

SOMERSWORTH PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF MEETING
February 15th, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ron LeHoullier, Chair
Jason Barry
Paul Goodwin, Alternate
Chris Horton
Mark Richardson
Jeremy Rhodes
Paul Robidas
David Witham, City Council Representative
Bob Belmore, City Manager

EXCUSED MEMBERS:

Ken Vincent, City Council Representative

STAFF PRESENT:

Michelle Mears, Director Development Services
Cyndi Harris, Code and Assessing Clerk
Anna Stockman, Planning Secretary

Mr. LeHoullier called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

Mr. Goodwin was appointed as a full voting member of the Board.

1. Approval of the minutes of the meetings:

a. January 18th, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Mears said that the representative from W. T. Porter Realty Investments, Inc. had believed that one of their waiver requests had been voted on at the January meeting of the Board but that she had not had a chance to research it. She proposed to amend the minutes to include the waiver and to also vote again on the waiver at the meeting. Mr. Rhodes said he was not included on the list of attendees and asked to be added. Mr. Belmore requested an amendment to the minutes on page 10, paragraph 3; he asked for clarification on a statement that Mr. Rhodes made on page 11; and said that the motion to adjourn was listed twice on page 11. The Board agreed to table the approval of the minutes until the next meeting of the Board, pending amendments.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas made a motion to table the minutes to the next meeting of the Board pending amendments; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion, and the Board passed the motion unanimously.

2. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Land Use Board Reports (ZBA, HDC, Conservation Commission, SRTC, Minor Field Reports): No comments.

City Council Report: Mr. Witham reported on the status of a number of city-owned properties, including the former site of Breton's Cleaners, the old police station and the former National Guard Readiness complex. He discussed potential issues with the sites and potential uses of the sites. He noted that the old police station had been remediated for asbestos and lead paint and that the City was ready to put it on the market by competitive bidding process, with a minimum bid of \$200,000.

He said that Council was going to accept proposals for redevelopment of the National Guard Readiness complex, for either residential or recreational uses. He said the Council was unsure whether the site would exclude an existing Little League field.

He discussed a solar array being proposed by Amiresco on a superfund site. He said the agreement documents were being reviewed by both parties' legal counsel. He said that Eversource, who would buy power from Amiresco, were also still working on final details.

He said that the Council had approved two ordinance changes, recommended by DDS staff, that would affect the Planning Board: one for circulation and parking in Chapter 19.21 and to Chapter 19.32 which would allow an applicant to apply for a Conditional Use Permit if their proposed project did not meet dimensional criteria.

Strafford Regional Planning Commission (SRPC) Update: Mr. Richardson said that the Commission had met on January 20th, 2023. He reviewed the actions taken at the meeting, including use of funds. He said that they had also discussed analysis of the safety of public transportation routes and the definition of non-motorized vehicles.

Vision for 30 Report: Mr. Barry said that at the first meeting in January, the Committee had discussed aims and goals. He said the mayor had given the Committee a specific mandate.

Other: None.

3. OLD BUSINESS

- a. Any old business that may come before the Board.
There was no old business to come before the Board.
- b. **PUBLIC HEARING (Continued from January 18th, 2023):** Favorite Development Group, LLC is seeking site plan amendment and conditional use permit approval for construction of new loading docks and pavement modifications for a property located at 20 Rescue Lane, in the Industrial (I) District, Assessor's Map 58 Lot 6G, SITE#17-2022 & CUP#15-2022

Ms. Mears said that the applicant had submitted a request to withdraw their application via email.

- c. **PUBLIC HEARING (Continued from January 18th, 2023):** W. T. Porter Realty Investments, INC is seeking a lot line adjustment and 9-lot subdivision for properties located at 271 & 289 High Street in the Residential Duplex (2) District, Assessor's Map 15 Lots 13 and 16A, SUB#08-2022

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board. She noted that the application had been continued for the following reasons: to provide additional visitor parking spaces; to update

drainage analysis based on third-party review; update landscaping to remove proposed trees from the right-of-way; and to update the HOA agreement to prohibit landscaping on the sight angle easement area.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas made a motion to continue review of the application; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

The applicant was represented by Paige Libbey of Jones and Beach. She reviewed the amended application for the Board, noting the addition of 6 visitor parking spaces, which exceeds zoning requirements, and the response to third-party review of the drainage analysis as well as comments from SRTC.

There were no comments or correspondence from the Public. Mr. LeHoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Horton said he thought the applicant had done well addressing the Board's previous concerns. Mr. Witham said while he was mostly satisfied with the application as proposed, he thought additional lighting should be added due to the added parking spaces. Ms. Libbey agreed. Mr. Richardson said he also liked the additional parking spaces and agreed that it would be good to add lighting.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas made a motion to approve the waiver request; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Ms. Mears reviewed the proposed conditions of approval for the Board:

1. PLAN REVISIONS:

- a. Any outstanding comments from Horsley Witten review shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Development.
- b. Please note in the Home Owner Association Documents that the HOA shall be responsible for the maintenance of landscaping within ROW and cul-de-sac, along with the drainage swales and stormwater BMPs. HOA will also be responsible for lighting, and proposed parking area for visitors.
- c. Please list all waivers granted on the plan;
- d. Add the following note defining Active and Substantial Development and Substantial completion;
- e. Please revise the hydrants to show a Kennedy K-81 or Clow Eddy;
- f. Please note on the plan pump station will not be accepted by the City. The pump station will remain private and maintained by HOA.
- g. Street light needs to be added near visitor parking.

2. CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL

[For office use only date certified_____ ROD received_____]

- a. The final plans shall bear the stamp and signature of the engineer, licensed land surveyor, and the landscape architect. Please submit five folded 24" x 36" paper copies of the full set of plans to the Office of Development Services for final endorsement. In addition, the applicant shall provide the final plat in CAD drawing exchange file (DXF) or format acceptable to City.
- b. FEDERAL AND STATE PERMITS- All Federal and State permits shall be in place before plan signing and recording, including NHDES Alteration of Terrain, and NHDES Shoreland Permit, NHDES Wetlands permit and NHDOT driveway permit.
- c. Please provide HOA, Easements, Bylaws, Restrictive Covenants to open space, documents these will be reviewed by legal will be required. These documents shall address access, utilities, pump station, boundaries, and landscaping. Applicant shall supply draft condominium for the City for legal review and approval. An escrow shall be collected in the amount \$750 or determined by the Director of Planning and Community Development to cover the cost of the review and recording of the documents at the Strafford County Registry of Deeds prior to the issuance of a C/O.

3. CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE START OF SITE WORK:

- a. An escrow account, in an amount set by the City's contract Engineer and agreeable to the Department of Development Services, will be established for site construction inspections prior to any site work;
- b. A performance surety, in an amount agreeable to the Department of Development Services, but no less than 110% of the cost of site construction determined by the engineer's estimate of construction value, will be established for on-site erosion control and site restoration prior to any site work. If all site work is completed as proposed this account will be refunded;
- c. The applicant shall apply for a new Water and Sewer Connection Permit; The applicant will be required to pay standard water and sewer connection fees assessed on new properties connecting to the water and sewer system. Water fees will be based on the size of water meter needed and the sewer connection fees will be based on estimate of water used and equivalent number of bedrooms; and,
- d. Erosion control shall be properly installed on site PRIOR to any construction. Erosion control shall be properly maintained throughout construction; any breaks or breaches shall be repaired within 48 hours of the storm event.
- e. The development will require new addresses. Please submit a request for a new address to the City Engineer. If a hearing before the E-911 Committee is required, this hearing must occur prior to the issuance of Building Permits.
- f. A preconstruction meeting is required prior to the start of work. Please contact the Department of Development Services to schedule this at least 1 week prior to breaking ground.
- g. MONUMENTATION: Granite Bounds shall be installed at all intersections of lot lines and street right-of-way, as well as all property corners which do not abut the

public right-of-way per Subdivision Regulation 22.7.C.10. A surveyor is to submit a signed letter to the Planning Department stating that the new lot corner monuments have been set prior to building permit.

- h. All the pins and monuments must be set before the road is conveyed to City of Somersworth. A licensed surveyor is to submit signed stamped letter stating the pins/monuments were set.
- i. Active and substantial development for this project is defined as “construction of the road, drainage, sidewalk, and utilities. These improvements must be completed within 4 years approval of approval. A failure to complete such conditions within said four-year period will entitle the planning board to commence revocation proceedings on the subdivision in accordance with RSA 676:4-a.
- j. The development will require new addresses. Please submit a request for a new address to the City Engineer. If a hearing before the E-911 Committee is required, this hearing must occur prior to the issuance of Building Permits.

4. CONDITIONS APPLICABLE DURING AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION:

- a. There shall be no wetlands degradation during construction.
- b. Driveway permit will be must be applied for and approved by Department of Public Works.
- c. Per Section 19.23.E.9 the building shall display the designated address number in such a manner as to be a plainly visible from the street which abuts the main entrance to the property. Such numbers shall be a minimum of 3.5 inches in height and must be reflective prior to Certificate of Occupancy.
- d. Street Acceptance: Please provide agreement and associated deed to convey to the City land to be used for streets with transfer of title to such interest to be effective on such date as the City accepts the land; legal together with a title certificate of a New Hampshire attorney certifying that such conveyance will be free and clear of any other liens and encumbrances, especially mortgages. Easements and rights-of-way, including details relative to use and maintenance, over property to remain in private ownership; Rights to drain onto or across other property, whether public or private ownership;
- e. The City of Somersworth will not maintain the street or provide any customary and usual services to the property owners along the street (including snow plowing, garbage pick-up, school bus pick-up and delivery, street lighting and street cleaning) until the City Council has formally accepted the street.

5. AS-BUILT PLANS.

- a. Within thirty days of the completion of the project and prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, an electronic As-Built Plan of the proposed development with details acceptable to the Department of Development Services shall be provided in a .pdf and paper copy. Once approved by the Department of Development Services the applicant shall submit final As-builts in both paper copy and on CD.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

This plan must be in a .dwg or .dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates.

- b. As-built for road.

DURATION OF APPROVAL: All conditional approvals shall be valid for a period of 120 days in which time all precedent conditions must be met or the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension no later than 14 days prior to expiration.

EXTENSIONS: All requests for extension must be submitted in writing to the Department of Development Services no later than 14 days prior to expiration with the appropriate fees. Failure to comply with the deadline dates without submission of a written request for extension will result in the approval being null and void.

APPEAL PROCESS: Pursuant to RSA 677:15, an aggrieved party may appeal this decision to the Strafford County Superior Court within 30 days of the date the Board voted to approve or disapprove the application, or to the ZBA pursuant to RSA 676:5, III within 30 days of the date the Board made its decision.

Mr. Witham suggested requiring a street sign, with the indication that it is private, at the end of the street until the City takes the street over as a condition of approval. Ms. Libbey said the applicant would agree with that condition.

MOTION: Mr. Horton proposed a motion to approve the subdivision application with the conditions of approval as outlined by Ms. Mears; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

- d. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Fiona Johnson is seeking site plan and conditional use permit approval to construct a 5,700 SF warehouse/distribution facility with infrastructure on a property located on Willand & Commercial Drive, in the Commercial/Industrial (CI) District, Assessor's Map 43 Lot 1G, SITE#14-2022, CUP#13-2022

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board, noting that it had been continued pending the applicant's submission of architectural plans. She said that the requested plans had been submitted. She said that the applicant was seeking a Conditional Use Permit for wetland impact and had three additional waiver requests: for metal siding, required sidewalks, and stormwater setback regulations.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas proposed a motion to accept the application as ready for Board review; Mr. Horton seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Horton proposed a motion to accept the application as complete; Mr. Barry seconded the motion; and the Board approved the motion in a 9-0 vote, with Mr. Witham abstaining.

