CALL TO ORDER
Chairman Anne Stelmach called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ATTENDANCE: Anne Stelmach (Chairman), Richard Bairam (Vice-Chairman), Phil Denbow, Chris Pearson, and Roger Duhaime (Town Council Representative).

ALTERNATES: Timothy Stewart

EXCUSED: Gerald Hyde

STAFF: Matt Lavoie (Code Enforcement Officer)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

August 6, 2020
Chris Stelmach needs to be added as present.

R. Bairam motioned to approve the amended minutes of the August 6, 2020 meeting. Seconded by P. Denbow. C. Pearson abstained due to not being at the August 6, 2020 meeting. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

August 11, 2020 – R. Bairam motioned to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2020 meeting. Seconded by A. Stelmach. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING:
CNC Investments, LLC #Z20-9
1 Goonan Road, Map 37 Lot 30
LDR

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE:
From Article 4 Section C. 1, of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: a two-lot subdivision with the westerly lot approximately 45,328 sq. ft. of area where 87,120 sq. ft. is required, and the easterly lot having approximately 45,721 sq. ft. of area where 87,120 sq. ft. is required and approximately 119 feet of frontage where 200 feet is required.

A. Stelmach: This matter is scheduled to go the Planning Board on September 14, 2020.

C. Pearson motioned to continue the application for a variance from Article 4 Section C. 1, of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: a two-lot subdivision with the westerly lot approximately 45,328 sq. ft. of area where 87,120 sq. ft. is required, and the easterly lot having approximately 45,721 sq. ft. of area where 87,120 sq. ft. is required and approximately 119 feet of frontage where 200 feet is required for CNC Investments, LLC #Z20-9, 1 Goonan Road, Map 37 Lot 30, LDR to the October 13, 2020 meeting. Seconded by P. Denbow. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

NEW PUBLIC HEARING

EIP Communications I, LLC #Z20-10
180 Londonderry Tpk, Map 43 Lot 4
COM

APPLICATION FOR A TWO (2) YEAR EXTENSION OF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION:
Is requesting an Extension for two (2) years ending on November 13, 2022 of A Special Exception requested from Article 10 Section B(2) Pursuant to Article 10, Section B(2), a Wireless Communication Facility is allowed by Special Exception in the Commercial Zoning District, COM, in accordance with Section 28 (Wireless Communication Facilities) the applicant proposes a 140’ monopole tower with Sprint’s 6 panel antennas mounted at a centerline elevation 135’ above ground level. This Special Exception, Z18-20, was granted on November 16, 2018 by the Hooksett Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Attorney Daniel Klasnick (Duval & Klasnick LLC): The installation was approved November 13, 2018 to allow a wireless communications facility by special exception in the commercial zoning district in compliance with the zoning ordinance. There will be no changes proposed to the approved telecommunications facility. The reason we are requesting the extension is because, although EIP has been pursuing this project, the initial customer, Sprint, went through a merger with T-Mobile. That has been finalized but there is on-going analysis and adjustments as the companies combine their networks and decide how best to allocate their resources. Although EIP is continuing to pursue that with it’s customers, they need additional time to complete the integration and finalize things with it’s customer.

P. Denbow: Is two years a normal timeframe for this?
M. Lavoie: An excerpt from NH RSA 674:33 states that the ZBA may extend the approval for good cause. “Special exceptions authorized under this paragraph shall be valid if exercised within 2 years from the date of final approval, or as further extended by local ordinance or by the zoning board of adjustment for good cause, provided that no such special exception shall expire within 6 months after the resolution of a planning application filed in reliance upon the special exception.” It is up to the Board.

A. Stelmach: Has anything been built?

Attorney Klasnick: I do not believe so. They have been working through the issues I described.

Open public hearing.

Open to public comments.

No public comments.

Close to public comments.

Close public hearing.

