



Town of Merrimack, New Hampshire

Community Development Department

603 424-3531

6 Baboosic Lake Road

Fax 603 424-1408

Town Hall - Lower level - East Wing

www.merrimacknh.gov

Planning - Zoning - Economic Development - Conservation

MERRIMACK PLANNING BOARD

APPROVED MINUTES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2016

A regular meeting of the Merrimack Planning Board was conducted on Tuesday, October 4, 2016 at 7:01 p.m. in the Matthew Thornton Room.

Robert Best, Chairman presided:

Members of the Board Present: Alastair Millns, Vice Chairman (arrived at 7:07 p.m.)
Councilor Thomas Koenig
Desirea Falt
Michael Redding
Nelson Disco, Alternate
Jeff Sebring, Alternate

Members of the Board Absent: Lynn Christensen
Vincent Russo

Also in Attendance: Timothy Thompson, AICP, Community Development Director

1. Call to Order

The next meeting of the Planning Board will be conducted on October 18, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the Matthew Thornton Room.

Chairman Best designated Jeff Sebring to sit for Lynn Christensen and Nelson Disco to sit for Vincent Russo.

2. Planning & Zoning Administrator's Report

Chairman Best commented historically the Board has not conducted a second meeting in November as the meeting date usually falls close to the Thanksgiving holiday. That is not the case this year. The Board has scheduled a special meeting for November 15, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. for a presentation on Complete Streets by Rebecca Harris, Director, TRANSPORT NH. The group advocates the complete streets inclusion in planning. It is a planning concept that involves streets, roads, and transportation infrastructure. They have been instrumental in getting these programs started in several cities and towns in the State. No other items of business will be included on the agenda.

- 3. Meridian Land Services, Inc., North View Homes & Development, Inc., & Bernstein, Shur, Sawyer & Nelson, P.A. (applicants) and Greenfield Management, LLC. (owners)**
– Continued review for consideration of Final Approval for a 66-lot cluster subdivision on four lots (originally part of the Greenfield Farms subdivision) located on Wire Road and

Whispering Pines Lane in the R-1 (Residential) and Aquifer Conservation Districts and the 100-year Flood Hazard Area. Tax Map 7C, Lots 28, 30, 40 & 40-1. **This agenda item is continued from the July 19 and September 6, 2016 meetings.**

Director Thompson informed the Board, since last before the Board on September 6, 2016, there have been no new plans submitted by the applicant. However, back in September, the plans were submitted very close to the meeting date, and staff did not have the opportunity to conduct a full and thorough review of the project. That has now taken place. There are new comments from Public Works; several of the comments from the previous memo have been addressed. There are a few cleanup items that are itemized in the proposed conditions of approval.

Director Thompson stated he has had an opportunity to re-review the plans and go through the comments from Keach Nordstrom, who has been acting as the peer review consultant. When this was originally reviewed by Keach-Nordstrom, there were 16 pages of comments and roughly 139 individual comments. There are approximately 40 items remaining that have either not been addressed or are items that need decisions to be made by the Board before they can be addressed by the applicant.

Mr. Ken Clinton, Meridian Land Services, Inc. remarked on Director Thompson's comments and his memo dated September 29, 2016; he believed the application is at a point where it is reasonable to consider conditional approval provided a few key items are addressed.

When last before the Board a range of topics was discussed. The question arose of whether the applicant would keep the stop signs/bars on the plan. They had been included on the plan from the start of the project; however, early on in the process Kyle Fox, Director, Public Works Department (PWD) indicated he did not believe they were necessary. Mr. Clinton stated the Board engaged in a discussion of whether there are true engineering standard warrants to require them to be there, and while he admitted that perhaps there are no warrants, it is a much better project when inclusive of the stop signs.

Mr. Clinton spoke of the following commented provided by Dawn Tuomala, Deputy Public Works Director/Town Engineer: "The proposed stop signs and stop bars intersection with road A remain on the revised plan and should be eliminated." Mr. Clinton stated he would leave it to the Board to make a decision with regard to removal of the stop signs and stop bars.

Director Thompson remarked last month he had indicated he would come back to the Board with examples of other locations in Town. There are so many he couldn't possibly state where they all are; basically for any subdivision that has a minor amount of traffic, the internal roadways and intersections do not have stop signs and stop bars. They are throughout Town and it is very common in Merrimack that we do not have the stop signs and stop bars in the locations that don't meet the warrants.

