

KINGSTON PLANNING BOARD
September 29, 2020
Public Hearing

Minutes

The Chairman called the hearing to order at 6:30 PM; he noted a quorum present through the Zoom platform for a remote hearing; there were no challenges to the validity of the hearing. Mr. Coppelman began the hearing by reading the Right-to-Know checklist explaining the requirements, workings and access information for the remote hearing via the Zoom platform; contacting the Planning Board through emails and phone during the meeting was also noted as available. Mr. Coppelman explained that Glenn Greenwood was the host for the meeting.

A roll call vote of the Board members present occurred; each member noted whether any one was present with them in the room while attending this meeting. < Board note: There were 35 participants present at the start of the hearing.>

Members present:

Glenn Coppelman, Chair; alone	Peter Coffin; alone
Lynne Merrill, V.Chair, alone	Robin Duguay, alone
Peter Bakie, alone	Chris Bashaw, alone
Richard Wilson, Board of Selectmen (BOS) rep., alone	
Ellen Faulconer, alternate/admin. asst., alone in the room	

Members absent: Chris Bashaw, Steve Padfield, alternate.

Also present: Glenn Greenwood, Planner; Dennis Quintal, Town Engineer

Board Business

- Mr. Greenwood reviewed an action taken by the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) regarding a proposal for a third apartment on a site on Mill Road; a conditional of their approval was to go to the PB for site plan approval. He contacted Town Counsel on how to proceed and was advised that the Board should follow the standard site plan process and apply waivers as needed/appropriate. He added that he would like the Board's input and would like to meet with the applicant to set up a list of possible waivers. Consensus vote of the Board:

Richard Wilson: no objection	Peter Coffin: no objection
Robin Duguay: fine with her	Peter Bakie: fine with him
Lynne Merrill: fine with her	Chris Bashaw: fine with it
Glenn Coppelman: fine with it.	

Mr. Greenwood will contact the applicant on how to proceed.

- Ms. Faulconer informed the Board that the deadline for plan and easement submission for the Fieldstone application had passed with no plan revisions or easement submitted. Mr. Coffin stated that the easement was critical; he also questioned whether abutters to the Comcast property should be notified as that property was part of the proposal. Mr. Wilson suggested that this stays on the agenda for next Tuesday but since the material was not received on time, the Board might decide not hear it. Mr. MacGuire stated that he thought digital copies would suffice, he will submit the paper copies tomorrow (Wednesday); he is anticipating receiving the easement by Thursday. Mr. Coppelman explained that the paper copies are distributed to the Board members and Department Heads and the reason for the deadline is so people can get them; he stopped the additional discussion as not pertinent to the current issue. Mr. Coffin stated that if the Department Heads don't have the plans in time to review then the Board can continue. By consensus, the hearing will stay on the agenda and discuss this issue at that time.

266 Rte. 125, LLC

266 Rte. 125

Kingston, NH 03848

Tax Map R41 Lot 17-1

Mr. Coppelman read the public hearing notice that included review for subdivision of 4 lots, site plan and conditional use permits (CUP). He explained that this was the first hearing for this application; there had been a previous design review. He added that the documents for the hearing were on the web site; there were significant comments from the Town Planner and Town Engineer that had been sent in advance to Karl Dubay. Mr. Coppelman reviewed the hearing guidelines prior to turning the hearing over to Karl Dubay and the team representing the applicant.

Mr. Dubay reviewed the proposal that included an existing building on a 12-acre lot, an office building on a 5-acre lot and a 5-acre lot along the front. He said that they will address the easement language and other information that is being asked for, most are administrative in nature. He agreed that some of the plan sheets aren't stamped but will be; there is some monumentation that needs to be addressed. He noted receipt of the Mr. Greenwood's and Mr. Quintals comments adding that the team is pleased as they are all straight and to the point and they are tackling these comments. He reviewed the plan noting that the connector to the professional office lot will be eliminated; the existing building will be re-tuned; everything on existing items will be upgraded including fixing the pavement and the water treatment. He described the proposed building as the 800,000 sq. ft. distribution center; they will be increasing the buffers. He shared the screen with the buffer summary and landscape sheet of the plan; there will be a 50-foot buffer to the residential uses; they are leaving existing vegetation and supplementing with an understory of vegetation and with fencing.

