

**Official**

**HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**

**Hooksett Municipal Building**

**35 Main Street**

**Council Chambers, Room 105**

**Monday, July 20, 2020**

**6:00 PM**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:02 P.M.**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

**PRESENT: Richard (Dick) Marshall (Chairman), Tom Walsh (Vice-Chairman) (arrived at 6:05 pm), Christopher Stelmach, Matt Reed, Paul Scarpetti, Brett Scott, and David Boutin (Town Council Representative)**

**ALTERNATES: Mike Somers**

**EXCUSED:**

**STAFF: Nicholas Williams (Town Planner)**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 6, 2020**

**July 6, 2020 Meeting – D. Boutin motioned to approve the minutes of the July 6, 2020 meeting with amendments. Seconded by M. Reed.**

D. Boutin: Page 2, Line 81 should read “conditionally” instead of “continually”.

Brett Scott should be listed as a full Board member.

**Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.**

**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

**1. CONTINUED PRESENTATION OF THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN**

Representatives from Police, Fire, and DPW were present.

M. Reed and D. Boutin were appointed at the last meeting to speak with Fire, Police, and DPW. M. Reed reported their discussions and recommendations by going over a letter he provided to Planning Board members dated July 15, 2020. D. Marshall commented on the recommendations and made clarifications and suggestions. Fire Chief Burkush discussed the work that has been done relative to down-

46 sizing and alternatives to their fleet over the past few years as well as their recommendations. Discus-  
47 sions ensued between the Board and Assistant Fire Chief Colburn over reuse of chaise's and control-  
48 ling rust on the vehicles. T. Walsh asked about the use of the boats. Assistant Chief Colburn stated that  
49 they have been used a lot in the last couple of years for rescues as the river and conservation area gets  
50 more use. He also stated that they repowered Boat 1 so when it comes time they will be looking to re-  
51 place only the boat, not the motor. The life expectancy of an inflatable boat was discussed.

52  
53 Discussion ensued between DPW department head, Earl Labonte, and the Board. Mr. Labonte stated  
54 that the floater car is available to employees to go to meetings and events, however, individuals do not  
55 want to drive it. It was slated to be replaced with a police vehicle. If town employees use their own car  
56 they cannot be paid mileage because there is a vehicle available for their use. The other assessor and  
57 town clerk used to use it constantly. Mr. Marshall asked if there is anything wrong with it. M. Reed  
58 stated that it just has to be made available. Mr. Labonte discussed the engineers vehicle. Mr. Labonte,  
59 Assistant Fire Chief Colburn, and the Board also discussed potential vehicle purchases and rotations.

60  
61 Andre Garron (Town Administrator) commended the Board members and department heads for work-  
62 ing together for the benefit of the CIP and doing it in an efficient manner. He stated that it is his hope  
63 that the structuring changes can wait until there is a more structured well-rounded CIP committee next  
64 year and that he would like to get the capital needs of the Town to where they need to be for the future.

65  
66 T. Walsh stated that he believes that when budgeting the \$200,000 it should be a different line item and  
67 be put towards the historical town hall and the citizens should decide if they want to spend the money  
68 there. He stated that he believes that building can be historically repaired and improved and that there is  
69 need for it in Hooksett to hold meetings and conferences for the town and it's people.

70  
71 M. Reed stated that he would like to take off the town pool car and the South Bow land purchase and  
72 take those into consideration next year.

73  
74 Police Chief Bouchard stated that there is no interest in selling the South Bow property.

75  
76 ***M. Reed motioned to: 1) Remove the pool car; and 2) Remove the South Bow land tower purchase***  
77 ***from the CIP. Seconded by D. Boutin.***

78  
79 M. Reed: The rest of the items for discussion are not slated for a few more years.

80  
81 T. Walsh: We have the ability to move things around. If the Board agrees with the merits of the Town  
82 Hall we can move it. It will still go through Town Council, the Budget Committee, and then to the town  
83 people to decide this year. A lot has been done with grants and it is not that far from being done. It is a  
84 worthy asset. I think the people should have a choice now and by pushing it out for five years the peo-  
85 ple are not being given a choice.

