

APPROVED

**TOWN OF PELHAM PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
July 20, 2020**

Chairman Tim Doherty called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00pm.

The following notice was read aloud “A Checklist To Ensure Meetings Are Compliant With The Right-to-Know Law During The State Of Emergency” (*regarding access to the meeting*)

Secretary Cindy Kirkpatrick called the roll:

PRESENT ROLL CALL: Tim Doherty – present
 Jim Bergeron – present
 Cindy Kirkpatrick - present
 Danielle Masse-Quinn – present
 Selectmen Representative Kevin Cote – present
 Alternate Paddy Culbert – present
 Alternate Bruce Bilapka – present
 Planning Director Jeff Gowan – present

Via Telecommunication:

Roger Montbleau – present via telephone; no one in the room
Paul Dadak – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Selectmen Representative Hal Lynde – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Richard Olsen – present via telephone
Alternate Sam Thomas – present via Zoom; no one in the room
Alternate Mike Sherman – present via telephone

ABSENT/

NOT PARTICIPATING: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

MEETING MINUTES

**June 6, 2020 (site walk) - deferred
July 6, 2020**

MOTION: (Cote/Dadak) To approve the July 6, 2020 meeting minutes as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
 Mr. Bergeron – Yes
 Ms. Kirkpatrick – Yes
 Mr. Montbleau – Yes
 Mr. Dadak – Yes
 Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
 Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS**Case #PL2019-00016****Map 39 Lot 1-49****WILLIAMS, Bruce & Rhonda–157 Mammoth Road-Proposed 4 Lot Subdivision and Special Permit for Wetland & WCD Crossing for Access to proposed homes**

Representing the applicants were Shayne Gendron and Peter Zohdi of Herbert Associates, appearing in person. Before speaking, Mr. Gendron provided the Board with information. He stated they had received a review letter from Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm) on July 15th and had worked through those comments as much as possible prior to the meeting. The requested waivers have been updated; there are a total of four waivers being requested. They also included an application for Special Permit for a Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') that will be impacted by the driveway crossing the wetland and one well (lot 5) located within the WCD.

Ms. Kirkpatrick noted three of the waivers were accepted for consideration during the last meeting.

Mr. Zohdi explained they originally didn't submit a waiver for the shared driveway because they had received a Variance for it; however, in response to Mr. Keach's letter, they have now submitted a waiver request.

Based on comments during the last hearing, Mr. Gendron submitted a covenant for easements (shared driveway and associated maintenance) for Town Counsel to review. In the submitted information to the Board they included a set of revised plans and a colored plan. He stated Mr. Keach's letter contained general and 'housekeeping' items and they had no issues with any of them. He added if the Board were to act favorably regarding the plan, they would agree to continue working with Mr. Keach to receive a letter of satisfaction from him.

Mr. Bergeron inquired where the driveway maintenance language was located on the plan. Mr. Gendron replied page 2, under section 3. Mr. Bergeron asked if Town Counsel had reviewed the language. Mr. Gowan replied he received the language earlier in the day; it would take counsel at least a week to get to it. Mr. Bergeron asked if waiver requests were allowed to be listed with a conditional approval. Mr. Doherty didn't believe they should but would leave the decision to the Board. Mr. Bergeron wanted to know how the Board could apply conditional approvals based on recent advice from counsel. Mr. Gowan replied the context/assertion of that advice was in relation to the 'time clock'. He described the appeal process and noted the Board had previously granted conditional approvals based on receipt of a letter of satisfaction from Mr. Keach. Mr. Bergeron felt if the Board were to grant conditional approvals the appeal 'clock' would start from the time the last condition is approved. Mr. Gowan recommended if the Board wanted to be clear regarding the time clock that they include language with their approval regarding such or they could meet again once the letter of satisfaction was received by Mr. Keach. Mr. Bergeron felt the opinion from legal was in conflict with local information.

Mr. Doherty reviewed the waiver requests and confirmed the language of the requests. The Board made the following motions.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Dadak) To accept for consideration the waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-1 B.4 – well radiuses for Lot 1-49-4 and 1-49-5 to be less than 15ft. from side lot lines.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes

Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

It was noted the Board previously accepted a waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-4 C.1 – to allow a shared driveway for Lots 1-49-4, 5 & 6. Mr. Gendron spoke to Mr. Keach's comment regarding utilities being run into the site and stated they had requested a waiver to Section 203-7 A to allow overhead utilities for the four homes; it would be very difficult to run underground utilities because of the wetland crossing.

MOTION: (Montbleau/Cote) To accept for consideration the waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-7 A – to allow overhead utilities.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Dadak questioned if the utilities would be above ground only for the wetland crossing and then be run underground. Mr. Zohdi answered no; the project was only for three lots.

Mr. Gowan believed until changes were made to the regulations the applicant and Board should consider a waiver to Section 202-7 B where it causes a plan to expire in six months if not recorded. Mr. Zohdi agreed with the suggestion as currently (due to Covid-19) the State may take more than six months to process applications. He said at this time they will submit a request for a one-year extension. Mr. Gowan read aloud a proposed motion. Mr. Cote made the motion and Mr. Montbleau seconded. The applicant was told they would need to submit the waiver in writing for the record/file.

MOTION: (Cote/Montbleau) To allow adequate time for State Permitting, the Planning Board has accepted for consideration a waiver to Land Use Regulation 202-7 B and has extended the approval of this project one year from the date of approval.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty spoke to Mr. Dadak's question regarding underground utilities. The plan showed three lots beyond the wetland crossing. He asked if the lot to the north (on Mammoth Road) would have overhead wire service.

Mr. Zohdi replied the house was currently existing and would not be redone. Mr. Doherty understood there would be three houses with new service and asked the Board if they wanted to start a precedence for allowing overhead services to new homes when underground was possible. Mr. Bergeron believed the Conservation Commission was opposed to any disruption to the wetland; if overhead service for three lots had less of an impact, he felt it wouldn't harm the spirit and intent and would be willing to accept a waiver for such (overhead utilities). He added that the whole idea for the common driveway was to preserve the wetlands.

