

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

MARCH 5, 2002

A meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee was held on Tuesday, March 5, 2002 at 8:25 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chamber

Chairman Brian S. McCarthy presided.

Members of the Committee present: Alderman Scott A. Cote, Vice Chair
Alderman Timothy B. Nickerson
Alderman Lori Cardin

Members Not in Attendance: Alderman Kevin McAfee

Also in Attendance: Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
Alderman-at-Large Fred Britton
Kathy Hersh, Director, Community Development Division
Mike Yeomans, Community Development Division
Mike Lowe, Planning Board Liaison

COMMUNICATIONS

From: Chief Michael Buxton, Nashua Fire Rescue
Re: Ordinance O-2002-08

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COTE TO ACCEPT AND PLACE ON FILE
MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY ALDERMAN NICKERSON THAT THE RULES BE SO FAR
SUSPENDED AS TO GO OUT OF THE REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS TO
CONSIDER O-02-08
MOTION CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS - ORDINANCES

O-02-08

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman Kevin McAfee
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane

TO RESTRICT THE USE OF A CERTAIN WAY BETWEEN CATHEDRAL CIRCLE
AND PROPERTY IDENTIFIED AS SHEET F, LOT 21, TO GATED EMERGENCY

ACCESS ONLY

MOTION BY ALDERMAN NICKERSON TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE OF O-02-08 AS AMENDED AT THE FULL BOARD

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Tollner

I just want to thank the committee for their indulgence this evening. We amended this legislation at the full Board level before sending it. I want to make sure that we continue to discuss properties between lots 953 and 954. I think that you have already heard the discussion on this development and the effect that it would have on this neighborhood and the reason for this. I would respectfully request the committee's approval.

Chair McCarthy

I would just comment that in its current form covering both lots it covers the maximum of what is going to happen. It doesn't really hurt us to have in place a restriction on a paper street that we will eventually perhaps not get rid of so I guess I would encourage us to continue with it as is because it solves the problem that we are looking at.

Mike Lowe

We've had this at the Planning Board before about gated accesses, and I think maybe you need to come up with another ordinance that specifically says that there is a large fine for illegal use of these accesses. I really think it needs to be on the books.

Chair McCarthy

This is the only one where we could actually enforce that.

Mike Lowe

Then let's do it.

Chair McCarthy

The one that is the problem on north Southwood Drive is in private property. We can't really do anything about that if people choose to trespass on that property.

Kathy Hersh

I don't envy the Board. This is a difficult decision that is before you tonight. There are a few things that I would like to bring to your attention, and maybe suggest that you think about. First of all I would like to make sure that I read to you because it is always important to refer to the master plan and ... tape flipped ...

Under objective 1, which is personal and commercial motorized transportation it says develop a comprehensive management plan for the city's roadways that provides smooth transitions and linkages to the state highway system, and one of the recommendations under that is to ensure that new sub-division road tie into the existing road network in a way that eases the flow of traffic and encourages the optimal distribution of trips throughout the city. I think the challenge that you are really facing tonight, and I am sure I am not telling you something new after all of the conversation, is that this is a neighborhood that – and we all live in neighborhoods for a reason because we want to have that quality of life in neighborhoods and yet having the connections between neighborhoods is important for both neighborhoods, not only for the new neighborhood, but also for the neighborhood that currently exists - certainly from a transportation circulation standpoint, but more than anything from a safety standpoint.

I think that you need to think about this in two different ways. This situation may be a little different than most of the situations that you are going to be looking at in the rest of the city. This situation has the issue of Broad Street and that new high school, and I think that there is real concern about how the traffic is going to act when that new high school opens because at certain times of the day there will be considerable pressure on Broad Street, but what you really want to think about I think is whether or not this is a decision that you are making holistically – what happens when the next proposal comes in to put a gate on a public street in the middle of a public street because there is traffic going back and forth and that is impacting the quality of life in a neighborhood. I think you need to think about how this decision affects that or if there are different criteria for this that you really want to clearly distinguish so that the next time you are faced with this decision you are making the decision for the right reasons or that you are not creating a situation where the next decision is predicated on the previous decision.