Chairman Best remarked he has expressed himself thoroughly on the subject; he supports the stop signs. He understands the question of the warrants, and believes ultimately regardless of what the Planning Board thinks, if they are proposing that the roads be accepted by the Town it will require the PWD to make a recommendation as to whether the roads are in the appropriate condition to be accepted, and that is where they get to make the final decision on stop signs.

Mr. Disco asked for clarification, and was informed these will be public roads. He stated his preference for stop signs. He believes they promote safety, and do not cost much to be maintained. Vice Chairman Millns stated his awareness that, as Director Thompson stated, the internal roadways and intersections of subdivisions do not have stop signs and stop bars.

Councilor Koenig commented he has been somewhat opposed to putting stop signs up for the sake of putting stop signs up. He understands the concern for safety, but also that people are responsible and reasonable. He does not see, in this instance, an additional factor that might suggest the need for stop signs, e.g., road feeding into an arterial road, issue with sight distance, etc.

The consensus of the Board was that the stop signs and stop bars be removed from the plan.

Mr. Clinton spoke of the prior discussion of the offsite water extension on Wire Road from the new Road A as it intersects Wire Road and heads south towards Lois Lane. Comments received from the Merrimack Village District (MVD) did not state emphatically that there needed to be a design plan. It was in the comments from staff as well as Keach-Nordstrom. A plan has been prepared for review by the MVD.

Mr. Clinton noted there have been numerous comments and discussions about whether the previous separate extension plan set for the sewer main extension should be added to and become part of the entire plan set for the subdivision. He has stated repeatedly he does not believe that to be appropriate; it is a separately approved plan set that stands on its own and not necessarily as part of the subdivision. He stated it is conceivable that the extension might have separate financing. It would need to be a standalone plan set. If it was then also incorporated and built into this plan set that wouldn't be appropriate from that standpoint, and furthermore it also might be separately contracted and constructed, and ultimately accepted.

Note #25 reads: "No building permits shall be issued for any of the 66 cluster lots until the sewer extension, see Plan Reference 6, is accepted by the Town of Merrimack." The note was put on the plan to help connect this project, and make it recognize this is dependent upon the sewer extension being constructed and accepted. Upon further consideration of that note having it tied firmly to solely the acceptance is a bit problematic because once the new construction is in the ground the sewer is operational, and acceptance could be some time down the road.

Mr. Clinton stated he would like the flexibility to consider adding some reference to bonding. Perhaps some sort of maintenance bond could be left as an option. He proposed, instead of having it end with "is accepted by the Town of Merrimack", that the sentence end with "is constructed and either accepted by or bonded with the Town of Merrimack." He reiterated an accepted sewer line could be months or a year out from when it is constructed, thereby hampering the ability to pull a building permit.

Chairman Best responded he believes it makes sense to offer some alternative to being accepted. He questioned if it would create the same problem he was dealing with in the plans where he would create an obligation to potentially bond part of a sewer installation that isn't part of this project. Mr. Clinton stated the sewer installation itself is what has to be bonded.

Chairman Best responded that would be by someone else who wasn't there. Mr. Clinton commented in this particular instance it is the same individual.

Chairman Best stated his belief, from the Board's perspective, all they were looking for on this issue in the overview of the plan was to show where the sewer will connect to the subdivision. Mr. Clinton stated they will add the extra annotation relative to the connection point, which is sewer manhole #82 on Whispering Pines Lane. Three locations in the plan set were identified (sheets SP1, SP3, and P2). Chairman Best asked if that would be shown graphically on the plan set, and was informed it would.

Director Thompson commented he would be revising comment "m" regarding the sewer manhole #83 that the reference note would be okay to be revised to the satisfaction of the PWD including revisions in Sheets SP1, SP3, and P2 to indicate the offsite connection to sewer manhole #82.

Mr. Clinton spoke of an abutter that appeared before the Board last month, Michael Petrocelli, who resides directly opposite of Road A as it connects with Wire Road. He met with Mr. Petrocelli onsite, looked at his property and how it relates to the new road access, and what may or may not be able to be done to help mitigate any issues/concerns he had. They came up with an offer for some landscaping to be installed. They have a written letter that has been provided to him. As far as he is concerned, it is a private matter that wouldn't necessarily be part of conditional approval; however, they did follow up, and do have a landscaping package for him.

