



Meeting Minutes
North Hampton Planning Board
Tuesday, November 7, 2017 at 6:30pm
Town Hall, 231 Atlantic Avenue

These minutes were prepared as a reasonable summary of the essential content of this meeting, not as a transcription.

In attendance: Tim Harned, Chair; Nancy Monaghan, Vice Chair; Members Phil Wilson, Josh Jeffrey, and Jim Maggiore, Select Board Representative; Jennifer Rowden, RPC Circuit Rider; and Rick Milner, Recording Secretary.

Chair Harned called the meeting to order at 6:35pm.

I. Old Business

- 1. Case #17:12 - Applicant, Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, 7 Scott Road, Hampton, NH 03842.** The Applicant requests a site plan review to construct a 35 foot by 56 foot water treatment plant and associated piping to consolidate treatment activities for four water supply wells. Property Owner: Aquarion Water Company of New Hampshire, 600 Lindley Street, Bridgeport, CT 06606; Property Location: Mill Road adjacent to 3 Mill Road and Hampton town line, North Hampton, NH 03862; M/L: 003-004-000; Zoning District: R-1, High Density District.

In attendance for this application:

David Cedarholm, engineering consultant for the applicant; James Collins, engineering consultant for the applicant; and Ari Pollack, attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Cedarholm addressed the Board. Mr. Cedarholm presented a revised site plan showing the 35 foot by 56 foot new building construction and associated activities for water treatment on the approximately 41 acre lot and across the town line in Hampton. The building will be located approximately 700 feet down the access road off of Mill Road. In addition to consolidating operations, the location of the new building will mitigate possible contamination of the wells by ensuring that the bulk of treatment activities occur outside of the 400 foot protective radius around each well.

Mr. Cedarholm and Mr. Collins noted the following revisions to the plan previously presented to the Board:

- a. Page C101 has a completed property boundary survey indicated and all professional stamps.
- b. 19 trees have been added to the plan on the northern side of the access driveway to provide screening for abutter.
- c. The Town Engineer has provided a clean letter for the project.
- d. Lighting for the new building will be dark sky compliant and motion activated. Lighting on the rest of the site will be updated to be dark sky compliant and motion activated.

Mr. Pollack addressed the Board. Mr. Pollack noted that letters from himself and Abutter Jeremiah O'Sullivan's attorney have been submitted to the Planning Board detailing conflicting views regarding the use classification of the proposed treatment facility structure as it relates to whether a special

exception is required in order for the proposed site plan to be in compliance with the Town of North Hampton Zoning Ordinance. If the proposed use is classified as a public utility building, then a special exception is required. If the use is classified as an essential service, then no special exception is necessary. Aquarion's position is that the project site is located in the R-1 High Density Residential District. "Essential Services" are listed amongst the "Permitted Uses" within the district, and defined within the ordinance as "the erection, construction, alteration or maintenance by public utilities... of water transmission and distribution systems... and other similar equipment and accessories in connection therewith, reasonably necessary for the furnishing of adequate service by such public utilities." Consistent with the industry standard for such treatment facilities, these essential treatment mechanicals and equipment are to be located within a protective plant. The protective plant aids maintenance, site safety, and containment, and does not have interior finishes, office spaces, or administrative features that would be typical of a "Public Utilities Building." The plant is nothing more than a protective cover for the essential treatment equipment. It is not a public utility building. Therefore, a special exception is not required.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 6:45pm.

Abutter Jeremiah O'Sullivan addressed the Board. Mr. O'Sullivan referred to his attorney's letter which stated that "Essential Services," by definition, do not include buildings. The intent of the definition is to capture non-structural instrumentalities through which utility services are transmitted. "Public Utility Buildings" require a special exception. The structure proposed in the site plan is a building. It has a roof, walls, glass windows, and power. People enter and exit the building and work inside the building. Therefore, a special exception is required.

Mr. O'Sullivan added the following comments:

- a. Aquarion representatives have indicated that the facility operations may be expanded to two more wells in the future. Mr. O'Sullivan expressed concerns that the amount of deliveries and amount of chemicals used on the site could not be effectively monitored.
- b. The chemical spill control valve system cannot be made totally fail safe. Human error or mechanical breakdowns cannot be eliminated.
- c. The topography slopes down toward his property from the access road. The proposed berm and curbing will not control a chemical spill as the applicant has stated.
- d. The larger quantity of chemicals included in the proposed plan could have a larger adverse effect on surrounding neighbors than the current smaller delivery amounts. Neighbors could be subjected to chemical odors on a regular basis and be negatively impacted by inhaling chemical fumes in the air.
- e. Mr. O'Sullivan requested that the Planning Board vote no on an unwise and unsafe application.

Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 7:00pm.

Ms. Monaghan asked for clarification on the procedure if a special exception may be needed.

Ms. Rowden stated that the Board could add a condition regarding a special exception to an approval decision.

Mr. Wilson stated that as a matter of law that the Planning Board must move forward with consideration of the application, even if a special exception may be needed. It is the role of the Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) to determine if a special exception is required. In his opinion, the treatment

95 plant structure is a building. The structure, as proposed, has a roof, windows, doors, four walls, and
96 power. People will enter and exit the structure. These features qualify the structure as a building.

97
98 Mr. Wilson further stated that the Planning Board must balance the good of the many against the good
99 of the one. It is in the best interest of the community to have the best treatment facility to provide the
100 best water quality. The Board also has a responsibility to consider the consequences to an abutter of the
101 site plan application and make sure all reasonable efforts to provide protection against adverse effects
102 of a chemical spill and effective screening are taken.

103
104 Mr. Jeffrey stated that the site plan application improves upon the existing treatment facilities. There
105 will be extra levels of protection and containment at a single operating site, rather than a lower level of
106 protection at multiple operating sites.

107
108 Mr. Maggiore stated that he agrees that the treatment facility structure should be classified as a
109 building. The applicant has been responsive to many concerns expressed by the Board and abutters. The
110 applicant has met or exceeded many safety requirements.

111
112 Mr. Harned stated that the proposed structure is a building. In his opinion, the proposed use requires a
113 special exception be granted by the ZBA.

114
115 Mr. Wilson stated that, in his opinion, the only reason for denying the application is if the Board agreed
116 with the abutter's assertions that the potential safety hazard is too great for the neighborhood.
117 However, there are trucks posing a similar hazardous risk travelling on Mill Road or in other North
118 Hampton residential areas on a daily basis. The focus of the Board must be what happens on the site
119 and make all efforts to eliminate human error to the best of its ability.

120
121 Mr. Harned asked, if more than one containment tank failed inside the building, would the spill overflow
122 the containment area.

123
124 Mr. Collins stated that the industry standard for the amount of chemicals that would be contained in the
125 event of a spill is 110% of the largest tank. If two tanks failed, then the spill would overflow the
126 containment area.

127
128 Mr. Harned asked for clarification regarding how many gallons of chemicals could be delivered to the
129 site at any one time.

130
131 Mr. Collins stated that the trucks used for deliveries to the Mill Road site would have a maximum 4,500
132 gallon capacity. The outside delivery area spill containment tank is 7,000 gallons.

133
134 Mr. Harned asked if there was any other type of valve system that could provide a fail-safe process to
135 protect against chemical spills.

136
137 Mr. Collins responded that any other system would complicate the process and not eliminate all
138 possible human error or other deficiencies.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he works near larger tanks with similar and/or more harmful chemicals on a daily basis with no odors detected or adverse effects occurring. His experience is that this type of operation is very controlled.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board approve the Site Plan Review application for Case #17:12 to construct a 35 foot by 56 foot water treatment plant and associated piping to consolidate treatment activities for four water supply wells on property located off Mill Road adjacent to 3 Mill Road and Hampton town line subject to the following conditions:

1. A note shall be added to the recorded page of the plan stating that the water treatment facility shall be operated according to the standard operating procedures submitted with the application and plans on October 25, 2017.

2. The applicant shall receive from the Zoning Board of Adjustment either a determination that no special exception is required for this application or an approval for a special exception to construct the water treatment facility building in the R-1 residential zoning district.

3. Before a certificate of occupancy is issued, all lights on the site shall be motion sensed and dark sky compliant.

4. Applicant shall submit a recordable Mylar of the approved plan with signatures and seals affixed of all licensed professionals whose names appear on the plan. All conditions of approval shall be listed on the Mylar pursuant to NH RSA 676:3.III.

5. Applicant shall submit a Certificate of Monumentation, stamped and signed by a NH Licensed Land Surveyor, certifying that all monuments depicted on the plan have been properly set.