Mr. Dubay pointed out the buffer requirement along the Little River and reviewed the Shoreland and Aquifer overlays and the Wetland. He noted that they pulled the design away from the river; he showed the buffering. He shared the screen with a colorized plan showing the different buffered areas. He noted the parking lots are buffered and meet the criteria. He stated that his team paid attention to previous comments; he re-iterated that they are complying with the regulation regarding maintaining existing, undisturbed buffers and would like to supplement with understory plantings.

Mr. Dubay continued that the existing septic is being improved; they are finishing up and waiting for RCCD (Rockingham County Conservation District) approval of the test pits which will meet Town requirements. He stated the proposed system will be a 4,000-gallon package with a safety factor of 2 for the warehouse which meets the State's criteria with a standard Presby system that will supplement treatment to reduce the loads to the fields and redistribute them equally; they can then super-treat the water which will help with the hydrogeologic report. Mr. Dubay noted that they will be providing the zoning criteria and CUP (Conditional Use Permit) information for the Wetland Conservation District and Aquifer area and they will be supplementing the information for the Board's review.

Doug MacGuire reviewed the drainage; he stated that they will add more treatment as it is a sensitive area due to the Aquifer and they are happy to do the items as suggested by Mr. Quintal. He returned to the screen and the Landscape Overview to explain utilizing the out-board, lower areas to provide treatment and storage of potential large-scale run-off and maximize recharge areas; he reviewed separation areas in the parking lot; large re-charge systems; storing peak run-off by utilizing treatment swales and ponds; he highlighted the ponds used to accommodate the drainage. He stated that all of the roof run-off can't be in one area and he pointed out the several ponds on the site. He reviewed dissipation, storm events and noted that this was designed for a 50-year, 24-hour storm event which would be 7.34 inches in 24 hours. He stated the Mr. Quintal had suggested a model that would include a 100-year storm event and they will provide updated calculations for systems that will work with a 100-year storm; that information will be provided with the next submission. He stated that they are using a Storm-Tec chamber system which is essentially a massive field of underground infiltration chambers designed for under-pavement; it acts as a large underground storage system with infiltration; it has safeguards, emergency overflows; the two-year storm is fully contained and fully infiltrated in the system. He continued that the system has to be above the water table to filter through and this meets that criteria; he said where 3 ft. is the normal requirement, this provides 4 feet of separation due to the Aquifer. Mr. Dubay stated that they will be happy to provide the extra standards per Mr. Quintal's comments. Mr. MacGuire continued explaining the drainage by explaining that they will use large open basins where possible and they will all be lined basins with a low water transmission to provide a substantial protection with a long way to travel to the pond outlet; he reviewed a mechanical structure for further control as an additional safeguard per Mr. Quintal's suggestions and will appear on the revised plan set.

Mr. Dubay stated that they had no issue with Mr. Quintal's comments and they have "action items" to pursue them for the plan revisions. He added that the plans show the summary for the Shoreland and the impervious summaries. He stated that if they put it over the percentage, they can re-work the lot lines. Mr. MacGuire discussed issues regarding type-2 distribution, run-off peaks, pond capacity for more than needed for a 100-year storm and suggested being able to review with the Town Engineer as it seems able to accommodate this issue. Mr. Dubay noted that lighting and elevations are shown and meet Town requirements; the hydroanalysis is complex; they will review with the Town Engineer and their engineers and are accommodating Mr. Quintal's suggestions; they are happy to make adjustments per Mr. Quintal's and Mr. Greenwood's comments.

Steven Pernaw, Pernaw and Company, reviewed the traffic information. He said that he had a scope meeting in November of 2019 with DOT (Department of Transportation); he explained the process and analysis for review for a traffic study and a mitigation plan for the site to work safely and efficiently. He reviewed statistics: Rte. 107=40 mph, Rte. 125=55 mph; in 2019, daily traffic counts: Rte. 125=12,800, Rte. 107=3500, average speed: Rte. 125=58 mph, Rte. 107=48 mph; he explained that they used data from the Kingston Crossing project from 2018 and projected upward; they did projections for 2022 and 2032 and added in a COVID-19 adjustment. Mr. Pernaw said that the estimated traffic to be generated at peak times would be 200 vehicles with most pointing south; the southerly Rte. 125 drive would handle 45% of the site traffic. He noted that the impacts on Rte. 125 will be an increase of approximately 5%; impacts on Rte. 107 would be 9%. He stated that the hourly traffic demand is less than capacity; going north will have to wait for an adequate gap. Mr. Pernaw said that at the Rte. 107/125 intersection, the hourly volume exceeds the capacity and they looked at the need for a traffic signal. He stated that while there is enough traffic there today to meet the signal warrant and is therefore an existing condition; this development is not creating the existing condition. He reviewed the proposal that included two driveways on Rte. 125; they will widen the roadway for an exclusive right-turn lane and do the same for the north-bound direction. He explained that the analysis shows the need for only one drive but they are going with two to minimize the delay; they are recommending clear site distance "triangles" established for 500 ft. of site distance. Regarding further mitigation, at the entrance at Rte. 107 which will be controlled with a security gate for passenger cars only, they are following the DOT recommendation of 400-ft. site line. If DOT concurs, they will signalize the intersection, Division 6 makes the ultimate determination and that will take a while. He stated that any conditional permit would be subject to 3 driveways from District 6.