C. Pearson motioned to grant the extension for two (2) years ending on November 13, 2022 of a special exception requested from Article 10 Section B(2) pursuant to Article 10, Section B(2), a Wireless Communication Facility is allowed by Special Exception in the Commercial Zoning District, COM, in accordance with Section 28 (Wireless Communication Facilities) the applicant proposes a 140’ monopole tower with Sprint’s 6 panel antennas mounted at a centerline elevation 135’ above ground level. This Special Exception, Z18-20, was granted on November 16, 2018 by the Hooksett Zoning Board of Adjustment for EIP Communications I, LLC #Z20-10, 180 Londonderry Tpk, Map 43 Lot 4, COM. Seconded by R. Bairam. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

Silver City NH LLC #Z20-11
39 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13 Lot 51
COM

APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE:

From Article 10 Section A of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: Warehouse and Industrial, non-nuisance (as defined in Article 22) uses in the Commercial District to support the redevelopment of tax map 13 lot 51

Nicholas Golon (TF Moran): The property is comprised of approximately 54 acres and is located on Hackett Hill Road on the east side of Rt. I-93. This site was formerly the home of Ritchie Brothers. In the 1950’s it was the Palazzi Corp. There was an industrial variance granted for Richie Brothers to clean their equipment before it was auctioned. There is currently a flat plateau with approximately 24 acres of developable area. We are proposing to lower that grade to
accommodate the proposed structure. The access is on the northern portion of the site. The existing buildings will be removed. There is an existing groundwater well. On the plan Hackett Hill Road is to the north. To the south the site was previously bi-sected by an access road to Rt. 3A. To the left is an existing reclaimed stabilized base which is gravel. There is an existing parking lot to the northeast quadrant of the site. Access would be required for oversized vehicles going into the proposed distribution center. We have accommodated that with the driveway design. Intent is the passenger vehicles would drive to the right into the parking lot. The oversized vehicles would drive to the left to the loading docks headed to the east closest to West River Road. We are proposing 225 parking spaces based off of the initial trip generation that has been done for this facility. The parking generation would necessitate 210 parking spaces. There is the ability to add an additional 50 spaces. We provided the layout of the two structures being proposed. This is our conceptual master plan. There are two phases to this project. The first phase is the distribution center which would be 595,000 sq. ft. There is also a future proposed industrial non-nuisance building to the south comprised of 150,000 sq. ft. Parking is located to the south. To the east is the loading bays.

N. Golon showed photos of what the proposed structure would look like.

Paul Roy (ProCon): The building would consist of 44 precast insulated panels. It would be concrete with a painted finish and some design elements and would accommodate the new racking system. Due to sprinkler heads this building allows for stacking to a higher height. There is a shortage of this type of space in New Hampshire and there is a demand for it. The mezzanine in the front can be subdivided into bays or have one tenant. Sewer will be in the front. Offices are in the front of the building. The logistics portion would be on the back. It is an attractive building and has a lot of strength.

N. Golon: We met with the Town Administrator, Code Enforcement Officer, and Town Planner to provide this information and show the vision for this proposed use. We understand this is a commercially zoned lot and distribution use does not fit. Given what we are proposing, in lieu of trying to mix in supplementary uses to the building to try and meet the ordinance, it was deemed most appropriate to move forward with the nature of the project. We received comments and feedback. We understand traffic will be one of the primary components. We had a meeting with DOT to review traffic and intersections to be evaluated and set the baseline for the traffic impact and access study that would be prepared should this project have the opportunity to move forward. We acknowledge this is more of a site Planning Board issue, but given that we have a use variance that we are requesting we wanted to touch on that. When looking at peak hour trips for the hotel and fast food restaurant that was approved for this site, there would be upwards of 300 during those peak hours. With this use we can spread traffic out and would be looking at 71 peak hour trips on a Saturday. There will be larger vehicles which may need off-site improvements which could be Hackett Hill Road or at the toll booth. That is within the scope of this work and will be reviewed by DOT. This project can bring value to the community as well as the developer which could include road improvements, water, and sewer. We designed our plans that were submitted to TRC for the purpose of connecting to municipal
sewer. We will be meeting with the Sewer Commission and town staff to make sure that can be a reality. We would need to make sure we are not to far ahead of the improvement being proposed at Exit 11 and Exit 10. We believe we can come to a compromise as to where we place our sewer that can benefit this lot as well as the surrounding area.

P. Roy: We are trying to attract a national tenant. They require sewer for their facilities.

R. Duhaime: You do not have a tenant for this building?

P. Roy: No. There are a multitude of tenants that are talking with us.

C. Pearson: What would be the ground elevation relative to West River Road?

N. Golon: 70’ of elevational change. From Hackett Hill Road there would be 25’ of grade change.

C. Pearson: Why are the loading docks facing the West River Road versus the highway?

P. Roy: The feedback from the town was that they want to see the loading docks along the Rt. 93 side.

R. Duhaime: Can the looks of this building be improved? Can you do anything with the architecture? This is not an industrial area anymore. I would like to see something more rustic like the Common Man. This is not what I am looking for at this site.

