



Stratham Planning Board Meeting Minutes
August 21, 2024
Stratham Municipal Center
Time: 7:00 pm

Members Present: Thomas House, Chair
David Canada, Vice Chair
Mike Houghton, Select Board's Representative
Chris Zaremba, Regular Member
John Kunowski, Regular Member

Members Absent: Nate Allison, Alternate Member

Staff Present: Mark Connors, Director of Planning and Community Development

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Mr. House called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and took roll call.

2. Approval of Minutes

a. August 7, 2024

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to approve the August 7, 2024 meeting minutes. Mr. Canada seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

3. Public Meeting (New Business):

a. Shamus Quirk (Applicant), 297R Portsmouth Ave CBC, LLC (Owner) - Request for after-the-fact approval of a Route 33 Heritage District application to allow the construction of a single-family home with vinyl siding at 297 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 22, Lot 23, Zoned Route 33 Heritage District.

Mr. House stated that the Route 33 Heritage District Advisory Committee met just prior to this meeting and they don't have any issues with the application. The house is set back from the road and it does bring in the character of the surrounding areas. The project came before the Planning Board for demolition approval. Mr. House stated his opinion that architecturally, vinyl is okay in the area and the applicant did a great job. He believes that it will be hard to tell that it is vinyl from the road and he likes the farmer's porch which brings out the traditional New England character.

Mr. Connors stated that the Town did not catch the error until the Building Inspector noticed the vinyl siding during the final inspection for the occupancy permit. Ideally the applicant would have requested approval from the Planning Board prior to issuance of the building permit.

Mr. Quirk stated that he tried to keep the Seacoast vibe with the color scheme of property - the woods, the whites and the blues to keep the nautical Seacoast feel. He added nice wood accents with the garage doors and mahogany decking. They set the house as far back from the road as they could to give it some privacy. In 2020 he worked on the houses next door and for this home they tried to make it different but kept it in line with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Canada asked for confirmation that vinyl siding is allowed in the Route 33 Heritage District with approval from the Board. Mr. Connors replied yes, as long as it is consistent with the character of the property and the surrounding area.

Mr. Quirk stated that the two houses he worked on next door in 2020 have vinyl siding that predates the revised ordinance passed in 2022.

Mr. Zaremba asked Mr. Connors to confirm that the process that should have happened is that when the building permit was pulled, the project should have gone through the Heritage application process at that time. Mr. Connors replied yes.

There was a general board discussion about the application process. Mr. Kunowski stated that he does not want to create a hardship for the owner to take down the vinyl and install concrete siding because that is not viable based on a town error and that this is a process to approve an application that did not get submitted previously. Mr. Kunowski is in favor of approving the application as long as it doesn't set a precedent that vinyl siding is okay in the District and that this is not a blanket approval that vinyl siding is okay. Mr. Zaremba agrees with Mr. Kunowski. Mr. Canada stated that he does not believe this project sets a precedent as the applicant has demonstrated that he's trying to make the house fit into the character of the town. Mr. Houghton is comfortable with the application.

Mr. Quirk asked that the permit fee be waived due to the error by the Town. Mr. Connors stated that is a decision of the Planning Board. The Board discussed the request and determined that this is a fee that would have been required anyway and needs to be paid.

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Drew Goddard of 1 Sanctuary Drive spoke. He stated that he is concerned with the precedence but agrees that in this case it is fine because the house is set back from the road.

Bruce Scamman spoke. He stated that there is a 100 by 100 section on that lot that's that was put into conservation by mistake when they did the duplexes, that the well was on.

Mr. Zaremba made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the after the fact approval of a Route 33 Heritage District application to allow the construction of a single-family home with vinyl siding at 297 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 22, Lot 23, Zoned Route 33 Heritage District. Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

94 **4. Public Hearing (Old Business):**

- 95
- 96 a. Copley Properties LLC (Applicant), C.A.N Realty Trust and GGF Limited Liability Co (Owners)
- 97 – Request for approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit at 89 and 91 Portsmouth Avenue
- 98 (Tax Map 13, Lots 22 & 23), zoned Professional/Residential, to construct a mixed-use
- 99 development to include six residential units in three buildings and two office buildings totaling
- 100 12,624 square-feet of general office and medical office uses and to allow encroachment into
- 101 wetland buffer. Application submitted by Emanuel Engineering Inc., 118 Portsmouth Avenue,
- 102 Stratham NH 03885. This application was tabled from the July 10, 2024 meeting.
- 103

104 Mr. Connors stated that this is the third time with this application. The applicants made some

105 modifications requested by the Town and he thinks the application is in good shape for a

106 conditional approval. He stated there are some items in the staff memo that should be discussed.