Mr. Clinton stated there to be two requests for subdivision waivers. The first is relative to the short cul-de-sac roads B, C, D, E, and G; specifically not including F. The request is for a reduction of the -2% road grade requirement to -1.5%. As previously explained, given the road grades onsite and the depth to sewer and basically shallow depth to sewer they are trying to hold, they wanted to reduce the -2% as they left Road A on 5 of the short cul-de-sac roads.

Mr. Clinton read into the record comments received from the PWD regarding the requested waiver:

"The request of the -1.5% grade vs. the -2% grade may be OK so long as Meridian can prove that there will be no water ponding in the intersections from this change. The areas in the radius sections of the intersections are prone to puddling water. We would expect that Meridian show a detailed grading plan for each intersection where the grading waiver is granted."

Mr. Clinton commented Meridian has done a similar detailed grading plan on a couple of other subdivisions in Town where there could potentially be a problem if they didn't have additional detail for the contractor during the grading. They are fine with providing that extra detail during construction. He added, by definition, -1.5% grade can't puddle because it is a constant -1.5% grade. However, it comes during the construction.

Chairman Best noted roadways will have to be bonded during construction with a maintenance bond afterwards. He asked for clarification that those bonds would be available to remedy the situation should puddling or ponding come about within a few years after construction. Mr. Clinton responded he would suspect that could be an item that could be called. When asked if that is the appropriate way to look at the issue, Director Thompson responded it is. He added

he agrees with and Mr. Clinton is agreeable to the request for small grading plans at the intersections.

Vice Chairman Millns asked for clarification the impetus is because of the shallowness of the sewer system. Mr. Clinton responded early on in the project he spoke too soon and suggested the site is so flat it will be fairly easy to take care of and would have very little impact and changes in grading. It turns out, given the sewer cover they have (effectively this is the end of the line from a gravity system) they are fighting depth. The terrain is so flat naturally that they are forced to try to create grade change in order to direct storm water in certain locations so it can be treated. In doing so they looked at 5 or 6 different waiver items, sat down with Director Fox, and agreed on this one particular waiver.

Vice Chairman Millns questioned what could be done if puddling were to occur. Mr. Clinton stated during construction they will be shimming the pavement. They might actually have to grind some pavement and then adjust and shim pavement. It is more of a pavement remedy.

MOTION MADE BY MEMBER DISCO TO GRANT A WAIVER FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 4.12.d (INTERSECTION APPROACH GRADES) OF THE REGULATIONS NOTING SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES RELATIVE TO THE SUBDIVISION, OR CONDITIONS OF THE LAND IN SUCH SUBDIVISION INDICATE THAT THE WAIVER WILL PROPERLY CARRY OUT THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE REGULATIONS

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER SEBRING

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

With regard to the waiver request relative to the surveying of the bounds along the Right-of-Way, Mr. Clinton stated the request is for a partial waiver specific to the road frontage bounds along the open space lots on both Wire Road and Pearson Road. Sheet #7 of the plan set was displayed to show the southwest corner of the sub-division. There is a stone wall along Wire Road. Being proposed in the corner of the property is a granite boundary. The last stone at the end of the wall marks the sideline of the Right-of-Way. It is in that area that the applicant is not proposing a monument. A monument at that location would not serve a purpose of marking the sideline of the Right-of-Way. The wall itself is the monument.

Being proposed is installation of new road monuments. Again, there is an end of wall on Wire Road and it is all open space land adjacent to it. A monument at this location where again the wall itself is the monument from a survey standpoint, serves no purpose.

Chairman Best questioned the thinking behind requiring a monument there. Mr. Clinton stated technically it is an angle point. There is a comment in the staff memo that states for the lot known as 7D/360 (recent correction in assessing records), the lot corners should have been set in previous surveys, but never were. The applicant is happy to set those, but is looking to cut down the number of unnecessary monuments along the open space lots because there is no residential development, and it is not known if it would ever be developed in any way. It is an open space lot that has been offered for public recreational use.