P. Roy: We could do some bump outs. As far as changing roofs, that does not make sense on a building of this size. This building is over 1,000 ft. long. We are doing what we can with the glass.

N. Golon: We have to be mindful of what we will see and from where. This is a 44’ tall building but there are grade differences. West River Road has 70’ of elevation. There is existing mature forest which is upwards of 80’ tall that provides shielding to the residential users on the river side of West River Road. From the interstate there is a break in the tree line on the southerly most portion of the site. We would be dropping the elevation upwards of 25’ so you would be looking at the top 25’ to 30’ of the building. There may be some challenges in keeping this with the area that we would hope to work through with the Planning Board.

R. Duhaime: So we will be looking at the mechanical units?

P. Roy: We would do the appropriate screenings around the HVAC equipment that would normally be done.

R. Bairam: You have no idea what traffic will be like?
N. Golon: We are in the early stages of the full development of the project. We have made our TRC submittal and are preparing a traffic study that would be submitted to the Planning Board should this Board deem this an appropriate site for this project. Currently we have a snapshot of what our expectations are. We are proposing a distribution use for the larger of the two buildings versus a warehouse use. There would be an additional 20 trips for the warehouse building. There would be 71 peak hour trips Saturday for the larger structure. For the smaller structure there would be an additional weekday pm peak of 20. Aggregate this is under 100. We understand the sensitivity of traffic to this area, but we also feel that with the development of this project, and with the appropriate use of TIF funds, it is providing a mechanism and opportunity to provide improvements to the area.

R. Duhaime: How can you know the traffic if you don’t know the tenant?

N. Golon: By the intended use.

R. Duhaime: There could be quite a few different tenants.

N. Golon: Relative to how this is being designed it is big trucks in and out.

R. Duhaime: Will this be 24 hours a day?

N. Golon: 3 shifts 24 hours.

N. Golon read the application into the record.

C. Pearson: You are making a substantial drop in the elevation which is in the backyard of a residential area.

N. Golon: There are no visual site lines along that pathway.

C. Pearson: You are going to drop 30’. Now you have a loading dock with trucks What are you going to do to buffer noise and site lines?

N. Golon: There is a set back. There are limits of the right-of-way and an existing slope. There will still be over 100’ of existing tree line that remains. We are reducing it by 50’ at its closest point. We acknowledge there is a reduction in that component. Perhaps something that would be a benefit would be a prospective that shows how this building would not be directly visible from the West River Road area.

C. Pearson: This is a significant change from previous uses and from a commercial to an industrial loading zone. I would argue your point that there is no significant change to the site.
R. Duhaime: This area had changed to less industrial. I like the idea of this building in Hooksett, just not in this area. You are talking about putting a 24/7 operation in a valley with sound that travels.

N. Golon: Sound travels at a 45 degree angle from its source which, in this case, would be up, not down. Relative to the geography that we have of that topography, it equates to the acoustics.

R. Duhaime: I would like to see the loading docks facing towards Hackett Hill.

N. Golon: I am hearing a concern about the layout of the facility relative to the loading docks and a preference to have them pointing towards Hackett Hill Road. It is a long thin site. Relative to how we have the building currently oriented, running with the highway would be the necessary layout. Relative to the loading docks there is more flexibility.

R. Duhaime: Do you have additional photos of the front of the building?

P. Roy: Not at this time.

N. Golon: We can provide additional images as to what the building would look like.

P. Roy: We can show photos of proper elevations, how it sits on the site and of how it would look from all angles.

A. Stelmach: I want to make sure you are not trying to say that Ritchie Brothers or Palazzi were industrial uses. They were not and they never had an industrial variance.

N. Golon: Ritchie Brothers got a variance for the purposes of providing certain services that fell within the industrial classification. We limited those uses and did not ask for industrial wholesale. We asked for the specific use of cosmetic repair and cleaning of vehicles.

A. Stelmach: It was a groundwater variance. An industrial variance is very different from a groundwater variance and they were not industrial uses.

N. Golon: We are only drawing similar parallels to the functions that they served.

R. Duhaime: This is not the best value for the tax value of the town.

P. Roy: As far as usage for this site, it is not an office building or hotel. This is the best use for this site. It is direct access on and off the highway. It makes sense as far as the logistics. The retail world is not coming back. Would you want residential use right off the highway?
C. Pearson: You might be correct. This is a prime property and I think the town needs to weigh in. Is this best for the public interest?