107

108 Bruce Scamman of Emanuel Engineering spoke on behalf of the applicant. Regarding landscaping,

109 they added a tree in front of the building. He stated that they cannot add trees under the power

110 lines, but there is a dense population of trees and they added three large arborvitae to the plan. He

111 stated that they added a row of lilac bushes between residential units. Drew Goddard of Copley

112 Properties stated that there are a number of existing trees that will remain. He stated that he is

113 trying to make the landscaping look period correct with the style of buildings and is not commercial

114 driven landscaping. He added that they are building a beautiful building that he wants to show off

115 and would like the landscaping to look natural.

116

117 Mr. Scamman addressed the request for sidewalks along Portsmouth Avenue. He stated that

118 traditionally NHDOT does not require them and the ones he has seen are out of the right of way

119 which would put the sidewalks on the property. He demonstrated that the land drops off towards

120 Portsmouth Avenue by about eight feet. He doesn't think that sidewalk installation makes sense

121 with the fill that would be needed. Mr. Canada stated that ultimately the Board would like to see

122 sidewalks throughout the entire district and asked Mr. Scamman what is his recommendation for

123 the long-term. Mr. Goddard stated he is agreeable to providing an easement for future sidewalks.

124 Mr. House asked Mr. Connors if the Master Plan suggests sidewalks on both sides of the street.

125 Mr. Connors replied only up to Bunker Hill Avenue. Mr. Scamman described the complexity with

126 the need for handrails and ADA compliance. Mr. Goddard stated that he does not own up to

127 Butterfield so sidewalks would be very segmented. Mr. House stated that comment is voiced all

128 the time but they have to start somewhere. Mr. Canada stated that he believes it is quite important

129 to hold developers to put in sidewalks, otherwise it will be a multi-million-dollar project for the

130 Town down the road. He added that in this case, the applicant has provided a road in the back and

131 that may be a good contribution as well. The other board members agreed. The applicant agreed

132 to provide a five-foot sidewalk easement with a 5-foot grading easement in the front and a road

133 easement in the back of the property.

134

135 Mr. Goddard stated that he would like to not have the architectural plans as a condition of approval.

136 He stated the site plan regulations focus on the site plan and not the architectural building in the

137 Professional/Residential District. He added that he has been working with the Heritage

138 Commission on the architecture and he does not see himself deviating from what is currently

139 proposed. He stated that he received comments from the Heritage Commission on both buildings,

140 mostly on size and stature of the standalone secondary barn and siding materials. Mr. Goddard

141 stated he is 100% on board with taking those recommendations, but he prefers not to have that as

142 a condition of approval. Mr. Scamman stated that they are not changing the size of the building in

the sense of square footage. Mr. Goddard stated that he would potentially be changing the wall heights to lower the overall height.

