

**HAVERHILL PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

**DATE: Wednesday, July 11, 2018**

**Place: City Council Chambers, Room 202**

**Time: 7:00 PM**

Members Present: Bill Evans, Karen Buckley, April DerBoghossian, Esq., Alison Colby Campbell, Bob Driscoll and Karen Peugh

Members Absent: Paul Howard, Kenneth Cram and Jack Everette

Also Present: William Pillsbury, Planning Director

Member Karen Peugh read the conduct of hearings into the record.

**Approval of Minutes:** June 13, 2018

Member Karen Buckley motioned to approve the minutes of the June 13, 2018 Planning Board meeting. Seconded by Member April DerBoghossian, Esq. All members present voted in favor. Member Peugh, Member Evans, Member Buckley, Member DerBoghossian, Esq., Member Campbell, Member Driscoll. Members Absent: Member Cram, Member Everette and Chairman Howard. **Motion Passed.**

**Public Hearings:**

**Definitive Plan for West Gile Street:** Please be advised, the Haverhill Planning Board at its meeting held on 7/11/18 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers continued the above cited definitive plan to the August 8, 2018 meeting. It was noted by the Planning Director that the applicant has filed a definitive Plan to create a roadway and one lot on West Gile Street. Upon review by the City Departments the Fire Department and other departments have raised several issues. The applicant has requested that the hearing be postponed to the August meeting to allow time to address the city department concerns.

After board consideration, Member Bill Evans motioned to continue the hearing to the August 8, 2018 Planning Board meeting at 7:00 pm in the City Council Chambers. Member Alison Colby Campbell seconded the motion. Members present voted in favor: Karen Peugh, Bill Evans, Karen Buckley, April DerBoghossian, Alison Colby Campbell, Bob Driscoll. Members Absent: Paul Howard, Jack Everette and Kenneth Cram. **Motion Passed.**

**List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Continuation request from the applicant dated July 12, 2018

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

**Preliminary Plan for 316 Gile Street/146 Crosby Street Ext.** Planning Director William Pillsbury stated I just want to make one thing clear for the public and a reminder to the board. A preliminary plan depending on the action of what the Planning Board takes this evening this is preliminary in nature. It doesn't afford the opportunity for the applicant to do anything. It's an opportunity to seek input to the plan, get advice from the City Departments and hear the neighbors. Even if the Planning Board at the end of the evening was to approve this plan it doesn't allow them to do anything. They would need to file a definitive plan. This would have the notices to the abutters and advertised in the paper.

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti of 70 Bailey Blvd. addressed the board on behalf of the applicant. He stated he met with Mr. Pillsbury and we will work collaboratively with the neighbors. With that being said I will turn it over to the engineer, William Hall.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc., 100 Main Street, Acton, MA addressed the board. (Describes the plan). There will be two roads. Road "A" will serve 7 lots and Road "B" will serve 11 lots. There is an ANR lot that is on the east side (top right hand corner). This lot has frontage on Crosby Street Extension. This plan here meets the board's rules and regulations. There is an emergency road that will access both roads. There were many concerns from the departments. Among one of the concerns is the grading. There are also little pockets of wetlands. One is up at the top right, adjacent to lot 19. There are adjustments that need to be made to the plan. However, regarding the grading and cuts on the plan (tape cut out).

Attorney Magliocchetti stated I am not sure how you want to proceed with this.

Acting Chairman Driscoll stated, I think it will be best to let the neighbors have an opportunity to speak. Then you can come back and discuss any of those points.

Mr. Pillsbury stated there was assertions made that it meets the requirements of the subdivision regulations. I take exception to that right of the bat. I don't believe it does. I don't believe there is enough evidence submitted to make that determination on this difficult site with slope.

