal access right of way. There is a side setback requirement and that meets the 25' requirement. There is a 30' building separation requirement which is shown. Shown on this plan is the parking as well as some notes regarding the density. Note 5 says that base density is taking the developable area and divided by the background area for dwelling unit requirement (5,000) which allows 23 units. Since the ordinance allows for a maximum of 1.5 times the base density unit, they would potentially have 35 bonus units which totals 58 units with a density bonus. However, there is a maximum cap of 1.5 times the base density so in this case that only allows 35 units. They are proposing that every unit be affordable and they are proposing 30 units. Their rear and side yard setbacks have been multiplied by 1.3 as if they are getting a density bonus they require bigger setbacks. This plan shows the layout of the parking lots and sidewalk access to the buildings and a sidewalk access to Bedford Way which will be submitted with the next revision. There are 35 parking spaces on the south side of the road. They have additional parallel parking, bringing them roughly to 2 spaces per dwelling unit.

Utility and Grading Plan. Mr. Chagnon noted that utilities will be brought in underground and they are proposing to connect sewer along the road out to existing sewer manholes on Kearsarge Way. The City water is available in the corridor that is on the property and they will tap into that to distribute it to the units. They are proposing an underground collection stormwater system. It will be collected from the street and parking areas and there will be chambers to catch the peak flow. It is similar to what was approved by the Board for the Cicero Lewis project around the corner from this project.

Detail Sheets. There are four sheets showing various components of the project. Sheet 4 shows the retaining wall feature. As the lot slopes, they will be doing some major filling and re-grading for this project and one tool they are using to keep the site integrity and to get a suitable buildable area is the use of retaining walls. They have chosen a modular block retaining wall, in a suitable earth tone color so as to not detract from the project.

Architectural plans show elevations, layout and roof plans of the units. All buildings will be similar so as to create the essence of a neighborhood.

The site has 5.2 acres. Use is limited to residential. Up to six free standing buildings are allowed so they are taking advantage of that. They are creating open space. He pointed out the area of the lot that was previously paved for a way to get to the neighborhood when the bridge was constructed. The pavement was never removed so they will take it out and restore it back to green. Because the project is entirely affordable there is a section that talks about mixing affordable and market rate and there was great discussion about trying not to differentiate between the markets and the classes of units. All units will look the same. They are asking for their preliminary approval and would like to move forward to Site Review.

Chairman Ricci asked for legal questions to the applicant first.

Mr. Coker asked, in the future, how do they guarantee that this will remain in perpetuity affordable housing? Attorney Somers stated that they would have to talk about the form of the restrictions (deed). When they were talking about the zoning change they talked about condominium documents and they would have to come up with some form of corollary document to make sure the affordability was carried on. This property would not be used for any type of flipping purposes.

Mr. Ingram added that the financing they are pursuing, if they follow through, when they obtain tax credits to finance a project like this includes 15 – 30 year lock ups of the property and additionally the NH housing authority requires them to execute a document that will essentially maintain affordability for 99 years. If there was a desire to sell the property and turn it into market rate housing, there would be a series of opportunities for other non profits to obtain the property.

Councilor Dwyer stated that she understands the 120% but when he talks about the 60% she assumes those are boundaries as opposed to driving down the 120%. Mr. Ingram confirmed that was correct. The ordinance defines affordability as 120%. If they pursue tax credit financing, the tax code determines that they must have tenants with incomes that do not exceed 50% – 60% of median income. Councilor Dwyer asked if that was a requirement of some tenants or all tenants be in the 50-60 range? Mr. Ingram responded that in a perfect world if they could obtain financing for all 30 units they would do that but, regarding boundary, that would be between 30 and some lower number, depending on the number of tax credits or other sources of financing they may have. Councilor Dwyer asked if, in fact, there really is a range of income affordability they are looking at but it's unclear at this time. Mr. Ingram felt that was true but they are using tax credits on all 30 units.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if she was correct that the reason they are pursuing this financing is because there aren't a lot of options? Mr. Ingram agreed and stated that he is committed to continuing to try to work home ownership into it but he has not been able to make the numbers work yet.

Councilor Dwyer asked Deputy City Manager Hayden if there are any city or country available subsidies that make it possible to add more of a range of income? Deputy City Manager Hayden was not able to answer that but probably not at the level to make this project work. It is very constrained in many ways on housing financing. Mr. Ingram added that any project will not have one source of funding. If they have any tax credit at all, that becomes the least common denominator in determining the demographics. Deputy City Manager Hayden felt it becomes the biggest driving force to get the most money. Mr. Ingram stated he would like to find a way to do this without tax credits but he has not figured out how to do that yet.

Mr. Coviello asked if they have looked at 35 units at 120% of income levels. Mr. Ingram confirmed that the 35 units went off the table after discussions with PHA as they agreed to 30 units. Mr. Coviello felt they were trying to get affordable housing but he sees low income housing being presented. Mr. Ingram understood the distinction.

