

**Kingston Planning Board  
Public Hearing  
May 3, 2016**

The Chairman called the hearing to order at 6:50 PM. There were no challenges to the legality of the meeting.

Members in attendance:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair  
Carol Croteau  
Ernie Landry (alternate)

Peter Coffin  
Peter Bakie

Members absent: Adam Pope, Chris Bashaw, Mark Heitz, Richard St. Hilaire (Alternate), Ellen Faulconer (Alternate)

Also in Attendance: Glenn Greenwood, Circuit Rider Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer

Mr. Coppelman noted that Mr. Landry would be a voting member for this meeting unless other Board members arrived during the meeting. A table copy of the minutes was being passed around by the Board members for later approval.

**Tasbak, LLC  
Landscape's Depot  
59 Rte. 125  
Kingston, NH 03848  
Tax Map R9-90**

Mr. Coffin, as an abutter, recused himself from the Board at this time.

Mr. Coppelman explained that this was a public meeting at the request of the Board due to some issues that were brought to the Board's decision; the Board asked to meet with the property owner.

Pat Trent, the in-house accountant for Tasbak and Landscape's Depot, introduced herself to the Board. Mr. Greenwood recapped that the Board had received a letter from an abutter; per the Board's request, he had reviewed the concerns in the letter and there were some issues on the site that appeared to need to be resolved.

Ms. Trent said she had a copy of the letter and asked to address each individual issue by going through the points noted in the letter. She noted that the letter being referenced was dated November 14, 2015; she said that they were aware of concerns of the buffer abutting the neighbor's land and understood that it needed to be a 50-foot buffer acknowledging that there have been issues. She read each paragraph and addressed each one.

- Buffer area – compliance: commercial activity/trash storage in the area; trees not replaced; disturbance by earth-moving equipment or coverage with trash so no vegetation

able to grow. Her reply was that there was no commercial activity occurring in the buffer zone; there are employees that walk the area and check the site; the owner walks the dogs back there to review the area; they are aware of former concerns so they are not ignoring the issue. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that there is nothing being stored and no commercial activity occurring. They are willing to admit that sometimes it is hard to know where the buffer zone begins; they have pictures to make sure that no employee is going into the wrong area. She clarified that they are a landscaping supply company with multiple people coming and going so the staffing changes; they now have a cinder block area delineating the buffer zone now. Ms. Trent had pictures showing some dirt in the area but they haven't done bulldozing, adding that it is a ledge site and difficult to grow things; trucks do go to the area and park on a pad near the buffer zone; driver drives up, loads the oil, then leaves clarifying that this activity is not in the buffer zone. She stated that from the woods, someone might misconstrue the location but they have now taken steps to clarify the setbacks so nothing is going on. She continued that regarding items being stored and confirmed that the owner did go back and look and agreed that some pallets and old scrap metal were way too close to the buffer and placed there inadvertently; these have now been moved. She re-iterated that there were some before and after pictures she was going to provide to the Board adding that they were not trying to cause problems and fix what they found. She stated that the owners had made some conscientious effort in the last few months to make sure they are not making any rules. Mr. Coppelman confirmed with Ms. Trent that the cinderblock wall was a recent addition.

- Problems with “no trespassing” signs being on the abutter’s land: Ms. Trent said that they had some vandalism so these signs were put up and an employee put them up where they didn’t belong and it is their understanding that the signs still up are on L. Depot’s land and the other signs were already removed. Ms. Trent re-iterated that it was a mistake on the part of the employee and was unintentional.
- Lack of keeping buffer vegetated per the site plan: Ms. Trent has pictures from December, 2015 and they did find dead things; the trees keep dying on the ledge site; in December they cleared the land and replanted new trees that died so they have gone out and dug up the dead trees and have replanted them; they are struggling to keep things growing there. Mr. Coppelman asked if it was the “north” side; it was determined to be the “east” side. Ms. Trent said that the pictures show slopes where the vegetation is struggling but there are several trees growing, the area is not barren. She did state that during the busy time of year, they are not checking the area daily to check how the trees are doing; the owners have agreed to try harder. Mr. Coppelman said it is important that the buffer be maintained properly as it is part of the approval of the site plan; if it gets to the point where the buffer cannot be maintained, Mr. Greer might want to think about some other type of buffer such as a fence although a vegetated buffer is the preferred option. Ms. Trent showed the pictures to the Board.
- Picture review: equipment shown in December; abutter Peter Coffin noted that one dead spruce had been replaced in December; he said 16 new trees had been planted in the last month. Ms. Trent stated that the property owner is making the effort. Mr. Greenwood asked if they were all still alive; abutter Mr. Coffin said that some were “yellowed” but it was much better since the letter from the Planning Board asking for a meeting was sent in March. Ms. Trent returned to reviewing the pictures; on April 8<sup>th</sup> they removed