Acting Chairman Driscoll asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

Dr. Gerard Young of 184 Crosby Street addressed the board in opposition. The quit-claim deed that was filed at the time when my wife and I purchased the property in December 2006 included an Order of Conditions. This recognized the wetlands all the way around Crosby Street as protected wetlands. Those are subject to all of the protections afforded by Mass General Laws 131, Section 40 and 310 CMR 10. The Department of Environmental Protection file number is 33-1067. There are both plants as well as well as animals on the Massachusetts Endangered and threatened list that reside in the wetland areas around Crosby Street Extension. I have been documenting them in pictures for weeks. I have already captured numerous species on this list. These have become the basis of a complaint that I filed last week with DEP in order to halt all activity within this protected area. I have offered these photos to the DEP. As homeowners in the Crosby Street development I have to be honest with you we are not intending to take any action by this board lying down. I implore you to stop any development in these wetlands areas now.

Philip Balboni of 126 Crosby Street Extension addressed the board in opposition. I understand the preliminary nature of the plans. I do have some issues with the plans. The existing Crosby Street Extension was developed as Crosby Heights since then there has been another

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

development that added another 12 homes. The roadway "A" would add another 10 homes to Crosby Street Extension. A roadway that was designed for 10 houses will now serve 33. Crosby Street Extension is local access street. The width in front of my home is 25'. There are no sidewalks on Crosby Street. There are no curbs. In the winter the street is essentially a one way street. There used to be a crosswalk at the end of Crosby Street Extension to allow safe passage across Concord Street. The crosswalk no longer exist. For roadway "A" there's roughly a 40' cut that is being proposed. My concern is the trucks that will be removing the material from the site. The roughly 25' cut to add the drainage down to the detention basins will be a real challenge. It is a requirement for the EPA that any development that the City...My experience is that in residential construction storm water prevention plan (tape cut out). If this development is permitted I would ask another comment for the plan roadway "A" is going to require a force main sewer along with a sewer pump station. This is not identified on the plan. I heard there was some city review comments about the access to Gile Street. My concern would be any type of emergency access becomes a cut-thru. How would that be prevented. I believe one requirement of a preliminary plan is existing stone boundary walls are to be shown on the plan. I know that on my property are stone retaining walls. How the existing structure on 146 Crosby Street both in terms of zoning setbacks as well as the cut. For roadway "A" the plan does not show what the sight lines are. I have not measured them. I can tell you the sight lines both left and right are less than 250'.

Name inaudible of 31 Woodland Park Drive addressed the board in opposition. I live in Woodland Park Drive which you probably know is a condominium units with about 70 units in that area. We do have different zoning on the line of this development. We are concerned about the wetlands. I know from our own Homeowners Association we had numerous issues with wetland violations when we had the roadway re-done. We are very concerned with the loss of our natural habitat. My unit is close to the border line. We have a lot of mature trees. We have a lot of animals. We are subjected to a lot of heavy trucks going down Gile Street. We see a lot of problems coming from Gile Street to North Avenue. We are very concerned about traffic. It's already a nightmare trying to get off of Gile Street during commuter times. We have strange speed limit signs there. We have 25 mph nobody obeys that law. We would like the board to consider the natural beauty of the area, the trouble with noise, excess traffic, infrastructure issues and the overall concern about the beauty of our area being destroyed by cutting down an awful lot of trees.

Jocelyn Cascio of 170 Crosby Street Ext. addressed the board in opposition. I am in strong agreement with Gerry about the wetlands. Anytime somebody comes to my home I give them a serious warning which is the fact that it's a very dangerous street. It's narrow, very steep and right at the point where road "A" is being proposed is an "S" curve. You have two blind corners there. On an ideal day it's tough to drive. If you add any other variable such as trash day and people have their garbage barrels out its worse. It's dangerous to any pedestrians walking on that street. She discussed the conditions on the road in the winter. The mail truck can't make it up the hill in the winter. The road would become treacherous if this was approved.

Mark Segan of 175 Crosby Street Extension addressed the board in opposition. We lived in dirt and mud when we first moved in. We couldn't open our windows because that hill was a mess. The road as it sits today is not good. I have videos that I can email of the road conditions. The Department of Public Works knows about the road. The intersection of Crosby and Concord Street there are many car accidents especially in the winter because of the snow drifts, it creates a blind curve. I've totaled my car at the bottom of this intersection. This road "A" is putting a road in the worst spot of the street. These single family homes will generate two cars

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

per household. It will become a mess. We don't want any access to a dead end street at the intersection of Crosby and Concord Street a telephone pole in the middle of the road with essentially two lanes on one side and one land on the other. My children are both special needs and get picked up by a bus and we have problems in the winter getting the bus up the street. We are not in favor of this.