Mr. Coker asked them to explain tax credits. Mr. Ingram explained it is a provision of the tax revenue code. They say how much equity they need and an investor would get a certain amount to write off their taxes.

Ms. Tanner suggested making affordable housing energy efficient housing which would provide funding. Mr. Ingram confirmed they are considering that to the extent that they can.

Councilor Dwyer indicated that she was interested in what the margin is in how many units they would have to have before they could do what they thought they were going to do with home owner ship. She asked what type of density they would need? Mr. Ingram felt that was difficult to say. Councilor Dwyer asked if it was possible to get that information so they have a feeling of what that margin is? Mr. Ingram felt it was possible. From his point of view, when going through the process if there is learning revisions to be made, he is happy with that. They intend to be around to do this type of work for a long time.

Mr. Coker stated this is also a learning process for them. Mr. Ingram stated that he agreed with the PHA to limit the number of units they are building. Mr. Coviello asked what does the PHA have to do with this project. Mr. Ingram explained that because Bedford Way is an easement over City property which the PHA enjoys now, and they would have to travel over it, the City Council requested that they obtain permission from the PHA to travel over that. They agreed that it would make sense to make

some provisions that would make for a good partnership. Mr. Coker was having trouble connecting an easement with the number of units. Mr. Ingram explained that it went back to Councilor Dwyer's question on the ownership structure, because there are not other tax credits, they do not have time to wait until the units were sold. They cannot take that financial risk. Councilor Dwyer felt it was critical that the City know what that margin is. If they really want it, they can find the will for it. There is no easement on the land and there is no deed restriction on that so she wants to explore those barriers.

Mr. Coviello asked what do they picture as a typical occupant? Mr. Ingram stated that the majority of the units are two bedrooms and are intended to be family occupancy. Mr. Coviello asked about population trends. Mr. Ingram stated that right now they have 160 units that they actively manage and most are young families. Earlier this year they had 322 residents, 131 children, 155 adults 18-54, and 36 adults 55 and over. Mr. Coviello asked if changing from 50-60% income to 120% would change the resident make up? Mr. Ingram did not believe it would really change.

Mr. Coker asked, given the number of units they re proposing, would it behoove the partnership to have more units? Mr. Ingram responded that would not make a difference under their rental scenario. Mr. Coker asked if this number is viable? Mr. Ingram felt it was. What they are actually giving up is 5 units.

Ms. Powers indicated that she would like to see an analysis for permeable pavement in the parking areas or sidewalk as their stormwater treatment is a huge expense and that might reduce the flow during high storms and increase the safety because there is less ice on permeable surfaces.

Mr. Horrigan noticed that the lot slopes at a fairly steep angle to the railroad right of way and he wondered if this would be a blast and fill operation and what fill would be put in? Mr. Chagnon responded that this would be primarily a fill site and the fills would be site fills. They are also using it to infiltrate it back into the ground. Mr. Horrigan felt that given the drainage system they are proposing under the driveway, he would like to see permeable on the parking lots. Where would the impoundment water go? Mr. Chagnon stated that the underground storage would be structural into chambers which are plastic tanks so the water would be released slowly, back to the natural ground or eventually it will be day lighted and then flow to further treatment and sheet flow. Then there is an existing drainage ditch along the railroad that carries the water away. Their analysis shows that they are not increasing the peak flow. Mr. Horrigan asked if the site is essentially ledge outcropping? Mr. Chagnon stated that it was not as they did some borings and it varies from 1' to over 19'. Mr. Horrigan asked if permeable surface was possible? Mr. Chagnon indicated that porous pavement is potentially a lot more expensive than what they are proposing. They would be doing the same thing as they are putting the water back into the ground. Mr. Horrigan indicated that the Conservation Commission has discussed this and over 30% of Portsmouth is now impervious surface and it is eventually going to be dysfunctional. He felt they should start to use this technology. He also noticed today that it is a trash strewn site. He discovered a lawnmower full of fresh concrete or plaster. In the lower part of the slope it has been used as a fairly extensive dump. Will they have some safeguards in place so that they do not disturb some toxic materials? Mr. Chagnon felt that was a good point and when they do the environmental assessment they will make a note of that.

Ms. Powers noticed that a lot of landscaping is grass that needs to be mowed and asked if there could be a consideration of annuals or shrubs that do not involve that type of maintenance. Mr. Chagnon felt they could absolutely look into that.

Mr. Coviello asked for an explanation of the NH Heritage Bureau document. Mr. Chagnon responded that any project that requires permitting from State agencies requires that they submit the location of the project to the Bureau so they can check their data base for any known occurrences of endangered species.