vegetation that was dying and replaced the trees; April 15<sup>th</sup> – more plantings were shown. Mr. Coffin noted that the “no trespassing” sign is located in the vegetated buffer zone but is not in an area being vegetated. Mr. Coffin added that the “no trespassing” sign was not legally posted as it is not around the perimeter with 300 feet of separation. Mr. Bakie suggested addressing one thing at a time to avoid confusion. Ms. Trent referred back to the April 15<sup>th</sup> pictures showing the healthy, growing trees and vegetation. Ms. Trent showed pictures taken April 29<sup>th</sup> of items that did not belong in the buffer and the pictures taken today show the cinderblock division separating the buffer zone; she noted that everything was pulled back from that area; tracks from equipment are shown from equipment that went back to move the material not from excavation. The vegetation line of the 50 foot buffer continued to be reviewed; Mr. Coffin confirmed that there were now 30 trees as there were 16 new trees added to the 15 older trees and existing growth. Ms. Trent showed a picture of how the area looked before it had been cleaned up showing a comparison between April 29<sup>th</sup> and May 3<sup>rd</sup>. Mr. Coffin asked if the Board had the pictures he had provided in April noting that they had previously been mailed out to the Board through the office. Ms. Trent continued reviewing the remaining points.

- Question regarding the companies on the property: Ms. Trent reviewed the companies registered on the site. TK Trucking was the original name of the company from 1983 when moved to New Hampshire there was a current NH corp. called EMB Inc. which they kept as doing business as TK Trucking; as L. Depot evolved they stopped doing transactions under TK Trucking except that some of the vehicles are registered as TK Trucking so it is kept for that reason, once those vehicles are gone, the name will disappear; DOT requires that the name TK Trucking appear on those trucks. A sister corporation called TASBAK was set up to own the real estate where the company stands so in actuality, L. Depot rents all of the buildings from Tasbak. Another LLC called Organic Disposal is in the business of removing manure; nothing is done on-site, it is taken to an off-site plant in Merrimac, MA; Organic Disposal has an office that they rent from Tasbak. The last name in State records is Extreme Truck Body, LLC as in 2005 they received a patent for their compartmentalized dump body that was designed by the owner and one of the mechanics; the name was established in case they decided to make the truck bodies which is not currently done; holding the patent under the name is as far as it went.
- Concern of storage tanks for home-heating fuel: Ms. Trent understands that the Planning Board gave permission for the tanks with Plan 34953 on August 31, 2007 with the site plan showing the tanks for diesel waste oil and #2 fuel oil.

Ms. Trent stated that she believed that all the points in the abutters’ letter were addressed. Mr. Bakie asked how many abutters were associated with the property; Ms. Trent had no idea. Mr. Greenwood said an abutters list would be in the file and might be on the site plan. The Board reviewed the file. Mr. Coffin pointed out locations on the plan. Mr. Bakie asked if there was anything in the letter that had not been addressed by Ms. Trent. Mr. Greenwood said that the issue still stood as to whether the double tree line exists as shown on the plan and it sounds like it currently does exist; the line of demarcation for the 50-foot buffer seems like an appropriate mechanism for the property owner to be able to ensure that his activities stay on the correct side and a good effort by the owners to handle the issue; the explanation given of the businesses on-site makes sense. Mr. Greenwood explained that there is a regulation stating how trespassing signs are to be placed on a site and it appears that maybe they are not complying with that. Ms.

Trent stated all the other signs except one had been removed but she will go back to talk with the property owners about removing that one sign. Mr. Greenwood said that action was by the property owner to put up the “no trespassing” signs which had not been a requirement by the Town so if they want to put up signs that are not compliant with the State then this is an issue that they need to take up with their insurance agency. Mr. Bakie said it can be located appropriately by contacting NH Fish and Game and they will give appropriate guidelines. Mr. Coppelman stated that a property owner has the right to post their land.