Abutter (never gave name) of 328 Gile Street addressed the board in opposition. I have lived in my house for 31 years. I don't feel like I have a right to say that he can't sell but I would like to highlight a few things for Gile Street. Gile Street goes down a hill. For the past 31 years I have had cars come onto my property, across my driveway, go up over a hill. I've had other cars just miss the driveway, skimmed along the front of the property and ended up on the corner (inaudible). We have had people come down the hill and end up in my neighbor across the street's property at. This street is a nightmare especially in the winter. During the summer or during the good weather it's also a trash area. We are just the right distance away from McDonalds that I end up with all of their wrappers in my front yard. There are cigarette butts and I don't smoke. That is a nuisance. That has nothing really to do with the development but I wanted to point that out. I believe that I am the only person that abuts the land on three sides. (Inaudible) I did want to make reference to the problems that we face on Gile Street. Over the 31 years the water from all of the different developments that have occurred on the hill really changes how the water flows into my property. Many years I had a stream that would come down the hill underground and flow underneath my garage. I have a driveway that slopes. I don't know how putting additional housing is going to affect us...I know there will be sewer and that type of thing but people will still be out there watering and working in their gardens (inaudible) All the changes on the hill have affected my property. I'm not against it but I'm not totally happy.

Brian Dubina of 139 Crosby Street Ext. addressed the board in opposition. My home is directly across from the proposed road "A". (Tape cuts out) it would be impossible for anyone but residents to know the flooding, seepage that comes into our yards, home and driveways. My concern is having two roads cut into a glacial hill. It's very rocky and it will be excavated. There is a ton of material that has to be removed. Tons of material will have to be removed, mudslides, soil erosion, blasting around foundations. (Tape cuts out). I'm concerned about Road "B" I am worried about our neighbors landscaping. We are concerned about the proposed water and sewer lines which will be directly ahead of our driveway including the sewerage. I want to know who is going to be responsible for pumping the sewer. From the DOT statics we are concerned about the 175 more daily trips exiting onto Crosby Street. There will be headlights directly into our house. I don't believe he has the proper site lines. Where will the snow be removed? He discussed further damage to their garage due to melting snow. Concerned about the damage a giant construction site will cause for our homes and property values. We are concerned for our neighbors their land, for our own land, noise pollution, signage, welfare of the kids on the street, fire risks and a historically significant family home that is to be demolished and rezoned. It's about the destruction of a rural neighborhood and the safety of its residents.

Paula Komola of 136 Crosby Street addressed the board in opposition. I speak of what is going to happen to Crosby Street Ext. (recording goes off/on.) I have taken everything out of my retirement fund to refinance my house. I'm concerned for the value of my home. I have pictures of the bottom of my street where the sewer cap is duct taped to the ground. The City duct taped the sewer grate. I've called the city and expressed that we are constantly having sewer issues. It's constantly overflowing. They literally taped it to the road. I've called the Mayor's Office immediately. They said this couldn't believe that was happening and they sent

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

someone out to fix that. I am on my own. I am a single parent. I don't have anybody to help me. I have you and I have nobody else. I live at the steepest part of the hill. The street is 29' wide and when two cars pass I have about 12' or maybe 13'...Its difficult for the trash, UPS or emergency vehicles getting up the road. Our road is not a road it was used as a driveway that happens to have some houses on it. If I try to back into my driveway we are taking life and limb into our hands. I swear if this is allowed in something tragic will happen. I don't have a problem with houses. I have a problem of where this road is. Somebody is going to get killed. This Crosby Street Extension should not be extended.

Audience addressed the board in opposition. I agree with everything and all the sentiments. That house is a 100 years old. (Inaudible) I really hope that you do the right thing.

Acting Chairman Driscoll asked if there were any other comments.