Tim Stone, Stonehill Environmental, spoke about the hydro study; it was noted that they had started interaction with the Town's reviewer. Mr. Stone reviewed the ordinance and items needed for the overall hydrogeologic report for compliance including the monitoring wells and nitrogen/nitrates at the property boundary. He reviewed having advanced treatment to the septic effluent such as Aquapoint Bio-clear units. Mr. Stone gave an overview of

upcoming work; they will commence drilling for monitoring wells on Thursday; they will collect samples within a month; he will continue to be in touch with Danna Truslow.

Mr. Dubay explained that there are several ponds around the site there is one recharge area under the parking lot and is for roof recharge only and not for trucking; each pond functions separately.

Mr. Dubay commented on the Lighting Design by noting that the pole height meets the Town's requirements using the maximum allowed pole height and they are not asking for any waivers for this; they are meeting the Ordinance and all of the criteria. It was noted that there are currently 50 participants at the hearing. Mr. Dubay noted that the site distance for Rte. 107 was shown; signalization at Rte. 107 and Rte. 125 will benefit the whole Town; the DES Shoreland criteria does not apply to this site but they could meet the criteria; the local one does apply. He re-iterated that the entrance onto Marshall Rd. would not be used by trucks it is identified to only be used for specific employees. Mr. Dubay asked if the Board was continuing, they would like a time and date certain determined this evening; they are looking forward to moving forward. Mr. Coppelman explained that any continuation would require a time and date certain from the Board prior to the end of the hearing.

Mr. Greenwood reviewed his 4 pages of comments that were basically those regarding "procedural", "subdivision" and "site plan":

- Invoking jurisdiction
- Peer review of substantial reviews and studies
- CUP need review and approval which happens further in the review
- Items on plan complying with regs. note
- Discussion re: separation of existing building into 2

19 comments re: site plan including:

- TRC review
- Easement review for utilities, drainage features, etc.
- Access onto Marshall Road - # of employees/ Would prefer emergency access only
- Peer review of Traffic study – traffic remains an object of concern
- Feedback re: on-site signage, directional signage on-site – would like to see information

Mr. Quintal reviewed his 4 pages of comments that included:

- More information on buffer zone mitigation
- Parking requirements need to be adequate and better explained
- Edge of wetland, 100 ft. buffer should be shown
- Proposed pond is lower than water level; close to property line that could affect vegetation on abutting property
- Grading concern/easement – capture impact
- Drainage into abutter's property, is an easement needed, some in ROW (right-of-way)
- Drainage/density/100 ft. buffer line

- Rip-rap (drafting issue)
- Mitigation for disturbed area; notation/waivers noted
- Sq. ft. of detention basins – labelled
- Multiple drafting issues (rip-rap, grass swale)
- Limit of easement shown
- Septic overview - % for each system explained/internal controls?
- Septic tank requirements reviewed
- % of impervious/subdivision requirements
- Pre-construction meeting required
- Outlet detail note missing
- Sediment clean-up noted after 25%, recommend remove of ALL sediment
- Recommend catch basins have hoods
- Driveway/parking regulations
- Retaining wall/guard rail location should be shown
- Approvals noted
- Snow storage
- Pages to be recorded
- Test pit information
- Stormwater management requirements for pre and post development/consider long-term impacts for MS4.
- Large development with natural characteristics and wildlife and aquifer – quantity of run-off, may require additional mitigation; volume of run-off increased 47%; it was noted that 23% of a 50-year storm event is 2 million gallons – what is the impact to the Aquifer and to Down-stream.
- Treatment and grass swales – no enough, recommendations for additional structures.
- 100-year storm event – already discussed; he will review with the engineer.
- BMP (Best Management Practice) guidelines
- Infiltration report
- Bond requirements
- Performance Guarantee determined prior to approval
- Bond is place
- Registry of Deeds requirement

Mr. Quintal stated that most of the comments can be easily addressed. Mr. Coppelman said that he expects that most of the items will be checked off prior to resubmitting the plan which will make for a much shorter list. Mr. Quintal stated that it was a great set of plans but can be improved and there were not a lot of severe issues.