Ms. Croteau referred to general standards, 904.6 (D) and the appropriate buffer zones and asked for a clarification as to what the 50 foot buffer zone means and the reference to the 15 foot width of the screen. Mr. Greenwood said that the Board applies the requirements on a case by case basis in order to best meet the standard; he said in this case the Board was asking for an adequate vegetative buffer to provide screening for the abutter which was done by a double row of pine plantings although it seems like this has never been completely established although now may be approximating the 30 trees that were required. Mr. Quintal said there appears to be confusion in the requirement for a 50-foot vegetated buffer with a screening of 15 feet in width that is to be maintained by the owner which is what was approved. Both Mr. Quintal and Mr. Greenwood agreed that the cinder-block delineation is a great idea. Mr. Greenwood said that the Board does anticipate that the 15 foot width of screening will be done by plantings that are alive; Mr. Quintal said that periodic inspections would cover that. Ms. Croteau re-iterated that the ordinance does make the property owner responsible for maintaining the live buffer. Ms. Trent said that the owners are making every effort to be good neighbors; the owners did ask Ms. Trent to express to the Board that anyone having concerns can come to them and talk with them. Mr. Coppelman explained the buffering between commercial and residential activities. Mr. Greenwood said that from the perspective of the Planning Board, there had been issues with the buffer for a long time and wasn't addressed until the Planning Board got proactive about it. Ms. Trent said that an effort has been made to address it and keep it addressed. Mr. Greenwood said the cinderblock separation is a good fix adding that it has been a long-time coming. Mr. Coppelman stated that it would be good for the owner to keep a close watch on the vegetation so anything that died would be replaced as it was an approval of the site plan. Mr. Greenwood asked if there were additional comments from the abutter, Peter Coffin, for the record. Mr. Coffin cited several letters. Mr. Greenwood said he was more concerned with the 2015 letter as that was the recent concern of the Planning Board.

Abutter comments: Peter Coffin introduced himself and noted his property location. He said that he was pleased to see that there was a response to the Board's letter. He said there were on-going issues with use of the property; he asked if there was any documentation regarding permission of the fuel tanks as the original request was to park two trucks, without fuel, in the designated paved parking areas and that no fuel would be transferred on-site. Ms. Trent said there was something on the next year. Mr. Coppelman said that he had a concern regarding a level of conversation that should occur with the property owner rather than putting Ms. Trent on the spot. Mr. Coffin asked Mr. Greenwood whether he was aware, when he reviewed the files, of any approvals by the Board for fuel transfers on the property. Mr. Greenwood said that he saw approval for the parking of two fuel distribution trucks. Mr. Coffin said that they would be fueled off-site which are in the PB minutes; he cited minutes done in January 2006. Mr. Greenwood said his recollection is that there were fuel tanks. Mr. Coffin read the minutes that

there was an approval of an amended site plan and noted the conditions that needed to be met by April 2006. Mr. Coppelman said that he was reviewing the letter from November, 2015 and thought that was what the Board was discussing and did not see what he was talking about in reference to uses. Mr. Coffin said that he was requested to produce an outline from a previous letter that had been reviewed by the Board. There was discussion regarding the correspondence; Mr. Coppelman said he did have the photos that had been submitted and were attached to the November letter. Mr. Coffin said that the photos were from earlier in the year and showed the trucks refueling in the 50-foot buffer; he pointed out the non-compliance within the buffer areas and noted the concrete pad as being out of the buffer zones adding that the vehicles operate within the buffer zone; he added that they didn't have to do this as they could park on the pad which would be a DES requirement for transferring fuel instead of doing it in the buffer zone. Mr. Greenwood said that these are items that Ms. Trent was not addressing. Mr. Coffin said his comments clarify that there are commercial activities occurring in the buffer zone which contradict Mr. Trent's statement. Mr. Greenwood said that for the purposes going forward, there should not be any activities going on within the buffer zone; Mr. Coppelman agreed adding that the buffer zone is more than just where the trees are located; there is still a buffer zone in areas other than where the cinderblocks are now located. Mr. Coppelman said while the Board has answers on some of the issues, there are still questions on some of the other items from Mr. Coffin related to the pictures that went along with the November 14 letter. There was discussion of a site walk to compare the approved plan in order for the Board to go forward. Mr. Coffin showed a pile of trash, packing materials, building materials within the 50 foot buffer that was taken in April 16<sup>th</sup>; Ms. Trent said it was now removed. Mr. Coffin showed a picture indicating where corrugated metal was used to cover up an area to keep vegetation from growing that was there for several months which was clearly in the vegetated buffer area; he showed scrap metal being stored in the area of the fuel tanks. Mr. Greenwood said that Ms. Trent did a good job responding to the letter of November 14 and suggested the best way to resolve this issue would be for the Board to go out on site with a site plan and simply talk with Mr. Greer to establish that the buffer areas won't get intruded upon. He continued that the pictures were frustrating and it would be nice to speak with Mr. Greer to clarify that certain areas need to stay clear. Mr. Coppelman agreed that the Board should really walk the property with the approved site plan and find what is in compliance with Mr. Greenwood adding that then everyone involved would know what the site plan requires. Mr. Coffin said that based on the information given about the businesses, there are no assurances that trucks are not being manufactured on site; he stated that there are some garbage removal sites on the property. Ms. Trent said that the garbage trucks are owned by Organic Disposal and leave the property to bring the waste to Massachusetts. Mr. Coppelman said if the Board was doing a site walk then those items would be checked at the time and questions could be asked at that time in comparison to the plan with the answers coming directly from the property owner. He said that it is incumbent upon the Board, or a representative from the Board, to view the property. Mr. Greenwood suggested the site walk noting that when the Board has been able to speak with Mr. Greer directly, things have gone well and that makes more sense. Mr. Coppelman said the issue would be asking Mr. Greer for a date that works for him but noted that it would be his busy time. Mr. Greenwood suggested that Mr. Greer would set up a time knowing that the Board would come to his site for about 45 minutes; Mr. Greenwood will contact Mr. Greer to establish a date and time for the site walk; May 14<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 AM was proposed expecting it to last no more than one hour; a back-up date was May 21<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Greenwood will contact the Board when the date is established. Ms. Trent was thanked for coming to speak with the Board.