Bob Stowell of Tritech Engineering represented the applicant before the Board. He reviewed the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) request and said that it had been presented to the Conservation Commission and that the proposed impact would improve existing conditions. He reviewed the waiver requests.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

Mr. LeHoullier opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the Public and Ms. Mears said there had been no correspondence from the Public regarding the application. Mr. LeHoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Goodwin suggested the addition of protection for the metal siding around areas of heavy use. Mr. Stowell said that bollards had been added for protection. Mr. Witham asked what the Board thought about the appearance of the building. Mr. Witham questioned the applicant's justification for the sidewalk waiver. He thought that if a sidewalk wasn't going to be required that he would like to have the applicant install additional lighting. Mr. Rhodes agreed that additional lighting would increase pedestrian safety. Mr. Witham suggested possible locations for additional lighting. Mr. Stowell agreed to add additional lighting.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore moved that the site plan and Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Fiona Johnson did not have the potential for regional impact; Mr. Barry seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas proposed a motion to approve the waiver request for stormwater setback regulations; Mr. Horton seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Rhodes proposed a motion to approve the waiver request to allow for the installation of metal siding; Mr. Barry seconded the motion.

Mr. Witham asked about the color of the siding, the position of the masonry and the composition of the roof.

The Board unanimously approved the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Witham proposed a motion that the waiver request for sidewalk be approved with the condition that the applicant add additional lighting at the southerly end of the Applicant's property on Commercial Drive; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Ms. Mears listed the conditions of approval for the CUP as outlined by the Conservation Commission:

1. Non-native plantings shall be replaced by native plantings;
2. Development shall conform with City hazmat requirements;
3. The lighting shall be reduced to 0% within the undisturbed buffer;
4. Dumpsters shall be bear-proof;
5. Silt and chain link fence symbols shall be added to the plan set legend; and
6. The plans shall be stamped and signed by a certified wetland scientist.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion that the Conditional Use Permit be granted with the recommended conditions of approval as outlined by the Conservation Commission; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Ms. Mears reviewed the proposed conditions of approval for the Board:

1. PLAN REVISIONS:
 - a. Please list all waivers granted on the plans, including any conditions of approval;

- b. Applicant shall address any outstanding comments from the Horsley Witten Third Party Review to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Development;
 - c. Please include a note on the plan that all parking shall be on paved areas.
 - d. Street light added to commercial drive.
2. CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL
- a. The final plans shall bear the stamp and signature of the engineer, licensed land surveyor, and the landscape architect. Please submit five folded 24" x 36" paper copies of the full set of plans to the Office of Development Services for final endorsement.
 - b. FEDERAL AND STATE PERMITS - All Federal and State permits shall be in place before plan signing and recording, including NHDES Alteration of Terrain, and NHDES Shoreland Permit, NHDES Wetlands permit and NHDOT driveway permit.
3. CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE START OF SITE WORK:
- a. Construction Cost estimate for this project shall be submitted to the Department of Development Services.
 - b. Building Plans shall bear the stamp of a Certified Fire Protection Engineer licensed in New Hampshire to certify compliance with all egress, emergency lighting, smoke, heat, and CO detection systems, fire alarm monitoring and reporting systems, fire suppression systems, and any other fire protection or related life safety systems required by National and/or NH Code.
 - c. A preconstruction meeting is required prior to the start of work. Please contact the Department of Development Services to schedule this at least 1 week prior to breaking ground.
 - d. An escrow account, in an amount set by the City's contract Engineer and agreeable to the Department of Development Services, will be established for site construction inspections prior to any site work.
 - e. A performance surety, in an amount agreeable to the Department of Development Services, but no less than 25% of the cost of site construction determined by the engineer's estimate of construction value, will be established for on-site erosion control and site restoration prior to any site work and off-site improvements. If all site work is completed as proposed this account will be refunded.
 - f. The applicant shall apply for a new Water and Sewer Connection Permit. The applicant will be required to pay standard water and sewer connection fees assessed on new properties connecting to the water and sewer system. Water fees will be based on the size of water meter needed and the sewer connection fees will be based on estimate of water used and equivalent number of bedrooms.
 - g. Erosion control shall be properly installed on site PRIOR to any construction. Erosion control shall be properly maintained throughout construction; any breaks or breaches shall be repaired within 48 hours of the storm event.

- h. Wetland buffer areas shall not be impacted by any construction activities (other than those impacts permitted under the CUP and DES wetlands permit). Wetland buffers shall be marked with orange snow fence prior to any onsite activity, and such markers shall be maintained throughout construction.
 - i. LANDSCAPING SURVIVAL SECURITY: Ten percent (10%) of the total cost of landscaping or a minimum of five hundred (\$500) dollars, whichever is greater, shall be held for a period of 2 growing seasons to guarantee the survival of the landscaping installation.
- 4. CONDITIONS APPLICABLE DURING AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION:
 - a. Per Section 19.23.E.9 the building shall display the designated address number in such a manner as to be plainly visible from the street which abuts the main entrance to the property. Such numbers shall be a minimum of 3.5 inches in height and must be reflective.
 - b. There shall be no wetlands degradation during construction.
 - c. A copy of the completed Stormwater Inspection & Maintenance Log shall be provided to the Development Services Department annually on or before July 1st. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval and noted on the final plans.
 - d. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be replaced in a timely manner as long as this site plan remains valid.
 - e. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and roadways.
- 5. AS-BUILT PLANS:
 - a. Within thirty days of the completion of the project and prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, an electronic As-Built Plan of the proposed development with details acceptable to the Department of Development Services shall be provided in a .pdf and paper copy. Once approved by the Department of Development Services the applicant shall submit final as-builts in both paper copy and on CD. This plan must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates.

