

The Planning Board for the Town of Derry held a public meeting on Wednesday, January 16, 2019 at 7:00 p.m., at the Derry Municipal Center (Third Floor Meeting Room) located at 14 Manning Street in Derry, New Hampshire.

Members present: David Granese, Chairman; John O'Connor, Vice Chairman; Lori Davison, Secretary; Randy Chase, Town Administrative Representative; Frank Bartkiewicz, Members

Absent: Brian Chirichiello, James MacEachern, Maya Levin, Mark Connors, Elizabeth Carver, Matthew Leavitt

Also present: George Sioras, Planning Director; Elizabeth Robidoux, Planning and Economic Development Assistant; Beverly Donovan, Economic Development Director.

Mr. Granese called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The meeting began with a salute to the flag. Mr. Granese then noted the emergency exits, the location of meeting materials, and introduced the Board members and staff.

Escrow

#19-02

Project Name: Medical Office Building

Developer: 11 Tsienneto Road, LLC

Escrow Account: Same

Escrow Type: Letter of Credit

Parcel ID/Location: 08073, 11 Tsienneto Road

The request is to establish a Letter of Credit #43374-1, drawn on Enterprise Bank, in the amount of \$403,678.08. The expiration date will be December 27, 2019.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Bartkiewicz to approve as presented. The motion passed with all in favor.

#19-03

Project Name: Health Service Facility

Developer: 29 Ashleigh Drive, LLC

Escrow Account: Same

Escrow Type: Letter of Credit

Parcel ID/Location: 08280-006, 29 Ashleigh Drive

The request is to establish a Letter of Credit #43724, drawn on Enterprise Bank, in the amount of \$198,434.45. The expiration date will be January 07, 2020.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Bartkiewicz to approve as presented. The motion passed with all in favor.

Minutes

The Board reviewed the minutes of the January 02, 2019, meeting.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Bartkiewicz to approve the minutes of the January 02, 2019, meeting as written. The motion passed with all in favor.

Correspondence

Ms. Davison advised the Board has received the January/February issue of *Town and City*, as well as a copy of a reminder letter to BR-10, LLC advising its Letter of Credit should be renewed. The Board is also in receipt of a copy of the Summary of Public Input for the November 28 visioning forum prepared by the Master Plan consultants. Also included is a map, outlining the private right of way known as Adams Way. Mr. Sioras explained at the last meeting, the Board approved a voluntary merger of lots adjacent to this right of way. Board members had asked about the status of Adams Way. It is a private road, established in the 1970s. There are several private roads around Beaver Lake as well as several unofficial rights of way along the lake. They are intended for the residents to access Beaver Lake.

Other Business

Discuss proposed amendment to the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance, Section 165-30 to move five properties from the CBD to MHDR and to move six properties from MHDR to MHDR II

Mr. Granese stated at the last meeting, the Board discussed the disposition of several properties near 19 Elm Street. Mr. Sioras asked the Board members to look at the attached memo and information. The Board had discussed what should be done with 19 Elm Street, and then took a look at properties nearby. The Board decided to move five properties from the Central Business District to the Medium High Density Residential District. Those properties are 13 Elm Street, 19 Elm Street, 15 Elm Street, 34 Maple Street and 18 Maple Street. Moving those properties back to the MHDR will allow townhouse development. The majority of those property have existing multifamily on the lots. The second part of the memo speaks to moving six properties from the Medium High Density Residential zone to the Medium High Density Residential II zone. Back in 2017, the Board moved the parcels in this area from MHDR to MHDR II. These six properties should have been included in the change and were missed. The properties are 8 Elm Street, 42 Hillside Avenue, 42.5 Hillside Avenue, 44 Hillside Avenue, 17.5 Beacon Street, and 54.5 Hillside Avenue. This proposal would clean up that zoning and move those "orphan" lots into the intended zone. Multifamily dwelling units are not allowed in MHDR II.

Mr. Granese confirmed the Board members were in favor of these changes. As there is no opposition, the Board will move to schedule a public hearing at the next meeting on February 06. The public hearing will be held on February 20th.