*<Board note: Mr. Coffin re-joined the Board.>*

**Environmental Compliance Specialists, Inc.**  
**111 Route 125**  
**Tax Map R10 Lot 2**

Jesse Wright introduced himself as owner of 111 Main, LLC which houses ECSI. Mr. Wright apologized to the Board regarding his lack of appearance and seeming disrespect and inconvenience to the Board. Mr. Coppelman said that some activities on the site were brought to the attention of the Board that might not be consistent with the approval; the Board authorized the Town Engineer to view the site for compliance with the approved plan. Dennis Quintal reviewed his letter of May 2, 2016 and the associated photos. He noted, among other things, that there is no outlet for storm water run-off; evidence of erosion in one section of a steep slope; paper and plastic litter observed along the slope and the woods; post and rail fence in the parking area does not exist; riprap swale behind a row of 3' diameter boulders along the top of the steep slope does not exist; proposed catch basin in the low area of the gravel parking to collect the surface run-off and piped to a storm water detention basin and an outlet treatment swale have not been constructed; a sediment control device was not found; directions for Erosion and Sediment Control and Storm Water Management have not been followed. Mr. Coppelman stated that it appears, at the very least, that some things on the approved plan did not get done. Mr. Greenwood contacted DES per the Board's instruction but they were not interested in attending the site walk. Mr. Quintal reviewed the photos he provided to the Board noting the deficiencies and other areas of interest previously mentioned. Mr. Quintal said that he did not believe the wetlands were impacted at this time and the banking is stable except for the area with the wash-out but it should be corrected; he continued that the banking is not beyond where it is supposed to be; the ground and the slope is within what was proposed. He stated that the missing items included the fence across the front, the drainage and detention basin and the treatment swale for treating the run-off before it gets to the wetlands; he said that the requirements for motorized vehicles to be parked on pavement were not followed as vehicles were parked on gravel. Mr. Quintal confirmed that the Chair of the Conservation Commission was also present for the site walk; Mr. Coppelman said that he did not have any comments from the Commission. Mr. Quintal said she spoke with the owner's representative and said that she was going to try to come to the meeting but obviously something must have occurred keeping her from the meeting. Mr. Coppelman said there had been concerns from items that might be stored on site so he was hoping to hear from Conservation. Mr. Coppelman said that the run-off issues and proximity to wetlands should be a concern for the Board. Mr. Greenwood said that when he reviewed the property in May of last year he had issues with the number of storage containers on site and their placement; he asked if there were still dumpsters tucked into the woods. Mr. Quintal said he didn't see that. The placement was reviewed. Mr. Quintal said there were some on the left hand side but they were empty; Mr. Greenwood said at the time he was there, they were not empty. Mr. Coffin said they he drives by there on a regular basis and sometimes the dumpsters are empty, sometimes half full; the real question is whether storage of building materials on site had been prohibited on the site. Mr. Coffin said the erosion control issues were significant but the