R. Duhaime: We are looking at the TIF district and tax base. This type of use is built for truckers and distribution. This is a beautiful site and not what I thought would go into it. For all I know it may be the best use. I will look at it and bring it up to Town Council.

R. Duhaime: How do you come up with the square footage. Could it be smaller? Would it be less viable if it was smaller?

P. Roy: Yes. We want to be in the 700,000 sq. ft. range to attract tenants. When we calculated the areas we did it by the inside to allow for proper racking in the most effective way possible. That is how they make their money. We maximized this size building.

N. Golon: The distribution facilities are the modern day retail. That is why we are saying it is a reasonable use.

R. Duhaime: This area and Hooksett has changed. It is constantly changing. I want to make sure that in 30 years when it keeps changing whatever goes here is something that will stay with the town. Something like this by Manchester Airport is fine. This is not the location for something like this. I am looking for something that will fit. I know this is a tall order but it can be done.

N. Golon: I am hearing there is concern as to how this will fit in with this specific local. Not so much the use that is distribution, but the end product. What the outside of the structure looks like and are we able to make it more in keeping with the locality.

C. Pearson: For me, there is some ownership here on the Town of Hooksett and the Town Administrator. I am going ask that our Town Council Representative work to get that feedback. This is a huge change. I thought that what was previously proposed was the direction the town wanted to go in. I want feedback on why this is the only viable option. I would like feedback from the Town Administrator.

R. Duhaime: I believe that this is a new owner and this is what he would like to do.

C. Pearson: You just put up a great hotel and restaurant in Concord. Why can’t something like that be done? This may be a great spot for this but is it in the best public interest for the town? We need feedback on that from the town.

N. Golon: We understand that we need to provide the following: 1) Additional graphics; 2) See if we can make some tweaks to the architecture to be more in keeping with the town; 3) Provide site lines; 4) Identify that there would not be a negative impact on the community relative to acoustics.
A. Stelmach: The burden I am struggling with is it is stated repeatedly in the application that this property is unique. I am struggling to find that criteria a hardship. I think this is the best situated parcel on that road in terms of what is around it. That is the burden you have to prove in the criteria and I am not even nearly sold on how this is unique to change the zoning. It is up to us to decide whether or not to change this from commercial to industrial regardless of the plan. In order to even get that far I can not figure out what piece of this parcel makes it different than any other parcel in the surrounding lots. The argument is weak. I am taking this back to what is the criteria.

William Tebow (Owner): Malls are down tenants. Retail, housing, and office market isn’t there. This parcel has direct access off of the highway. I bought this site at a bankruptcy. We looked at the site and the options. We did not see the office, retail, hotel, residential, or restaurants being viable as they took the biggest hits with COVID. We are not getting any tax base. The demand dictates what you put up. This is the biggest demand and the wave of the future. It is taking the place of retail. It is a beautiful site along the highway with access. When you look at the uses in today’s times this is the best use we came up with. We can permit this to put in a hotel or restaurant, but if no one is going to come what is the point.

R. Duhaime: We have given many approvals prior to there being a tenant and then there is no tenant. I hesitate when there is no tenant before something is built. We have a sign on the highway and did not get what we thought we would. You are planning to build and think you will fill it?

W. Tebow: First you have to drop the site. The lower you go down the wider this site gets. Along Rt. 3A you are 100’ up. You won’t even see this from Rt. 3A. You will see it from the highway but it will be dropped down so the view will be softened. Some shrubs or trees could be put along the highway. You try to get users while the site is being prepped. This is a vacant site that we paid over $7,000,000 for and we have no use for it. Based on the market we want to create a use based on analysis that we have received. We understand this may not be what you are looking for aesthetically but it is the best use for this site.

R. Duhaime: What does a building like this cost to build?

W. Tebow: At least $50 - $60 million.

P. Duhaime: Are you looking at dry goods?

P. Roy: We don’t know. It is planned for dry goods, but can be set up with refrigeration.

W. Tebow: There is a demand for cold storage. These types of buildings can have multiple uses.

C. Pearson: Will you build this building without a tenant?
W. Tebow: We are considering that. We are meeting with the realtors next week. It would take about a year to a year and a half to get to the site elevation. If we get the approval we would market it. If we can’t find a user we will build one building and wait to build the other one.