Alderman Britton

At the full Board I will support this legislation. I think it does protect the integrity of the neighborhood. It improves safety for the residents from drive through traffic as well as it improves safety as far as access for the police, fire, ambulance, etc. I think it provides reasonable access for all the emergency equipment that needs to get there. There aren't too many developments like this left as far as the city's buildup that you are concerned about. We don't have too many left to deal with, and I think if we can handle what is left in a reasonable, safe manner and preserve the integrity of those neighborhoods then we should do it.

Alderman Cote

I'm going to support this, but I am going to support it reluctantly. The reason why I say that is because I have a couple of concerns. I raised the snow removal issue earlier because I am

concerned that sometimes we don't do a very good job with those things. We have challenges as it is today just plowing the streets that aren't gated let alone those that are gated, and I am concerned about the liability that the city would assume in the event that we neglected to open that area the way it should be and God forbid that it would be any of you sitting in this audience that was neglected the services to protect you in the event of an emergency because of such of an issue.

I do although appreciate the fact that there are concerns about people cutting through neighborhoods. I don't really agree Alderman Britton with your statement that we're limited in terms of these developments because our traffic situations seem to continue to change themselves as we go through redevelopment or other issues occur or what have you. I appreciate it, and I will support it, but again reluctantly because I am concerned that we may be putting people's lives in a situation that may actually require us to look at this again in the future.

Alderman Cardin

I'm going to support this too, but I have concerns about setting a precedent, concerns about what might happen if the toll booth goes in Nashua, what other kind of traffic situation we will be dealing with in neighborhoods, etc. I think this is a good unique situation in your neighborhood, and that is why I will support it, but I am concerned about setting a precedent and what might happen in the future.

Alderman Deane

I think what I see going on with the city is that you will start seeing a lot of – since the city is just about built out and anything that is left people are trying to preserve, and I don't think you will set a precedent by doing this. I think what will happen and we've seen it go on with the traffic problems up in your ward Scott – things are going to have to be looked at in a fashion that nobody ever thought before. If you look at the way the roads were created and the way the highways were built – people wanted to get from point A to point B in a quicker amount of time and now people are doing that through the residential neighborhoods – to preserve a neighborhood I think is important, and if we can make amends with it by supporting this I would do it as well. There will be a lot of issue like this that this committee will end up looking at because these types of scenarios that are left in the city are slowly dwindling away and there are not going to be many left.

Chair McCarthy

I have thought about this one a lot since we started looking at it. I sympathize with the concerns that Mrs. Hersh brought up regarding overall planning, and in the ideal world we really need to have neighborhoods connected because one of the ways we got into this mess is by having a city where everybody has to go out onto one of our five collector roads to get to the house that is in the neighborhood next door. Having gotten into that condition it is really difficult to adjust it

without major impacts on small groups of people at a time. We have experience in Alderman Cote's ward with streets where we did exactly the same thing, and said we would block them off. We have experience with streets where we didn't do that and even in the case of fairly small neighborhoods that was not without at least perceived impact on the part of the neighbors to those actions, and we certainly have some examples of places where cut through traffic is a major issue to the people that live there. I guess we have to be very careful about that. To me I will support this and the reason is – there are several and one is the high school and the fact that we are making drastic changes to the traffic patterns on Broad Street and we will continue to have to make drastic changes not just because of the high school but the deal with the background traffic. All you have to do is stand at the Hollis border and look at the amount of traffic that comes east in the morning and goes west in the afternoon to understand that it has been way too long since we paid any attention to that flow and we still have no idea how to fix it. If traffic starts to cut through this neighborhood it will do so onto Coburn Avenue, which is not a place I want any more traffic than we have to have. It is a rural road and we would like to preserve it as a rural road. We don't really want to increase it to where it can handle that traffic. I would not want to do that. It strikes me actually looking at the maps that in fact were one of those accesses were to be open it is a much better second access to Cathedral Circle for emergency purposes than the existing one. Just looking at the map tonight in an ideal world if I were going to try to solve that problem I would open that access up and close the existing one at the top of the neighborhood so that traffic doesn't go out onto Coburn Avenue in there, but then the neighborhoods along Broad Street are connected together, but that is not what we are looking to do.