Mr. Montbleau agreed with Mr. Bergeron and felt the Board should approve overhead utilities for the three lots. Mr. Dadak said his question was out of curiosity; he agreed with Mr. Bergeron and protecting wetlands.

MOTION: (Cote/Dadak) To approve the waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-7 A – to allow overhead utilities.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board if they felt further discussion was necessary regarding the waiver for the driveway to cross the WCD to access the lots. Mr. Lynde inquired if they received a letter or report from the Conservation Commission. Mr. Keach referenced a letter dated February 9, 2020 addressed to the Planning Board and Zoning Board from the Conservation Commission. *(The letter was included in the Board meeting packets)*

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To approve the waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-1 B.2(d) – to allow the driveway to cross the Wetland Conservation District to access the lots.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Doherty noted the Board previously accepted the waiver request to Land Use Regulations, Section 203-4 C.1 – to allow a shared driveway for Lots 1-49-4, 5 & 6. Mr. Bergeron stated he wanted an approval to be conditioned upon the Board receiving approval from legal counsel that the document for shared responsibility of the driveway would be long standing. Mr. Doherty commented the Board had a waiver (for this section) under consideration as well as considering the entire plan. Mr. Bergeron wanted to hold the approval of the waiver under the condition that (the waiver) meets legal muster and the Board's interpretation of that legal opinion. He wanted the Board to vote on the waiver with that condition. Mr. Cote suggested the reference to the lots be accurate. Mr. Gendron believed counsel was simply calling out three lots and wasn't specifying lot description numbers. He said the waiver should be updated to include the accurate map and lot numbers. Mr. Cote understood Mr. Bergeron was requesting the Board to accept

the waiver for consideration so it could go to legal and be returned to the Board. Mr. Bergeron commented it would be transferred into the recorded deed for perpetuity of the lots. Mr. Gowan noted counsel would need to see the draft easement language along with the associated plan. Mr. Zohdi understood. Mr. Gowan said he would like to hear Mr. Keach's thoughts on the plan. Mr. Doherty said he would like to hear Mr. Keach's thoughts on the waiver being approved.

Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom joined the discussion via Zoom. He said he raised the comment regarding the waiver and presumed it wasn't raised in the first instance because a variance had been granted that effectively allowed the same thing. He said this was one of those circumstances where a Subdivision Regulation and Zoning Ordinance that effectively control the same thing identically. He viewed the waiver as somewhat redundant due to the variance that was granted to allow the common driveway. He told the Board he wouldn't have a problem with the waiver being granted; he didn't want to see a disconnect between planning and zoning. Mr. Doherty asked if the Board should condition the approval of the waiver or the plan. Mr. Keach said he would condition the approval of the application. He said the waiver itself would be meaningless if the application wasn't subsequently approved.

Mr. Lynde assumed the Town had no responsibility to maintain the proposed driveway. Mr. Keach stated that was correct.

Mr. Sherman understood the variance was a 'permission' to go ahead and build a shared driveway and with the waiver the Board could 'condition' building the driveway by finding a way to specify who would take care of it. He said if the language wasn't solid for the shared driveway there would be problems in the future.

MOTION: (Bergeron/Masse-Quinn) To approve the waiver request to Land Use Regulations, Section 203-4 C.1 – to allow a shared driveway for Lots 1-49-4, 5 & 6.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Cote/Montbleau) To approve the waiver request to the Land Use Regulations, Section 203-1 B.4 – well radiuses for Lots 1-49-4 and 1-49-5 to be less than 15ft. from side lot lines.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Cote/Dadak) To allow adequate time for State Permitting, the Planning Board has approved a waiver to Land Use Regulation 202-7 B and has extended the approval of this project one year from the date of approval.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Mr. Keach reviewed the highlights and recommendations from his memorandum dated July 15, 2020. He spoke about Gumpas Brook and how a 100-year flood zone was shown on the property as well as a flood way. He said the application invoked Pelham's flood plain development ordinance. To satisfy this the applicant needs to receive approval from the New Hampshire Wetlands Bureau of the impacts (currently in progress) and the applicant's representative must demonstrate through hydrologic and hydraulic analysis in accordance with standard engineering practices. Mr. Keach believed with the box culvert the outcome would be achieved but the Zoning Ordinance requires the conclusions of a licensed professional engineer to make that statement for the records. He continued to review his review letter.

With regard to the box culvert, Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Keach was concerned with the finished elevation of the common drive interfering with the 100-year flood event. Mr. Keach replied the grade of the stream would be preserved. He said the specified dimension would affectively act as a small bridge rather than a culvert. He said the flood way extended beyond the bank and could, under the right circumstances, create a constriction. If this occurs, they could scour that portion of the street channel immediately downstream.

Mr. Gowan asked Mr. Keach if he had any problems with the Board contemplating a conditional approval. Mr. Keach answered no. Mr. Gowan asked his opinion regarding the inclusion of a condition for receiving a letter of satisfaction from him. Mr. Keach spoke about conditions 'precedent' and 'subsequent'. He believed all conditions imposed by the Board would be finalized. He suggested a proposed condition regarding matters listed in his letter of July 15, 2020 be resolved to his satisfaction. Mr. Gowan spoke about the 'appeal period' and asked for input. Mr. Keach explained 'appeals' are made based on decisions of land use boards, which is done within 30 days of a board's decision. He said the only time that would change is if there was a condition to come back to the board. He discussed a recent case in Rockingham County involving the Town of Plaistow that gave rise to this subject. He said the Superior Court judge seemed confused and believed that case made some bad law that would be corrected.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Gowan to make notes of possible conditions in the event the Board decided to go in that direction. He then confirmed members connected to the meeting via telecommunication were able to hear the proceedings. Members connected via telecommunication answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Bergeron asked about the status of the Fire Chief's comments regarding the turn arounds. Mr. Keach replied the Highway Safety Committee is advisory to the Planning Board. He felt the Fire Chief wanted to see what specifically was going to be provided; to resolve the item he said the applicant could receive sign off from the Fire Department. Mr. Bergeron asked if the applicant's engineer would reconfigure the area or seek a waiver. Mr. Gendron replied since receiving Mr. Keach's letter they added radiuses. Within Mr. Keach's letter under