Discuss proposed amendments to the Town of Derry Zoning Ordinance, Section 165-33, Central Business District and Section 165-49, Traditional Business Overlay District, to remove the second floor residential restriction

Mr. Granese said at the last meeting, he discussed with the Board that he had been in opposition to allow residential on the second floor of buildings in the downtown. Nothing has happened in the downtown since the Board restricted residential use on the second floor. He would be in favor of removing that restriction but placing certain conditions on residential use on the second floor. Mr. Sioras said there has been some interest in redeveloping buildings in the downtown for commercial and retail use, with residential on the second floor. Staff would recommend changing the ordinance which states residential use is prohibited below the third floor, to the second floor. This will allow for a better mix of uses. Mr. Granese said limitations need to be in place on what can be built for residential use on the second floor. He would prefer to see higher end, market rate apartments, with nice features. This puts professionals in the downtown. The Board was in agreement with the proposed change. Mr. O'Connor had a comment about parking. For residential uses in the CBD and TBOD, parking can occur on site, off site, utilizing public parking or private parking partnerships; it could also be a combination. This will be placed on the agenda under other business at the next meeting so that the Board can discuss the limitations that should be included. Board members were asked to be prepared to discuss their suggestions.

Workshop

Workshop #2 – Review permitted uses in the OBD and review the definitions of those uses

Mr. Sioras facilitated. The Board has a map of the proposed expansion area before it. The intent is to expand the Office Business District which starts near the Marion Gerrish Center and Storer Court. This zone is noted in light yellow on the map and continues to the Londonderry town line near Dickey Street and on either side of Valley Street. This draft was prepared by Mrs. Donovan and Mrs. Robidoux. There has been some interest in potential redevelopment of this area. The suggestion is to expand the zone to include the Derry Restaurant and Pizza lot, the lots on either side of Ela Ave, Valley Street, Lowell, Aiken, and the west side of Fordway Ext., to the Transfer Station lot. The purpose of the discussion is to see what the Board may want to permit as uses and if the Board wants to expand the zone. The permitted uses are outlined in the packet.

Mrs. Donovan explained they combined some of the existing permitted uses as some were redundant. They also looked at the existing downtown zoning and cross referenced what was allowed in the area to maximize the redevelopment opportunities. Some uses were added because it made sense to do so in context with discussion with some of the landowners. For example, 'Bank' was added as a permitted use because many of the banks being constructed now are the boutique style with no drive through. The intent was to have more flexible zoning in this area as these lots are also in the Opportunity Zone which runs along the south side of West

Broadway. Setbacks for the zone should be discussed. Research Lab was added as a use because in many cases those are small. Restaurant would be permitted without a drive through. The lots in this area are not very large.

Mr. Granese asked if Daycare was for children or others, and why was that taken out? Mrs. Robidoux explained the current definition covers children and adults; there is no definition for canine daycare. Daycare services is not a permitted use in the Office Business District. It could be added back in. The way the Zoning Ordinance is written, if a use is not listed as a permitted use, the use is not permitted. Mr. O'Connor also questioned the inclusion of that use and asked for clarification of the wording "multifamily similar to the arrangement in CBD"; also, why is Workforce Housing a permitted use, this area is being targeted for commercial development. Mrs. Robidoux said the setback and lot limitations would need to be fleshed out in this ordinance; they wanted it as a talking point. With regard to Workforce Housing, she explained per the RSAs, similar to Sexually Oriented Businesses, the town has to list Workforce Housing as a permitted use per the state definition, within a zone in town. Currently Workforce Housing is not listed as a permitted use. She and Mrs. Donovan thought this would be a good area to list it. Mrs. Donovan said given the size of the lots, there was a very small chance that workforce housing would go in this area because of the way any new residential development would need to be priced to be profitable. Allowing the use in the zone covers the statutory requirement but the town is not at peril for any one type of housing. Mr. O'Connor felt the town was covered in any event because it has been found Derry exceeds its regional fair share of this type of housing. Mrs. Robidoux said by listing it as a permitted use in the zone, the town is protected from liability. Mr. Sioras said per the state law, there needs to be a definition of workforce housing in the ordinance and it needs to be allowed in a zone. If challenged, the town can produce the numbers to prove it meets its fair share for the region. Manchester and Derry provide most of the workforce housing for the region. Mr. O'Connor asked if workforce housing would be an allowed use in the West Running Brook District, because people are looking for apartments.

Ms. Davison asked why would this zone be an expansion of the OBD and not the CBD or a business overlay. Mr. Sioras said the intent of the TBOD is to maintain the character of downtown Derry with zero setbacks and minimal side yard setbacks. In the OBD, the homes have slowly turned over to businesses. In the 1990's the Planning Board did not want to have this area develop like Crystal Avenue with strip development; they wanted to keep the character of the area. This area is not the traditional downtown but changing the uses in the zone might open up the area to future development. He discussed the architecture of the neighborhood. The character should be maintained, and the Board may want to consider not having a building setback.