86  
87 Roll call

88 D. Boutin: Yes

89 B. Scott: No

90 P. Scarpetti: No

91 T. Walsh: No

92 C. Stelmach: No

93 M. Reed: Yes

94 D. Marshall: No

95

96 **Motion fails with a vote of 5-2.**

97

98 *P. Scarpetti motioned to: 1) Remove the pool car; 2) Remove the South Bow land tower purchase;*  
99 *and 3) Move the \$200,000 and put that towards repair of the old town hall. Seconded by T. Walsh.*

100

101 D. Boutin: No

102 B. Scott: Yes

103 P. Scarpetti: Yes

104 T. Walsh: Yes

105 C. Stelmach: Yes

106 M. Reed: Yes

107 D. Marshall: Yes

108

109 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**

110

111 D. Marshall: In the future, the CIP Committee will have a clear set of rules and guidelines to go by.  
112 The work Matt and Dave did is fantastic. They have set the tone for what should be done and I am  
113 happy with the way Fire, Police, and DPW department heads handled the request from the Planning  
114 Board.

115

116 A. Garron: We would love to have a volunteer from the Planning Board to sit on the CIP Committee  
117 for next year.

118

### 119 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW AND PUBLIC HEARING**

120

#### 121 **2. SPRINGWOOD HOMES AND DEVELOPMENT CORP. #2020-20**

122 **Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-1**

123 **Commercial site plan**

124

125 D. Marshall: Staff is this complete?

126

127 N. Williams: Yes. They provided access to the abutting lot for the fire apparatus to access the cistern.

128

129 *D. Boutin motioned to find the commercial site plan complete for Springwood Homes and Develop-*  
130 *ment Corp., #2020-20, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-1. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion***  
131 ***carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

132

133 Jon Rokeh (Rokeh Consulting): These are the second and third lots of the three lot subdivision. This  
134 will be the commercial building with offices in front and garage bays in the back. Access is through a  
135 common driveway. The entrance comes off of Zapora and into the commercial site. The Fire Depart-  
136 ment wanted an approved access which we added to the plan. Bruce Thomas provided comments and  
137 we have addressed everything. He sent us an email stating that he is all set with the engineering com-  
138 ments for both sites. Springwood Homes is paved, landscaped, has lighting, and the drainage goes into

139 a detention pond on the far northerly lot. The water is treated and released into the existing pond. This  
140 is similar to what you already looked at with Scott Bussiere's project.

141  
142 P. Scarpetti: As far as the building, you mentioned it would be almost exact. We have changed our  
143 town regulations. I would be fine if it is the exact colors as the other buildings so it looks like one pro-  
144 ject.

145  
146 T. Walsh: Can you give us a highlight of the landscape plan?

147  
148 J. Rokeh: We put some street trees along the front and shrubs as you are coming up to Zapora. Scott's  
149 driveway has a tree in the middle. There are perennials along both sides of the commercial building.  
150 The Fire Department wants to have four sided access. It is hard to put landscape islands in the middle.  
151 We did plantings along the far side on the edge going along to the pond.

152  
153 D. Marshall: I am suggesting that he continues with the use of the boulders and rocks. That was a crea-  
154 tive use and looks really nice.

155  
156 T. Walsh: We are saying we would like to have the buildings continuous. We could also say we want  
157 the landscape continuous.

158  
159 P. Scarpetti: What is there going to be for signage?

160  
161 J. Rokeh: There would be a monument sign in the center of Springwood Homes. American Asphalt  
162 also wants to have a standalone sign. There would be one monument sign per lot. I can add that to the  
163 plan.

164  
165 Open public hearing.

166  
167 Open to public comments.

168 No public comments.

169 Close to public comments.

170  
171 Close public hearing.

172  
173 ***T. Walsh motioned to approve the commercial site plan for Springwood Homes and Development***  
174 ***Corp., #2020-20, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-1 with the following conditions: 1) The***  
175 ***The landscape design is the same as on the other sites; 2) The colors are the same as the buildings***  
176 ***on the sites; and 3) The signage is added to the plan. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion carried***  
177 **unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

178  
179 **3. AMERICAN ASPHALT PAVING #2020-21**  
180 **Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-2**  
181 **Commercial site plan**

182  
183 Jon Rokeh (Rokeh Consulting): This property is owned by Springwood Homes. They are doing a con-  
184 tract for sale. This lot is cleared and a parking lot has been put in. It made sense to combine the two

185 sites with the drainage and grading. American Asphalt Paving will eventually have a garage in the back  
186 of the property. It will be a stick built garage with siding and shingles.