Zoning Matters, Mr. Bergeron referenced paragraph 2, Article 307-13, A (ref. 35,000). Mr. Gendron replied they had already updated the lot. Mr. Bergeron suggested referencing the entirety of Mr. Keach's letter in a conditional approval. His remaining item was the driveway, if legal would accept the language and how it would be recorded to protect people's interest in the future. Mr. Zohdi stated the shared driveway document would be reviewed by Town Counsel. He said if it were satisfactory it would be recorded at the Registry; the recordable plan will include a reference to the document and included in the homeowner's deeds. Mr. Sherman agreed with Mr. Bergeron that the driveway gave him 'heartburn'. He would like to see the language before it was approved and forwarded. He questioned what would happen if counsel had concerns that the Board didn't think about. He stated he didn't like shared driveways.

Mr. Montbleau understood there was a specific purpose for having the shared driveway so the wetlands weren't impacted and there would be one ingress/egress onto Mammoth Road. He said the benefits of having the shared driveway have already been reviewed by the Conservation Commission who felt it was a better way to form the plan to preserve and have less impact on the wetlands and with traffic. He agreed not all cases should have a shared driveway but, in this case, there were a lot of benefits for having one. Mr. Sherman didn't disagree. He felt the Board should understand the legal aspects regarding maintenance. Mr. Montbleau stated the maintenance would be included in the covenants. He felt the Board's job was to make the best of the plan. Based on the recommendations they received, he felt it was time for the Board to take a stand and move forward with the plan.

Mr. Gowan said if the Board had a condition to leave the easement language in Town Counsel's hands there wouldn't be an opportunity for the matter to come back in front of the Board. He said they could also wait for counsel's opinion before making their final decision.

Mr. Cote understood the applicant filed a request for extension (of one year) with the State and therefore couldn't start work until it was received back. Given this fact, he didn't see a problem approving the plan on a conditional basis.

Mr. Doherty asked if the shared driveway would have similar documents to a homeowner's association. Mr. Zohdi replied the documents would be the same as those used for a condominium where owners shared costs.

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication. No one voiced a desire to speak with the Board in person or via telecommunication. Discussion was closed to the public. He asked the Board how they would like to proceed. Mr. Cote felt the applicant had done a good job with the plan and entertained all the Board's requests. Mr. Doherty added the applicant had also spent a lot of time with the Conservation Commission. He felt the proposal was probably best for the Town as there may be a roundabout (in the future) just down the street from the access. Mr. Dadak agreed with Mr. Cote and felt the Board should proceed with added conditions.

Mr. Gowan reviewed the proposed conditions:

- 1) All State permits, other than individual septic permits, to be received and approval with numbers noted on the recordable plan;
- 2) Approval of Special Permit for Wetland Conservation District ('WCD') impacts to be noted on recordable plan;
- 3) All approved waivers to be noted on recordable plan;
- 4) Written memorandum from Steve Keach (of Keach Nordstrom) indicating his satisfaction that the engineer has satisfied the issues identified in his review letter dated July 15, 2020;
- 5) Placement of WCD signs every 50 feet accurately depicting WCD setback, signs must be placed by a surveyor or along stakes placed by a surveyor;
- 6) Surety and plan compliance escrow to be provided as estimated by Keach Nordstrom prior to plan recording;
- 7) All applicable impact fees to be paid at the time of Building Permit issuance;
- 8) Fire Department to approve 'hammer head' turn around;

- 9) Flood Plain Development Ordinance in Zoning to be confirmed by an engineer the development is compliant and not exacerbating flooding;
- 10) Driveway and utility easements to be found satisfactory by legal counsel;
- 11) Homeowner Association to be established for driveway maintenance, etc.

Mr. Doherty asked if a member of the Board wanted to make a motion with the stated conditions.

MOTION: (Cote/Montbleau) To approve the plan subject to the conditions stated by Mr. Gowan (listed above).

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes; with the conditions
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes; with the conditions stated
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes; with the conditions

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To approve the Special Permit - Article VII, Section 307-40 of the Zoning Ordinance (wetland and wetland conservation district crossing)

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Case #PL2019-00024

Map 35 Lots 10-200, 10-312 & 10-351

NEIL FINEMAN 2018 TRUST & LEMIEUX, Albert III & Christine–Currier Road, Peabody Lane & Bridge Street (Rte. 38) – Proposed 40 Lot Residential Conservation Subdivision with 3 Open Space Lots

Representing the applicant in person were Peter Zohdi and Shayne Gendron of Herbert Associates along with Attorney John Bisson of Cronin, Bisson & Zalinsky. Mr. Zohdi stated during the previous meeting they resolved the number of lots, view shed and to show a stub road (Clover Lane) to Currier Road with no connection through to Peabody Lane. Subsequent to that meeting they appeared in front of the Conservation Commission and asked that their recommendation letter (dated July 20, 2020) be read aloud. To the best of his knowledge the commission was satisfied. He noted there was previous a portion of lot 10-351-4 in the flood zone; that lot has been revised and submitted to the Board. The trail head location was relocated, and the trail easement being given to the Town is shown on the plan. Mr. Zohdi said a remaining item was to know if the Town wanted to take over the open space; if not, it would be included with the covenant for the open space. He said the drainage study for the subdivision was recently submitted to the Town's engineer and understood it would take time for review. He asked the Board to review the waivers because there were a few that were no longer needed since

the road would not connect through to Peabody Lane. He submitted a written copy of the appropriate waiver requests.

Mr. Doherty inquired if the view shed area along Peabody Lane was included with the open space. Mr. Zohdi answered no; it would be included with the subdivision and the homeowners would own it through the homeowner's association.