Mr. Connors clarified that the application meets the architectural standards and Nate Merrill of the Heritage Commission provided comments that he would like to see implemented and that he would work with the applicant. Mr. Connors is concerned that because the Planning Board approves the project, it is out of the ordinary to delegate the approval to the Heritage Commission. He recommends that the applicant come back to the Planning Board for a public meeting (not a public hearing or application process) to discuss the final architecture. Mr. Scamman stated that a traditional light fixture on the outside around doorways does not meet dark sky compliance and a light bulb that shines out does not meet some of those traditional things that lighting regulations say. The Heritage Commission is asking for more traditional lighting fixtures similar to Mr. Goddard's last project across the street. Mr. Scamman thinks those are the types of things the Board should be thinking about and they are showing some of those on the plan. He described the lighting around the front door and stated they were asked to make something more traditional. Mr. Goddard further described lighting on the project and his request is to remove the condition that he return to the Planning Board after working with the Heritage Commission on the final architectural design and that in the Professional/Residential District there is no architectural oversight mandated. Mr. Canada is a member of the Heritage Commission and he stated that the Commission members are happy to work with Mr. Goddard and Mr. Goddard as been receptive of the suggestions and he is comfortable with the informal process. Mr. Houghton is also a member of the Heritage Commission and stated that he is generally comfortable with that and as a point of clarification, he recalls there being a lot of discussion on other properties about lighting and he underscores that it is really important to have a collaborative approach towards it, which Mr. Goddard has demonstrated. Mr. Scamman stated that with residential code, lighting is required around doors and they would make sure the lighting is downward facing LEDs. Mr. House stated that he is okay with the applicant continuing to work with the Heritage Commission and noted that two of the Planning Board members are on the Commission. Mr. Connors asked if the changes are minor. Mr. Goddard replied that comments are related to coloring and shifting an entrance in the back and things of that nature. Mr. Kunowski asked if the condition could be worded that in lieu of returning to the Planning Board that it state "to the satisfaction of the Town Planner". Mr. Zaremba agrees that the project does not need to return to the Planning Board.

Mr. Houghton asked if the lighting plan should be updated for the back. Mr. Scamman replied the lighting in the back will not change and the parking lot lighting is traditional dark sky.

Mr. House asked where the sign is. Mr. Scamman described the location and the landscaping around it. Mr. House asked if there will be lighting on the sign. Mr. Goddard replied not internally, but he would like to have uplighting and he will submit a sign permit application for it. Mr. Canada clarified that just because there is a sign depicted on the barn does not mean the Planning Board has approved it. Mr. Goddard understands. Mr. Scamman provided an example style of sign from Millbrook Office Park.

Mr. House asked if they have good sight distance. Mr. Scamman replied they are working with NHDOT on that.

Mr. Scamman described the Butterfield Lane connection. They are providing a 50-foot right-of-way across the rear of the property and the Town's consultant did not like the version that went around the wetlands and prefers the one straight through the wetlands to get it further away from

192 Portsmouth Avenue onto Butterfield Lane.

193
194 Mr. House asked if the road will be public or private. Mr. Scamman replied private and Mr.
195 Goddard will work with the Select Board on a name.

196
197 Mr. Canada stated there is language in the proposed condition to the effect that if the Town can
198 get right to Butterfield, there'd be a contribution from the applicant to help fund the road
199 construction. He asked to what extent is the applicant developing the back road. Mr. Scamman
200 replied they are developing about halfway down in the development. If it was made a requirement
201 of the project, there is a wetlands impact and in the past the Town was involved in helping fund
202 some connector roads in the Gateway District where it is required, so the applicant believes the
203 donation of the easement itself is a good donation to the town. Mr. Canada asked Mr. Connors if
204 he agrees with the Town's engineering opinion about constructing the road through the wetlands.
205 Mr. Connors replied that the engineer's concern is that by going around the wetlands, the curb cut
206 would be placed too close to Portsmouth Avenue. Mr. Canada asked what's the problem with that
207 as Butterfield does not see too much traffic. Mr. Connors replied that he believes it is a default
208 comment and that engineers don't like intersections close to each other. There was a discussion
209 about the easement and the engineer's comment. Mr. Goddard agreed to show both easements on
210 the plan for maximum flexibility.

211
212 Mr. House asked what the water source for fire protection is. Mr. Goddard stated he will work with
213 the fire department on the requirements.

214
215 Mr. House requested a presentation on the waivers. Mr. Scamman requested a waiver on the
216 landscaping and certification of a landscape architect. Mr. House asked if the plan includes species.
217 Mr. Goddard replied yes and he used the same designer that he used across the street. Mr. Scamman
218 described the landscaping plan.

219
220 **Mr. Zaremba made a motion to open public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.**
221 **All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

222
223 No members of the public were present.