187  
188 D. Marshall: With the plans submitted in our package it appears as if the building has been moved.  
189

190 J. Rokeh: Yes. He needed room to swing his vehicles differently. I pushed it and put it against the  
191 back. The plan that was approved by the Town Engineer has the revision.  
192

193 ***D. Boutin motioned to find the commercial site plan complete for American Asphalt Paving, #2020-***  
194 ***21, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-2. Seconded by M. Reed. Motion carries unanimously***  
195 ***with a vote of 7-0.***  
196

197 J. Rokeh: This is a gravel storage yard. He needs it to put his equipment on site. He has pavers and ex-  
198 cavators that are associated with his business. We have all the drainage being directed into the pond.  
199 There will be some landscaping in front. The wetlands are behind and in front of it.  
200

201 P. Scarpetti: How much have they encroached into the wetlands?  
202

203 J. Rokeh: They are not in the wetlands at all.  
204

205 P. Scarpetti: They have a metal storage building. How will they screen that if it is going to stay. I have  
206 seen trucks but now they are piling asphalt. What are we approving as far as what is going to be on that  
207 site?  
208

209 J. Rokeh: The trucks and equipment. The storage container is there now because he does not have a  
210 garage. He only graded in the front part of this lot. Those things can be pushed to the back of the lot,  
211 screened, and out of public view.  
212

213 P. Scarpetti: I would like to see what this will look like and I want to see more landscaping. I want to  
214 know if they are going to be backhauling and stockpiling asphalt.  
215

216 T. Walsh: I agree with Paul. I did not realize this was done illegally. I have my concerns with how this  
217 will look. In terms of landscaping, there is nothing planted on the north side. If someone is looking at  
218 tis from the corner of Zapora and By-pass 28, would like it so they are not seeing a condex box and  
219 piles of materials.  
220

221 C. Stelmach: I do not want to see piles of asphalt. Is he planning on paving this? Where is he is park-  
222 ing his equipment? If oil leaks where is that going to go? Into that pond?  
223

224 J. Rokeh: Yes. Into the retention pond and the fore-bay.  
225

226 D. Boutin: Can we get a definitive answer on if he will be storing asphalt on that site?  
227

228 J. Rokeh: I believe he wants to back haul and have storage piles on site from time to time.  
229

230 D. Boutin: I share the sentiments of Chris as far as not storing asphalt on that property.  
231

232 *T. Walsh motioned to continue the public hearing for the commercial site plan for American Asphalt*  
233 *Paving, #2020-21, Londonderry Turnpike, Map 32, Lot 25-2 until August 3, 2020 at which time: 1)*  
234 *Definitive answers as to what will be stored on the property will be provided; and 2) Definitive plans*  
235 *on screening and landscaping will be provided. Seconded by C. Stelmach.*  
236

237 Open public hearing.

238

239 Open to public comments.

240 No public comments.

241 Close to public comments.

242

243 Close public hearing.

244

245 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

246

247 **4. DIANE ROBERTS CASEY #2020-22**

248 **20 Jacob Avenue, Map 48, Lot 26-2**

249 **3 lot subdivision**

250

251 T. Walsh stepped down. M. Somers will be voting.

252

253 *D. Boutin motioned to find the plan complete for a 3 lot subdivision for Diane Roberts Casey, #2020-*  
254 *22, 20 Jacob Avenue, Map 48, Lot 26-2. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously***  
255 ***with a vote of 7-0.***  
256

257 Jacques Belanger (Surveyor that prepared the application): This is a lot on the corner of Jacobs Ave.  
258 and Brookview Drive. It was created in 2000 when they sub-divided and is 4.75 acres. The intent is to  
259 break that up into three lots. The large lot will be 2.35 acres with access to remain on Jacobs's Ave.  
260 The other two would have access of off Brookview Drive. One lot is 1.12 acres and the other is 1.28  
261 acres. The proposed lots will have on site septic and municipal water from the Brookview subdivision.  
262 The existing lot will remain on residential well and standard septic. There are some wetlands to the east  
263 and those have been mapped. This will require a state sub-division application which has been applied  
264 for.