Mr. Doherty referenced the strip of land along the back side of the development in the area of the well system. He asked the Board if they felt that section should be included with the homeowner's association or included with the Town's open space. He asked if the snowmobile went through that area. Mr. Gendron stated the realignment of the snowmobile trail would be located with the open space. Mr. Doherty asked how close the trail would be to the well field. Mr. Gendron believed it was located closer to the wetland. Mr. Zohdi referenced the last sheet of the plan set; all the trails were shown. Mr. Cote asked if there would be an easement for the well area within the open space. Mr. Zohdi spoke about a development in another town he was engineering. In that plan, open space was transferred to the conservation commission and they reserved the right (for the homeowner association) to have a well field in the open space.

Mr. Doherty read aloud the letter submitted by the Conservation Commission dated July 20, 2020. He asked Mr. Zohdi if he was in agreement with the letter. Mr. Zohdi answered yes. Mr. Doherty asked if the developer would do the work to relocate the trail. Mr. Zohdi answered yes.

Mr. Gowan said it was hard to predict what the Selectmen would do with the large open space parcel. He asked if Pennichuck would manage the water system. Mr. Zohdi replied if Pennichuck didn't want to manage/own the system there were other companies that could be approached. Mr. Gowan asked if any trails were located within the strip of land in the rear of the parcel. Mr. Zohdi said if there were it would be by easement. Mr. Zohdi stated he would do whatever the Board recommended.

Along with wanted to know information regarding the water system ownership/management he would like more explanation of (sheet 57) the trail system. He also felt they should look at all the aspects of the open space pertaining to what would be part of the homeowner's association and what would be public land.

The Board discussed the open space and view shed area. Mr. Lynde asked if there were regulations the well would have to meet. He wanted to know how confident they were about being able to get water in that area. As a Selectman, he would prefer the Town not own the well land. Mr. Zohdi explained the first step in the process was to send the well citing permit application to the Department of Environmental Services ('DES'). The DES provides instruction; after which quality/quantity will be measured and sent to the DES. If they are satisfied, the well system will be approved. He said it took over one year to have Pennichuck agree to take over a water system in another Town because their rules are more stringent than the State's rules.

Mr. Doherty confirmed Board members connected to the meeting via telecommunication were able to hear the proceedings. Members connected via telecommunication answered in the affirmative.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication.

Mr. Bruce Jewett, 4 Peabody Lane via Zoom wanted to know if the snowmobile trail would be located within the 100-foot buffer across from his house and where it would connect through. Mr. Doherty believed there was a walking trail near Peabody Lane, not a snowmobile trail. Mr. Zohdi stated that was correct. Mr. Doherty explained there would be a walking trail that led to the snowmobile trail and Wolven Park. Mr. Jewett asked if the trail would be paved. Mr. Doherty believed it would be similar to what it currently was. Mr. Gendron

indicated the snowmobile trail access was located at their second access out to Currier Road and aligned with the roadway. There was a walking path within the view shed.

Mr. Albert Lemieux (90 Currier Road) via Zoom told the Board he had no questions/comments for the Board.

Ms. Kim Jewett, 4 Peabody Lane via Zoom wanted to confirm the view shed was 100-feet. Mr. Doherty replied the width was 100-feet along Peabody Lane. Mr. Zohdi referenced plan set page 5 of 57; the minimum would have a width of 100-feet. The view shed would run along the applicant's property line on Peabody Lane. Ms. Jewett questioned if any work would be done along Peabody Lane; she saw markings on the road. Mr. Zohdi replied when the survey was done, they did a lot of markings. He stated with the revised plan and no connection through, they were not doing anything on Peabody Lane.

Mr. Paul Diamantopoulos, 11 Peabody Lane came forward in person. He asked for clarification regarding the walking path that traveled along the (Peabody Lane) view shed and continued along the gas line easement and wanted to know if snowmobiles were going to be allowed. Mr. Doherty stated the walking path would be part of the homeowner's association. Mr. Diamantopoulos told the Board he had voiced his concerns during the plan review process. Those concerns were privacy, drainage, well water and others. He stated those concerns would remain with him until the project was finalized and he could see he had no issues through the Planning Board process. He was recently informed by the applicant a 10-foot wide no-cut zone would be located on the development side of the gas line along his complete property line. He also understood there would be a 25-foot no cut area along his southern boundary. He didn't see these two no-cut areas shown on the plan. He told the Board if those areas were added, he would have no other concerns at this time as long as his previous concerns were addressed. Mr. Zohdi stated they would add the 10-foot no-cut zone onto the plan, along the easterly side of the gas line and Mr. Diamantopoulos' property. Mr. Bergeron referenced plan sheet 5 that showed the no-cut areas. Mr. Zohdi stated he discussed adding a 10-foot no cut zone (along the easterly side of the gas line and Mr. Diamantopoulos' property) with the developer; the developer had no objection. He will add it to the plan. Using the displayed plan, Mr. Zohdi showed Mr. Diamantopoulos the proposed 25-foot no-cut buffer along his southerly property line (except the area where the gas line runs through) and where a 10-foot no-cut zone would be added along his easterly boundary. Mr. Diamantopoulos asked if the 10-foot no-cut area would be shown on a plan for him to obtain a copy. Mr. Bergeron wanted Mr. Diamantopoulos to understand that his property line extended into the high-pressure gas line easement. He stated if planting were done along the property line in that location the right of the gas line to exterminate the plantings would override anything the Board could do. Mr. Diamantopoulos understood. He said the 10-foot no cut zone would be located on the development side of the gas line right-of-way, not on his property or within the gas line easement. Mr. Doherty understood the developer would provide a 10-foot no cut zone on the back of lots 10-351-57 and 58 (before the gas line). Mr. Zohdi stated that was correct.

Mr. Joe Norkiewicz, 14 Island Pond Road came forward in person. He was concerned with water coming across the road at Currier Road. He was told there would be a retention pond that would absorb the water coming down from the development. He wanted to know the size of the retention pond. Mr. Zohdi replied the size was 80ft by (an average of) 40ft. Mr. Norkiewicz noticed markings had been placed on Currier Road and questioned if they showed the location of the retention pond. Mr. Zohdi didn't know anything about markers; during the last couple weeks they dug a test bed within the subdivision, and they opened the gas line (for the gas company) for a second crossing. Mr. Norkiewicz told the Board if the road markings were indicating the location of the retention pond, it would be 100-feet (or less) from his house. He questioned if water would sit in the pond.