Richard Metts, 8 Dustin Avenue, confirmed that if someone today wanted to have a daycare in the OBD zone, they would need to apply for a variance.

Mr. Granese noted multifamily is not allowed in the OBD currently, why would this use be included in the expansion? Mrs. Donovan explained if one looked at the potential for redevelopment, the lots in this area are shallow. Development will be mostly be vertical. People who want to maximize and redevelop the properties won't get second floor office use; it is possible there might be a few condominiums over an office or storefront. Mr. Granese noted the

wording that suggested allowing multifamily in a similar arrangement as in the CBD. He quoted the residential restrictions found in the CBD and he suggested looking at the height requirement in this proposed zone. With small lots of land and no height restriction, there could be a 10 story development. Members and staff present agreed. Mr. O'Connor also felt there needed be further clarification of the multifamily density requirements. Mrs. Robidoux explained the current wording in the document was just a placeholder, meant to spark conversation about density restrictions. She suggested if the Board wanted to mimic the density requirements found in the CBD, then it could be worded that Multifamily Dwellings would be allowed as per Section 165-33.5.B.

With regard to some of the permitted uses, Mrs. Donovan advised they were tweaked because the uses did not match the description. Mr. Granese noted he did not see "real estate office" listed as a permitted use. That use would be considered "professional office". Mrs. Davison asked for clarification of the difference between "office" and "professional office". Mr. Granese read the two definitions aloud. The basic difference is that "office" could be the smaller type of office found at a plumbing or other service type company that would handle customer inquiries and billing. "Professional Office" is more for brokers, lawyers, engineers, real estate professionals, etc.

Mr. Granese said he liked that Brew Pub and Commercial Arts were included as uses in this zone. These are things that other communities are not offering. Mrs. Robidoux commented there is proven data that breweries and brew pubs create economy. Mrs. Davison confirmed uses such as a salon or spa would be considered "commercial service establishments".

Mrs. Robidoux said electric charging stations should be allowed in all zones. How would the Board accomplish that and put it in the Ordinance? Mrs. Donovan said it was similar to a tire filling station. Mr. Granese asked if there was a place in the beginning of the Ordinance to state that. It was noted Churches are allowed in all zones except the Industrial IV zone. Mr. Granese suggested adding something near that section about Electronic Vehicle Supply Equipment.

Mr. Chase felt Daycare should be a permitted use in this zone as professionals working in businesses in the area would appreciate having a daycare near where they work. There are limitations on the setbacks in this area. The lots are small, and he feels it is asking a lot to have a 35 foot front building setback in that area. The buildings should be to the front of the lots with parking in the rear. He used as an example 84 West Broadway. The lot would have looked better with the building to the front of the lot and the parking to the rear. He would not want to see parking to the front of this zone. Mr. Granese agreed. It might be beneficial to not have setbacks or have it so that the Planning Board has purview over the developments. Mrs. Donovan agreed it made sense as some of the lots may not have access from the back of the lots. Mr. O'Connor noted the average lot size in this area is 0.3 acres. Mr. Chase felt the Board should also not restrict the frontage of the lots; 100 feet is not feasible in this area. Mrs. Robidoux asked if the Board wanted to have development by Conditional Use Permit. With a Conditional Use Permit, the Planning Board has purview over any waiver requests and has the authority over how the Zoning Ordinance is followed. For example, if a development requested 50 feet of frontage and the requirement is 100 feet, the Board could make the decision to allow that; it would not need a variance. Mr. Granese was not as certain; it is possible there could be a

Board in the future made up of members with a different vision. How can the Board write the ordinance to protect the development for the future? Mr. Chase said the Board should look at lot width and setbacks, there need to be some parameters; those are both concerns for him. He does not want the Planning Board to be contrary and there needs to be protection for the developers as well to stand on. Mr. O'Connor cited the need for residential buffers; people cannot be boxed in. Mrs. Robidoux suggested putting dimensional criteria in place in the zone but give the Board the ability to waive the restrictions on new development through a Conditional Use Permit, which alleviates the applicant having to go to the ZBA. The applicant would have to meet certain criteria in order to be granted relief, just as occurs with waiver requests.