265

266 D. Marshall: Lots 3 and 4 will have municipal water?

267

268 J. Belanger: Yes.

269

270 Open public hearing.

271

272 Open to public comments.

273 No public comments.

274 Close to public comments.

275

276 Close public hearing.

277

278 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the 3 lot subdivision for Diane Roberts Casey, #2020-22, 20 Jacob*  
279 *Avenue, Map 48, Lot 26-2. Seconded by B. Scott. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
280

281 T. Walsh returned. M. Somers is no longer a voting member.  
282

283 **5. THE PAMELA A. LAVOIE REV. TRUST #2020-23**  
284 **136 & 138 West River Road, Map 24, Lots 52 & 53**  
285 **Lot line adjustment**  
286

287 D. Marshall: This is a request to waive the requirements of Items 4, 18, 21, 24 and 28 on the lot line  
288 adjustment checklist - Full boundary and detail survey for lot 24-52 of the Development Regula-  
289 tions/PZ Zoning Ordinances. "Full boundary and detail survey has been done on lot 24-53 and Parcel  
290 A. Using plan of record for lot 24-52 and showing part of house; Increasing the size of the smaller par-  
291 cel while leaving lot 24-53 and is still almost 350' from house lot 24-52; The cost to do a full survey  
292 and locate all detail on lot 24-52 would be significant."  
293

294 *D. Boutin motioned to grant the waiver for the lot line adjustment for The Pamela A. Lavoie Rev.*  
295 *Trust, #2020-23, 136 & 138 West River Road, Map 24, Lots 52 & 53. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. Mo-*  
296 *tion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
297

298 Joseph Wichert (Joseph M. Wichert, LLS, Land Surveyor): There is a house, pool, and barn on the  
299 property. Their abutter to the rear, Lot 52, is Mr. Doyon (The Richard W. Doyon & Judith A. Doyon  
300 Joint Living Trust). The proposal consists of adding a strip that is 55 x 150 to the rear of the Lavoie  
301 property. We are going to take 8,240 sq. ft. off of the 20 acre Doyon property and annex that to the La-  
302 voie property. Currently that property is zoned MDR. You need 1 1/2 acres and 200' of frontage. We  
303 have 150' of frontage on the Lavoie property and 50' of frontage on the Doyon property. The Lavoie  
304 property is currently 1 acre. The Doyon property is 20.1 acres. She the application be approved, the La-  
305 voie property would increase to 1.10 acres and the Doyon property would decrease to 19.9 acres. Be-  
306 cause we are adding to the smaller lot and larger lot is over 5 acres, we don't need state sub-division  
307 approval. We are not changing any of the curb cuts on the roads so we do not need a DOT permit. This  
308 is being done to allow for future improvement on the Lavoie property.  
309

310 Open Public Hearing  
311

312 Open to public comments.

313 No public comments.

314 Close to public comments.  
315

316 Close Public Hearing  
317

318 *D. Boutin motioned to approve the lot line adjustment for The Pamela A. Lavoie Rev. Trust*  
319 *#2020-23, 136 & 138 West River Road, Map 24, Lots 52 & 53. Seconded by C. Stelmach. Motion*  
320 *carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*  
321

322 **EXTENSION REQUEST (PUBLIC HEARING PER DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS)**  
323

324 **6. FOREST OAKS, LLC #2020-24**

325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371

**49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lot 33-1  
Extension Request**

Doug MacGuire (The Dubai Group): This request is for a one year extension. Over the last year, we have been moving forward, however, state permitting as far as the AOT permit has been lagging. The employees are all working from home and have been for several months. We are just about finalized but don't have that permit. We would like to be able to finalize that permit. It is the last item we have to take care off.

*T. Walsh motioned to approve the extension request for Forest Oaks, LLC #2020-24, 49 Mammoth Road, Map 45, Lot 33-1. Seconded by M. Reed. Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

**7. STARBUCKS AT MERCHANTS PLAZA  
1275, 1277 AND 1279 Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lot 46 & Map 31, Lot 1  
Impact fee appeal**

N. Williams: I provided everyone with correspondence from our legal counsel. We have been looking for a compromise on the northern most access point of the site. They have altered the northern most access point to reflect traffic to turn northbound only onto DW highway. They are amicable to making that change to the site plan as well as paying \$10,000 for the impact fee.

T. Walsh: Are they creating an amended site plan with the driveway changes?

N. Williams: How would you like to handle that procedurally? The most appropriate thing would be to have another public hearing if there is an amendment to the driveway design.