Ms. Tanner added that a lot of times they send out the form but they never really look at the area. She suggested having someone actually look at the area and report back. Chagnon felt they would have to be specific regarding the scope of the investigation but they can do that.

Chairman Ricci looked at some of the finished floors and existing grades and he notices 13' and 14' differences to the retaining walls. Also, regarding the infiltrators under the slab, he doesn't see room for riprap or swales. He asked if they have a rough estimate of the cubic yards they are bringing into the site? Mr. Chagnon indicated he did not have that. Chairman Ricci stated he would be interested in that.

Conservation Commission Chairman Steve Miller had a concern of rubble being discarded over the slope. Mr. Chagnon indicated that they will minimize the blasting and the key to the development of the site is erosion control. That will involve heavy stabilization of the edge with heavy retaining walls and the sequence will be very important. Chairman Miller referred to the slope and asked what is the vegetative cover? Mr. Chagnon indicated it would be trees. Mr. Miller requested a minimum of cutting and what is left after construction to protect the trees that are left. Also, the water flow and the cover will be very important to erosion control on the site. Be mindful of minimum disturbance of the tree cover and after things are going, those trees can be maintained as natural cover. Mr. Chagnon agreed and indicated that tree cutting and retaining walls will create a natural buffer and they do not want to cut into the trees. The trees that are left will be inaccessible so there will be less human interaction.

Mr. Coviello noted their potential recreation use of the road and there will be a lot of children. What are their plans for a playground or recreational uses? Mr. Chagnon stated that they are open to discussion. If the neighborhood allows, there is a park at the intersection of the roads, there are basket ball courts and a playground. They should have a discussion with Community Development to complement what is already there.

Mr. Hopley wondered if there will be basements? Mr. Chagnon did not know at this time. There may be basements. They are building on a hill and it depends on the final design whether it makes sense to build deep footings and avoid a lot of the fill and whether that is cheaper than just putting in the slabs. If it is a cost benefit to introduce a basement then it might be considered. Then they would have a bulkhead and there is no more than a 6' grade change across the building. Mr. Hopley felt that the team needed to be aware of Chapter 11 of the Building Code on accessibility. All doorways need to find a way to a paved surface or parking lot. They will probably need to arrange their grades to get to those doors. Mr. Chagnon thought they can add sidewalks from the back to the roadway.

Mr. Rice referred to 10.5.8.J., Design Requirements, which indicates they should construct in a way that is harmonious with surrounding neighborhood dwellings. He noted the neighborhood is primarily two story buildings and these are three story buildings. Mr. Chagnon indicated that Sheet A-1 was done by the architectural team so he can't address them. He did mention a three story building that was recently approved in the area. He can get the architect to come and address those concerns.

Mr. Coker asked if it was their wish to not have a change of 6' in grade on any building. Mr. Chagnon stated that is the code requirement. Mr. Coker could see 12', 14', 16' on the existing conditions. Mr. Chagnon confirmed they will fill 8'.

Mr. Coviello referred to J-1 regarding harmonious with the neighborhood. They don't really have a lot of authority over architecture but he would like to have questions answered by the architect. Mr. Chagnon pointed out that this will be its own little neighborhood within a neighborhood.

Councilor Dwyer asked, given the trees that they plan to leave, how visible will these buildings be? Mr. Chagnon stated that some of those trees are pretty mature and 60' tall and may be taller than the buildings. It is their intent to keep as many trees as they can along Kearsarge Way. The building that



is more visible is the building to the east. Councilor Dwyer also mention because of the number of children, a place for the toddler and pre-school children would be nice.

Ms. Powers stated that she spoke to someone that stated that 3 bedrooms encouraged families and she asked what the intent was on what size families they will have.

Mr. Coker indicated that he recently attended the Planning Conference in Lincoln and attended the affordable housing workshop and he was stunned by a study by Russ Thibeault that destroyed the notion that affordable housing and 2-3 bedrooms bring a lot of kids. They did a study that showed a low number of children brought into a town with a development. Do they have any intent to discuss with the School the number of children that they expect to bring in.

Mr. Coviello pointed out that the School Department weighed in during the zoning matrix. Mr. Holden confirmed they are also a part of this application.

Chairman Ricci noted ledge at ground level and ledge at a 1' below and stated he is concerned about erosion control.

The Chair opened up the Public hearing and called for speakers.

Delmire Morse, 35 Concord Way. The Housing Partnership told them last night that this will be low income. Atlantic Heights is still suffering from congested traffic, the Irving Oil Station with trucks and lumber yard, Atlantic Point Housing Development and the Falkland Way development. This is another intrusion and there is no parking. They do not want any more intrusions. They have now established themselves as a quaint village and people are refurbishing and maintaining their homes. She filed a petition signed by over 100 people who were opposed to the construction.