DURATION OF APPROVAL: All conditional approvals shall be valid for a period of 120 days in which time all precedent conditions must be met or the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension no later than 14 days prior to expiration.

EXTENSIONS: All requests for extension must be submitted in writing to the Department of Development Services no later 14 days prior to expiration with the appropriate fees. Failure to comply with the deadline dates without submission of a written request for extension will result in the approval being null and void.

APPEAL PROCESS: Pursuant to RSA 677:15, an aggrieved party may appeal this decision to the Strafford County Superior Court within 30 days of the date the Board voted to approve or disapprove the application, or to the ZBA pursuant to RSA 676:5, III within 30 days of the date the Board made its decision.

Mr. Belmore said that while the City would need to apply to Eversource for connection to the additional lighting, the applicant would be responsible for all associated costs.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas proposed a motion to approve the site plan application with the conditions of approval as outlined by Ms. Mears; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

6. NEW BUSINESS: **Items a. and b. were heard in reverse order*

- a. PUBLIC HEARING:** The Oaks are seeking a Conditional Use Permit for proposed timber cut on a property located at 100 Hideaway Place in the Commercial/ Industrial (CI) and Residential Single Family (R1) Districts, Assessor's Map 50, Lot 11 CUP#: 17-2022

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board. She noted that the application had been reviewed by the Conservation Commission, who had conditionally approved the CUP.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas made a motion to accept the application as ready for review by the Board, Mr. Horton seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

Peter Harrity represented the applicant before the Board. He presented the application to the Board. He said that the conditions set forth by the Conservation Commission were acceptable to the Oaks.

Mr. LeHoullier opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Vince Kurlovich, 34 Coles Pond Road, said that a tree situated on the Oaks property had been felled onto his property in heavy winds a number of years ago and that he would like the tree to be removed as part of the timber cut. He felt that removal was the responsibility of the property owner of where the tree was originally situated. He presented photos of the tree to the Board.

Mr. Zachary Russ, 201 West High Street, asked if removal of the trees would affect the wetlands behind his residence. He expressed concern about stormwater filling his basement.

Mr. Rhodes showed Mr. Russ a plan of the trees proposed to be cut. He noted that the Oaks would not be doing a clear cut and the 60% of the trees in the area to be cut would remain.

Ms. Mears said there had been no correspondence from the Public.

Mr. LeHoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Harrity said he was aware of the tree in Mr. Kurlovich's yard. He said that he did not think the cut would have major wetland impact or disturb the current view.

Mr. Witham discussed past troubles with existing trees on the site, which if not thinned, lead to lack of airflow and less healthy undergrowth as well as diseased trees. He said he thought the timber cut was a good way to maintain the health of the forestlands surrounding the gold course. Mr. Barry agreed and said that periodic harvesting of the trees edging the golf course was advisable.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

Mr. Harrity agreed that occasionally cutting the trees led to healthier trees, which required less use of insecticides and pesticides. He restated that it would not be a clear cut, only a thinning of the trees.

Mr. Barry agreed that the cut sounded like a way to maintain the health of the tress overall and said he had no concerns with the application.

Mr. Rhodes said that, as a member of the Conservation Commission, he thought that the applicant had been very cooperative and responsive the concerns of the Commission. He asked Mr. Harrity if there are any trees to be cut in the conservation area. Mr. Harrity said that there would be no cutting in the conservation area. Mr. Rhodes suggested that replanting of some low growing species on non-play areas might be made a condition of approval. Mr. Harrity said he could agree to that.

MOTION: Mr. Rhodes moved that the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by the Oaks did not have the potential for regional impact; Mr. Horton seconded that motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Mr. Rhodes listed the conditions of approval outlined by the Conservation Commission:

1. No timber cutting on the conservation land;
2. Cutting on stream buffer near road only for dead and diseased trees;
3. No skidders on the wetlands;
4. Tree count to reflect no cutting on conservation land;
5. Signage around wetlands/buffer areas to keep golfers out of sensitive wetland buffer areas.

MOTION: Mr. Rhodes proposed a motion that the Conditional Use Permit be granted with the recommended conditions of approval as outlined by the Conservation Commission; Mr. Witham seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

- b. PUBLIC HEARING:** John J Flatley is seeking an extension of the Planning Board Condition of Approval granted January 26th, 2022 to complete conditions prior to final approval for the site plan amendment for access to a self-storage facility located on a portion of the lot within Rollinsford through a property located at Royal Drive in the Business (B) District, Assessor's Map 39, Lot 03, SITE#: 09-2022

Ms. Mears advised the Board that the applicant was still seeking review and comment from NH DES and sign-off on the plans from the Rollinsford Planning Board.

Mr. Witham noted that while the applicant was still awaiting approvals, work on the site had already commenced. Ms. Mears said that there was typically a pre-construction meeting, but that she had not been to the site. Mr. Witham asked if there was time before the applicant's approval expired to continue the application and request that a representative from John J. Flatley come before the Board. Mr. Rhodes said that the approval date was listed as 1/26/23, in which case, the applicant had enough time to present the application to the Board.

The Board discussed whether the applicant would have enough time to come before the Board before their approval expired. The Board expressed concerns about the work being done prior to receiving required approvals.

Mr. LeHoullier called a recess at 7:50pm. The meeting resumed at 7:55pm.

Ms. Mears said they received approval on August 18, 2022.

MOTION: Mr. Witham proposed a motion to grant the extension with the condition that all work cease on the site until NH DES approvals have been received; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion.

Mr. Belmore asked if the applicant had completed all proposed work in the City and was now just doing proposed site work in Rollinsford. Ms. Mears said that the City did not have final plans from Rollinsford. Mr. Belmore said the applicant needed to provide state approval for alteration of terrain. Ms. Mears said that the City had the authority to address terrain disturbance in the City.