C. Pearson: Changing this from commercial to industrial is like writing a blank check. If you are going to be excavating it becomes an excavation pit without a tenant.

W. Tebow: When we first came we knew the concerns across the street. That site is a lot lower than what we want to do. We did not want to come in for an excavation permit because we wanted to get going sooner rather than later. We wanted to get a parallel pass.

A. Stelmach: Can you add anything on the smaller building. One tenant may not want to co-exist with the other.

W. Tebow: We are trying to maximize the square footage.

Open public hearing.

Open to public comments

Steve Korzyniowski (329 West River Road): My family has lived on my property since 1952 and I have been a resident all my life. I understand the economic development benefits. I think it would be great for the tax base and is low residential impact, however, I live right across the street. Now I look up at the hill and see trees. Most recently the auction house put up the cleaning building. The lights were shining into my home. I will be looking at a brick wall, the trees will be gone, and I will see this building. The trucks will come to this building 24/7, back in using their back up signals, and I will hear the noise. You will have to deal with problems with the larger higher end homes along the water front. The back side of this building will have lights so people can see at night. I am sure there are other things we will learn along the way. What does industrial non-nuisance mean?

N. Golon: The definition of non-nuisance is: “Any industry which is not detrimental to the environment in which it is to be located by reasons of emissions of smoke, noise, odor, dust, vibration, or excessive light. It will not be obnoxious or dangerous to adjoining properties or groundwater and will not generate excessive traffic with its intended hazards.” It does on to list compliance with federal standards that echo those points.

S. Korzyniowski: This building may be the highest and best use for this time. 15 years ago Cabela’s was supposed to be the highest and best use.

N. Golon: Relative to your concerns with the lights, we can provide a plan to show the light levels.
S. Korzyniowski: Would there be an option to put in a barrier wall that would be light and sound absorbing?

N. Golon: I cannot say yes or no at this time, but we can evaluate further buffering.

C. Pearson: I would like to understand from the Town Administrator why it was determined that the loading docks facing the riverside was the best possible way to face this building.

P. Roy: We can look at laying out the building differently.

M. Lavoie: The Town Planner and myself thought it would be better having the loading docks on the Rt. 93 side seeing as the highway is higher than the building. Having 90 or so loading docks facing Rt. 93 would make that end of it more aesthetically pleasing.

C. Pearson: I think about the what is will look like from the river side and from across the river.

Dave Scarpetti (321 West River Road): My brothers and I own the soccer field. Traffic is a concern. We have a lot of problems with Rt. 3A going north. It gets bottle necked. They are going to try to get off at Exit 10 and not pay the toll which will increase the traffic on Rt. 3A. There has to be some sort of resolution as far as either side of the highway before anything gets done. When that gets blocked up it could be a serious problem. You have an upscale neighborhood next to the Tri-Town Arena. Maybe it is the best thing for Hooksett because it is within the TIF. Are they going to do the sewer and water? The pump station is going to be in tri-town parking lot. That needs to be taken into consideration.

Joel Bergeron (325 West River Road) and Kate Donovan (327 West River Road)

J. Bergeron: If you look at the topography of the hill directly across from our properties there is a V. All of the water that is on the hill funnels down the hill and onto our property every time we get hard rain or snow melt. There is an outlet pipe on the west side of Rt. 3A, exactly across the street from our two parcels, that DOT did not even know it was there. It was installed in 1920. The outlet pipe is buried going underneath Rt. 3A and all the water that comes down that hill bubbles up on our property. That pipe was put in before the structures on our parcels were erected. We have done everything we can to mitigate that water runoff. When our houses were not there the was was probably going into the river. When a building is there the water will not be going into the ground anymore. That will be a major issue for us. Half way up that hill is an outlet pipe. I am willing to bet that pipe is due to a catch basin on top of that hill. As property owners we want to see something to collect that water. We will get washed away.

N. Golon: We have located that on our conditions plan. That is directly across from your garage. There is a V channel picking up from the slope and the old driveway. There are catch basin structures that are further up the hill that are discharging portions of stormwater from the up-
per portion down to the lower section. It was armored at some point. There is a rip rap embankment where stormwater discharges out to. As part of the design of this facility, stormwater management would have to be addressed. Because of the district we are located in, we have to evaluate up to the 100-year storm event. The expectation is that we would design this site so that there is no discharge during the 100-year storm event from the stormwater management systems that we are designing. We have to do that to be consistent with the pre-development condition. I would like to connect with you afterwards. One of the benefits to bringing down the elevation of the site is that we would be working down into that area where that existing draining infrastructure exists.