147 (?) Crosby Street addressed the board in opposition. The road is very narrow; the snow banks barely make it wide enough for one car to go up. You can't go up the street with a car its so steep. It makes the street very dangerous. Right now it looks fine but imagine in the winter time. It's a very steep hill where many cars end up on the front yards. In the winter time plow trucks can't make it up the street. Sometimes I go and plow my driveway at twelve o'clock and the street is not plowed because they can't make it up the hill. Never mind in the summer time I can't imagine in the winter time when kids get out of school and it starts snowing mid-day. How will they walk up the hill? It's a tough street to plow. Its very narrow and dangerous. Take 3' off the street when the snow piles up. It wasn't designed as a street. It was a driveway. The house that I own was the third house built on that street. It's not a regular Haverhill street.

Planning Director William Pillsbury stated I did want to acknowledge that my office did receive today from Attorney William Faraci who resides in the neighborhood at 159 Crosby Street Extension. He wanted this letter to be introduced for the record of the board.

Acting Chairman Driscoll asked if the applicant would like to rebut.

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti stated I'm going to invite the engineer back up to go over and address all of the issues that were talked about.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. addressed the board. In regards to the width of the road. This meets the requirement. We have comments from different departments that we will have to address.

Mr. Pillsbury stated you have substantially more work. What you are showing on your plan is not documented in anyway complies with all the grade requirements. You didn't even label the plan sufficiently to know that it is 28' wide width road. This is one basic bit of information and there are many, many others.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated we plan to address all of the concerns. On Lot 19 in the upper right hand corner we will have to do a field survey to...

Mr. Pillsbury stated your assertion that there are no wetlands on the property has not been verified by a flagging or assessment at this point. You really don't know.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated not in the field survey.

**Planning Board Meeting  
7-11-18**

Mr. Pillsbury stated not in the field?

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated correct.

Member Peugh asked if the applicant had received the comments from the City Departments.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated yes, I have received many of the comments today. I did review them quickly but I haven't had a chance to really fully address all of them. The property line to the north it's on the property line or just over. Again, that is an adjustment that will have to be made to the plan.

Mr. Pillsbury stated that again was done without a field survey? Are you basing it off of something you looked at online on a map?

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated I drove up to the site and looked at flags.

Mr. Pillsbury asked if it was flagged?

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated it has been flagged. There is a fire hydrant that is on Gile Street which is shown on our plan approximately.

Mr. Pillsbury asked if the flagging was brought to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated no it has not. There are large cuts to the vertical slope. We would like to work with the board and figure out how we can get this to be less of an impact on site. We will try to minimize these cuts as much as possible. (Inaudible) Sewer and water we will have to do calculations to confirm the capacity.

Mr. Pillsbury stated we will have the City Departments reviewing that. You are saying you are not going to pump it up. That maybe a requirement. Some of the statements you are making are balanced against the fact that these are not based on any engineering at this time.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated yes. We will have to do the engineering.

Mr. Pillsbury stated yes, that will be very helpful.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. talked about the cut thru for emergency access. Our experience we have used bollards and a chain across it.

Mr. Pillsbury asked if he was aware that the Fire Department today said that they find this an acceptable solution.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated with stone walls...when we do need to do a boundary survey on the property. Site lines....Traffic generated from the subdivision is that single family houses are not generally large traffic generators.

Mr. Pillsbury asked if this was based on a traffic analysis at this particular site and location, at peak hour?

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated we based this off of ITE Traffic Study. We have not done the survey on that. The trip generator that we use is standard in how it classifies everything. It doesn't go area to area; it goes from use to use.

Mr. Pillsbury stated our expectation would need a full traffic study which we would then have at the developers expense peer reviewed.

Mr. William Hall of Stamski and McNary, Inc. stated wetlands and flooding when we do our engineering we will be doing a large storm water report and we are required to meet the 100 year storm. We cannot create any more runoff then the site generates now. We had a lot of concerns were brought up about Crosby intersection and we would like to work with the Planning Board.