Mr. Witham said he was confused about the property lines and could not get answers from the absent applicant. Mr. Robidas proposed to extend the deadline and request that the applicant come before the Board. Mr. Rhodes suggested a 30-day extension and an appearance by the applicant. Mr. Goodwin noted that the City was just waiting for NH DES approval and that the approval of the Rollinsford plans would not affect the approved plans in the City. Ms. Mears said the applicant would need to submit final plans from Rollinsford.

Mr. Witham withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Mr. Rhodes proposed a motion to grant the request for a 30-day extension on the condition that the applicant would appear at the next regular meeting of the Board; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

- c. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Northam Survey LLC are seeking a Conditional Use Permit for a new single-family dwelling unit within the Riparian and Wetland Buffer district for a property located at Coles Pond Road in the Residential Single Family (R1) District, Assessor's Map 49, Lot 14, CUP#: 16-2022

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board and recommended that the Board accept the application as complete. She said the application had been reviewed by the Conservation Commission who recommended a number of conditions of approval.

MOTION: Mr. Horton made a motion to accept the application as complete; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Eric Salovitch from Northam Survey, LLC presented the application to the Board. Also present was the owner of the property, Peter Ransom. Mr. Salovitch reviewed the history of the lot and the existing "camp" building on the site. He said there were suitable soils for a leach field for septic. He said he has submitted a shoreline permit application to the state and was still awaiting a response. He said some trees would need to be removed but are outside the tree buffer line.

Mr. LeHoullier opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Jeff Wituszynski, 17 Coles Pond Road, said he shares a private road which was his primary concern. He said he was concerned about adding additional people to the neighborhood and additional traffic on the road. He said the existing building on the site was not used as a residence. He said he

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

was concerned with the current amount of truck traffic on the road. He said he did not think the proposal was in the best interest of the City or of the neighborhood.

Mr. Vince Kurlovich, 34 Coles Pond Road, presented a letter from another abutter to the Board. He said he had concerns about the unique conditions of the area and the impact further development would have upon them. He said he was concerned about flood water and the proposed septic system. He said he was also concerned with current truck traffic on the road. He said that he did not believe there was proper road frontage and that the existing building was more of “a shed.”

Mr. Wituszynski asked about the zoning conformity of the site and asked why the proposed building didn't need a variance.

Ms. Mears reviewed the abutter letter for the Board. The abutter stated that they felt the wetlands should be protected and that new construction would negatively affect the current quality of life.

Mr. Peter Ransom, the owner of the property, said that the proposed single-family home would only be used seasonally, as a “camp” home and that the existing structure on the lot would be used for storage with a sleeping loft. He said he thought a camp home would have minimal impact and would mostly be used in the warmer months, though occasionally in the winter. He said that he was currently part of an HOA in York and could recognize the concerns of the abutters and the importance of being a good neighbor.

Mr. LeHoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Horton said the project might warrant a site visit from the Board to get a feel for the layout of the proposed project as well as the potential concerns of the abutters.

Mr. Goodwin asked if it were possible for a future owner to use the house as a permanent residence. Mr. Northam said the structure would be built as a four-season home.

Mr. Richardson asked if the loft was going to be the bedroom. Mr. Northam said it was an additional sleeping area. He asked where people would be parking. Mr. Northam said that parking could be along the aggregate driveway.

Mr. Witham confirmed that the CUP was for the impact to wetland buffers. He questioned whether the proposed dwelling met the other zoning requirements. He said that he thought the Board should be able to review the applicant's NH DES permits with the ability to red flag or even stop construction should issues arise. He asked Ms. Mears to point out the ordinance which would allow for construction of the home. Ms. Mears said that Section 6.19.6.A.1: Non-conforming Lots, allows for dwellings to be built on lots created for that purpose. Mr. Northam said they had worked to make the lot more conforming.

Mr. Belmore expressed confusion over the use of the camp, as it was going to be heated and could be used year-round. He asked whether it would be limited to seasonal use.

Mr. Rhodes said that the applicants had done all they could to minimize impact and that they are in a zone that allows for 4-season homes. He said the neighbor's concerns were valid, but because the road

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

was private, the City did not have authority over it. He agreed that a site visit might be a good idea. He said he did not see any grounds to deny.

Mr. Robidas said he was not comfortable with 4-season use, but could not see a reason to deny the application.

Mr. Belmore said he didn't think a site visit would be necessary and he thought the application could be voted on. Mr. Witham agreed.

MOTION: Mr. Rhodes moved that the conditional use permit application submitted by Northam Survey LLC did not have the potential for regional impact; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Mr. Witham asked Mr. Rhodes about a request by the Conservation Commission for a drip edge to be added to the proposed home. Mr. Rhodes asked that it be added to the list of conditions of approval.

Ms. Mears reviewed the proposed conditions of approval for the Board. She listed the conditions of approval recommended by the Conservation Commission:

1. Aggregate driveway as close to (south leach field as possible);
2. No pesticide or herbicide use for lawn;
3. No lawn beyond existing treeline;
4. Snow storage as far from the buffer as possible;
5. A drip edge must be added to the proposed home.

She then reviewed further conditions of approval for the Board:

1. PLAN REVISIONS:
 - a. Aggregate driveway as close to (south leach field as possible);
 - b. No pesticide or herbicide use for lawn;
 - c. No lawn beyond existing treeline;
 - d. Snow storage as far from the buffer as possible
 - e. Add a note to the plan that any pesticide usage shall be in line with Chapter 19 Section 13, the Riparian and Wetland Buffer District Ordinance
 - f. Install drip edge around perimeter of the house;
2. CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL
 - a. The final plans shall bear the stamp and signature of the wetland scientist. Please submit three folded paper copies of the full set of plans to the Office of Development Services for final endorsement.
3. FEDERAL AND STATE PERMITS - All Federal and State permits shall be in place before plan signing and recording, including NHDES Wetlands permit.