Mr. Clinton remarked while he firmly believes it to be reasonable to ask for the waiver for the frontages of these two open space lots, he also has to point out that the PWD is opposed to it. Director Thompson commented he tends to side more on the side of the PWD on this issue. In

his 19+ years in the profession the only time he has ever recommended a Planning Board grant waivers for monumentation is when they are unable to be set due to wetlands or other specific topographic conditions.

Mr. Disco stated he would not be in favor of granting the waiver. Boundaries are something the Town has required most everywhere. He does not see a compelling reason present in these instances to grant a waiver, and in fact sees some good reasons why the PWD would want the area marked. Vice Chairman Millns stated agreement.

**MOTION MADE BY MEMBER DISCO TO DENY A WAIVER TO SECTION 4.06.1.i
(MONUMENTS)**

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MILLNS

MOTION CARRIED

6-1-0

Member Sebring voted in opposition

Mr. Disco spoke of the gravel pit reclamation, and commented he remains uncertain of what will occur there. Mr. Clinton responded the project will utilize half of that area for some house lots, a community area, and drainage (south end). With regard to the north end, there are no specific plans, as part of the subdivision, to do any reclamation. However, there may be some associated with its current use (laydown and storage area for Town projects). At this point, they do not have a more formal reclamation plan. Mr. Disco stated his opinion one would be appropriate; some plan or a concept on the plan showing what will occur there.

Mr. Clinton stated it certainly would not continue to be a gravel pit. In fact, it is not currently used in that way. For the improvements that are shown as part of the plan set (utilizes southerly half of pit area) it is in the applicant's best interest to ensure it is aesthetically pleasing and taken care of properly because there will be residents of the subdivision utilizing an area on the south end for recreation, and there will be 5 or 6 homes that will have a direct view across that area from the back of their residences. He reiterated he cannot say there are detailed descriptions of what will be done. He noted he does not know the duration and agreement with the contractor that is doing the Town work.

Chairman Best stated his understanding a reclamation plan is the normal process of stopping the use of a gravel pit. Director Thompson stated that to be the case if being used for gravel excavation under RSA 155-E, which this really isn't. It is being used as a laydown and storage area. Mr. Disco suggested there be some notes covering the intent for that area. Mr. Clinton stated an appropriate solution could be reached with staff. He suggested some level of loam and a wild mix of grass would be appropriate. He stated he would commit to making a note on the plan of what is believed should be the final disposition of the remaining former gravel pit area. Chairman Best requested, when worked out with staff, that it be distributed to the members of the Board in a packet; perhaps for informational purposes only.

Vice Chairman Millns questioned if there would be a phasing plan for the project. Mr. Clinton stated no phasing is required in these developments. However, there is a Note on page 22 that reads: "The development may be phased by individual roads and their related infrastructure with Road A constructed first and subsequent roads to follow at the discretion of the developer." Chairman Best stated his opinion the note adequately covers phasing.

Chairman Best opened the floor for public comment at 7:47 p.m.

Public Comment - None

Chairman Best declared the public hearing closed at 7:48 p.m.

**MOTION MADE BY MEMBER FALT TO GRANT CONDITIONAL FINAL APPROVAL, WITH THE FOLLOWING PRECEDENT CONDITIONS TO BE FULFILLED WITHIN TWELVE MONTHS AND PRIOR TO PLAN SIGNING, UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED
MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER MILLNS**

1. Final plans and mylars to be signed by all property owners. The appropriate professional endorsements and signatures shall also be added to the final plans and mylars;
2. The applicant shall obtain any required State approvals/permits as may be applicable, note the approvals/permits on the final plans and mylars and provide copies to the Community Development Department;
3. The applicant shall note all waivers granted by the Board on the final plans and mylars (including Section, and date granted) as applicable;
4. The applicant shall provide draft copies of any legal documents (easements and required Homeowners Association/Condominium Declaration from Section 3.08.18 of the Zoning Ordinance) for review, at the applicant's expense, by the Town's Legal Counsel;
5. The applicant shall obtain, and provide a copy to the Town, a Joint Use Agreement with Eversource to permit the construction of a portion of a drainage basin, access to the basin, and the crossing of "Road A" through the Eversource easement area;
6. The applicant shall address and modify the plan as necessary regarding "remediation of the former gravel pit area" in the proposed open space lot to the satisfaction of Town Staff;
7. The applicant shall address any comments from the peer review consultant, Keach-Nordstrom Associates, that have not yet been addressed from their July 26, 2016 memo, as well as any further (forthcoming) peer review comments as may be determined applicable/necessary by the Community Development Department or Public Works Department;
8. The applicant shall address the following comments from the Public Works Department:
 - a. Address the following on Sheet #8:
 - i. The Access, Drainage and Slope Easement (aka IB-1) should be labeled (not just as open space);
 - ii. The access road to IB-1, as it is shown on the sheet SP-2, shall be located totally within the Access, Drainage and Slope Easement and shall not be within the proposed recreation area labeled as the "Community Area" on Sheet 8. The easement line shall be adjusted accordingly;