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti stated clearly there is a lot more detail that needs to be added to the plan. We knew there was going to be neighborhood concern and we wanted to put something out there. This type can't be done without waivers. We do need to discuss what would be in the best interest of the neighborhood. Whether that would be a thru-street or cul-de-sacs. Or we do a development coming in off of one of the streets. We are just shy of meeting the requirement, we have 15 acres...(inaudible) this would require a waiver. It is our opinion that this would be the most feasible. We intend to address all of the comments that were made by all departments. We believe they can be addressed. There maybe something....Mr. Hall did try to remediate some of the issues. That being said it would be in the best interest to...

Mr. Pillsbury stated I would suggest generally with preliminary plans it's a one hearing and a recommendation. The purpose for this evening has been served. We are seeking input. We are adding additional information on this plan. If you want to move along you would do so with a definitive plan. The Planning Board still needs to take an action.

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti stated I completely agree. I'm doing this out of respect for everyone here. I would like to continue with this process to see how this evolves. That was my suggestion and that is why I suggested that.

Mr. Pillsbury stated I will not recommend a continuance tonight. I think we need to move forward. There is enough absence of information to make a decision. That is where I think this is going tonight.

Attorney Paul Magliocchetti stated that is all the more reason to table.

Mr. Pillsbury stated that is all the more reason to deal with this in finality, in my opinion.

Member Peugh stated reviewing the comments from the City Departments...(inaudible).

Attorney Magliocchetti stated I just saw that today.

Member Buckley stated I'll say this kindly but all my years on the board this plan is the most rudimentary of plans I have ever seen. Not much homework was done and I feel that there was way too many unanswered questions that should have been prepared for. The data that was presented...a total lack of data.

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

Acting Chairman Driscoll asked if any members had any questions at this time? Hearing none, I will close the public portion of the hearing and open it up to comments from the Planning Director.

Mr. Pillsbury stated the applicant has filed a preliminary plan showing 2 unconnected cul de sac roadways to service 19 lots. The plans have been reviewed by the City Departments and several significant major issues of concern have been raised which call into question the viability of the plan as presented. The department comment letters are contained in your packages. The conservation, fire department and building inspector and city engineer have raised major concerns and objections to the plan as proposed. The plans shows two unconnected cul de sacs instead of the preferred scenario of the through street. A significant concerns overall in the plan relative to the steepness of the grades. It is unclear how the plan intends to comply with the 7% roadway grades. Several lots are oddly configured in an apparent attempt to add lot area ignoring average lot depth requirements. Additionally, there are major questions, related to a majority of the lots as to whether they comply with the buildable lot definitions requirements contained in the zoning ordinance. There is insufficient information presented to identify how the plan would comply with storm water management, the validity of the proposed drainage etc. The proposed intersection with Gile Street does not indicate site control to the right of way and appears to be deficient as to intersection line of sight. The intersection with Crosby Street Extension appears to have questionable line of sight and appears to be located on an existing house lot. For proper access for public safety access to the proposed lots, the roadway must be configured as a through street. Extensive cut and fill with substantial gravel removal and related impacts as identified in the letter from Conservation must be thoroughly evaluated. This preliminary plan does not show sufficient information about the subdivision to form a properly informed recommendation as required by the City of Haverhill subdivision regulations. There is clearly insufficient information provided relative to this complex site to be able to recommend approval at this time. Therefore, I recommend that this preliminary plan be denied and significant interaction with the City Departments on the full breadth of issues be responded to and addressed should a definitive plan be forthcoming.

Member Karen Buckley motioned to deny the above cited preliminary plan application/plan citing the recommendations and concerns raised by City Departments, Planning Director and input/concerns from abutters as basis for denial. Seconded by Member Alison Colby Campbell. Members voting in favor: Karen Peugh, Bill Evans, Karen Buckley, April DerBoghosian, Esq., Alison Colby Campbell, Robert Driscoll. Members Absent: Kenneth Cram, Paul Howard and Jack Everette. **Motion Passed.**