D. Marshall: That means the only issue before the Board would be the impact fee.

T. Walsh: We are asked to do things correctly and by the book. I reviewed our statute and ordinance. I refer back to 31(f), paragraph 8. I agree. If a new development replaces an existing use then the fee is to be calculated as the net fee between the former use and that of the replacement use. My interpretation is that it doesn't matter that it was never charged an impact fee to begin with. We didn't impose impact fees when those buildings were created. To create an actual net is to figure out what the assessed impact fee would be for the two existing structures versus what the new one is and do the math from there. The driveway is a different issue. I don't know how that would play into the impact fees. I am trying to be fair and do things by the book.

Attorney John Sokul (Hinckley Allen): The amount would be \$11,411.32 if you take the netting you described. That is what I offered with the first site plan application that we submitted in accordance with what I thought should be done. The offer came to be due to some of the comments the Board members made about the condition of approval that said there would be no left turns out. We were thinking about putting up a sign that said no left turns out. It was insinuated by a few Board members that might not be enough so we came up with something a little more robust. I view it is meeting a conditional of approval rather than needing an amended site plan. The condition said we needed to come up with something that said left hand turns would be restricted and that is what we did. As far as the



372 \$10,000, there is an RSA that was amended in 2012 that says you cannot assess impact fees for im-  
373 provements to a state highway.

374  
375 D. Boutin: I want to address the site plan. I can not see how it is going to work. This is not going to  
376 stop left hand turns.

377  
378 Attorney Sokul: We have a raised island gearing all traffic to turn right. Somebody would have to de-  
379 viate and do an abrupt left turn over a raised island.

380  
381 D. Boutin: In this configuration they could do that.

382  
383 Attorney Sokul: I have a traffic engineer that disagrees with you.

384  
385 P. Scarpetti: Thank you for making that change. I think if we can work to make this so they don't have  
386 to come back to the Board again it makes sense to do that. I would like to see them get going on this.  
387 As far as the \$10,000 we need to have a track record. I think we should review the netting to make sure  
388 that is correct. I don't want to play lets make a deal.

389  
390 Attorney Sokul: The total impact fee that we originally suggested would be reasonable.

391  
392 M. Reed: They have worked with us on the no left hand turn. It is not our job to control what people  
393 will do.

394  
395 T. Walsh: Are you back to the \$14,000 for the impact fee?

396  
397 Attorney Sokul: \$11,411.32 is what I proposed and what would be acceptable.

398  
399 ***M. Reed motioned to accept the impact fee of \$11,411.32 for Starbucks at Merchants Plaza, 1275,  
400 1277 AND 1279 Hooksett Road, Map 25, Lot 46 & Map 31, Lot 1. Seconded by B. Scott.***

401  
402 M. Reed: I agree with the standard of netting.

403  
404 T. Walsh: I thought the \$11,411.32 was the difference in our ordinance.

405  
406 M. Reed: It is.

407  
408 **Roll Call**

409 D. Boutin: No

410 B. Scott: Yes

411 P. Scarpetti: Yes

412 T. Walsh: Yes

413 C. Stelmach: Yes

414 M. Reed: Yes

415 D. Marshall: Yes

416  
417 **Motion carries with a vote of 6-1.**

418

419 D. Boutin: This is a change from what the public had an opportunity to comment on. It is a change  
420 from what the Board was concerned with from the beginning. The resolution had not been reached at  
421 the time of public input.

422  
423 N. Williams: Board motioned to prohibit a left hand turn. The site plan does not have to be revisited if  
424 the site plan has been met.

425  
426 ***P. Scarpetti motioned: 1) That the condition of approval for a no left hand turn has been satisfied;***  
427 ***and 2) The Chairman is authorized to sign the plans. Seconded by M. Reed.***  
428

429 M. Reed: I appreciate you working with us.

430  
431 D. Marshall: This has to be approved by DOT.

432  
433 Attorney Sokul: They are satisfied with the design.

434  
435 D. Marshall: We need that as a matter of record.

436  
437 Attorney Sokul: We are waiting for the driveway permit.

438  
439 D. Marshall: I need that in the file.

440  
441 Roll Call

442 D. Boutin: Yes

443 B. Scott: Yes

444 P. Scarpetti: Yes

445 T. Walsh: Yes

446 C. Stelmach: Yes

447 M. Reed: Yes

448 D. Marshall: Yes

449  
450 **Motion carries with a vote of 7-0.**

451  
452 **8. GORDON WELCH**  
453 **1253 Hooksett Road, Map 31, Lot 91**  
454 **Conceptual discussion for site plan**  
455

456 Gordon Welch (RCA Holdings has property under contract with Mr. Houle): I have the property under  
457 contract with current owner and it is under discussion for commercial use.