Christy Cardoso, Concord Way. The present incarnation of the project is a sever breach of trust. They initially proposed ownership and this is low income rentals. After a number of years, these "projects" will no longer be new and pretty.

David Choate, resident of Rye, indicated that they have a housing partnership project in Rye which is well kept up. They knew this would be the reaction of people and they finally found a land owner who would sell this property at a price that makes this project possible. The big issue of affordable housing is finding property they can afford. They did not "just dump this on Atlantic Heights" as they have held numerous meetings with the neighborhood and this has been going on for three years. He stated that people earning \$38,000 - \$43,000 are not low income housing so it should not be categorized as that. It is important for people to visit other Housing Partnership projects to see how they are kept up and run. It is imperative to have housing for teachers, waitresses and fireman. These projects don't happen if you apply 100% of for profit rules to them. There is a very thin margin of working and not working in these projects. Everyone knows we have an affordable housing problem but no one wants it in their neighborhood.

Mr. Coker asked a question about his statement that other communities won't be moving into the units. What assurances do they have. Chairman Ricci indicated that the applicant could address that at the end of the public comment session.

Andre Cardoso, 199 Concord Way. Anyone living in a work force housing project is seen to take away homes and opportunities for the people of the town. This couldn't be further from the truth in Atlantic Heights as they are work force housing that are owner owned and well kept. He addressed articles of the RDI PUD regulations. He mentioned the grade of the site and felt it is not developable. The site is not appropriate for 30 units. This project has changed from inception when it was a mixed income project. These units will lack community involvement. It was never the neighborhoods understanding that the units would be rentals. This site will add to the traffic congestion of Atlantic Heights. He is concerned about rental prices being affected in Atlantic Heights.

Mary \_\_\_\_\_, 600 Kearsarge Way. Last night they met with the Housing Partnership. They were stunned to find that the units were going to be rentals rather than owner owned. They want their neighborhood to remain the wonderful neighborhood it has become.

Attorney Doug Macdonald, representing Edna and Dick Fusigni, of Kearsarge Way. It is very important to listen to the residents and refer to the petition that was submitted. His clients also oppose the project for many of the same reasons as those who have addressed the Board. When the City Council heard this proposal, there was quite a bit of discussion. Looking at this from the point of the Atlantic Heights neighborhood, to approve the project would basically be to ignore their concerns. It is a one way in/one way out situation. The project access is still in question. The first correspondence he saw from the Housing Authority was dated October 2006, addressed to this Board, when they had significant concerns about the excessive amount of units and the encroachment on the Atlantic Heights. This project proposed 30 units where 23 would normally be allowed. Traffic concerns, school buses and police will be required through the one accessway from Kearsarge Way. Looking at the requirements of the ordinance, they are requesting waivers of some items. They also do not seem to meet the market mix. This project has evolved from an ownership project to a rental project which is not harmonious with the neighborhood. They do not meet the requirements of the ordinance. Section M.1.d requires this Board to look at the detrimental effects, one of which is how it will affect market value. Atlantic Height residents are concerned it will affect market values. Traffic needs to be looked at, along with environmental impacts. He referred to the reference to projects in other towns and stated that they were irrelevant and shouldn't be considered. He believed if they listen to the concerns of the residents and follow the rules of the ordinance, there is no way this could move forward. He reminded them that the ordinance also indicates that the Board is not required to grant conditional use.

Stephanie Krenn, 13 Porpoise Way. She spoke to the nature of their conversations with the Housing Partnership. They have met over the years but what they discussed at great length is not what they are discussing tonight. They are work force housing and are not opposed to work force housing. She recognizes that they have an age in work force crisis. What builds communities is ownership and the ability to accommodate their family. The only way they can justify an intensely developed area is if it meets the needs of the people they are serving. Work force housing needs to meet the social needs as well as the economic needs and physical needs of our workers.

Phil Cohen, 11 Porpoise Way. He shares his concerns with a lot of other residents. He asked that they have the applicant consider the current difficulties of the site. He doesn't understand the tax credit issue but it sounds like developing this particular site is prohibitive. They should consider a workforce housing ownership model that everyone would like to work towards and examining this site as well as other sites where there could be ownership.

The Chair called for any further speakers. Seeing no one rise, he asked if the housing partnership would like to respond.

Mr. Ingram responded to how they assure that the tenants are who they want them to be. They have a very strict tenant management process which he would be happy to share with the Board. They check criminal records and check prior landlords. They appreciate the comments from the neighborhood and he understands the emotion and the history that led them to come tonight to show how much they love their neighborhood. They have a commitment to work through these issues and building relationships. He would hope that the Board would see fit to grant the Conditional Use Permit.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Mr. Holden advised that Board that this is the first of many steps. All arise from how the Board decides to proceed from this presentation of the preliminary application. There are four conditions they need to consider. They need to decide if they have enough information on this application to go

forward. Another option is if they have questions then they may wish to have additional information provided and they may wish to postpone but make clear what information they are seeking. Thirdly, if they have sufficient information but require clarification, they may grant preliminary approval so that TAC can review and report back to them. Fourth, they may want to seek guidance and have a Work Session with TAC and the applicant. They have a lot of flexibility and they need to determine what is their next step.