Mr. Zohdi stated the proposal was for a rain garden not a detention pond. He referenced page 17 of 57 that showed the details for the rain garden. He stated pre- and post-development condition had to remain; the drainage study supported this. Mr. Doherty understood the proposal was for a rain garden not a retention or detention pond. Mr. Zohdi stated that was correct. Mr. Gowan explained a 'rain garden' was the name for a 'bio-retention pond' that would recharge the ground water and have plantings on top. Mr. Norkiewicz didn't want to see water running over Currier Road. Mr. Keach said there wouldn't be water over Currier Road. Mr.

Norkiewicz questioned who would maintain the rain garden, so it continued to operate properly. Mr. Keach replied in the initial instance the developer maintains all roads and infrastructure. He said after the project was built out the developer would give the Town (Selectmen) the opportunity to accept the road as a public road. If the Selectmen accept the road, the drainage infrastructure would be publicly owned/maintained. He explained the maintenance of a bio-retention area was fairly straight forward and simplistic. He described the maintenance. He added the basin itself would be within the applicant's land and not within the public way. He believed the markings on the road were some type of 'dig safe' marking. Mr. Gowan noted water currently coming from Peabody Lane would have no improvements made. He said the project's development shouldn't make the existing problems worse. Mr. Keach noted he received fresh plans the prior week. He offered to meet with Mr. Norkiewicz to review the final plan.

Ms. Suzanne Larson, 39 Currier Road came forward in person. She questioned if the trees (currently) behind the houses along Currier Road would be protected. Mr. Doherty stated the plan showed a 25ft no cut zone between the existing lots (along Currier Road) and the proposed lots within the development.

Ms. Sarah St. John, 12 Island Pond Road came forward in person. She asked if the public could view the water plan. She stated currently water drained down to Currier Road and eventually flowed to her property. She wanted to know where it was being diverted to. Mr. Keach stated most of the water would flow to the south. He said the smallest discharge point was across from Mr. Norkiewicz's house. Mr. Gendron used the displayed plan to show the proposed discharge points. Ms. St. John was concerned about drainage coming from the stub road (Clover Lane) onto Currier Road. Mr. Keach stated he had just received the plan set and would be conducting detailed review of such. Ms. St. John wanted the Board to realize that the existing drainage system from the area of Clover Lane was interconnected and flowed along Currier Road into 'swamp retentions' and eventually flowed to Cara Lane and onto her property.

Mr. Jewett asked for the location of the rain gardens be pointed out on the plan. Mr. Keach noted the discharge area across from Mr. Norkiewicz's house is a rain garden, the discharge on the south end of the proposal is a traditional detention pond. At this time, he couldn't speak to the middle area (Clover Lane). Mr. Zohdi referenced plan page 25 of 57 and discussed the drainage flow.

Mr. Cote inquired how much water would be discharged into the Wolven Park area. Mr. Zohdi replied based on the law, the pre- and post-development flow would be equal. He commented the drainage study contained the information. Mr. Cote was concerned about the Town (potentially) accepting land that would eventually grow as a swamp and be unusable.

Mr. Bergeron spoke to the rain garden and wanted to know when they would come into play and allow water to cross the street. Mr. Keach replied the outlet/system at the northeast corner in an everyday rainstorm won't discharge water; it was there as an overflow structure. The discharge occurs at an existing culvert at/about an existing location under Currier Road. He explained at the location just above Mr. Norkiewicz's house at the end of Peabody Lane (at the brush line and remnants of a stone wall) there was a pipe that drains/discharges. He said the system the applicant was doing at that low spot (Peabody Lane/Currier Road) would pick up some of the water that was now tributary to the opposite side of the road. He said he needed to review the calculations before he could give the Board assurances about the numbers, but he understood the concept; the drainage controls were proposed so the basin walls weren't breached.

Mr. Cote suggested they wait to take action so Mr. Keach could conduct his analysis of the plans. Mr. Keach stated he didn't know what he would find until he had an opportunity to review the plan. He was fairly comfortable with the drainage concepts on the north and south ends because it hadn't really changed. He said the applicant's engineer would be supplying more information regarding the third piece on Currier Road (Clover Lane).

The Board discussed how they wanted to proceed.

The Case was date specified to August 17, 2020.

Mr. Culbert left the meeting.

Case #PL2020-00012

Map 24 Lot 12-204

LOOSIGIAN, Peter& Lisa –8 Foreman Lane –Proposed 4 Lot Subdivision

The applicant's representatives Karl Dubay of The Dubay Group and Thomas Loosigian came forward in person. Mr. Dubay thanked the Board for conducting a site walk. They have subsequently made adjustments and provided the Board with the revised plan set. He summarized the revisions and suggested they proceed with those revisions and submit the full package to Mr. Gowan and to Steve Keach of Keach Nordstrom (Board's engineering review firm). He said they would work with Mr. Gowan, Mr. Keach, and the Highway Safety Committee to effectively wrap up the plan.

Mr. Doherty liked the revision shown next to the abutting lot (5 Foreman Lane). Ms. Kirkpatrick recalled discussing stockade fencing along the abutter's horse pasture and asked if it was being considered. Mr. Loosigian stated it was considered. At this point he and his family felt they've made several attempts to help the abutter (Margery Moore) with a product that would be more satisfactory to her. He noted they moved the proposed house further back and moved the driveway, which all had additional development expense (to the applicant). He said they were happy to have made the proposed changes, which increased the setbacks to her lot. At this point Mr. Loosigian said they chose to leave the plan as shown with the new revisions and felt the discussion of a fence could be a private matter. He has chosen not to volunteer a fence on the plan.

Mr. Dadak stated he didn't attend the 'official' site walk but had gone on his own to the site. He applauded the applicant for listening to the comments discussed during the site walk and saw appropriate changes were made to the plan.