6. Applicant shall submit evidence of receipt of all required federal, state, and local permits including, but not limited to, NHDOT driveway and NHDES subsurface system approvals and shall note their numbers, as appropriate, on the recorded page of the plan.

7. Applicant shall submit a check made payable to the Rockingham County Registry of Deeds in the amount of \$25.00 for mandatory state fee to fund the Land and Community Heritage Investment Program (LCHIP).

8. All fees incurred by the Planning Board including, but not limited to, consulting, engineering and legal fees, have been paid by the applicant.

9. There shall be no changes to the approved site plan on the recordable Mylar except to meet these conditions of approval.

Second by Mr. Maggiore. The vote was 3-2 in favor of the motion with Mr. Harned and Ms. Monaghan opposed.

II. New Business

1. Case #17:15 – Applicant, Bethany Morse, 105 Main Street #3, Epping, NH 03042. The Applicant requests a Change of Use from the previous barber shop and office space use to a skin care studio use. Property Owner: 106 Lafayette Road, LLC, 106 Lafayette Road, North Hampton, NH 03862. Property Location: 104 Lafayette Road, North Hampton, NH 03862; M/L: 013-026-000; Zoning District: I-B/R, Industrial – Business/Residential District.

In attendance for this application:

Bethany Morse, applicant; Ernest DelleDonne, property owner.

Ms. Morse addressed the Board. Ms. Morse explained that she wished to start a skin care studio business on the first floor of the former barber shop and office building located on the property at 104 Lafayette Road. Services will include facials, waxing, pedicures, and eyebrow tinting. The business would

also sell a full line of skin care products. The building has been vacant for over one year. However, the property owner has kept the building fully maintained during this period.

Mr. Harned asked for clarification on any second floor proposed uses.

Mr. DelleDonne stated that a variance application has been submitted to the ZBA to allow Ms. Morse to live on the second floor.

Mr. Wilson stated that he believes that the retail use proposed by Ms. Morse is similar to the previous barber shop use. In his opinion, no change of use approval is necessary.

Ms. Monaghan asked for clarification regarding the uses noted on the floor plan.

Ms. Morse explained the uses on the floor plan and that she will be the only employee.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board find that no change of use approval is required since the change from a barber shop to a skin care studio is the same type of retail operation. Second by Mr. Maggiore. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

2. Case #17:16 – Applicants, Charles and Laurie White, 77 Lovering Road, North Hampton, NH 03862.

The Applicants request a Conditional Use Permit for an Accessory Dwelling Unit. Property Owner: Charles and Laurie White Family Trust, 77 Lovering Road, North Hampton, NH 03862; Property Location: 77 Lovering Road, North Hampton, NH 03862; M/L: 019-059-000; Zoning District: R-2, Medium Density District.

In attendance for this application:

Charles and Laurie White, applicants; Robert Gray, contractor for the applicants.

Mr. Gray addressed the Board. Mr. Gray stated that the applicants wished to construct a 24 foot wide by 30 foot long addition to their existing single family home at 77 Lovering Road. The addition would include an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) with 688 square feet of living area. The addition would extend into the westerly side yard structural setback. A variance has been granted by the ZBA to allow the proposed encroachment into the structural setback. The applicants seek a conditional use permit from the Planning Board to allow the ADU within the building addition.

Mr. Gray further explained how the proposed ADU conforms to the zoning ordinance. The building addition is proposed to be one story on the same level as the first floor living area of the existing two bedroom traditional cape style home. There will be an interior door for access between the connected units. The floor plan of the ADU includes one bedroom, one bath, and an open concept kitchen-living area. The roof pitch and exterior finishing work of the proposed addition would maintain a single family home appearance.

Mr. Wilson noted that Section 513.1 of the zoning ordinance regarding accessory dwelling units states "...the property must conform to the dimensional requirements of a single-family lot." The Planning Board must deny the application given that the dwelling with the addition attached does not meet the structural setback standard set forth in the Town's zoning ordinance. Setbacks are part of the dimensional requirements. The ZBA setback variance does not make the property conforming. Since the

zoning ordinance states that an ADU can only be approved through the issuance of a conditional use permit per the conditions stated in Section 513, the only remedy to resolve a non-conformance to the conditions set forth in Section 513 (such as structure setbacks) is to seek relief from Superior Court, not the ZBA.