DURATION OF APPROVAL: All conditional approvals shall be valid for a period of 120 days in which time all precedent conditions must be met or the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension no later than 14 days prior to expiration.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

EXTENSIONS: All requests for extension must be submitted in writing to the Department of Development Services no later 14 days prior to expiration with the appropriate fees. Failure to comply with the deadline dates without submission of a written request for extension will result in the approval being null and void.

APPEAL PROCESS: Pursuant to RSA 677:15, an aggrieved party may appeal this decision to the Strafford County Superior Court within 30 days of the date the Board voted to approve or disapprove the application, or to the ZBA pursuant to RSA 676:5, III within 30 days of the date the Board made its decision

MOTION: Mr. Robidas proposed a motion that the Conditional Use Permit be granted with the conditions of approval as outlined by Ms. Mears; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

- d. PUBLIC HEARING:** 85 Elm Street Somersworth LLC are seeking Site Plan approval of a 128-unit multi-family development and infrastructure property to be located at 85 Elm Street and 20 Green Street in the Business with Historic and Form-Based Codes Overlay (BHFBC) District, Assessor's Map 10, Lots 176 and 177, SITE#: 20-2022 and CUP#: 01-2023

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board, noting that the applicant had come before the Board in August 2022 for a Conceptual Review and had received approval with conditions for the demolition of four existing building on the site as well as the proposed design of the building by the Historic District Committee at their November 2022 meeting. She said the applicant was seeking waivers for the number of required parking spaces and for landscaping in the parking area. She said the City was waiting for a second third-party review of the revised plans as well as traffic impact study information to be provided by the applicant.

MOTION: Mr. Horton proposed a motion that the application be accepted as complete; the motion was seconded by Mr. Barry; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Neil Hanson, of Tighe and Bond, represented the applicant before the Board. Also present were Ben Stebbins and Rob Previti, the applicants. He presented the application to the Board. He said the proposed building would be located on Elm and Green Streets as well as the corner of Elm and Fayette Streets. He noted a slope from Elm to Green Street, into which the proposed structure would be built and which would allow for an underground parking garage on the site.

He said there would be parking both onsite and street parking on Green Street. He acknowledged that issues had been raised about available parking and that those issues were being addressed. He mentioned additional parking on Main Street. He said the proposed building would have bike storage and that there was a public transportation stop close by to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

He discussed plans for winter parking, suggesting residents could park at a park and ride facility, located in neighboring Dover, and then take public transportation to the building during winter parking bans. He said residents might also be able to purchase a winter parking pass at local parks. He said prospective tenants would be required to sign up for parking alerts sent out by the City and would then need to find alternative parking.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

He said in addition to the two waiver requests, the applicants had applied for two Conditional Use Permits for dimensional requirements, for frontage and for side yard setbacks.

He said that the applicants had addressed the third-party stormwater review comments and that stormwater would be retained and infiltrated on site and then directed towards existing City stormwater infrastructure on Washington Street. He said the drainage pipe would need to be upsized and that the application included a long-term maintenance plan for stormwater and utilities.

Mr. LeHoullier opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Matt Dinola, a direct abutter, said that while he was generally in favor of the proposed project, he did have concerns with the impact on traffic flow, particularly on Church Court. He said parking would definitely be an issue and that it was already an issue in the area as well as a potential safety issue. He said as a local business owner, he relied on street parking for customers. He also expressed concerns about the impact of construction, including dust and noise, and said he would like to see a mitigation plan to deal with potential construction impacts. He expressed further concerns about trees that abutted his property and that he thought might need to be cut down to allow access for construction vehicles. He said he would also like to see a construction timeline in order to make appropriate plans for any possible impacts to his business.

Ms. Mears read two letters submitted by the Public. One from Dawn Cortez, 142 Green Street, received in November 2022, which expressed concerns about parking on Green Street, which might block driveways or cause people to park in her driveway as well as increased noise levels from additional vehicles. She thought a new parking permit plan should be required.

The second letter, from Kimberly Shoen, was received on 11/29/22. In her letter, Ms. Shoen expressed concerns about the size and scope of the proposed building and the proposed parking, which she felt was inadequate for the potential new population of residents and their guests of the proposed building. She said that as the project was not intended to create workforce housing, it was likely to mean an influx of new residents who would likely require more than one parking space per unit. She encouraged the City to mandate that a percentage of the proposed units be reserved for workforce housing.

Mr. LeHoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Goodwin said that he was excited about the proposed project and thought it would be an upscale addition to the City, but said the most obvious issue was inadequate proposed parking. He said that the parking calculations were not realistic with the number of potential tenants. He asked about a parking plan for the historic Agent's House, which did not seem to be included in the current plans. He said that the parking issues made it difficult to promote the benefits of the project to the Public.

Mr. Goodwin asked if there was some sort of agreement with the City for the 10 on-street parking spaces. Mr. Hansen said that there was no agreement with the City and they were just depicted as potential parking for tenants. Mr. Goodwin said there may be an opportunity to lease the parking spaces for a fee from the City for tenant use.

Mr. Goodwin said he didn't think the park and ride/public transportation scenario being proposed by the applicant was in any way realistic, noting that no one would want to wait for a bus in a snowstorm.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

He said that the 13 bike storage units being proposed were not adequate if the applicants were trying to promote alternative means of transportation. He said he didn't think the tenants of the applicant's market-rate building would be using public transportation at all and they would likely have cars. He suggested looking into renting nearby parking spaces for dedicated tenant parking.

He questioned whether the applicant had made any provisions for pets, and said it was likely that there would be many dogs living in the apartments. He said he did not see a school impact report. He said that how the building was situated seemed more suburban than urban. He questioned why the building was going to be built into the incline rather than align with Elm Street. He questioned the placement of the dumpsters. He asked about potential improvements to the historic Agent's House. Mr. Stebbins said that they would be doing some improvements to the Agent's house but that building the proposed apartment building was their priority.