J. Bergeron: We are also concerned about the traffic and the tractor trailers. We had to take down trees because they were threatening safety, but if those tractor tailors go to the property via Exit 10, I can only imagine what that would be like. Our front door is 150’ from the road. If the loading docks face easterly, we are the ones that have to live there and see the lights and hear the noise 24/7. In the Fall and Winter when there are no leaves on the trees you can hear and sound travels on water.

Kate Donovan (327 West River Road): I want to echo the concerns of the Board and neighbors as far as lights and noise. Once the foliage falls off we can see everything. With the trucks backing up and spotlights that is a definite concern.

J. Bergeron: There has been talk of the loading docks are facing the residents. We are the ones who live here not the people traveling on the highway.

Close to public comments.

A. Stelmach: I would like to see a site walk done. I think Planning, Conservation, and the Town Administrator should be invited. Could we get someone from DOT to come? I would like the site staked out for us prior to the site walk.

M. Lavoie: DOT is pretty much unresponsive.

N. Golon: We can reach out to our contacts.

A site walk was scheduled for September 22, 2020 at 5:00 pm.

It was agreed that for the site walk, the property will be: 1) Staked with the proximity to all three sides, broken down by phases; 2) Balloons for site elevation.

C. Pearson motioned to continue the public hearing for an application for a variance from Article 10 Section A of the Zoning Ordinance to permit: Warehouse and Industrial, non-nuisance (as defined in Article 22) uses in the Commercial District to support the redevelopment of tax map 13 lot 51 for Silver City NH LLC #Z20-11, 39 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13 Lot 51, COM until
the October 13, 2020 meeting prior to which we will 1) get questions answered from this meeting from the applicant; 2) feedback from Town Council, the Town Administrator, and Town Planner; and 3) Site walk scheduled for September 22, 2020 at 5:00 pm. Seconded by P. Denbow. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

DISCUSSION / APPLICATION REVIEW:

Silver City NH LLC #Z20-12
39 Hackett Hill Road, Map 13 Lot 51
COM

CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION FOR EXCAVATION PERMIT:

Other Ordinances #OO14 Section 6 - The board may grant conditional approval subject to a public hearing. Section 8 - A public Hearing shall be held on such decision or any matter determined thereby. A notice of the hearing shall be sent to abutters. Conservation Commission, & per RSA, the local newspaper.

N. Golon: Are there any questions that you would like to have addressed prior to the next meeting?

A. Stelmach: The Conservation Commission needs to be notified of this.

N. Golon: I will check to see if they have been.

A. Stelmach: I have found some deficiencies in the application. There is no letter of authorization to you. Statutorily I don’t see everything in the statute that addresses an reclamation plan. There is a lot embedded in what is required in a reclamation plan so you might want to RSA 155(E)(3)(6).

N. Golon: Subject to that requirement, the RSA expands on that is required if it is not consistent with the development that is being proposed. We are proposing a development as part of this. That subset of the RSA would not be applicable. We are not going to reclaim the site based off of the excavation grades. We are hoping to build a building.

A. Stelmach: What if that does not happen?

N. Golon: Our assumption is that would not move forward if the use that we are requesting is not approved.

A. Stelmach: I would have a reclamation plan in your pocket. What is not going to happen is what is happening next door?

N. Golon: Duly noted.
A. Stelmach: As far as the access plan, could you walk through the profile view.

N. Golon: We are trying to show you the route of entering and exiting, not emergency vehicles. The access coming from Hackett Hill. The north side is the left side.

A. Stelmach: It would be helpful to have a copy of that blown up.

N. Golon: We will provide that for next time.

A. Stelmach: RSA 155(E)(3)(6) talks about specific actions relative to fuel and chemical handling, dust control, storage control, traffic, etc. while the excavation is taking place.

N. Golon: We will make sure those notations are added if they are not currently on the plan. It should be on Sheet 7 but we will add any notations that may be missing.

N. Golon agreed to notify the abutters, return receipt, of the site walk at the cost of the applicant.

**ADJOURNMENT**

P. Denbow motioned to adjourn. Seconded by R. Bairam. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 pm.

The next Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting will be held October 13, 2020 at 6:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

/s/ AnnMarie White

AnnMarie White

Recording Clerk