Mr. Gray stated his opinion that the ordinance could be interpreted as the property being in conformance prior to the construction of the building addition.

Ms. Rowden stated that the Planning Board has jurisdiction over a proposed use, not necessarily structural setbacks. The variance granted by the ZBA makes the property legally non-conforming.

Mr. Maggiore presented information from State of NH RSA 674:72 regarding ADU's to the Board.

Mr. Harned stated that the RSA seemed to indicate that an ADU shall be allowed as long as the requirements for a single family dwelling without an ADU are met. If a variance is allowed for a single family home without an ADU, then a variance should be allowed for a single family home with an ADU.

Mr. Jeffrey stated his opinion that Section 513.1 should be interpreted as meaning that the property was in conformance with the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance prior to the proposed construction of the building addition which will contain the ADU.

The Board discussed options for obtaining a legal opinion to help with interpretation of the zoning ordinance and proper jurisdictional procedures.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board take jurisdiction of the Conditional Use Permit application for Case #17:16 to allow an accessory dwelling unit at 77 Lovering Road. Second by Mr. Jeffrey. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Ms. Monaghan moved that the Planning Board continue Case #17:16 to the November 21, 2017 meeting in order to seek a legal opinion prior to making a decision. Second by Mr. Maggiore.

Discussion of the motion – Mr. Wilson stated that, even though he agrees that a legal opinion should be sought to resolve any possible conflict between the State RSA's and the zoning ordinance, he believes that the Board can make a decision based upon the interpretation that the property was in conformance with the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance prior to the proposed construction within the structural setbacks of the building addition which will contain the proposed accessory dwelling unit. A variance for the proposed construction within the structural setbacks is required and has been granted by the ZBA.

Mr. Maggiore withdrew the second to the motion. Ms. Monaghan withdrew the motion.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 8:37pm. No comments were made. Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 8:38pm.

Mr. Maggiore moved that the Planning Board approve the Conditional Use Permit application for Case #17:16 to allow an accessory dwelling unit at 77 Lovering Road based on the interpretation of the Planning Board that Section 513.1 of the Town of North Hampton Zoning Ordinance means that the property was in conformance with the dimensional requirements of the zoning ordinance prior to the proposed construction within the structural setbacks of the building addition which will contain the

proposed accessory dwelling unit. A variance for the proposed construction within the structural setbacks is required and has been granted by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on October 24, 2017. Second by Mr. Jeffrey. The vote was 4-1 in favor of the motion with Ms. Monaghan opposed.

3. Case #17:17 - Applicant, Linda Chestney, 1399 Ocean Boulevard, Rye, NH 03870. The Applicant requests a lot line adjustment between properties located at 208 Atlantic Avenue and old railroad corridor property. The Applicant also requests waivers from the Town of North Hampton Subdivision Regulations:

a. Section VIII.B.20 – Stormwater Drainage Control Plan

b. Section IX.D – Monumentation Requirements

Property Owners: Ravenmore Properties, LLC – Linda Chestney, 1399 Ocean Boulevard, Rye, NH 03870 and Boston & Maine Corp, c/o Guilford Transportation, Iron Horse Park, North Billerica, MA 01862; Property Locations: 208 Atlantic Avenue and old railroad corridor; M/L: 007-076-000 and 999-011-000; Zoning District: I-B/R, Industrial - Business/Residential District.

In attendance for this application:

Linda Chestney, applicant; Anne Bialobrzkeski, surveyor for the applicant.

Ms. Bialobrzkeski addressed the Board. Ms. Bialobrzkeski reminded the Board of the issues previously discussed at the June 6 preliminary consultation. During marketing for sale of the train depot property located at 208 Atlantic Avenue, research by the property owner's consultant discovered that portions of the train depot building and the septic system associated with that building encroached upon the adjacent former railroad corridor property. The applicant wishes to purchase approximately 10,630 square feet of the corridor property to remove the encroachment issues.

Ms. Bialobrzkeski presented documents to the Board which indicated the following:

a. Boston and Maine Corporation authorized the applicant to discuss and finalize the lot line adjustment.

b. The State of NH has released its right of first refusal to purchase the railroad corridor property.