Mr. Coppelman read the Department comments – Health: RCCD does the test pits; questioned lot loading for the restaurant and whether they were using paper or china; verify setbacks. Mr. Dubay said that no restaurant was being proposed at this time. Mr. Coppelman continued with comments – Fire: comply with NFPA codes; Mr. Coppelman suggested that an early

conversation with Fire and Police was better than later. Mr. Coppelman read the comments submitted by the Conservation Commission that included:

- Concerns regarding Little River, a 3rd Order River and tributary of the Exeter River, a protected river
- The project falls under the Shoreland Protection Act, RSA 483-B
- Within the 300 ft. Shoreland Protection District per Article 205
- The project would create a major stress upon, and disruption of, wildlife corridors and vernal pools in this glacial kettle terrain, with associated uplands.
- This specific corridor along Little River is also Kingston's most heavily populated Blandings turtle habitat. Blandings turtles are a State endangered, critically imperiled turtle species.
- Mitigation concerns about filling an active vernal pool
- Unnecessary incursion into the Shoreland buffer – the two northernmost bays
- Questioned use of the building which could cause safety and environmental issues.
- Traffic contributing to noise and air pollution; contaminants, stormwater run-off; long-term impacts; MS4 requirements

There was discussion regarding the Board's procedural actions.

MM&S for Mr. Greenwood to assemble the TRC (Technical Review Committee). (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll Call Vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA (passed unanimously).

MM&S to send the traffic study out for peer review. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll Call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

MM&S to send the hydrogeologic report out to Danna Truslow for review. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll Call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

MM&S to accept the plan for jurisdiction. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Coffin) Roll Call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

Ms. Merrill asked the applicant to explain the phrase “safety factor of 2”. Mr. MacGuire said that this was used per NHDES regulations and was based on meter flow and average readings basically determining an overdesign of the system for up to 1200 employees. Mr. Coffin noted that in response to buffer requirements, there is a note that there is a 50-ft. buffer abutting residential property but pages 8 and 9 only show a 20-ft. buffer. Mr. Dubay said that this is an existing conditions plan and the buffer should be reverted back to a 50 ft. buffer per the requirements in the existing zone as it is the stricter requirement; he noted that this was a “good catch”; they do provide 50-ft. which will supersede the existing conditions page.

Mr. Coppelman explained the procedure for the public comment part of the hearing.

Public comment:

Jason Fellows, 15 Marshall Road: expressed concern with the entrance on Rte. 107 and asked what assurances there would be that the access would be controlled by the tenant. Mr. Dubay said that users and the Fire Department would want a back access to the site; users would agree to a security system; he stated that it would be a 15% figure to meet the DOT requirement for the employee driveway at peak hours. Mr. Pernaw was asked 15% of what. Mr. Pernaw explained his process in determining issues with access on Rte. 107; he answered that it is 34 trips during evening peak hours which is where the 15% came from, adding that it is a multi-step process. Mr. Coppelman asked how the Town could be assured that this was the actual number. Mr. Dubay said that this is not used by the office building or the existing building as they had a separate drive. He said that the only people are people who want to leave and take a right turn; if coming in, they would take a left turn into the site instead of being open to any employee; it can be self-regulated. Mr. Fellows said that his experience in living here was that most will want to take a right turn to take the left to go the Brentwood Fire Station which is easy access. Mr. Dubay questioned Mr. Fellows’ location on Rte. 107 and stated that his property will miss any of the traffic. Mr. Coppelman stopped the back and forth discussion but added that he had hoped for a more straight-forward answer. He added that his first preference was no entrance onto Rte. 107 or an emergency exit only; he was disappointed that there is regular traffic proposed.