I will support it. I am not convinced that it is the last time we will hear of it, and I don't want – I wouldn't want anybody who lives up there to go away thinking that us passing that ordinance ends that issue for all time. It means we will have to come back and revisit it, but I can tell you that happens quite frequently. The decisions that we make can be reversed by another Board in the future and often times are. On the other hand, if it were to turn out to be a colossal mistake to gate those accesses it is something that can be corrected in the future. I guess I would like to go ahead and do that from the perspective of certainly until we have the high schools on line and we understand what the traffic is like on Broad Street to just not add any more variables to the mix than we need to.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COTE TO RETURN TO THE REGULAR ORDER OF BUSINESS

MOTION CARRIED

O-02-03

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Frederick Britton
 Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
 Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton
 Alderman Brian S. McCarthy
 Alderman Scott A. Cote

Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon
Alderman-at-Large David Rootovich
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon

ADOPTING A MISSION AND VISION STATEMENT FOR THE CITY OF
NASHUA

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COTE TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE
MOTION CARRIED

O-02-04

Endorsers: Alderman-at-Large Frederick Britton
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton
Alderman Brian S. McCarthy
Alderman Scott A. Cote
Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon

ADDING THE MAYOR AS A MEMBER OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING
COMMITTEE

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COTE TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE
MOTION CARRIED

O-02-06

Endorsers: Mayor Bernard A. Streeter
Alderman-at-Large David Rootovich
Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
Alderman-at-Large Paula I. Johnson
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon
Alderman Scott A. Cote
Alderman-at-Large Frederick Britton
Alderman Brian S. McCarthy
Alderman Timothy B. Nickerson

AMENDING THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING A TRACT SOUTHWESTERLY
OF
NORTHEASTERN BOULEVARD FROM PARK INDUSTRIAL (PI) TO C URBAN
RESIDENCE (RC)

MOTION BY ALDERMAN COTE TO RECOMMEND FINAL PASSAGE PENDING A
RECOMMENDATION FROM THE NASHUA CITY PLANNING BOARD

ON THE QUESTION

Chair McCarthy

I would envision that what will happen is that if the Planning Board makes a favorable recommendation that will go straight to the full Board. If they make recommendations for changes then we will deal with it then.

Mike Lowe

I have e-mails from the Conservation Commission me as a Planning Board member to hold this until such time as the delineation of the upper wetlands that are there are actually delineated so we actually know where they are and how they fit into the mix. I think that is probably a good thing to do. There is a large pond, which really as full as it normally would be because we are in the middle of a drought. Somebody has to really go out there and delineate it.

Chair McCarthy

The question I would ask is will a delineation of the wetland make it any less likely that this property should be developed as residential rather than park industrial.

Mike Lowe

I don't think so. I am in favor of the ...

Chair McCarthy

That comes down to more of a site planning issue than a usage issue, and it certainly strikes me that a residential use is more consistent with a property where you have to work around a substantial wetland.

Alderman Cote

I had the chance to speak earlier today with Director Hersh and also was playing phone tag with Jim Petropolis from Hanner & Swanson who will in fact be doing the flagging of the wetlands out there in that area, and they don't see much of an issue with it. I wanted to get a sense or a flavor as to how the Conservation Commission meeting went, and it is my understanding that meeting went quite well. It is really a matter of getting an understanding of what the wetlands look like out there. I will say though that there is not the illusion of a pond out there at all. There are fingers of wetlands, there is a brook that runs down through there as well, there have been some issues associated with drainage on Northeastern Boulevard that perhaps could be directly related to this site that would actually be improved as a result of what it is that we are doing out there. I think really all the Conservation Commission is looking for is to understand in greater

detail what it is that they are looking at not necessarily with any opposition to the legislation that is before us.

Kathy Hersh

I do want to say that the Conservation Commission did go out and do a site walk on this, and they have been diligently looking at this to make sure that it is consistent with not only with the other requirements that they have for different sites, but also with regard to receiving conservation land for the city.

Alderman Cote

Are there any problems that you are aware of?