Mr. Cote inquired if the applicant intended to do a harvest of the trees on site. Mr. Loosigian replied they intended to clear the trees necessary to put the cul-de-sac and lots in. Mr. Cote asked if they were required to file a Notice of Intent. Mr. Dubay replied they would have to do so as part of initiating tree clearing. He pointed out they showed proposed street trees. Mr. Dubay spoke about the plan revision of the lot abutting Ms. Moore's property. He said the revision devalued the lot, but the applicant felt it was fair and reasonable and added aesthetic to Ms. Moore's lot. Mr. Cote questioned if the applicant had filled out an Alteration of Terrain Permit with the State. Mr. Dubay replied the proposal was a small project that did not trigger the 100,000SF soil disturbance threshold. They had filed a Subdivision Permit with the State; the only thing coming from that was a request to file easement language for the drainage; the State had no other comments. Mr. Cote thanked the applicant for following the required steps prior to doing site work on the property.

Mr. Doherty found the discussion during the site walk insightful regarding the water runoff from the developments in the back did not come through the applicant's parcel. Prior to the site walk concerns were raised about water coming from those other developments and running through the applicant's property; however, during the site walk they saw that wasn't the case. Mr. Dubay stated the pre-development watershed plan showed this information. He added that Mr. Keach would review all the information. Mr. Doherty wanted to know if water would ever flow out of the proposed catch basin and over the road. Mr. Dubay said the elevation of the basin near Ms. Moore's lot was purposefully set higher than the other basin. He said all calculations were included with the submitted information. He described the existing and proposed flow. He then discussed the grading plan and mentioned the plan showed the elevation information.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication.

Ms. Margery Moore, 5 Foreman Lane came forward in person. She stated during a previous meeting there was discussion about pushing the cul-de-sac back; however, it was not pushed back, it was moved over. She said it was better than it was but didn't want her lot to be located in the middle of it. She was concerned about the proposed retention pond and it being an 'open pond' because she had neighbors with little children. She didn't want it to look like the pond on Dutton Road; she felt that one looked horrible. Ms. Moore was happy the applicant had 'flipped' the abutting house but was still concerned about the distance of the proposed house to where her horses were located. She wanted to know if it would still be approximately 15-feet from her property line. Mr. Dubay replied the house could have been located at 15-feet, but the corner of the building would be approximately 30-feet. He informed the deepest pond they had was approximately 48-inches deep and went on to provide the elevations of it. Ms. Moore was concerned about a child drowning in the pond. Mr. Dubay noted it was designed to fill up with water and disburse. Ms. Moore confirmed no one would be maintaining the pond over the years and it would just grow wild. Mr. Dubay said they would rather have it grow wild because it would provide vegetation surface area treatment. He described the basin located in front of Ms. Moore's lawn (within the right-of-way) and noted it had been shifted over approximately 50-feet and would be approximately 24-inches deep. He said if she wanted to, Ms. Moore could mow the area. He said the area was more of a drainage depression and would not act like pond.

Ms. Moore voiced concern regarding the center of the cul-de-sac because she was previously told the Town will not maintain the area. Mr. Gowan replied the Town does not take care of maintenance for vegetated cul-de-sacs. He asked that the finished plan be as low-maintenance as possible. Ms. Moore told the Board her biggest issue was the location of the cul-de-sac because she thought it would be pushed back further.

Ms. Lisa Gagnon, 6 Foreman Lane spoke via Zoon. She stated she was unable to attend the site walk but was given a copy of the handouts from her neighbor. She understood there was an adjustment to lot 3 (abutting her property) and wanted to know what it was. Mr. Dubay explained they pushed the house further back from where it was previously shown and had the garage-under facing forward instead of facing Ms. Gagnon's lot. They also located the septic in the back of the lot behind the house and will have the well in the front. The driveway was moved toward the center of the lot. Ms. Gagnon inquired if the house location (lot 3) was further back from the location shown on the plan during the site walk. Mr. Dubay answered yes; it was slightly further back. Mr. Loosigian provided an additional description of the proposed house's new location. He said the new plan set shows the footprint of her lot so she will be able to see the proposed house was pushed further back. A plan was displayed for Ms. Gagnon to see her house location and where the proposed house would be located. Ms. Gagnon asked for the distance from the proposed driveway to the property line. Mr. Dubay replied it was approximately 15ft-19ft. and pointed out that area was a small back up stub and not the driveway itself. He offered to show her driveway location on the next update of the plans. Ms. Gagnon believed the proposed home on lot 3 would have a full view of her back yard. She said there would not be a buffer because that area is so wet. She stated she would lose all the privacy of her back yard. Mr. Dubay noted Ms. Gagnon's garage was facing the proposed lot. Ms. Gagnon said with the proposed house being moved back it placed it almost lateral to her back deck. Mr. Dubay wanted to know if Ms. Gagnon wanted the proposed house to be moved forward. Ms. Gagnon replied she was asking the question because she could not see the new location in relation to where her house was. Mr. Dubay commented when they stake out the lot line it would be easy for them to also stake out the proposed house. Ms. Gagnon explained the reason she bought her property was for the back-yard privacy. She said her whole reason for buying her home was diminishing fast and very upsetting. She then spoke about her concern for nesting hawks in the area of the proposed house.

Mr. Doherty asked Ms. Gagnon if she had any comments regarding the placement of the proposed home being brought back forward. Ms. Gagnon replied she didn't have a perspective on what it would look like for the proposed house to be moved forward. She would like to see it as a comparison. Mr. Dubay replied they could do that for her. Ms. Gagnon questioned if the proposed drainage would improve her current situation of runoff

from the back corner of her lot. Mr. Dubay displayed the pre-development watershed plan and the area that would have drainage mitigation. The rear area of lot 3 contained a voluntary buffer and would not be touched.