Mr. Coviello indicated that they have a specific application before them and the way it is written now he could not support it but he does not want the project to die. He would recommend working with TAC and the applicant. With the units being rentals and the median income level as low as it is, he cannot support the project.

Councilor Dwyer stated that she was thinking along the same lines as Mr. Coviello. The neighborhood was not against the owner owned. She thought the change in the project has caught everyone off guard. She noted that her neighborhood has a lot of apartments and people might be surprised to know that. What they have tonight is a mind shift from what people thought they had. She felt they need to do a mix and they need to understand more about what it would take to do the mix and how much they could get on this parcel. The neighborhood would like more Atlantic Heights and the type of homes. Mr. Cardoso spoke that the people living there would be very similar to the Atlantic Height residents. She feels they need to keep working on this issue for multiple purposes.

Deputy City Manger Hayden agreed and did not want to see this killed tonight as the applicant has come a long way. The building elevations look much better from the last iteration when it was ownership. A work session would give them an opportunity to converse with them. She did not think TAC would be appropriate at this point and they should discuss whether the Conservation Commission should be invited.

Ms. Roberts felt that in addition to this being a mental shift, it is also somehow a philosophical shift. This feels very different from what they were intending by the RDI PUD and the residents addressed that. They need to have a conversation about that and the feasibility to afford the Board a better understanding of affordable housing.

Mr. Coker stated that this breaks his heart. Finally there is a specific proposal in front of them, the neighbors object to it and some objections are arguable regarding traffic, noise, and neighborhood compatibility. However, the Board does not get to make up their rules and regulations. J.2. states that affordable units shall be disbursed through the development to insure a true mix of market rate and affordable housing. He felt the application could be denied on that point alone. He would like to see this worked out. He referred to the Stafford case. He would like to have them come back with something that meets their regulations.

Chairman Ricci felt that they had a consensus and asked for a motion.

Mr. Coviello made a motion to postpone this application to a work session with the Planning Board and the applicant. Mr. Rice seconded the motion.

Ms. Geffert felt that the City has to start thinking about affordable housing. She is very familiar with renters and they are not fly by night people and they want to live in Portsmouth so that they can be close to their work. J.2. is an important element so when the housing partnership comes back she would like to amend Mr. Coviello's motion that J.2. be a particular focus. The mix of affordable and market housing really needs to be looked at. .

Chairman Ricci did not feel that it needed to be amended and Mr. Coveillo agreed. No amendment was made.

Chairman Ricci was torn as he wants to support this project and he struggles because if this was a flat piece of land it would be more feasible. The steep slope is also a concern.

Councilor Dwyer stated, for the record, she wanted to know if that was a duplicate petition. A resident clarified that it was a new petition that was just recently signed by everyone.

Mr. Coker stated that he would like to have the minutes of the meetings where the Board discussed the adoption of this NRI PUD. He recalled that there was a lot of debate about the mix.

Chairman Ricci confirmed that the Work Session would be scheduled on November 29, 2007.

The motion to postpone this application to a Work Session on November 29, 2007 passed unanimously.

Chairman Ricci stated there would be no public input at that Work Session however they can come and listen and it will be televised.

.....

A FIVE MINUTE BREAK WAS TAKEN.

C. The application of **NiSource, Inc., Owner** (of easement), for property located at **333 Borthwick Avenue**, wherein a Conditional Use Permit is requested as allowed in Article VI, Section 10-608(B) of the *Zoning Ordinance* to install a pipeline pressure reducing station and security upgrades, within an Inland Wetlands Protection District. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 240 as Lot 2-1 and lies within an Office Research District;

The Chair read the notices into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Mike Ball, a Consultant Wetland Scientist, representing NiSource and Northern Utilities. In order to comply with minimum federal safety standards and reducing the pipeline pressure, they must install a pressure reducing regulator station adjacent to an existing above ground facility. This is within the 100' wetland buffer. They appeared before the Conservation Commission and there were two items with regard to the amount of gravel needed for this project and the protection of a large diameter of trees in the buffer zone. The Board's Memorandum refers to these items. They asked how much gravel service would be needed. Their original application describes applying gravel to the larger area in the buffer zone to replace an area that is currently vegetated and is very low to the ground. The gas company would basically do a favor by reducing the maintenance by applying gravel to the vegetative area. The Conservation Commission asked them to rethink that and they now only have gravel within the fenced area. The existing access road to this facility is crushed stone and the gas company may wish to add a new gravel surface. They included photographs in their submission which gave a pretty good idea of what the site looks like. A Conservation Commission member raised the issue of two fairly large trees. They did some field measurements and they determined that the trees are well outside of their work area and here would be no reason to remove those trees and therefore no need to shift the location of their site to save the trees.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public, wishing to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Holden indicated that the Conservation Commission was concerned about the trees and whether they will need protection so that the gravel does not effect them. Mr. Ball confirmed that they are far enough away so there will be no impact.