Kathy Hersh

I am not aware of any problems, but I really don't know the final resolution of that and how consistent it is. I know that there were some conversations I had with the Chair of the Conservation Commission a couple of weeks ago with regard to what they usually require for mitigation, and I know that she was making some calls to the state. I quite honestly have not talked to her in the last couple of weeks so I don't know how it was resolved, but the e-mail that I did get from here did not really reference that except to say that we recommend that the request for the city to receive conservation land on this site, which is on the ZBA agenda be postponed until the final review by the Conservation Commission for wetlands impact and mitigation is completed. She didn't say that she still had a concern about that other than that they are waiting for the wetland delineation and evaluation report.

MOTION CARRIED

O-02-07

Endorsers: Alderman Brian S. McCarthy
Alderman-at-Large Frederick Britton
Alderman-at-Large David W. Deane
Alderman-at-Large Steven A. Bolton
Alderman-at-Large James R. Tollner
Alderman Marc W. Plamondon

AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE TO PERMIT DAYCARE CENTERS BY
SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN THE AIRPORT INDUSTRIAL ZONE

MOTION BY ALDERMAN NICKERSON TO RECOMMEND TO HOLD IN
COMMITTEE

ON THE QUESTION

Alderman Nickerson

The city planning staff obviously has some concerns about it, and also the terming and judgment of special exception. There are several concerns about having it in an industrial area whether it is airport industrial or park industrial, as do I in a way. I don't think there is anyone else on this Board that certainly understands the role that quality childcare can have in a child's life. Being a former preschool teacher I have certainly witnessed that first hand, and I certainly advocate for those types of facilities, and not just those types of facilities but also quality ones. I somewhat have a concern where it would be an industrial area even though the one that is hypothetically in question there aren't any truly high industrial type facilities in that area there is nothing saying that it will not happen or a plan will not come forward for that effect. I'm somewhat concerned about those types of possibilities. I would like to get some further information about this, and deal with some of the possibilities of maybe explaining a special exception even further or replacing that terminology and giving some real specific criteria. I would like to get some further information on this.

Chair McCarthy

We can put further criteria on there. A number of the special exceptions do in fact have criteria that have to be met over and above the standard points of special exception. I would like to see some recommendations as to what we might do. This sort just has opened this can of worms that regardless of how you feel about it in the AI zone and there is a fairly small impact there that we really ought to have criteria for them in the PI zone – even more so because there is a much broader use of mixes in the PI zone citywide than we see up there.

Alderman Nickerson

I agree with you.

Kathy Hersh

We would certainly like to offer guidance to the Planning & Economic Development Committee and the Board of Aldermen in their deliberations of this piece of legislation. It would be helpful though if we could have some discussion about it tonight, and try to get some more feedback from you with regard to some of your thoughts and what kind of information you would like. I can certainly provide for you the use tables that tells you what is permitted in an AI, PI or GI zone so you can get an idea of what that is and what the criteria are for example a special exception -- a daycare center is currently allowed by special exception in a PI zone so you could then take a look at the use table and see how that works.

Generally, special exceptions are viewed as appropriate in a zone if it meets the certain conditions, which we can give you, as opposed to a variance, which generally says it is inappropriate unless there is something specifically different about that piece of property. Beyond that, the real question is the mix of uses and whether you feel that daycare centers are appropriate in certain circumstances and what those circumstances might be. Just to have that

general discussion would be helpful for us to provide you information.

Alderman Cote

I think the points that Alderman Nickerson has raised are very good ones. Some of the things that are of interest to me would be – this may be somewhat of a gross example, but I'll use it – I suspect that Hampshire Chemical doesn't have a daycare center on their site. There would be some obvious reasons as to why they wouldn't. Should we take a look at applications such as that as being sites that should be inappropriate for daycare centers. That certainly stands out as being one. I think the others that I would like to take a closer look at or have a better understanding because it is somewhat of a moving target is the FAA regulations that Alderman Britton had referred to earlier about the specific zone requirements as to what is permissible and what is not. We should look at those and determine whether or not those are acceptable to us. Perhaps even suggest having some dialog with the airport commission in terms of what their thoughts are not only on this, but what they view in terms of the overall AI zone and what they would like to see it look like in the future.