Mr. Jay Bistany and Amber Morse, 3 Foreman Lane spoke via telephone. Mr. Bistany questioned if the road and drainage would be completed prior to the houses being built. For the Board, Mr. Dubay described the abutter's house location. Mr. Gowan informed housing permits are not issued until the road is at least to binder. He said drainage was the first thing builders were required to install. Mr. Bistany wanted to know who would be responsible for future problems with the roads and/or drainage basins. Mr. Gowan replied it depended on timing. He said when the road extension is accepted by the Selectmen and the Town, the Town would 'own' the drainage.

Ms. Morse inquired if the Town would conduct a drainage study of other projects that had affected their neighborhood. Mr. Gowan answered no; however, the applicant was required to do a drainage study of the site (not other properties) that the Town would review. Ms. Morse wanted to know how the water table would be affected by the construction of the proposed homes. Mr. Dubay pointed out they included recharge water systems for the lengths of the proposed driveways and around the proposed houses. There were also notes on the plans for sump pumps. Ms. Morse understood the last drainage study was done in the 1960s. She spoke about information that was discussed at the time Ms. Morse's house was built regarding water. She wanted to make sure the proposed development didn't (negatively) impact the existing water problems. After spending close to \$20,000 she still has flooding problems. She told the Board they didn't want additional water flowing in their direction. Mr. Doherty informed the Board would be sending the plan to their engineer for review. Ms. Morse understood the existing drainage was a separate issue from the proposed development. She asked how to petition the Town to review the situation. Mr. Gowan replied she could write a letter to the Highway Agent.

Mr. Doherty asked the Board how they wanted to proceed.

Mr. Sherman asked if additional vegetation could be provided between Ms. Gagnon's property and the proposed driveway and hammerhead (lot 3) since the house had been shifted back. Mr. Dubay replied they had effectively provided more privacy by turning the garage (forward). Mr. Loosigian stated he planned to leave as much vegetative buffer between neighbors. He anticipated the people who live in the new homes would also like some vegetative buffers.

The Case was date specified to the August 17, 2020 meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Case #PL2020-00014

Map 35 Lot 6-31

WILLOWS PLAZA VENTURES(Owner) / CROTEAU, Britney (Applicant)–1 Willow Street – Site Plan Review for a Change of Use to operate All Breeds K-9 Training Center

Mr. Sherman recused himself. When appropriate, he would speak for Salon 38.

Mr. Gowan read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present or who had not been notified who asserted standing in the case.

Appearing in person were the applicants Britney Croteau and Jared Sparks. Ms. Croteau told the Board the company was celebrating its twenty-year anniversary and were looking to relocate the business from 87 Bridge Street to the Willow Plaza within the two end units. She provided a list of services they offer. There will be a maximum of 40-50 dogs per day in the daycare and split up into different groups/rooms. To be proactive, Ms. Croteau discussed common questions/concerns. Regarding noise from barking, she explained they were a dog

training facility and not behavior they allowed under their care. She spoke about the building being cinder block, similar to shooting ranges and noise cancelling. Mr. Sparks explained they were currently in a wood structure building and the new facility would completely eliminate any noise. The size of the unit will allow for a hall and separate rooms for different sizes/breeds. They are a fully self-contained activity; the only outdoor activity is from people bringing their dogs into the facility lobby. He provided decibel statistics comparing gunshots to dog noise and hair dryers to dog noise. Mr. Sparks noted there would be an approximate 17-foot buffer between the abutter (Salon 38) and where dogs will be housed. The 17-foot area will consist of the lobby, office space and an exercise room. He said they've spoken with abutters and provided the Board with a list of people who had no issues with the proposal. Some concerns were noise, smell, and cleanliness.

Mr. Sparks told the Board they prided themselves on cleanliness, which is one of the most important aspects of the industry. He mentioned solid waste was removed once per day by a waste management company and liquid waste was promptly removed and disinfected. Kennels contain plumbing underneath and will be properly; they don't expect any additional burden on the septic system. There will be no grooming on site. Typical hours are 6am-8pm; however, they will have boarding. Mr. Sparks discussed the communications with the abutters. Ms. Croteau had copies of letters of support that were previously submitted.

PUBLIC INPUT

Mr. Doherty invited the public to comment either in person or via telecommunication.

Ms. Patrice Fotino spoke to the Board via Zoom. She previously ran the local Animal Rescue League of New England and had known the applicants for approximately twelve years. She said they had given a lot to the Town through fund raising and time/effort to homeless dogs. She said they were local residents and she liked to see when residents were able to grow businesses within the Town. She's visited the existing location and noted it was very quiet and they were good neighbors. She felt it would be a loss for the Town if the business had to move outside of Town.

Ms. Kim Gillis, a Town resident for approximately fifty years came forward in person. She said she previously raised a dog the wrong way but in going through Ms. Croteau's program with her new puppy saw a world of difference. She said the current facility was over another facility and didn't know how they ran their business at that location. She described her experience with the All Breeds business and said she couldn't say enough good things about them. She believed the location move would be a huge help to the Town.

Ms. Lisa Corbett came forward in person. She told the Board she had been going to All Breeds for approximately twenty years. Her dogs trained with Ms. Croteau who she felt was amazing and an asset to the community. She's recommended Ms. Croteau to many dog owners and said it would be great for her to be able to expand her business.

Ms. Suzanne Desroche came forward in person. She was a 10-year client of Ms. Croteau and agreed with the others who spoke highly of her and the business. She spoke about the current situation with the pandemic and how the business benefitted people to have a place for their dogs to go while they worked at home.

Mr. Gowan read aloud comments received via email: 1) Amanda Kennedy, 3 Willow Street had no objection to All Breeds moving to the Willow Plaza, and 2) Julie Michaud of Salon 38 (abutting unit to proposed business) had no objection but listed concerns regarding noise, barking. She requested a sound-proof wall be installed before the proposed operation begins. She (and other businesses) were concerned about animal waste (picking up and disposal). The final concern was regarding leashing pets when entering and leaving the facility given that the handicap accessible ramp was at the end of the plaza past the entrance to the proposed business.