Mr. Rice made a motion to approve Conditional Use Permit. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded the motion.

The motion to approve Conditional Use Permit passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

- 1) That the new gravel area be reduced to not exceed the fenced enclosure;
- 2) That the fenced enclosure be moved to the southwest if possible to avoid the removal of existing trees.

.....

Mr. Coker made a motion to extend the 10:30 rule and proceed with the remainder of the agenda. Mr. Coviello seconded the motion. The motion to continue past 10:30 pm passed unanimously.

.....

D. The application of **Portsmouth Regional Hospital, Owner**, for property located at **333 Borthwick Avenue**, wherein a Conditional Use Permit is requested as allowed in Article VI, Section 10-608(B) of the *Zoning Ordinance* to install landscaping, ornamental walls and sidewalk, totaling 660 s.f. of impervious area, within an Inland Wetlands Protection District. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 240 as Lot 2-1 and lies within an Office Research District;

The Chair read the notices into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Gregg Mikolaities, of Appledore Engineering, appeared on behalf of the applicant, Portsmouth Regional Hospital. He was present with Bill Duffy from Portsmouth Hospital. This is a simple request. The plans showed the central entrance to the hospital. The wetland area is across Borthwick Avenue and they showed the 100' setback. The hospital wants to do substantial landscaping on the front of the property. They want to put in 650' of ornamental walls, which are impervious surface in the buffer. Also, there is a new sidewalk they are extending into the entrance for safety to pedestrians. They met with the Conservation Commission and they received a unanimously recommendation. They have taken their comments and have reflected them in the new plans. They were concerned that the proposal was for white ash trees and a disease would wipe out all of them so they now have three different types of trees. They were concerned about the amount of grass and they have changed some grass to ground cover. They were concerned about the irrigation system in the buffer so within the buffer zone it will be a trip irrigation system installed.

Mr. Coviello asked if the Board will see this as part of site plan review? Mr. Mikolaities confirmed this is just for the section in the wetland buffer and they will not have to come back for Site Review.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public, wishing to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Deputy City Manger Hayden made a motion to approve the conditional use permit as presented. Mr. Hopley seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the conditional use permit passed unanimously with the following stipulation:

- 1) That a new landscape plan be submitted that incorporates multiple species, mulch or ground cover in place of grass, and drip irrigation.

.....

E. The request of **Fleet Street Properties, LLC, Owner**, for property located at **154 Fleet Street**, for a second additional one year extension of Site Review Approval which was granted by the Planning Board on October 20, 2005, to construct a 3,246 ± s.f. 4-story building with basement, after removal of the existing building, with related paving, utilities, landscaping, drainage and associated site improvements. Said property is shown on Assessor Plan 117 as Lot 6 and lies within a Central Business B, Historic A and Downtown Overlay Districts.

The Chair read the notices into the record.

**SPEAKING TO THE APPLICATION:**

Gregory Whalen, Managing Partner of Fleet Street Properties, LLC, addressed the Board. He went through a chronological recap. On August 3, 2005 the project was approved by the HDC, followed by Planning Board approval on October 20, 2005. One condition was an easement agreement with the City and that Agreement was formally executed on May 18, 2006 and recorded in the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds on May 24, 2006. On August 17, 2006 the Planning Board approved an amendment for a grease trap. On September 21, 2006 the Planning Board approved a one year extension and they are now before the Board for a second one year extension. At the TAC meeting on October 2, 2007, they requested that the Construction Management & Mitigation Plan (CMMP) be updated and reviewed by City Staff. On October 5, 2007 they submitted an application to the HDC for an extension of their approval as well. There are no proposed changes at this time to the plans.

Chairman Ricci stated he would like to see a note added to the plans addressing the hours of construction which are 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m, Monday - Friday. Mr. Whalen confirmed that was referenced in the CMMP but he will add it to the plans.

The Chair asked if anyone was present from the public, wishing to speak to, for, or against the petition. Seeing no one rise, the Chair closed the public hearing.

**DISCUSSION AND DECISION OF THE BOARD**

Mr. Rice made a motion to approve the request for a second one year extension with the TAC stipulations and the addition of the hours and days of construction to be added to the Site Plans. Deputy City Manager Hayden seconded the motion.