Mike Norton, 49 Little River Road, questioned whether the Board understood the true value of the traffic that would include the number of daily employees, daily travel trailers, daily delivery vans. He did an estimate of what he perceived to be a similar use that came up to 4,418 trips daily. Mr. Coppelman said that the applicant was under a non-disclosure agreement although they can still disclose accurate traffic information. Mr. Dubay said that different types of facilities have different functions; they are proposing

a warehouse facility that does distribution whereas the numbers proposed by Mr. Norton are more for a fulfillment center; that type of user would have a couple of thousand parking areas and this is not being proposed. He said that they are using required standards set by the DOT. He said that they can't name the user nor do they have to name the user. He noted the impact fees and tax base for the proposal. Mr. Coppelman said that they are not being asked to disclose the user but as an applicant, they should represent the impacts based on the user; if the information is consistent with the proposed user than they are covered; they are being relied upon to provide the correct traffic numbers. Mr. Pernaw said that he would have to see Mr. Norton's calculations to see how he came up with it. He continued that the purpose of this is to do mitigation; even if Mr. Norton's numbers were correct, the proposed mitigation would be the same. He is confident that the mitigation plan would work for a whole host of tenants; he stated that it would be unlikely that the mitigation would be different whether a fulfillment center instead of a warehouse facility that does distribution. He stated that his analysis is conservative to cover all the bases; it is a "belt and suspender" approach.

Almus Kenter, 22 Marshall Road, questioned the buffers to his property and the stockade fence specifics; he expressed concerns with the entrance on Rte. 107, the size of the access for emergency vehicles; the 107 exit being used as much as possible; he was amazed that the Fire Department was not requiring an entrance/road suitable for handling a fire truck; he expects that a light would need to be at that entrance as there is a blind spot. Mr. Dubay shared the screen with the plan pages that showed the buffering in relation to Mr. Kenter's property; he noted that the building is 1200 ft. from their house. Mr. Kenter said that information was not pertinent to the buffer. Mr. Dubay said that there would be a stockade fence all around the area abutting their property along with a 50 ft. buffer; he noted that the topo was relatively flat. Mr. Coppelman confirmed that the fence was in addition to the 50 ft. vegetated buffer and they used the Commercial Zone I (C-I) guidelines even though not required. Mr. Coppelman asked Mr. Dubay to address the 107 entrance and the slope. Mr. Dubay said that they are holding the 50 ft. buffer around the Kenter property; the 24 ft. road is not designed for tractor trailers; there will be an island with a gated entrance. He added that there is a retaining wall with a guard rail; he added that this is one portion of the work in the buffer; access and utilities are allowed and they will be providing more information to the Board for the CUP needed in this area.

Andrea Kenter, 22 Marshall Road, asked that her written comments in the "chat" function be read as her connection wasn't very good. Mr. Greenwood read her comments and Mr. Dubay responded. Ms. Kenter's first comment questioned the trips; Mr. Pernaw explained the total trips table. Mr. Dubay reviewed the site distance plan; he stated that he didn't anticipate vegetation clearing and certainly none on any else's lot. Mr. Pernaw referenced photos available in the appendix. Ms. Kenter's comment referenced requirements in the NHDES Shoreland but Mr. Dubay had already stated that it didn't apply to this project. Mr. Greenwood read Ms. Kenter's question regarding the wildlife corridor, specifically for deer, and the impact of the stockade fence. Mr. Dubay thought that the stockade fence would be the preference of abutters; he then stated that this was a permitted use in the C-II district adding that when the woodlands are converted, a deer wouldn't be in the parking lot; he stated his belief that the fence will protect the deer population from entering the parking lot. Ms. Kenter's comment regarding the traffic study's 34 anticipated trips did not account for the numbers for the fueling station or convenience store; Mr. Greenwood noted that neither of these uses are proposed at this time. She questioned who the "lucky

34” would be using the 107 entrance; she stated that there would be significant impact for stormwater compliance. Mr. Dubay said that they have talked at length about the numbers and in summary, the Town has Stormwater regulations and ordinances and they are required to mitigate those points and control their own run-offs; they have to meet State and EPA requirements. Mr. Greenwood continued with Ms. Kenter’s next question regarding NHDES Air Resource requirements for idling sources such as idling engines. Mr. MacGuire said that they would have to look into this further and they will take a look at this issue. Mr. Coppelman stated that this would be a “to-do” item.

Marghi Bean, 44 Tucker Road, said that there is just enough curve in the road to not see traffic coming; she expects increased use of 107 to avoid 125.