458  
459 N. Williams: They were in front of the Board in May for a two lot subdivision. This has lot frontage on  
460 Whitehall Rd. This is the lot that the stone house is currently on. We received a demolition permit ap-  
461 plication about two weeks ago and held the public hearing. Based on the community feedback I thought  
462 it would be a good idea to bring Mr. Welch in to present the Board with a conceptual site plan.

463  
464 G. Welch: I have only entered into contract with Mr. Houle for the larger lot.

465

466 N. Williams: The other lot was Camp K-9 and they found another location.

467

468 G. Welch: Our intent is to develop a self storage facility.

469

470 D. Marshall: You will demo the stone house?

471

472 G. Welch: Initially I looked at coming in Whitehall Road and staying away from the house, however,  
473 the wetlands that were created have separated that lot and do not allow enough viable building area for  
474 my use. In working with Mr. Houle they came up with this scenario to make this economically viable  
475 which pushed me further to the house. That along with other restraints make the house problematic for  
476 me.

477

478 D. Marshall: There is a petition with 8,000 signatures to save the house.

479

480 G. Welch: That is nationwide. I understand there are people whom are pationate about the house. I  
481 have looked at retaining it, however, making it part of this project is not economically viable.

482

483 B. Scott: I understand people like that place but I don't think it is our right to tell anyone what they can  
484 or cannot do with it.

485

486 G. Welch: It has been on the market for over 10 years without any serious inquiries.

487

488 D. Marshall: What did the townspeople expect of the Planning Board? What do they think we can or  
489 cannot do?

490

491 D. Boutin: Nick asked him to come in to talk about this.

492

493 D. Marshall: We are a Board that is responsive to the community.

494

495 P. Scarpetti: Gordon can do what he wants with the property, but if there is an opportunity to save the  
496 house I think that should be looked at. If he came in from Whitehall maybe the Conservation Commis-  
497 sion would help him to do the wetlands crossing. Can you come to terms with him to take the whole  
498 piece or is it out of touch? This was for sale because it was overpriced.

499

500 G. Welch: I inquired about this a few years ago and it was a short discussion. It then became viable. I  
501 hear what you are saying. It is the volume and location. For me to get enough buildable area is pretty  
502 close to impossible. We have looked at this many ways for a long time.

503

504 P. Scarpetti: It does bottle neck there.

505

506 G. Welch: DOT is favoring an entrance at the southern most portion of the lot. There is a built in mid-  
507 dle turn lane there already. This would be a low impact use. The physical aspect of the structure itself is  
508 not good. I agree it has a certain unique style to it. Inside it has concrete decks on both floors. There are  
509 concrete beams in the basement.

510

511 N. Williams: The first alternative was to use it for his office space. It was also discussed to possibly  
512 utilizing the masonry from the house on the new structure.

513

514 G. Welch: I would be willing to repurpose the stone from the house. Salvage rights, cataloguing, what-  
515 ever the Heritage Commission found appropriate. I still have one meeting with them to discuss the al-  
516 ternatives to reach some sort of compromise.

517

518 T. Walsh: I thought this was waiting for a developer. I agree that the problem with these situations is  
519 we don't own it. If you could repurpose things that would be great. I think the recommendation would  
520 be a 90 day moratorium to potentially find another use and I am agreeable to that.

521

522 D. Marshall: You don't expect to be back in front of us for a couple of months?

523

524 G. Welch: Correct.

525

526 C. Stelmach: Paul you have been inside the house. Is it physically impossible to move the house?

527

528 P. Scarpetti: The only thing that is wood are the windows and the door. The rest is concrete and free  
529 standing.

530

531 **OTHER BUSINESS**

532

533 **None.**

534

535 **ADJOURNMENT**

536

537 ***D. Boutin motioned to adjourn at 8:10 pm. Seconded by M. Reed.***

538

539 **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7 -0.**

540

541 **The next meeting of the Planning Board will be held August 3, 2020 at 6:00 pm.**

542

543 **Respectfully submitted by,**

544

545 **/s/ AnnMarie White**

546

547 **AnnMarie White**

548 **Recording Clerk**