We hadn't ought to fool ourselves – Daniel Webster College is certainly adjacent to the airport as well, and I'm not suggesting that a young person such as being 3-5 years old is any less important than a young person being 18-20 years old. I think there is a balance here that we can find in all of those things. Those would be some of the obvious things that I would like to look at – what would be appropriate. I think the questions that Alderman McCarthy raised earlier about the whole question about the PI zone is an intriguing one. I don't think that it has ever been addressed before.

Kathy Hersh

I would think that maybe what you would like is maybe to have a representative from the Nashua Airport Authority to come in and talk about FAA requirements and about the master plan – the future of the airport and that type of thing. I can tell you also that maybe Mr. Yeomans might have some additional comments to make with regard to that because I know that you have talked to both Roy Rankin or gone back and forth on voice mail as well as the daycare provider with regard to this.

Mike Yeomans

It was basically through a quick conversation on the phone that I asked Roy Rankin if he wanted to have a daycare – if the employees wanted to have a daycare on the airport for airport employees would he have an objection to it, and he said they would probably look at the question as a little different than having a facility that was open to the public where you would have a great number of children on an airport – clearly that would not be supported. He was unsure whether or not they would specifically prohibit by the FAA, but he certainly would not get support by the NAA for such a use, but they might consider such a facility for airport employees.

The airport is more of a defined area. Where we are talking about an AI zone, which is a much broader area geographically, and it encompasses many different kinds of land uses so I think for us it was separating the airport proper from the AI zone property, which again includes a lot of land uses, which are unrelated to the airport whatsoever. It is clearly an area that they could certainly give us some guidance on.

Alderman Nickerson

Also some concerns that are issues that I would like to have looked at are transportation to and from this area or to areas where childcare facilities exist. Having some type of emergency access as well, or more than one access and such to that area. I have some of those concerns because the actual State of New Hampshire in the last probably 5-7 years or so increased the number of children that teachers can have within childcare facilities – within the 3 year old range I believe it used to be 1 teacher for every 8-10 children. – now I believe it is somewhere around a few more children. If the situation were to arise where evacuation needed to be brought up obviously containing 10, 3 years olds is certainly very difficult for one person and so forth – just working with the ratios that the state has provided to us. Transportation to the areas during events of emergency and such is certainly a major concern as well especially looking at the types of facilities that could go in these types of areas.

Mike Lowe

Just for the record I would say again all of our daycare centers do not have cross access. That is the one thing that we don't do is allow cross access into daycares. This one, as proposed, does, but I think we have to look at it globally and say that we don't want cross access through a daycare center to an additional site. Yes, emergency access to get through and out, but not cross access to go to some other place.

Kathy Hersh

One of the other things that you might want to look at is where private daycare centers are currently permitted and not permitted at all. If you are going to look at daycare centers then you probably should think of it as holistically as possible and step back and say when we site a daycare center what are the criteria we want to use – what do we at least want to bump it up against and think about as we are sighting a daycare center. Do we want it in a place that is on an arterial street so that it is really accessible or do we want it off an arterial street so that it is quieter and less impacted by fumes from cars or those types of things? Right now for example a private daycare center is permitted in local business, general business, commercial business, and highway business, but it is not allowed at all in any residential zones. It is the type of thing that you might want to think about how you view daycare centers. This is a really good exercise, and I will tell you why – because we are going to be updating our land use regulations and will be having a lot of these conversations and coming back to this committee, the Board and other boards and saying what is your vision.

Chair McCarthy

I was just thinking about those particularly on Amherst Street. Within a fairly short distance of the site that brought this up you have places where a daycare would in fact be allowed because they are in GB that are adjacent to intensive automotive repair places, etc., and certainly those are as hazardous as most of our – if not more so than most of the industrial sites in the city that one could be next to.

Alderman Cote

On that line, what is the criteria that is used to site a location for a new public school?

-
Kathy Hersh

I can get you that information, and we will ask Mr. Rankin and/or members of the Airport Authority to come to the next meeting. Would you like it if somebody came from a daycare provider that might be able to give us the other perspective of what they look for when they site a daycare center – what are the things that are important to a daycare provider. That might be helpful. Did you have any comments on that? I know that you spoke with someone on that as well.