Dale Ames, 51 Little River Road, questioned the Town’s ability to take action if the property gets bigger than approved; he expressed concern regarding monitoring going forward. Mr. Coppelman said that the Town can ask for updates or do enforcement if the conditions aren’t being met; if the site plan is not in conformance with the approval, it can be enforced. He said that the property has high visibility; it is not an invisible site and enforcement can occur. Mr. Ames asked if, in addition to stormwater compliance, there was information on any impacts on area property and whether there was on-going water tests and checks and whether this was part of the plan. Mr. Coppelman explained that the Board can require as part of an approval; he asked if the applicant wanted to provide any information. Mr. MacGuire said that during the construction phase, there is monitoring and inspections; permitting criteria of the AoT (Alteration of Terrain) permit criteria is checked; hydro-monitoring can be required. Mr. Coppelman asked if there would be monitoring of the river. Mr. Dubay said that they would monitor their sites to establish criteria on their own site before hitting the river. Mr. MacGuire reviewed some numbers for perspective that concluded that there would be a 97% reduction of items coming from the site into the river; they recognize the size of the project but they are accommodating it. Mr. Dubay re-iterated that the AoT would require compliance inspections. Mr. Greenwood said that recorded schedules are often required. Mr. Wilson suggested continuing at this point. Mr. Ames asked for the time for two more questions. He asked if there was a plan for snow and salt to address possible contamination. Mr. MacGuire said that they are a “clean snow” property and anything contaminated with salt and sand would drain into the treatment systems; they are not bypassed; if more than able to be treated, it would have to be put elsewhere, off –site. Mr. Greenwood clarified that the refueling, referred to by the Conservation Commission, was no longer part of the plan.

Mr. Coppelman noted that there were no further comments and closed the public comment portion of the hearing at this time. Mr. Wilson suggested continuing to November to get the most information addressed to move the project along; getting the traffic study reviewed would answer a lot of questions.

MM&S to continue to Nov. 17th at 6:45 with revised plans due by noon on 11/5. (Motion by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Bashaw) Discussion: Mr. Bakie doesn’t think that this will be 100% complete by November and suggested meeting in October to address a lot of the items that can be taken off the list. Mr. Dubay said that they have their marching orders and they can have the changes done quickly. Mr. Wilson revised the motion:

MM&S to continue to October 20, 2020 at 6:45 with the revised plans due in the Planning Board office by October 8th at noon. (Motion by Mr. Wilson, second by Mr. Bakie) There was discussion regarding the timing of receiving the revised plans. Mr. Coffin and Mr. Wilson suggested only requiring paper copies of the revised pages. Ms. Faulconer added that the Board files would need 2 full sets submitted and the electronic copy should be due at the same time to be on the web site. Board agreement by consensus. Mr. Wilson asked that they be available to the public. Ms. Faulconer and Mr. Greenwood explained that the plans are already on the web site and the changes would be added. Roll Call vote on the motion:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

Board Business

Correspondence:

- Letter from Kingston Pizza re: new ownership; Mr. Wilson said that he was 99% sure that they were approved for 7 days a week; Ms. Merrill said that they previously were open on Sundays.

MM&S that there is no need for further review. (Motion by Mr. Bakie, second by Mr. Wilson) Roll call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA. Ms. Faulconer will send a letter of reply.

- Letter from Southern NH Pet Grooming located at Church St. Station, currently in Unit 9 and expanding into the adjacent unit 8; Mr. Wilson noted that there used to be a grooming place in the unit; Ms. Merrill added that they are moving into the salon which used more water.

MM&S that no further review is required. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Bakie) Roll Call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

- Copy of letter sent to Mr. Hannigan from the Building Inspector, informational only, no Board action required.
- Copy of letter from Ingalls re: Solar Hills; no Board action required.

Mr. Coppelman stated that there were no minutes to review this evening.

Mr. Coffin brought up the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) Committee membership; Mr. Greenwood explained that the Committee met once a month over the next four months.

MM&S to appoint Glenn Coppelman, Peter Coffin and Robin Duguay to the CIP Committee. (Motion by Ms. Merrill, second by Mr. Wilson) Roll Call vote:

Glenn Coppelman – yes
Lynne Merrill- yes
Richard Wilson – yes

Chris Bashaw – yes
Robin Duguay – yes

Peter Bakie – yes
Peter Coffin – yes

Motion PUNA.

Mr. Greenwood will send information on ListServe re: Food Trucks.

Mr. Coppelman declared the hearing adjourned at 10:20 PM.