storage of materials on the site might be an issue. Mr. Coppelman said the recorded site plan did not show any dumpsters on the site; Mr. Greenwood agreed. Mr. Quintal said that note #8 says that there shall be no hazardous materials stored on site. Mr. Coffin said then it would have to be known what comprised the demolition materials and whether they contained lead or asbestos, for example. Mr. Coppelman asked if there were any questions from the Board. Mr. Wright said that he would like to review the initial site plan adding that he is in the asbestos abatement industry; in Massachusetts as a contractor he has the right to keep a container at his place of business to reconsolidate asbestos waste that has already been containerized and transported back to the business and consolidated to larger vessels in order to be disposed of economically. He continued that when moving to NH he lost that ability to do that; he spent a long time putting together a transfer facility permit application to do this in NH and the State approved it and he came back to Kingston with a site plan to make room for a couple of tractor trailers and build a dock on the backside of the existing metal building along with other items and it was not met with great reviews so he abandoned it as he didn't think it was popular in the Town and did not want to "fight city hall". He added that it all went to the back burner and all but abandoned the idea of the transfer facility; alternative methods were found. He discussed permissible activities in surrounding states regarding asbestos containment and economic feasibility. Mr. Wright stated that about one and a half years ago, the State wanted all of the licensed contractors to obtain an asbestos transfer permit and license; he had a plan of action of transferring onto the site and now the State wanted to be involved in that; the transfer permit was received by him from the State; the State notified the Town of the permit. Mr. Wright said that he believed that this caused some concern for the Town; he assured the Board that nothing has changed, there is no asbestos stored on the site; there are no other hazardous materials at the site/facility; he is in the mediation business and adheres to the regulations. Mr. Coppelman confirmed with Mr. Wright that no asbestos is stored or kept on the site at all. Mr. Wright reviewed the containers aspect of the business. He described the issues involved with demolition of old businesses and the need to adhere to regulations. He said the container showed on the site is demolition with no lead and is going to a recycling facility; if they can't get to the facility while they are open, the load sits on the site; he said they come and they go; they do belong to the company and are stored on the property when not being used; Mr. Wright said that they are usually to the left of the driveway which is like a gravel parking lot. Mr. Quintal said that is where the septic system is located. Mr. Quintal asked for any abutter comments; there were none. Mr. Quintal noted that "sheet 2" of the approved plan showed the proposed plan which has the note #8; sheet 1 was the existing plan. Mr. Wright said that asbestos is not considered a hazardous material, it is considered a special waste; he said when the site plan was done it was so he could apply for an asbestos transfer permit so anything remediated by his company would never come back to Kingston but he was seeking to have an asbestos or special waste transfer facility permit. Mr. Coppelman noted that there was a complete plan set in the file and does go back to the approval in 2002. Mr. Coppelman said with all respect to the definition of hazardous waste and it was Mr. Greenwood's recollection that of course it is a hazardous material; Mr. Coppelman said that it was the Board's understanding, at the time of the approval, that there would not be asbestos stored on site. Mr. Coppelman said if he wanted to do that he needed to come back to the Planning Board; Mr. Wright said that when the State forced the contractors' hands to get the transfer permit, he had no intention of coming back to the Town to transfer on the site; so it is clear to him that he would have to come back to the Board.

Mr. Coppelman said that based on Mr. Quintal's review and Mr. Wright's explanation, the Board has a better idea of the conditions adding that one of the recourse items that Board could take was the revocation of the site plan; the Board should discuss any actions that need to be taken.