-
Mike Yeomans

I spoke to our resident expert on the location of daycare facilities and warehouse and that is Donna Lee Lozeau and only because her organization, Southern New Hampshire Services, has a food distribution program so warehousing of food is very much a part of the social services component that they have and so as a consequence they have always located their programming in warehousing/industrial type space, which has created certain challenges for them, but it is a necessary part of what they do because they do need that storage space. A brief list that she left for me when sighting and such buildings because the question to her was how do you deal with the location of these kinds of industrial buildings, and she mentioned a couple of the environmental issues – the interior environmental issues, which is the lead paint, asbestos, and those sort of things to be hazardous – the exterior environmental of who is next door. Where are they locating, and what kind of land use is it. It is a big concern for them. Is there a safe pick up and drop off area? How do you get in and out? They typically look for, if it is an industrial building space, on the first floor. A lot of times your upper levels are boarded up and are all covered – they need light, air access, and visibility. These are of major importance to them. You have to have adequate outside lighting for the pickup, play area, whatnot, and then of course you need an outside play area, which is of critical importance. There are not a lot of sites that really give all of that. Those are the kinds of issues at least with respect to industrial type uses that they have looked at over time when they have looked at many sites in locating their current facilities.

Alderman Cote

You made me think of something else when you mentioned Donna Lee Lozeau. The state actually has a very long list of regulation and requirements for the licensing of daycare centers, which in fact address almost all of those things and a whole lot of other things as well. I'm not absolutely certain how far they go into the environment of care surrounding a daycare center, but I am certain it might be one of those things that certainly could be looked at. Many of those things that you just suggested are there as well, and all of the daycare licensing information from the state is online. We could certainly pull that off easy enough to find it.

Chair McCarthy

Another comment that occurred to me as we are sitting here regarding that particular site and the safety of adjoining uses is that site is smack dab in the middle of our water supply of course. If there is something that you wouldn't want next to kids you probably wouldn't want it on the site next door to that one anyway.

Kathy Hersh

You can always add in the mix whether or not that section on the other side of the railroad should be AI anyway. It doesn't have access to the airport. It is really not associated with the airport, and based on what Attorney Kirsch said in the map that I saw that he had that was developed by Daniel Webster College, the fly over pattern doesn't go over that area at all. That is the big opening in the middle of the flyover pattern. You might want to consider that as well.

Chair McCarthy

From my perspective this is an interesting piece of legislation in that it is pretty easy to look at an application that comes in and see what we think we ought to do about it, but the problem gets to be abstracting that back to the land use regulations and while it might be easier not to do that, it is as I point out at every possible opportunity the responsibility of this Board to administer land use within the city and not to have it done by other boards as exceptions to the zoning policy and not as its intent and spirit. I certainly hope we will sort out some of these issues. It is really clear to me after this discussion that we have never – we haven't thought out a lot of aspects about daycare as well as we might with respect to criteria, and we probably should be looking at that again holistically and citywide as to where they ought to be allowed and how they ought to be allowed in those places.

Kathy Hersh

To continue your initial thought I would like to thank publicly Attorney Kirsch for being willing to go through this process so that we could look at this issue holistically rather than a site-by-site basis. I appreciate the opportunity to have this conversation with the board through his support.

Chair McCarthy

I would extend those thanks as well.

MOTION CARRIED

DISCUSSION

Chair McCarthy

Would you like to update us on the land use regulations?

Kathy Hersh

I am so excited to tell you all that today is the day that the request for qualifications closed. Actually we had already put this out looking for qualifications packages and it had closed in the beginning of February, but we got a limited number of responses, and not enough that we really felt that we could give it really a good review. I think it was really partly because of the holidays that we just did not get the number of responses so we sent it out again, and got 6 responses so we are quite excited to be able to go forward and review those. There is a committee put into place with Alderman McCarthy representing the Board of Aldermen as Chair of the Planning & Economic Development Committee as well as 5 people representing the other boards (Planning, ZBA, Conservation Commission and NRPC). That process is scheduled and we hope to be back to the Board of Aldermen with a consultant ready to sign a contract by the first of May.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION BY ALDERMAN NICKERSON TO ADJOURN

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting was declared adjourned at 9:12 p.m.

Scott A. Cote, Committee Clerk