224
225 **Mr. Houghton made a motion to approve the waiver from section 2.2.G of the subdivision**
226 **[sic] checklist to waive the requirement that a landscape plan be stamped and certified by a**
227 **certified landscape architect. Mr. Zaremba seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the**
228 **motion passed.**

229
230 Mr. House asked for a presentation on the conditional use permits. Mr. Scamman stated that one
231 application is for mixed-use development in the PRE District and the second application is for
232 development in the wetlands buffer. He stated that the Stratham Conservation Commission
233 endorsed the conditional use permit for the wetlands buffer because the area is currently pavement
234 and the project will result in less buffer impacts. Regarding the mixed-use development conditional
235 use permit, Mr. Scamman stated that duplexes are allowed in the District so he is not sure why the
236 permit is required. Mr. Connors clarified because the use category is mixed-use development, it
237 requires a conditional use permit.

238
239 Mr. Scamman presented the conditional use permit criteria for the wetlands application.

241 *Criteria 1. Spirit and Intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan*

242 Mr. Scamman stated that mixed-use development is promoted within the town. He stated with
243 having the commercial in the front and the residential in the rear, it helps with buffering of the
244 neighbors. With regards to the wetlands buffer, he stated the project is making the buffer better
245 than it was previously.

246
247 *Criteria 2. Site Suitability*

248 Mr. Scamman stated that adequate vehicle and pedestrian access has been designed for this project.
249 Emergency services traffic has been designed and they have included additional paving for some
250 areas. He added there is an absence of environmental constraints such as flood plains and that the
251 project includes a robust drainage system with porous pavement and green infrastructure with the
252 bioretention ponds.

253
254 *Criteria 3. External Impacts*

255 Mr. Scamman stated there is approximately 12,000 square feet of existing office space and the
256 proposed project will be the same size but include residential duplexes as an alternative to large
257 homes in town.

258
259 *Criteria 4. Character of development and impact on natural, cultural, historic, and scenic*
260 *resources*

261 Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission on the architecture
262 and the proposed drainage structures will improve stormwater treatment.

263
264 *Criteria 5. Impact on Property Values*

265 Mr. Scamman stated the new structures will raise property values along Portsmouth Avenue.

266
267 *Criteria 6. Fiscal Impacts*

268 Mr. Scamman stated they are donating to the Town possible roadways in two locations and the
269 front sidewalk which saves the Town future dollars on having to come in and take that public
270 interest.

271
272 *Criteria 7. Public Interest*

273 Mr. Scamman stated they are making the roads and sidewalks available.

274
275 *Wetlands Criteria 1 Proposed construction is essential to the productive use of land*

276 Mr. Scamman stated that the project includes underground power that is better during storm events
277 and is more appealing than overhead power lines.

278
279 *Wetlands Criteria 2 Design and construction methods to minimize impact to the wetland*

280 Mr. Scamman stated that the project includes porous pavement and silt socks and will have erosion
281 control that will make the wetlands safer and cleaner.

282
283 *Wetlands Criteria 3 Construction of utilities provides for restoration of the site*

284 Previously discussed.

285
286 *Wetlands Criteria 4 Alternative considerations*

287 Mr. Scamman stated the property could have been left in its current state which is already impacted
288 and this project reduces the paving that abuts the wetlands.

290 *Wetlands Criteria 5 Economic advantage*

291 Mr. Scamman stated that the applicant is giving easements to the town for roads and sidewalks.

292
293 *Wetlands Criteria 6 BMP design to mitigate wetland and buffer impacts*

294 Mr. Scamman stated that the property currently has no best management practices for stormwater
295 and that the existing treatment swale on the property has not been maintained and is all silted in.
296 He stated that by creating the porous pavement, there will be treatment before it gets in along with
297 secondary treatment with the bio filters.

298
299 Mr. Scamman presented the conditional use permit criteria for the mixed-use application. *[Note:*
300 *the CUP criteria in the Zoning Ordinance changed in March 2024, but the application form was*
301 *not updated prior to this application being submitted.]*

302
303 *Criteria 1. Spirit and Intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan*

304 Mr. Scamman stated that mixed-use developments are allowed with approval of a Conditional Use
305 Permit in the Professional/Residential District if over 25% of the gross interior habitable area is
306 non-residential. This project has 12,624 square feet of non-residential vs. 10,320 square feet of
307 residential.