The motion to approve a second additional one year extension passed unanimously with the following stipulations:

**Original Stipulations from October 20, 2005 Planning Board Approval:**

**Stipulations from the October 20, 2005 Planning Board Meeting:**

- 1) That an oil/water hood be installed on the catch basin located on Fleet Street, subject to review and approval by David Allen;

**Stipulations from the October 4, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:**

- 2) That the armor-tile panel shown on the Sidewalk Tip Down detail on Sheet D-1 be removed;
- 3) That the sidewalks be shown as a minimum of 5’ and so noted on the Site Plans;
- 4) That the City Attorney review the grease trap issue (See previous Stipulation #4 below) to determine how to address this issue for future potential restaurant use (perhaps as part of the deed);
- 5) That all parking space striping and installation of parking meters shall be coordinated with DPW;
- 6) That the Construction Management Plan, including but not limited to all licenses and easements, shall be approved by the City through the City Attorney, Planning Department and DPW, and shall be presented and approved by the City Council prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- 7) That the parking fees shall be calculated in conjunction with the Planning Department and the applicant;
- 8) That the engineer design the drainage line in such a way that future catch basins on the other side of Congress Street could be adequately drained using this new drain pipe;
- 9) That the applicant shall sign the Site Review Application;

**Stipulations from the August 30, 2005 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting:**

- 10) That a detail be added to the Site Plans regarding the front awning;
- 11) That details be provided relative to footings and building protrusions and that all footings either under or on the City right of way shall require approval from the City Council;
- 12) That the drainage line be extended from the building to the end of the City drainage line;
- 13) That a grease trap be installed for any potential restaurant use;
- 14) That a knock box and fire alarm box be installed;
- 15) That a Construction Management Plan be prepared for review and approval by the City;
- 16) That if a determination is made that blasting will be required, a plan will be submitted for approval prior to a blasting permit being issued;
- 17) That a note be added to the plan explaining the use of the shared driveway; and
- 18) That a note be added to the Site Plans reflecting that the replacement of the fence in the rear is “replacing in kind”;

**Stipulations from the October 18, 2007 Planning Board Meeting:**

- 19) That the hours of construction as allowed by City Ordinance be noted on the Site Plans;

.....

**III. CITY COUNCIL REFERRALS/REQUESTS**

- A. Proposed renovations to the property located at 2 Ceres Street;

Mr. Holden indicated that this is for a license to allow an encroachment on City property for a door to open into a right of way. The applicant was present to address the Board.

Rob Harkinson, of Destefano Architect, on behalf of John Golumb. He distributed a handout to the Board.

In the previous package they had a photo of the existing door on Ceres Street. It was their intention to leave that door however per discussions with the Inspection Department, once the space is added and opened up to the existing Cantina, the door will swing out. They moved the door jam as far to the interior wall as possible and they are asking permission to swing into the public right of way by 9". Turning to the package that he handed out, the top sheet showed the plan approved by the Inspection Department. If the doors are not allowed to swing into the right of way, he showed the only solution. They don't want to do that as they would be forced to overbuild the existing granite stairs and build a new masonry wall. Additionally it would create a very strange condition from the exterior of the building as the door would have to recess past the recess of the current wall. It would create a funny construction detail. Finally, there is an existing granite post that comes 17" into the public way at this location already.

Mr. Holden noted that the existing granite post does not belong to this property. It has a metal ring on it for a hitching post and was used for public purposes.

Mr. Harkinson pointed out the different colored bricks which show where the wall is set in.

Deputy City Manager Hayden referred to the preferred option with the outswing, she confirmed that would be 5 1/2', and the range of how much the door would swing into the right of way is 7" – 9".

Mr. Coker asked Mr. Holden what the objection of the City was to this? Mr. Holden did not know of any objection and he has just given the Board some history of past recommendations.

Mr. Coker stated that he was in the post office the other day and those doors pop open and a lady got clobbered in the head recently. He sees this as a real safety issue.

Mr. Harkinson stated in this case they are talking about 7' to 9' rather than the full width of the door. There is also 5' clear to the left. Additionally, if that is still a concern, the owner would be amenable to placing a granite post on either side of the door to prevent that from happening. Chairman Ricci noted that would be on City Property as well. Mr. Coker felt that would open up all sorts of other issues. Mr. Holden stated it would be a City Council issue and would be a further refinement of this. Basically they have a public right of way that goes right up to the building which has existed for a long time and they need to address how much the interior effects the exterior. Mr. Coviello stated it is outdoors so shouldn't they put something from prohibiting people from walking in front of it? Mr. Hopley stated that currently they swing in. Because their occupant load will be greater than 50, the doors have to swing out. Mr. Coviello asked if there is a provision to handle this? Mr. Hopley felt they would want to make it so that it wouldn't swing into the outer corridor. Because this isn't inside the building and is on the public way, and the sidewalk is pretty wide there, the building code will not address this application on an exterior sidewalk. A post certainly is a solution to circumvent that. He felt the other issue is whether this will be a primary thoroughfare to and from the cantina?