Ms. Bialobrzkeski presented two waiver requests to the Board with the following justifications:

a. A stormwater drainage control plan is not necessary because there are no physical changes proposed for the site by this application.

b. A monument for the southeast corner of the lot is not necessary because the corner is over 200 feet from the proposed new lot line and is in standing swamp water where no development may occur. An old monument may exist at the location.

Ms. Rowden noted that a NHDOT letter suggested that the proposed lot line adjustment will not render the railroad corridor unusable for future trail use or restoration of rail service.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 8:54pm to discuss both waiver requests.

Abutter Philip Thayer addressed the Board. Mr. Thayer stated that he was in favor of the lot line adjustment. The lot line adjustment will help promote development that will be beneficial to the surrounding area. Mr. Thayer also confirmed that the old monument in the southeast corner of the lot does exist.

Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 8:56pm

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board grant waivers from the requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section VIII.B.20 - Stormwater Drainage Control Plan and Section IX.D - Monumentation Requirements. Second by Ms. Monaghan. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Mr. Maggiore moved that the Planning Board take jurisdiction of the Lot Line Adjustment application for Case #17:17 between properties located at 208 Atlantic Avenue and old railroad corridor property. Second by Mr. Wilson. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 8:58pm to discuss the application. No comments were made.
Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 8:59pm.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board approve the Lot Line Adjustment application for Case #17:17 between properties located at 208 Atlantic Avenue (M/L 007-076-000) and old railroad corridor property (M/L 999-011-000). Second by Ms. Monaghan. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

4. Case #17:18 – Applicants, James Buchanan and Michael Oiler, 27 Birch Road, North Hampton, NH 03862. The Applicants request a Site Plan Review to construct a 40 foot by 100 foot commercial building. The Applicants also request a Conditional Use Permit to allow construction of building and other site improvements within the Aquifer Protection District. The Applicants also request waivers from the Town of North Hampton Site Plan Regulations:

- a. Section X.C – Landscaping and Screening
- b. Section X.E.3.b.5 – Windows and Doors
- c. Section X.I – Sidewalks

Property Owners: James Buchanan and Michael Oiler, 27 Birch Road, North Hampton, NH 03862;
Property Location: 5 Birch Road, North Hampton, NH 03862; M/L: 013-021-000; Zoning District: I-B/R, Industrial - Business/Residential District.

In attendance for this application:

James Buchanan, applicant; Christian Smith, engineer for the applicant.

Mr. Smith addressed the Board. Mr. Smith presented a plan to construct a 40 foot by 100 foot commercial building and associated site improvements at 5 Birch Road. A special exception has been granted by the ZBA to allow the light manufacturing use (HVAC duct work) proposed for the site. The access drive and portions of the site will have a gravel surface. The site improvements include:

- a. paved employee and public parking area,
- b. sand and stone stock pile storage area not to exceed 100 cubic yards,
- c. 30 foot by 60 foot paved truck parking area,
- d. much of the existing vegetation and trees will be retained to provide screening,
- e. stormwater drainage and infiltration basin and septic system.

Mr. Smith presented the following proposed uses within the building:

- a. 1,600 square foot work shop for heating and air conditioning business. This unit will include space for vehicle parking, storage, and a second floor office.
- b. 1,600 square foot space for storage of construction equipment to perform light, non-petroleum based maintenance. This unit will also include office space.
- c. 800 square foot space for storage of boat, vehicles, and other equipment.

Mr. Smith also presented the following professional reviews for the project:

a. Town Engineer letter recommending amendments to the site plan to bring it into conformance with various Site Plan Regulations requirements and/or drainage efficiencies.

b. Hydrogeological study in accordance with the Aquifer Protection Ordinance. A low volume of water use on the site is anticipated. Negative off-site influences on the ground water quality or quantity are not expected for the proposed development.

c. Stormwater drainage analysis. Due to the bowl-like configuration of the site (former gravel pit), most stormwater will remain on the site and recharge directly into the soil.

Ms. Rowden asked if the existing gravel area in the wetlands buffer area will still be used.

Mr. Smith responded that the area may still be used. However, no additional disturbance of the land beyond what is necessary to build the drainage pond will occur.

Mr. Harned suggested that waiver requests be discussed.

Waiver from requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.C – Landscaping and Screening. Applicant reasoning – The ground level of the site lies 14 feet below the roadway level. The existing lot is vegetated around the exterior perimeter with natural, mature trees. The existing slope of the property provides a natural screen to the abutting properties and roads.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 9:12pm. No comments were made. Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 9:13pm.