Mr. Greenwood commented that the site is not in compliance with the approved site plan: there are no areas showing storage of dumpsters on the approved plan, several storm water features have never been constructed; he thinks the approved site should comply with the approved plan; he recommends working toward that end. Mr. Coffin asked about the procedure for a non-compliant site; does the applicant want to apply for a site plan for those things added to the site or does the Board request that the site come into compliance for the original approval. He thinks the first step would be to get the site into compliance with the plan approved in 2002 and then the applicant can go from there for an amended site plan for the dumpsters and other items. Mr. Quintal said there is a note on the plan regarding the parking area on the left side that says "proposed gravel or crushed hot top area for vehicle turning or non-motorized vehicle parking only" and it shows the limit of the hot top and gravel area; the metal building does talk about consolidation vessels in a proposed loading dock but he could not recall what the consolidation vessels were. Mr. Wright said that the site plan was put together with the anticipation that the transfer station would be granted and thus, the use of the facility would change from the original approval but once it was not approved by the Town, it reverted back to the original purpose so there were no travel trailers, no constant traffic and no transfer facility. He said that it is now just being used as a yard for a contracting company; he is wondering if it is possible to change the site plan. Mr. Coppelman said he could do an amended site plan but the important thing now is compliance with what had been approved in 2002. Mr. Wright said the plan was approved but the use of the transfer station was not approved. He wondered again if he could change the site plan to eliminate some of the items that were noted as being missing; he added that he was on the cusp of retiring at this point. Mr. Coppelman explained that there is a process for amending a site plan but it is a public process requiring an engineered, revised plan that goes through the abutter notification process; he added that if the intent is to be alleviated of the requirement to do things like storm water management, he cautioned that those types of requirements from the Town and the State have been "beefed up". Mr. Coppelman explained the sensitive aspects of the site. Mr. Coffin said that all sites should be treated equally and as we do require owners to follow their site plan, we should require it of all approvals; storm water management and site stabilization is important for this site and the flow into the Pow Wow River watershed and Country Pond. Mr. Bakie suggested Mr. Wright contact an engineer to revisit the plans in case the current activities allow for different alternatives for the storm water run-off problems. Mr. Bakie confirmed that any changes to the approved plan would require the public process be followed. Mr. Coppelman explained the amended site plan process. Mr. Wright asked how long he would have to come into compliance with the approved plan; Mr. Bakie asked for Mr. Wright's idea of a timeframe to bring the site into compliance; Mr. Coppelman said the handling of run-off and drainage and the environmental issues needed to get done. Mr. Quintal said that this type of work is done on a regular basis and should be able to be done within a few weeks to a month and should be done before the fall when there is a lot of rain and run-off; grass re-establishment needs to be done as soon as possible to help filter the storm water. Timeframes were discussed. Mr. Coppelman said that Mr. Wright can always come back to speak with the Board if there is a delay in coming into compliance. Ms. Croteau suggested a 90-day timeframe which would be the end of August and if an extension is required, the Board can be contacted.

Mr. Coppelman did not encourage Mr. Wright to wait until the end of the 90 days. Mr. Quintal noted that the fence for the front was a DOT requirement so there would not be cars haphazardly entering or leaving the site; it was a traffic control measure. Mr. Wright said the previous plan had two entrances onto Rte. 125 and when they approached the State for a driveway permit they said that they could only have one to limit access to Rte. 125 and did not want multiple access points so the State eliminated one to funnel all the traffic to one location. Mr. Quintal the intent of the fence was to put some sort of a barrier to prevent traffic from going out of multiple areas. Mr. Wright agreed that it was the State limiting access to Rte. 125 from the site. Mr. Quintal said that it is a safety issue and assumed it would be an issue for the Police Chief as well. The Board agreed. Ms. Croteau added that Mr. Wright would need to move the motorized vehicles from the back to the front; Mr. Wright agreed.

Mr. Coppelman asked for a motion to allow for a certain amount of time for Mr. Wright to come into compliance with the approved site plan.

**MM&S to give Mr. Wright until August 2, 2016 to come into compliance with the approved site plan.** (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Ms. Croteau) **PUNA**

Mr. Coppelman thanked Mr. Wright for coming in and stated that the Board was looking forward to the site coming into compliance; Mr. Wright thanked the Board for their patience. Mr. Coppelman instructed Mr. Wright to contact the office prior to August 2 to confirm the actions taken and the Town Engineer could then go to the site and confirm compliance at that time.

### **Board Business**

**MM&S to approve the minutes of March 1, 2016 as written.** (Motion by Mr. Coffin, second by Ms. Croteau) **Motion carries 4-0-1** (with Mr. Bakie abstaining)

**Critical Correspondence:** Mr. Coppelman said there were three pieces of correspondence, two relating to Carriage Towne Plaza and one for 2 Marshall Road; Mr. Greenwood was going to review those requests and make a recommendation to the Board. Mr. Greenwood said that he needed to speak with the applicant for the issues at Carriage Towne Plaza as there were some proposals that may or may not be allowed depending on getting additional information. He said the changes at 2 Marshall Road seems okay on the face but the amount of people are doubling with no increase in parking so he needs additional information and may need an amended site plan. Mr. Greenwood will contact the applicants to gather additional information in order to make a decision and recommendation regarding amended site plan or expedited site plan.

Mr. Greenwood had a couple of mylars for Mr. Coppelman to sign.

Mr. Coppelman noted the upcoming hearing on May 17, 2016.

**MM&S to adjourn at 9:10.** (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Mr. Coffin) **PUNA**