- iii. The limits of all of the easements shall have the metes and bounds labeled;
- b. Address the following on Sheet #9:
 - i. Label the Access, Drainage and Slope Easement for IB-1;
 - ii. Lot 7C/30-47 shall be labeled as Access, Drainage and Slope Easement;
 - iii. The limits of all of the easements shall have the metes and bounds labeled;
 - iv. The hatching, type and scale, for all of the Access, Drainage and Slope Easements shall be the same (IB-1 is larger than IB-2);
- c. Address the following on Sheet #10:
 - i. Label the Access, Drainage and Slope Easements on both lots 37 and 47 for clarity;
 - ii. Label the Access, Drainage and Slope Easement for IB-3;
 - iii. Use the same type and scale of hatching for all similar easements;
 - iv. The limits of all of the easements shall have the metes and bounds labeled;
 - v. Road 'D' is labeled twice;
- d. Sheet #11 shall have the same hatching and labeling as noted above;
- e. Address the following on Sheet #13: There is a discrepancy in the labeling of the CB at Sta. 206+75+/-, the plans show 119A but on sheet 12 of 37 within the structure schedule table it is listed as CB 109A. All references to the CB shall be verified on all sheets and profiles;
- f. Address the following on Sheet #14:
 - i. There is an interception swale shown on lot 47. This shall have an easement around it and the easement shall be defined and shown on sheets 9 and 10;
 - ii. A detail of the interceptor swale shall be shown;
- g. Address the following on Sheet #27:
 - i. Add a silt sock detail to the plans;
 - ii. Add an erosion control mixed berm detail to the plan if there is a possibility that they can be used in place of the siltation fence. Add the specifications when and where they can be used;
- h. Add note that any work within the public right of way will require a ROW permit from the Highway Division of Public Works;
- i. Gravel access roads shall be located for all cross county drains and sewer lines (not shown for 206+75 lt; 244+50 rt and 253+80 lt)

- i. The main access for basin area IB-1 is shown from Sta. 209+00 verses of from Sta. 206+75. The easement documents need to be clear that even though the access road won't be constructed over this section, if the need arises, access can still be obtained and a road installed over the area from Sta. 206+75;
 - ii. Access to IB-2 has been shown from Sta. 244+50;
 - iii. The main access being constructed for basin IB-2 is from Sta. 244+50 and not from Sta.253+80. The outfall of the pipe at Sta. 253+80 will not be easily accessible from the access off of Sta. 244+50 due to the slope and shape of the basin and the close proximity of the property lines. The easement language needs to be very clear that an access road may be constructed in the future if the need arises on Lot 37 from Sta. 253+80;
 - j. Each road shall have a different stationing series for clarity during review and construction (ie 200+00, 300+00, 400+00). Stationing on the revised plans has remained all within the 200 series. Clarification of any stationing issues during review and construction shall be addressed. For example, on sheet 1 of 37, the stationing could be added to each of the road profile sheets (ie. 230+00 to Sta 234+00) and/or on sheet 12 of 37 (SP-1) label the profile sheet number next to the road names so that it is clear which sheet to view for specifics;
 - k. The street light has been added to the plan as requested. The reference shall be expanded to read and include that the lighting needs to be LED lighting as approved by the Town;
 - l. The proposed stop signs and stop bars at the B – G roads intersecting with Road A remain on the revised plan, and shall be eliminated. Following MUTCD guidelines, in order for the stop signs/bars to remain the designer needs to provide stop sign warrants to the Department of Public Works;
 - m. On sheet P-2, SMH 82 is headed southerly to SMH 83 however no information or profile has been provided for the connection into the existing system. The applicant shall provide on sheets SP-1, SP-3 and P-2 information regarding the off-site connection of the sewer to the project. In addition, Sheet 1 note 25 shall be revised meeting the approval of the Public Works and Community Development Departments;
9. The applicant shall verify that the comments from Merrimack Village District (dated April 4, 2016) have been addressed;
10. The applicant shall address the following planning staff technical comments:
- a. Please address the following relative to the notes on Sheet #1:
 - i. Note #1.B shall be revised to read "...WITH 3 OPEN SPACE LOTS...";
 - ii. Note #13 shall be updated as necessary for the requested waivers;
 - iii. Note #17 shall be updated with all state permit approval numbers;
 - iv. Note #22 shall be updated as necessary, or as directed by the Board, relative to the project phasing;