Mr. Chase felt there should be a restriction such that any lots that are merged and re-subdivided cannot create a lot that is smaller than what is there currently. If an existing lot of record has 50 feet of frontage, it should keep the 50 feet of frontage as a minimum. It is okay to combine lots, but the frontage of any one lot should not be less than its original frontage. If someone purchases lots on Aiken Street, now the lots have tripled in size, and the Board needs to make sure the lots are not micro-sized.

Mr. Granese asked that a draft containing tonight's suggestions be provided for the next workshop. Mr. Sioras said staff would do that but wanted to confirm the Board was comfortable with the proposed boundary of the expanded zone. The Board did not comment on the proposed boundary.

Workshop #2 – Proposed West Running Brook Village District

Mr. Sioras noted the Board has a lot of information before it. Mrs. Robidoux provided the minutes from the meetings over the last several years having to do with zoning changes in this area. The Board also has a copy of the census tract areas. He provided an overview of the proposed zone boundary. The character of this area is different from that found on Ryan's Hill, Manchester Road, or Crystal Avenue. There is history in this area, it is scenic, the West Running Brook runs through the area, and it is located near the Robert Frost Farm. Staff tried to pull it all together with the name of the district. Water and sewer were extended to this area; the tax base should be enhanced, and the town is looking for opportunities to develop and redevelop the land. The intent is to create a vision. For example, the Smith property (120 Rockingham Road) abuts the State property. There are walking trails behind this lot which connect the Robert Frost Farm to the Grinnell conservation land (11-23 Island Pond Road). The former Grandview Flea Market lot (2 Island Pond Road) is in redevelopment and there is some interest in the Siragusa, Butterfield and what is known as the Elmer Pease properties. The proposed uses can be discussed. Mr. Sioras suggested looking at a few more properties to be included in the zone. At the last meeting, there had been some discussion about adding the salvage yard lot (109 Rockingham Road). This is located on the corner of Bedard Avenue. Perhaps that lot and the other lots along Rockingham Road on that side of the road to the intersection of Route 28 should be included. Also, should the mobile home park across from the Robert Frost Farm be included? Those lots now have water and sewer which was paid for by a Community Development Block Grant. The lot is deceptive. It looks as though there is a lot of undeveloped land, but the lot drops off in the back just after the last home. The land has a lot of ledge. There will not be

development to the rear. Should this be in the zone? The thought is that the mobile home park adjacent to Clam Haven (which does not have water and sewer) should be included in the event someone picks up the land at this corner for a larger development. Mr. Granese noted the current zoning is General Commercial IV; it was rezoned several years ago.

Mr. Sioras said they separated out the proposed West Running Brook Village District because the character of the land is different from the rest of the GC IV. The Board has a side by side comparison of the original uses in the zone, the GC IV uses, and the proposed uses for the district. Mr. Granese asked why “assisted living facility” was removed as a use. Mr. O’Connor suggested adding it back in as a permitted use; this type of use generates taxes. Mrs. Robidoux noted that would address Ms. Levin’s suggestion as well.

Mrs. Donovan explained the draft was created using the information from Southern New Hampshire Planning Commission as a base, and then staff looked at the ordinances in other towns. They looked at the ordinances with an eye toward what makes an area vibrant. In looking what is already in this area, there is high density residential so there is no need to build more of that type of housing. There are two schools, playgrounds, conservation land, trails, cultural and State amenities at the Farm, as well as some commercial use. When they looked at mixed use in smaller buildings, assisted living will take up more space and won’t have the same effect of creating a market place that is walkable. It is not that staff did not want to see assisted living in the zone, it was more that it is available in other zones that are close by. She would not be opposed to adding it as a permitted use. Mr. Granese said he does not anticipate people will walk in this area like they do in the downtown given the proximity to the state road. Mrs. Donovan said the draft ordinance requires sidewalks and also slows and calms traffic down in the area. Children cross Route 28 to get to West Running Brook School and the fields on Humphrey Road. Mr. Granese noted that is a state highway and the Board would not have purview over the curb cuts. Further down Route 28 is a forgotten part of Derry. There are some really nice businesses located there. He would like to see a nice retail development at the former Grandview site similar to the McKinnen’s lot in Salem. There is a lot of land on that lot to be developed and it could be a good walkable retail area.