308
309 *Criteria 2. Existing violations of the Stratham Zoning Ordinance*

310 Mr. Scamman stated that the existing buildings do not meet the 30-foot front setback on Lot 23
311 and existing pavement is located within the 50-foot no disturbance buffer from poorly drained
312 soils. It is the intent of this project to remove the building and the pavement in these areas.

313
314 *Criteria 3. Site Suitability*

315 Mr. Scamman stated driveway, parking and pedestrian paths have been designed per the Zoning
316 Ordinance, Site Plan Regs, and the Subdivision Regs. Parking is located close to the office building
317 with pedestrian access included. The site is located on Portsmouth Avenue, therefore it is easy
318 access for emergency services, pedestrian facilities, schools and municipal services. The proposed
319 buildings are located outside of any wetlands buffer, and the site has been regraded as required to
320 accommodate the proposed development. No other environmental factors are present on site. A
321 septic system from a licensed designer is currently awaiting state approval for all the proposed
322 buildings. Emmanuel Engineering is working with the state to obtain the public water supply and
323 the NHDOT permit. The applicant will work with the electric company provide the necessary
324 electricity for the proposed buildings,

325
326 *Criteria 4. External Impacts*

327 Mr. Scamman stated that building heights and scales will meet all zoning requirements and site
328 design, traffic, noise, odor, and light will be typical for mixed use development.

329
330 *Criteria 5. Layout and design of the site in the character of the neighborhood*

331 Mr. Scamman stated the applicant will mitigate any extreme impacts of the use of the
332 neighborhood as a mixed-use design the professional and residential zone, the proposed use fits
333 the character of the neighborhood. The proposed layout will be consistent with office space along
334 Portsmouth Avenue, similar to the neighboring lots in the Professional/Residential District.
335 Residential units will be located behind the office space and be screened from Portsmouth Avenue.

336
337 *Criteria 6. Building design in the character of the neighborhood*

338 Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission to design the proposed

office buildings and duplexes.

Criteria 7. Natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources

Mr. Scamman stated the applicant is working with the Heritage Commission to preserve the historic character of the lot. The proposed structures are more historic looking than the existing structures. By combining the lots which were previously subdivided, makes the final lot more traditional.

Criteria 8. Diminution of neighboring property values

Mr. Scamman stated the proposed development is not expected to have a negative impact on neighboring property values as they will be similar to other existing office buildings in the district and the proposed parking and residential units will be located behind the office buildings without much visibility from the road.

Criteria 9. Adequate sewage disposal, solid waste disposal, water supply, utilities and drainage

Mr. Scamman stated the project will be served by an onsite septic system, a dumpster area, and the well will be registered as a public water supply.

Criteria 10. Fiscal Impact on the Town

Mr. Scamman stated the proposed commercial space will offset any negative fiscal impacts of the proposed residential use.

Criteria 11. Compliance with the ordinance and in the public interest

Mr. Scamman stated the proposed mixed-use development is allowed in the Professional/Residential Zoning District with a Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. House called for a Board discussion on the CUP for the mixed-use development. Mr. Zaremba stated that he believes the applicant demonstrated that they have met the requirements of a conditional use permit for the mixed-use development. The Board members agreed.

Mr. Houghton stated that with the Conservation Commission's endorsement, he is supportive of approving the Conditional Use Permit for the wetlands buffer disturbance. The Board members agreed.

Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Conditional Use Permit requested under Section 11.4.1, of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a disturbance within the Wetland Conservation District buffer area associated with grading activity to support a proposed driveway for a mixed-use development consistent with the site plan by Emanuel Engineering, last revised August 21, 2024 as per the Board's deliberations, the Board has determined the applicant meets all of the conditional use permit criteria. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.

There was a board and staff discussion regarding editing the proposed conditions of the CUP for the mixed-use development based on the application discussion this evening.