- b. On Sheet 3, Note #2: please remove the typo "l" before the word "issuance";
 - c. On Sheets 7-11 please revise the note to read "cluster residential lots";
 - d. Should the applicant's request for a waiver be denied by the Board, the applicant shall include all required monumentation at property corners and angle points as required by the regulations;
 - e. The applicant shall provide inclusion lines on all applicable sheets of the plan set wherever a stream, waterbody or stone wall (as applicable) is not a property line in order to clearly show the extents of the open space parcel;
 - f. The applicant shall address to the satisfaction of Public Works (see Precedent Condition 8.m above) how the municipal sewer is proposed to be extended to connect to the proposed development;
 - g. On sheet #16, the drain manhole 128A (in the profile view) is mislabeled as "DBH." Please revise;
 - h. The applicant shall indicate the sewer location, and any other underground utilities (as applicable) in the roadway cross-sections on Sheets #28-37;
11. Proposed fire hydrants and street names must be shown on an engineered plan for review and approval by the Fire Marshal;
12. The applicant shall coordinate with the Fire Department on road names for the proposed new roadways. The applicant should note that the NH E-911 Bureau has requirements that new road names do not conflict with existing names in the town (for instance Merrimack currently has street names that start with "Wood", i.e. Woodward, Woodbine Woodbury, and E-911 will not accept any more names that are similar). The applicant shall submit a list of 5 names for each proposed road so that an acceptable road name can be selected. Upon approval of the new road names by the Fire Department, all lots will be assigned the appropriate NH E-911 addresses.

The following general and subsequent conditions are also placed on the approval:

- 1. The applicant is responsible for recording the plan (including recording fee and the \$25.00 LCHIP fee, check made payable to the Hillsborough County Treasurer) at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds. The applicant is also responsible for providing proof of said recording(s) to the Community Development Department;
- 2. All proposed easements and any applicable legal documents (including the required Homeowners Association/Condominium Declaration from Section 3.08.18 of the Zoning Ordinance) shall be recorded at the Hillsborough County Registry of Deeds at the expense of the applicant. If possible, the applicant shall include in the Association documents (as recommended by the Conservation Commission) references or specific language on best management practices (related to fertilizer use, lawn and related debris storage, and potential improvements) when owning property abutting or in the vicinity of a protected brook/river;

3. As required by Section 3.08.13(f) of the Zoning Ordinance, all deeds transferring any interest in the real property included in the development shall specify that the common land/open space parcels in the development are acknowledged to be part of the residential use and do not qualify for "current use" real estate tax appraisal and assessment under NH RSA 79-A;
4. As stipulated in Section 3.08.18 of the Zoning Ordinance, any proposed changes to the project's Articles of Association or the Condominium Declaration following the final approval of the project shall require the prior written approval of the Planning Board;
5. Required Right-of-Way permits are available from the Highway Division of Public Works and shall be filled out and filed prior to any construction.

4. Discussion/possible action regarding other items of concern.

The Consensus of the Board was to accept the 2017 schedule as presented.

5. Approval of Minutes

MOTION BY MEMBER FALT TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 6, 2016 WITH CHANGES

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER REDDING

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

6. Adjourn

MOTION BY MEMBER MILLNS TO ADJOURN

MOTION SECONDED BY MEMBER FALT

MOTION CARRIED

7-0-0

The October 4, 2016 meeting of the Merrimack Planning Board was adjourned at 7:56 p.m.

Submitted by Dawn MacMillan