Mr. Goodwin asked about a pest mitigation plan. He said he thought that potential tenants would likely be New Hampshire residents.

Mr. Rhodes said he had severe concerns about parking and said that the applicants could not include the 10 City parking spaces into their parking calculations. He noted that public transportation in the area does not operate during snowstorms or other severe weather events so the suggestion that tenants use the park and ride and then public transportation was "laughable." He said that the lot was often completely full with commuter vehicles. He said that while two required spaces were not workable, the applicants were essentially proposing a single space per unit. He said that the proposed building felt like a suburban apartment building transplanted into an urban area and seemed out-of-place in the area. He said that the lack of parking would be a reason to deny the application.

Mr. Witham said that while he had concerns over proposed parking, he felt that it could be resolved, but needed further consideration from the applicant. He echoed the suggestion about leasing parking spaces from the city. He said that it might appease abutters to have the applicants update striping.

He discussed improvements on Church Street and suggested the applicant and the City work together to improve the full length of the street. He asked about proposed lighting and suggested putting a decorative light at the top of Church Street.

He said that he thought there would be little impact on the schools. He said he was not concerned about the impacts on City wastewater or services. He said that applicants needed to have a winter weather parking plan for tenants.

Mr. Richardson said he appreciated Mr. Goodwin's analysis of the parking situation. He said that while there may be parking on Main Street, it might not be particularly safe at night. He asked about the vestibule and where it opened into. Mr. Previti said it opened into the lobby and was for energy efficiency. He asked about lighting in the vestibule. Mr. Hansen said that a lighting plan had been included in the application. Mr. Previti said that lighting was designed to not flood the area with light.

Mr. Horton said he was favor of the project and liked the appearance of the project. He asked about the trenching plan down Elm Street and whether there would be an overlay installed after construction. Mr. Stebbins said that it had not yet been considered. Mr. Horton said he thought the project would increase workforce housing.

February 15, 2023 PB Minutes

Mr. Berry said he also liked the project, but was also concerned with parking. He asked about additional underground parking. Mr. Previti said that it was not economically feasible. Mr. Stebbins said that he thought 2 spaces per unit were too much. He asked what the Board thought was acceptable.

Ms. Mears said that the apartment building at 122 Canal Street was approved with 1.2 parking spaces per unit. She said that 1.5 parking spaces per unit were required in the Historic District as of 2006.

Mr. Belmore said he thought requiring two spaces was too much, and that 1.2 or 1.3 was more reasonable. He said the proposal to have tenants take the bus was a “nonstarter.” He said he thought it would be ok to park Main Street as more people parking down there would create more pedestrian traffic. Mr. Previti said that increased parking on Main Street would increase safety and increase use of the businesses along Main Street.

Mr. Belmore said he thought that the applicant should improve the entirety of Church Street.

Mr. LeHoullier said he was okay with parking on Main Street but questioned whether it should require permits and whether future development of neighboring structures would impact available parking. He suggested leasing spots on Pleasant Street.

Mr. Rhodes said that he would support 1.2 dedicated spaces. He discussed the pest issue and the displacement of the feral cat colony. He agreed about the need for a pest management plan.

Mr. Horton agreed that 1.2 spaces was acceptable.

Mr. Goodwin said that 1.2 spaces at 122 Canal Street worked because it had a significant commercial component. He thought that 1.3 would be better, but 1.2, including parking for the Agent’s House, was acceptable. He mentioned that the Shiva Market parking lot was underutilized. Mr. Stebbins said that he had been unable to contact the Shiva Market owner. Mr. Goodwin said that the parking issue needed to be solved and hoped that the applicant would bring a viable solution to the next meeting.

Mr. Robidas agreed that parking was the biggest issue with the project.

Mr. Witham said that while the Board could not grant approval tonight, the Board seemed in support of the project as long as the applicants addressed the issues raised by the Board. Mr. Horton agreed that there should be additional lighting on Elm and Church Street and liked the idea of additional parking striping.

Mr. Stebbins asked about the Conditional Use Permit application. Mr. Goodwin said he didn’t see any issues and there were no additional comments, for or against, from the Board.

MOTION: Mr. Horton moved that the site plan and Conditional Use Permit applications submitted by 85 Elm Street Somersworth LLC did not have the potential for regional impact; Mr. Belmore seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

The Board agreed that the application should be continued to allow the applicants time to address the concerns of the Board.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore made a motion to continue the application to the March 15th, 2023 meeting of the Board; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Witham made a motion to continue the meeting of the Planning Board past its set end time; Mr. Belmore seconded the motion and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

e. **PUBLIC HEARING:** Jake Rafferty is seeking Site Plan approval for a natural gas pipeline facility on a property located on Maple Street in the Single Family Residential (R1) District, Assessor's Map 34, Lot 8A, SITE#: 10-2022

Ms. Mears reviewed the application for the Board, noting that Staff supported the waiver requests included in the application.

MOTION: Mr. Witham made a motion to accept the application as complete; Mr. Rhodes seconded the application; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

Mr. Jake Rafferty on behalf of Unitil, Mr. Mike Pelletier of Pipeline Services and Tracey Sweeney of Unitil presented the application to the Board.

Mr. LeHoullier opened the Public Hearing. There were no comments from the Public. Mr. Lehoullier closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Horton asked about what would happen with the Bartlett Avenue site. Mr. Rafferty said that it was owned by Unitil who would demolish it at a later date. Mr. Horton suggested adding a set deadline for demolition of the building as a condition of approval. He also suggested adding landscaping at the Bartlett Avenue site as a condition of approval.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the existing High Street site would also be demolished and Mr. Rafferty said it would be eventually. Mr. Rhodes said he was glad it would be demolished as it was a potential safety hazard.