Mrs. Donovan said the existing rail trail system connects between the Alexander Carr Park to the Fairways; people can cross at the light and continue onto the conservation land to the Robert Frost Farm. This gives people a purpose, similar to what is seen on the rail trail today. This is another amenity for residents and visitors. The trail map can be provided to the Board for the next meeting.

Mr. O’Connor admitted to having negative feelings about the propose change, but said he is trying to be open minded. If mixed use is allowed, a whole new set of regulations would be required for the design of smaller, narrower streets, etc. He is not sure about the proposed uses. They were looking at a commercial area but there is land to add workforce housing. Multifamily was removed from this area previously and now it is being suggested it be added back as a use. He was not quite sure what was intended by the restrictions on the retail sales establishments.

Mrs. Donovan said there are several types of mixed use. Some are like those found in the downtown where there are uses on top of each other, in other instances it can be more than one

use on one lot such as retail/commercial buildings with housing to the rear. For this proposal, there can be either of those, or both. Staff discussed the reasonableness of uses and felt it was important to have developments be by Conditional Use Permit. The topography varies per parcel. For example, on the Siragusa property (45 and 49 South Main Street), the land goes up a hill, levels off and then it goes down into a deep bowl. One large building of any type could not be built on this lot without a lot of site work and fill. It is expensive to develop that way. It is possible to save the house and maybe add onto it with an addition that blends in the front and then perhaps have assisted living or housing to the rear. These are just examples of what could be done, not what is proposed or suggested to be done. It is all conjecture. On the Taylor property (2 Island Pond Road), there is going to be a gas station on the front corner, but retail along the frontage of Route 28 is a good use. There is a lot of land there. Maybe in the back there could be warehouse or a business that will need to relocate because of Exit 4A. The uses to the rear of the parcels would not take over the site. These projects need to come to the Board as a master plan for the parcel. A developer could not come before the Board and say they just want to talk about the housing today and commercial later. It has to be master planned. Mr. O'Connor asked if there has been any move to purchase a bunch of lots all at once. There have not. His vision of a village district is similar to Freeport, Maine. Mr. O'Connor feared people would "cherry pick"; he can see the lots being developed residentially and not commercially. Someone could put an inn on one parcel, single family housing on the next one and then the adjacent lot could have three or four multifamily residential units. He is not hearing a lot about commercial development. Mrs. Donovan explained in looking at each of the lots as they exist today, it would be difficult to build anything. 74 Rockingham Road has had a few attempts to develop it, with an assisted living facility or a rehabilitation facility. These did not go forward. This lot has almost 30 acres but only 15 acres of it are buildable, but the buildable land is not contiguous. Any development would need a lot of site work. The numbers don't work to make it profitable in that instance for those types of plans. In looking at what could go there, given the traffic counts, a bank or pharmacy would not consider siting on this lot, but the land could lend itself to housing pods. Mr. O'Connor commented there is Tiny House legislation in the works. Mrs. Donovan said staff wanted the Board to have the flexibility of a Conditional Use Permit, so if it was proven that nothing else could be developed on the lot but residential, it might be a good transitional use. There had been some comments at the last meeting about expanding the zone along Cemetery Road. All of the lots in this proposed zone front on Rockingham Road, Route 28, or at Island Pond Road. The two lots that don't are likely to be merged into parcels that do front on Route 28 as they are owned by the same landowner. There is no water, sewer, or gas down those roads and the lots further along Island Pond and Cemetery are more rural, so that might not be a good idea to include them beyond what is proposed. She agrees the zone should pick up the lots on the other side of Rockingham Road to include the salvage yard.

Mr. O'Connor asked if consideration had been given to the flood zone in this area. Mr. Sioras noted the land drops behind the storage facility to the town owned property. This lot is land locked and has a prime wetland on it. The back of some of the properties will not be useable because they are under water. He agrees there are some pockets of land that will not be developed. There had been an approved medical facility on 74 Rockingham Road, but the approvals lapsed, and it was not constructed. Septic and wells prohibited the use of some of the land, but with water and sewer now available, it is possible the town may see development along

the road. Mrs. Donovan advised the conceptual designs for this property show the buildings can be constructed, but there is little room for parking.