Mr. Sparks responded to the concerns. He said if there was a requirement for sound-proofing he would be in favor of doing so. They weren't proposing to have any dogs along the wall abutting the neighboring tenant

and there would be a 15ft- 17ft. separation from the wall and where the dogs would be located. He felt a concern was being raised about a situation that wouldn't be there to begin with. He said waste removal would not be an issue; he provided a description earlier. Regarding leashing, he said there was no potential of them taking on the liability of someone walking out of their facility with an unleashed dog; it hadn't occurred in twenty years and wouldn't occur in the future because they teach 'safety first'. Mr. Sparks stated he was willing to work with anybody regarding valid concerns. Ms. Croteau commented there may have been a misunderstanding with the abutting tenant regarding how the floor plan was set up. They have exchanged phone numbers. She explained the area that was formerly Pelham House of Pizza would be offices and rooms and the area formerly occupied by Northeast Rehabilitation would be the area for the dogs.

Mr. Sparks told the Board they spoke with the glass store and the dollar store and neither expressed issues.

Mr. Doherty asked Mr. Gowan if the Planning Department had received any complaints regarding the business at their current location. Mr. Gowan could not recollect any during his fifteen years as Planning Director. The business has been in their current location for twenty years.

Mr. Mike Sherman, stepfather to (abutter) Julie Michaud of Salon 38 spoke via telephone. He understood the exercise room shared a wall with Salon 38 and would have dogs in it; there would not be 17ft of separation. He informed there were two handicap curb/ramp cuts along the entire length of the sidewalk (in front of the building). The salon uses the ramp between the doors for the former pizza and rehabilitation units. Elderly/handicap clients would have to pass by both doors of the training facility. He said not all dogs are trained when they first arrive, and the salon is concerned with the safety of their clients who access the handicap ramp. Mr. Sherman said if the exercise room will have dogs inside and/or if the office is going to have a kennel in it the owner of the salon would like to have those walls sound-proofed.

Mr. Doherty reviewed the plan and saw that the exercise room would share a wall by approximately 16ft. with the salon. Mr. Sparks said the exercise room wasn't an area a bunch of dogs would be in. He maintained there would be a 17ft. separation between that room and the daycare area. He described the equipment contained in the exercise room that was used to get dogs in shape. He said during this process they would not be making noise. He invited anyone concerned to come to their existing facility and see how the business was run. He felt an issue was being made from something that was not really an issue. He said they would do whatever they needed to do. Ms. Croteau further explained the use of the exercise room was generally one dog at a time. She said a dog's body and brain were engaged at the same time; it was not a 'free for all' situation.

Ms. Croteau agreed the handicap entrance was a concern for everyone; they were currently located on the second floor of a building. She said safety is their number one priority when it comes to working with dogs. The first thing clients learn is how to safely and calmly get their dogs up and down the stairs.

Mr. Cote asked if they planned any demolition/construction. Mr. Sparks replied the daycare room would initially be built then build the separating wall. Mr. Cote did not feel it was unreasonable to sound-proof the exercise rooms since work would be done within the former pizza place unit. Mr. Sparks agreed it was reasonable. Mr. Cote cautioned Mr. Sparks on speaking about what dogs would/would not do because many people have been involved in negative situations. Mr. Sparks felt there were a lot of misconceptions which was why they conduct seminars to educate the general public.

Mr. Doherty inquired if the outside lighting would be changed. Ms. Croteau answered no. Mr. Doherty believed the septic load and parking seemed to be adequate.

Mr. Cote began to state a motion with conditions. Ms. Masse-Quinn seconded. Mr. Gowan listed his suggested conditions. With regard to the number of employees, Mr. Cote believed the number of employees the business could handle would be set at a maximum based on the number of dogs they were allowed to have. He agreed with the other suggested conditions.

MOTION: (Cote/Masse-Quinn) To approve the change of use with the following conditions:

ROLL CALL VOTE:

- 1) Sound-proof exercise room wall on Salon 38 side;
- 2) Town Health Officer review/inspection of the business;
- 3) Training hours – Monday-Thursday 6am-8pm, Saturday 8am-4pm;
- 4) Daycare hours – 6:30am-5:30pm;
- 5) Facility to accommodate maximum of 50 dogs per day;
- 6) Facility to accommodate overnight no more than 8 dogs at a time;
- 7) Dogs are to be video monitored 7-8 hours overnight;
- 8) Solid waste removed daily by waste management company;
- 9) Waste stations will be available outside in the event of outside elimination;
- 10) No changes to the building except for signage;

Mr. Doherty – Yes

Mr. Bergeron – Yes

Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes

Mr. Montbleau - Yes

Mr. Dadak – Yes

Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes

Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

Case #PL2020-00013

Map 20 Lot 3-137

RAYTHEON COMPANY–50 Bush Hill Road –Site Plan Review for Hillsborough Expansion (Phase VI)

Mr. Gowan read the list of abutters aloud. There were no persons present or who had not been notified who asserted standing in the case.

The applicant requested the case be date specified to August 17, 2020.

The Case was date specified to August 17, 2020.

NON-PUBLIC SESSION If requested in accordance with RSA91-A:3

Not requested

DATE SPECIFIED PLAN(S) – August 17, 2020

Case #PL2019-00024 - Map 35 Lots 10-200, 10-312 & 10-351 - NEIL FINEMAN 2018 TRUST & LEMIEUX, Albert III & Christine–Currier Road, Peabody Lane & Bridge Street (Rte. 38)

Case #PL2020-00012 - Map 24 Lot 12-204 - LOOSIGIAN, Peter& Lisa –8 Foreman Lane

Case #PL2020-00013 - Map 20 Lot 3-137 - RAYTHEON COMPANY–50 Bush Hill Road

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: (Montbleau/Dadak) To adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Mr. Doherty – Yes
Mr. Bergeron – Yes
Ms. Kirkpatrick - Yes
Mr. Montbleau - Yes
Mr. Dadak – Yes
Ms. Masse-Quinn – Yes
Mr. Cote – Yes

(7-0-0) The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:04am.

Respectfully submitted,
Charity A. Landry
Recording Secretary