Ms. Monaghan moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver from the requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.C - Landscaping and Screening. Second by Mr. Wilson. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Waiver from requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.E.3.b.5 – Windows and doors. Applicant reasoning – The style of the steel building does not meet the required 5% window requirement. The location of the building with the slopes from visual areas would make it hard to see the windows.

Mr. Harned asked if there would be any tree removal on the site as part of the construction process.

Mr. Smith replied that very little tree removal will occur. Most of the tree/brush removal will occur at the ground level of the site. The trees on the slope will remain as a natural screen.

Mr. Maggiore stated that he walks by the site on a regular basis. In his opinion, even with the natural screening in place and the bowl-like nature of the site, the building will be seen.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 9:20pm.

Abutter Robert Merrill addressed the Board. Mr. Merrill stated that there is a patch of woods between his home and the site. He will see the building clearly, especially in the winter. However, he is not bothered by it and supports the proposed site plan.

Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 9:22pm.

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver from the requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.E.3.b.5 – Windows and doors. Second by Mr. Maggiore. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Waiver from requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.I - Sidewalks. Applicant reasoning – The layout of the building entrances and the site's location along Birch Road are not feasible for walkways. The proposed use of the building is for employees. It is not intended for retail/public use.

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 9:25pm. No comments were made. Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 9:26pm.

Ms. Monaghan moved that the Planning Board grant a waiver from the requirements of Site Plan Regulations Section X.I - Sidewalks. Second by Mr. Wilson. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Mr. Wilson moved that the Planning Board take jurisdiction of the Site Plan Review application for Case #17:18 to construct a 40 foot by 100 foot commercial building and other site improvements at 5 Birch Road. Second by Ms. Monaghan. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

Mr. Harned opened the public hearing at 9:30pm.

Mr. Merrill addressed the Board. Mr. Merrill expressed his concern that surveyors may have come onto his property without his knowledge and delineated wetlands on his property that may not actually exist.

Mr. Smith stated that if the surveyors went on the abutting property that it was a mistake due to the nature of the wooded area between the abutting properties. The applicant's wetlands consultants are still trying to determine if the area is actually wetlands or an old drainage area.

Abutter Susan Leonardi addressed the Board. Ms. Leonardi stated that there are a lot of walkers along Birch Road. She asked if there will be an increase in the amount of traffic to the site as a result of the proposed new uses.

Mr. Buchanan stated that he could not estimate the future traffic flow at this time.

Abutter Mark Leonardi addressed the Board. Mr. Leonardi asked about hours of operation and possible increase in noise levels as a result of the proposed new uses.

Mr. Buchanan responded that his business is a very small operation. The business will operate during daytime hours, Monday through Friday. His business at its current location has operated with no noise complaints.

Mr. Harned closed the public hearing at 9:45pm.

Ms. Monaghan asked if the applicant could try to give an estimate of possible traffic flow to the site.

Mr. Buchanan stated that there are approximately 2-3 exits per day currently on the site. The proposed uses may create a maximum of 20 exits daily from the site.

Mr. Harned suggested that the Board continue the case to the next public hearing date in order to consider responses to the Town Engineer's review comments. Mr. Harned also suggested that the proposed tree line that will remain as screening be depicted on the final version of the plan.

Mr. Maggiore moved that the Planning Board continue Case #17:18 to the December 5, 2017 meeting date. Second by Mr. Jeffrey. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion (5-0).

III. Other Business

1. Minutes.

Mr. Harned presented the minutes of the October 17, 2017 Planning Board meeting.

Ms. Monaghan moved that the Planning Board accept the minutes of the October 17, 2017 Planning Board meeting as written. Second by Mr. Maggiore. The vote was 3-0-2 in favor of the motion with Mr. Harned and Mr. Jeffrey abstaining.

2. November work session attendance.

Mr. Harned and Mr. Wilson stated that they would not be able to attend the November 21 work session meeting. The Board came to a consensus without objection to cancel the November 21, 2017 work session meeting of the Planning Board due to a possible lack of a quorum. Any public hearing or agenda items will be moved to the December 5, 2017 Planning Board meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:03pm without objection.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Milner
Recording Secretary