Mr. Harkinson stated it would not be the major thoroughfare from the cantina as a whole but they will not be discouraging the use of that doorway. This will be the main in and out for the 2 Ceres Street space.

Chairman Ricci asked if the doors get narrower? Mr. Harkinson stated they are as narrow as they can be. They have discussed going down to a 1' 6" door and they still come into the public way by 3". They determined that door would be very narrow to walk through.

Chairman Ricci asked if it makes sense to put a wall stone on either side of the door? Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if there are other options such as a railing. If these weren't such great looking



doors, they wouldn't normally allow it. Also, the interior granite steps are nice. Mr. Harkinson indicated that a previous owner next to the granite post had approval for a temporary structure next to the door for a bench. Maybe they could do something like that.

Mr. Rice noted that the granite sill below the door is about 7" out. Doesn't that make people aware of the doorway? Also, people will not be hugging the brick door. He doesn't think they need to embellish it and they have the threshold. He feels natural caution will handle it.

Ms. Geffert liked the idea of two historic planters and that they recommend a 7" swing with blocks on either side by items that are non structural.

Chairman Ricci liked Mr. Rice's idea.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked, looking at the interior of the granite steps, can they set the door back in a couple of inches. Mr. Harkinson stated it is set back as far as it will go. Deputy City Manager Hayden agreed they cannot start adding things to the sidewalk area as an experiment. They have scrutinized these in other parts of town and the ones that exist have existed for hundreds of years. This is a unique case.

Mr. Holden stated they are doing work now under a permit and asked if there was a diagram that shows how that goes. Mr. Harkinson referred him to Sk 1 and he explained that basically allows them to come in further on the top stair so they have to build another stair and then they have to build more tread. The issue is how the wall frame and door jam works with that existing masonry opening. They are now coming inside the space and they have to cover the joint between the frame wall and the masonry wall. It then becomes an HDC issue as it would make it not keeping with other doors in the area.

Deputy City Manager Hayden asked if overbuild means the old steps would not be visible? Mr. Harkinson felt that would be up to the contractor on how it would be done.

Mr. Hopley referred to Photo 1 and asked if the door were moved back the way they want it to be, what is the distance from the inside door and the inside riser? Mr. Harkinson stated it would be a little over a foot. Mr. Hopley was pretty sure that this door way was supposed to be an out only door but he now finds out it is in and out. That creates a landing that he hasn't talked about before.

Mr. Coviello asked if they are re redoing the surrounding ramp? Mr. Harkinson understood the City would be redoing it down the road.

Deputy City Manager Hayden confirmed that whatever they may propose for the Riverwalk, this door will not be an issue.

Councilor Dwyer asked about the potential for a railing? Those are steep steps for outdoor steps. Mr. Hopley stated that the stairs should have a railing but he doesn't regulate that. The City Council may want to take that under advisement. Then they would possibly, at the first riser, turn the railing horizontally and it would be 4' 11" from door jam to riser.

Mr. Rice made a motion to recommend approval of this matter to the City Council without any accoutrements. Ms Roberts seconded the motion.

The motion to favorably recommend this matter to the City Council passed unanimously.

.....

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

A. Request of Parade Office, LLC, to name private right-of-way "Portwalk Place";

Mr. Holden advised the Board that the Police Department and the Emergency Operations Center have approved this name and have recommended alternate names, one of which was Port Place. If the Board has an issue with the name then they should advise the applicant that they have concerns. They can approve or suggest another one.

Deputy City Manager Hayden indicated that, based on a survey of her peers, they all thought of something else when she mentioned Portwalk Place. She suggested Port Place.

Mr. Coviello did not like Portwalk Place. Chairman Ricci did not like it either. He thought Port Place was a great name.

Mr. Holden confirmed that it was the Department's recommendation that:

1. That the street signs shall identify this street as being "Private" in addition to "Portwalk Place"; and,
2. That this name shall not be changed or altered in the future without the expressed approval of the City.

He suggested that a third condition could be

3. That the Board recommends that instead of Portwalk Place that consideration by the applicant be given to Port Place.

Deputy City Manager Hayden made a motion to accept Mr. Holden's recommendation. Mr. Hopley seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

.....

**V. AMENDED SITE PLAN REVIEW**

A. Albacore Way, Atlantic Point Builders – Minor Site Plan Amendment

Mr. Holden advised the Board that staff approved a minor amendment as a result of a 2' jog in the building, which DPW had no problems with.

.....

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn at 11:00 pm was made and seconded and passed unanimously.

.....

Respectfully submitted,

Jane M. Shouse  
Acting Secretary for the Planning Board

These minutes were approved by the Planning Board on November 15, 2007