Richard Metts, 8 Dustin Avenue, is a member of the Economic Development Advisory Committee. The Committee looked at the map of the proposed area and there was some discussion about allowing filling stations as a permitted use; he recalls there being discussion about that specific use a few years ago. There were also questions about the proposed two bedroom, single family detached dwelling units because single family was taken out of this zone. Mr. Granese recalled the Board added filling stations back in as a use in the GCIV and decided to let the market dictate placement. Mr. Metts said his concern is more with the single family residential because he recalled the landowners in this area felt their rights had been removed when single family was removed as a permitted use. There is not much that can be done with a two bedroom single family structure. Mrs. Donovan explained what is proposed here is not traditional housing. These would be small, clustered starter homes or retirement homes. The intent is to have the ability to construct something with a master bedroom on the first floor and a loft bedroom on the second. Residential brokers are saying people need a place to downsize from their current 3 acre properties and not go to an apartment or townhouse. There is no inventory in Derry and residents are moving to Litchfield and Hudson. Mrs. Davison asked if these types of homes would be condominiumized similar to what is found in Drew Woods. Mr. Metts thought the concept was more like the manufactured homes off Kendall Pond Road. Mrs. Donovan said it would be similar to a Planned Urban Development. Mr. Granese asked Mr. Metts if the EDAC was in favor of adding in single family residential to this proposed zone. Mr. Metts said the Committee did not vote as a whole on any particular use; members just voiced their individual reactions. Mr. O'Connor asked if there had been any discussion about waiting for the Master Plan input. Mr. Granese did not feel this should be put on hold until the Master Plan update is complete. Mrs. Donovan said people are looking to enhance the commercial development; that was an overarching theme at the visioning session. People want affordable options for housing.

Mr. Granese asked what are other towns not doing. That is what Derry should be doing to attract people to town. Mrs. Donovan said other communities are jealous that Derry has a downtown, a good vibe, and creative economy. The other towns are trying to create it, but it will be more sterile. This is nice because development will be organic and incremental. Tuscan Village is a 179 acre development that is happening all at once. This proposed area is 170 acres and will develop slowly. She feels it is good to have a different flavor in each pod.

Mr. Sioras related the Planning staff attended the annual Planners meeting which was held at Murphy's Tap Room. South River Road in Bedford is different but once one gets beyond the new high school in Bedford along Route 101 West, there is some nice, smaller scale, retail and office development that would be more of the type of use that is intended here. The intent was to make it look different from the area near Whole Foods.

Mrs. Robidoux said tight architectural regulations are in effect in Bedford and that is what is intended for this district so that there is control over what the district looks like.

Mr. Granese said he would be okay with multifamily residential so long as there is mixed use as proposed, but he has an issue with single family residential because that was a big issue when they were rezoning this area a few years ago. With water and sewer in the area, he would rather see more office or multifamily, not single family residential. He would like to have that retail vibe and tax base. Mrs. Donovan said single family residential would need to be a percentage of the overall planned development. It is unlikely that commercial uses would go on 74 Rockingham Road, given the percentage of buildable land on the lot. That is why it is important to have a Conditional Use Permit so that the Board has some flexibility to think outside of the box. It may not work for all properties and it allows for the best and highest use.

Mr. Chase said he agreed with Mr. Granese about the single family residential. That type of use has ruined the commercial land in Derry. No one wants a two bedroom ranch behind a commercial building; the commercial land gets sucked up by the single family residential uses. This is the only commercial land left. He cannot support single family residential use. Mrs. Donovan suggested if the only feasible use on a lot is single family residential, the Board may want to consider taking that lot out of the commercial district; there needs to be flexibility. Mr. Chase liked the development that occurred at 416 Island Pond Road; that development put 3 commercial buildings on a lot that had varying topography. The buildings work with the topography and it is a good development.

Mrs. Donovan said with 74 Rockingham Road, the location is also an issue. Traffic counts are not there for a larger commercial use; a smaller use could go that that would not rely so much on the higher traffic pattern. Mr. Sioras recalled that parcel was formerly zoned residential, and the owner asked to have it included in the General Commercial rezoning a few years ago. Mr. Chase maintained commercial and residential uses don't mix well but agreed there needed to be flexibility with mixed uses. He cannot support single family residential in this zone.

Mr. Granese suggested reviewing what the Board has and move forward with a plan at the next meeting. It was hoped the members who were absent this evening would be familiar with what was discussed.

Mr. Granese reminded the Board members with expiring terms they will need to reapply to the Planning Board.

There was no further business before the Board.

Motion by O'Connor, seconded by Bartkiewicz to adjourn. The motion passed with all in favor and the meeting stood adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Approved by: _____
Chairman/Vice Chairman

Secretary

Approval date: _____