### **List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Preliminary Plan dated June 1, 2018
- Fire Department letter dated July 11, 2018
- Conservation Department letter dated July 9, 2018
- Water/Wastewater Department letter dated June 25, 2018
- Water Department letter dated July 11, 2018
- Fire Department letter dated June 25, 2018
- Building Inspector letter dated July 11, 2018
- Fire Department letter dated July 11, 2018
- Letter from abutter Attorney Faraci dated July 11, 2018
- Request for comment sheet preliminary plan
- Stamski and McNary, Inc. letter dated June 15, 2018
- Application for approval of a preliminary plan dated June 15, 2018

## Planning Board Meeting

7-11-18

- Table of Contents
- Form B
- Form D
- Form D-1
- Form E

### **Definitive Escrows:**

**Carrington Estates/Bradford College Definitive Escrow Phase I:** Developer requested a bond reduction for Phase I of Carrington Estates.

In consideration of the report from the City Engineer, John Pettis, Member Karen Buckley motioned to reduce the amount \$374,762.00 from the \$754,837.00 balance and maintain a balance of \$380,075.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report to the board dated 7/5/18. Member Bill Evans seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor to reduce the account to the balance of \$380,075.00 as recommended by the city engineer in his report addressed to the board dated 7/5/18. Members Absent: Jack Everette, Kenneth Cram and Paul Howard. Motion passed.

### **List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Escrow Materials

**Carrington Estates/Bradford College Definitive Escrow Phase II:** Developer requested a bond reduction for Phase II of Carrington Estates.

In consideration of the report from the City Engineer, John Pettis, Member Karen Buckley motioned to reduce the amount \$365,635.60 from the \$1,021,791.10 balance and maintain a balance of \$656,155.50 as recommended by the city engineer in his report to the board dated 7/11/18. Member April DerBoghossian, Esq. seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor to reduce the account to the balance of \$656,155.50 as recommended by the city engineer in his report addressed to the board dated 7/5/18. Members Absent: Jack Everette, Paul Howard and Kenneth Cram. Motion passed.

### **List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Escrow Materials

**Greenough Street Roadway Extension Escrow:** Developer requested a bond establishment for the development.

In consideration of the report from the City Engineer John Pettis, Member Karen Buckley motioned to establish the amount of \$197,432.00 for the Greenough Street Extension. Seconded by Member Alison Colby Campbell. All members present voted in favor. Member Peugh, Member Evans, Member Buckley, Member DerBoghossian, Esq., Member Campbell, Member Driscoll. Members absent: Jack Everette, Paul Howard and Kenneth Cram. Motion Passed.

After board consideration, Member Karen Buckley motioned to approve the established amount of \$197,432.00 that was recommended by the city engineer in his report dated July 5, 2018. Seconded by Member Alison Colby- Campbell. All members present voted in favor. Member

**Planning Board Meeting**

**7-11-18**

Peugh, Member Evans, Member Buckley, Member DerBoghosian, Esq., Member Campbell, Member Driscoll. Members absent: Jack Everette, Paul Howard and Kenneth Cram. Motion Passed.

**List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Escrow Materials

**Form A Plans:**

**Mark Cottrell for 1387 Broadway:**

Member Karen Buckley motioned to approve and endorse the Form A for 1387 Broadway. Seconded by Member April DerBoghoisan, Esq., All members present voted in favor. Member Peugh, Member Evans, Member Buckley, Member DerBoghosian, Esq., Member Campbell, Member Driscoll. Members absent: Member Cram, Member Everette and Chairman Howard. **Motion Passed.**

**List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Form A Materials

**Christopher Zielinski for 42 Wainwright Avenue/29 Hillside Avenue:**

Member Karen Buckley motioned to approve and endorse the Form A for 42 Wainwright Avenue/1387 Broadway. Seconded by Member Robert Driscoll. All members present voted in favor. Member Peugh, Member Evans, Member Buckley, Member DerBoghosian, Esq., Member Campbell, Member Driscoll. Members absent: Member Cram, Member Everette and Chairman Howard. **Motion Passed.**

**List of all documents and other exhibits used by the public body during the meeting:**

- Form A Materials

**Frontage Waivers: None**

**Reminders for expiring Definitive Escrows: None**

Meeting adjourned.

Signed:

Robert Driscoll  
Acting Chairman