Mr. Zaremba made a motion that the Planning Board approve the Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit as provided under Section 3.6 of the Zoning Ordinance Table of Uses to permit a mixed-use development at 89 and 91 Portsmouth Avenue, Tax Map 13, Lots 22 and 23, Zoned Professional/Residential and subject to the site plan prepared by Emanuel

Engineering, last revised and the architectural plans by Art Form Architecture and subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary state and federal permits and note the permit numbers and Public Water System ID on the plans, including EPA Construction General Permit, NHDOT driveway permit, NHDES Public Water System final approval and registration, and NHDES septic approval.
2. Any outstanding technical comments provided by the town's consulting engineer or by the Town Planner shall be addressed to satisfaction the Planning Department.
3. The Town Planner shall confirm that no proposed landscaping is an invasive species as designated by NHDES.
4. The plan shall be revised to show a 50-foot right of way for an alternative road layout that avoids most wetland impacts consistent with the June 19, 2024 plans. The legal conveyance of the right of ways on the rear of the property shall be to the final satisfaction of Town's legal counsel.
5. A stormwater management agreement shall be signed by the Town and property owner and recorded with the site plan. During and after construction phases the owner shall be responsible for maintaining stormwater facilities. An Operation and Maintenance (O&M) plan for all storm water management facilities shall be recorded with the stormwater management agreement after completion of construction. The agreement will require the owner to submit annual reports to the Town completed by certified professional certifying that stormwater management facilities are functioning in accordance with their design intent.
6. The applicant shall submit a site plan and associated documents for recording. The applicant shall be responsible for all recording fees to the Rockingham County Register of Deeds as well as the \$25 recording fee of the Town of Stratham.
7. A private street name serving the development shall be approved by the Stratham Select Board and proposed addressing and Map and Lot numbers shall be approved by the Stratham Assessing Department and noted on the plan.
8. The applicant shall provide a 10-foot easement to the benefit of the Town of Stratham along Portsmouth Avenue frontage. The easement language shall be the final approval of town's legal counsel with providing that five feet shall be for the sidewalk and five feet for grading and maintenance of the sidewalk.
9. The applicant shall work with the Heritage Commission to make revisions to the architectural plan consistent with comments previously provided by Commission Chair Nate Merrill. The architectural plan shall be to the final satisfaction of the Town Planner.
10. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, a performance guarantee in the form of a bond, letter of credit, or check shall be provided to Town, along with a signed site development agreement consistent with the site plan regulations to guarantee site stabilization, erosion control, stormwater, and landscaping.
11. Prior to starting construction, details for the pervious pavement material shall be provided to the Planning Department review and approval.
12. Prior to start of construction, the Planning Department shall inspect the site to confirm that erosion and sediment control measures are in place according to plan and best management practices. The applicant shall afford reasonable access to the site for periodic planning inspections during the construction phases.
13. Prior to the start of construction, a pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled with the Planning Department all relevant Town Departments.
14. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any building in the development, details for

437 fire protection to include either individual fire suppression sprinkler systems or a fire
438 assisting cistern supply shall be submitted to the fire department and shall be subject
439 to the final approval of the fire chief.

440 15. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any building in the development, details
441 for building mounted exterior lighting shall be submitted to Planning Department for
442 review and approval. If any additional freestanding exterior lighting is proposed, the
443 applicant shall return to the Planning Board for approval of the revised lighting plan
444 in a public meeting without abutter or newspaper notification and a public hearing
445 required.

446 16. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any building in the development,
447 a street sign meeting details of the Stratham Department of Public Works shall be
448 installed along the Portsmouth Avenue frontage.

449 17. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any building in the
450 development, all landscaping for that building shall be installed. The building
451 inspector may issue a temporary Certificate of Occupancy under winter conditions at
452 his discretion.

453 The Board discussed the optional conditions in the staff memo for this project and determined they
454 would not be included.

455 **Mr. Houghton seconded the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

456
457 **Mr. Canada made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Kunowski seconded the motion.**
458 **All voted in favor and the motion passed.**

459
460 **5. Other Business:**

461
462 **a. Miscellaneous Community Planning Issues**

463
464 There was no discussion on this topic.

465
466 **6. Adjournment**

467
468 **Mr. Canada made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:13 pm. Mr. Zaremba seconded the**
469 **motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed.**