Mr. Witham asked about a reasonable timeframe to remove the disused infrastructure and landscape the sites. He asked if the proposed facility would be protected from vehicle impacts. Mr. Rafferty said there would be guardrails and that Unitil would be working closely with DPW to ensure safety.

Mr. Belmore asked what a reasonable timeframe for demolition of the disused facilities would be. Mr. Rafferty said he thought late summer, early fall of 2023.

Mr. Richardson asked if construction would impact traffic entering and exiting the school. Mr. Rafferty said school traffic could be accommodated.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore moved that the Site Plan submitted by Jake Rafferty did not have the potential for regional impact; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously approved the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for a landscape plan; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for a traffic study; Mr. Horton seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for a drainage analysis; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for bicycle storage; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for a sidewalk; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

MOTION: Mr. Belmore proposed a motion to grant the waiver request for a water system; Mr. Robidas seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

Ms. Mears reviewed the proposed condition of approval for the Board:

7. PLAN REVISIONS:

- a. Please note that per Section 12.8.a. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and fully shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and roadways.
- b. Please revise utility notes to clarify that all utilities will be underground, per Section 12.3.b
- c. Please show snow storage areas on the plan;
- d. Stormwater summary to us indicating the following:
 - i. Existing conditions summary including land cover (pervious, impervious, woods), area of project, HSG, etc.
 - ii. Proposed conditions summary including land cover (pervious, impervious, woods), area of project, HSG, etc.
 - iii. Indicate existing and proposed drainage patterns and if/how the patterns have changed in the design.
 - iv. Total impervious area in pre- and post-development condition.

8. CONDITIONS THAT MUST BE MET PRIOR TO FINAL APPROVAL

- a. Construction Cost estimate for this project shall be submitted to the Department of Development Services.
- b. The final plans shall bear the stamp and signature of the engineer, licensed land surveyor, and the landscape architect. Please submit five folded 24" x 36" paper copies of the full set of plans to the Office of Development Services for final endorsement.
- c. FEDERAL AND STATE PERMITS - All Federal and State permits shall be in place before plan signing and recording, including NHDES Alteration of Terrain, and NHDES Shoreland Permit, NHDES Wetlands permit and NHDOT driveway permit.

9. CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO THE START OF SITE WORK:

- a. Building Plans shall bear the stamp of a Certified Fire Protection Engineer licensed in New Hampshire to certify compliance with all egress, emergency lighting, smoke, heat, and CO detection systems, fire alarm monitoring and reporting systems, fire suppression systems, and any other fire protection or related life safety systems required by National and/or NH Code.
- b. A preconstruction meeting is required prior to the start of work. Please contact the Department of Development Services to schedule this at least 1 week prior to breaking ground.
- c. An escrow account, in an amount set by the City's contract Engineer and agreeable to the Department of Development Services, will be established for site construction inspections prior to any site work.
- d. A performance surety, in an amount agreeable to the Department of Development Services, but no less than 25% of the cost of site construction determined by the engineer's estimate of construction value, will be established for on-site erosion control and site restoration prior to any site work and off-site improvements. If all site work is completed as proposed this account will be refunded.
- e. The applicant shall apply for a new Water and Sewer Connection Permit. The applicant will be required to pay standard water and sewer connection fees assessed on new properties connecting to the water and sewer system. Water fees will be based on the size of the water meter needed and the sewer connection fees will be based on the estimate of water used and the equivalent number of bedrooms.
- f. Erosion control shall be properly installed on site PRIOR to any construction. Erosion control shall be properly maintained throughout construction; any breaks or breaches shall be repaired within 48 hours of the storm event.

10. CONDITIONS APPLICABLE DURING AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION:

- a. There shall be no wetlands degradation during construction.
- b. A copy of the completed Stormwater Inspection & Maintenance Log shall be provided to the Development Services Department annually on or before January 1st. This requirement shall be an ongoing condition of approval and noted on the final plans.
- c. All landscaping shown on plans shall be maintained and any dead or dying vegetation shall be replaced in a timely manner as long as this site plan remains valid.
- d. All outdoor lighting (including security lights) shall be down lit and shielded so no direct light is visible from adjacent properties and roadways.

11. AS-BUILT PLANS:

- a. Within thirty days of the completion of the project and prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, an electronic As-Built Plan of the proposed development with details acceptable to the Department of Development Services shall be provided in a .pdf and paper copy. Once approved by the Department of Development Services the applicant shall submit final As-builts in both paper copy and on CD. This plan

must be in a dwg or dxf file format and in NAD 1983 State Plane New Hampshire FIPS 2800 Feet coordinates.

DURATION OF APPROVAL: All conditional approvals shall be valid for a period of 120 days in which time all precedent conditions must be met or the approval shall be null and void. The applicant may request an extension no later than 14 days prior to expiration.

EXTENSIONS: All requests for extension must be submitted in writing to the Department of Development Services no later 14 days prior to expiration with the appropriate fees. Failure to comply with the deadline dates without submission of a written request for extension will result in the approval being null and void.

APPEAL PROCESS: Pursuant to RSA 677:15, an aggrieved party may appeal this decision to the Strafford County Superior Court within 30 days of the date the Board voted to approve or disapprove the application, or to the ZBA pursuant to RSA 676:5, III within 30 days of the date the Board made its decision.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas proposed a motion to approve the site plan application submitted by Jake Rafferty with the conditions of approval as outlined by Ms. Mears; Mr. Rhodes seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

f. Any new business to come before the Board

There was no new business to come before the Board.

6. WORKSHOP BUSINESS:

There was no workshop business.

7. COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS

Ms. Mears said that the Board would need to elect a new Vice Chair at the March meeting.

MOTION: Mr. Robidas made a motion to adjourn; Mr. Witham seconded the motion; and the Board unanimously passed the motion.

Mr. LeHoullier adjourned the meeting at 10:00pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cyndi Harris
Code and Assessing Clerk