

1 **Official**

2

3 **MINUTES**

4 **HOOKSETT PLANNING BOARD MEETING**
5 **HOOKSETT TOWN HALL CHAMBERS (Room 105)**

6 **35 Main Street**

7 **Monday, September 18, 2023**

8 **6:00 PM**

9

10 **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 6:00 P.M.**

11

12 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

13

14 **PROOF OF POSTING**

15

16 **NOMINATIONS & APPOINTMENTS**

17

18 None

19

20 **INTRODUCE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD**

21

22 **PRESENT: Chris Stelmach (Chairman), Mike Somers (Vice-Chairman), Sheena Gilbert, Paul**
23 **Scarpetti, D. Winterton, and James Sullivan (Town Council Representative)**

24

25 **ALTERNATES: Denise Pichette Volk**

26

27 **EXCUSED: Robert Duhaime (Alternate) and David Russel (Alternate)**

28

29 **NOT PRESENT:**

30

31 **STAFF: Elizabeth Robidoux (Town Planner) and Dana Pendergast (Code Enforcement Officer)**

32

33 D. Pichette Volk will be a voting member this evening.

34

35 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES 08/21/23**

36

37 *M. Somers motioned to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2023 Planning Board meeting.*

38 *Seconded by D. Winterton. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

39 Ridgeback Self Storage, LLC will be the first application taken this evening.

40

41 **COMPLETENESS REVIEW & PUBLIC HEARING**

42 **1. WICKASEE PROPERTIES, LLC represented by TFMORAN, INC.**

43 **6 Leonard Avenue**

44 **Map 41 Lot 93**

45 **Subdivision & Development Regulations Waivers**

46
47 Matt Routhier (TF Moran): We were continued due to some missing information. That information has
48 been resubmitted. We are before you to carve out the existing house located on Leonard Ave. The ex-
49 isting lot is 4.061 acres. The intent is to carve out 1.01 acres for the existing house leaving the 3.04
50 acres of undeveloped land. That proposed lot has a private sewer easement running through property
51 which is maintained by SNHU. We are asking for waivers due to site plan regulations.

52
53 E. Robidoux: The applicant proposes a 2 lot (minor) subdivision proposed at 6 Leonard Avenue. The
54 property is located in the Performance Zone and the parent lot consists of 4.061 acres. The purpose of
55 the plan is to subdivide off one lot which will consist of 3.043 acres, leaving the parent lot which con-
56 tains an existing 3 story residential home with 1.017 acres. No development is proposed at this time. If
57 future development of the new lot occurs, access will be from Cushing Avenue. Sewer would come
58 from Leonard Avenue and the appropriate easements would be created at that time. There is an existing
59 Sewer Easement agreement granted from CB Sullivan to SNHU, which is included as part of file.

60
61 At this time, the application can be viewed as complete. Staff recommends accepting jurisdiction of the
62 plan this evening and proceeding with the public hearing. As no development is proposed at this time, it
63 is unlikely a site walk would be warranted.

64
65 ***M. Somers motioned to find the revised plan submitted August 29, 2023 for the Subdivision & Devel-***
66 ***opment Regulations Waivers for Wickasee Properties, LLC represented by TFMORAN, INC. 6***
67 ***Leonard Avenue Map 41 Lot 93 complete. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously***
68 ***with a vote of 7-0.***

69
70 ***D. Winterton motioned to find the subdivision & development regulations waivers for Wickasee***
71 ***Properties, LLC represented by TFMoran, Inc., 6 Leonard Avenue, Map 41 Lot 93 has regional im-***
72 ***pect. Seconded by M. Somers.***

73
74 J. Sullivan: This is the first time of the proposals that I approved that references regional impact.

75
76 E. Robidoux: The law has changed recently and the state is getting strict with it.

77
78 **Roll Call**

79 **J. Sullivan - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

80 **D. Winterton - No. It is a small project.**

81 **P. Scarpetti - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

82 **M. Somers - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

83 **S. Gilbert - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

84 **D. Pichette Volk - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

85 **C. Stelmach - No. The criteria is not reached.**

86
87 **Motion fails with a vote of 7-0.**

88
89 ***M. Somers motioned to accept jurisdiction of the site plan/subdivision plan before the Board for***
90 ***Wickasee Properties, LLC, Map 41, Lot 93, 6 Leonard Avenue. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion***
91 ***carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

92

93 Open public hearing.

94 No public comments.

95

96 ***M. Somers motioned to close the public comment at this time for the 2 lot subdivision plan prepared***
97 ***for Wickasee Properties, LLC, before the Board. The Board reserves the right to reopen floor com-***
98 ***ment at a later date until such time as the public hearing is officially closed. Seconded by D. Winterton.***
99 **Motion carries unanimously with a vote of 7-0.**

100

101 E. Robidoux: The applicant has requested the following waivers, which staff supports:

102

- 103 1. Checklist items 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32, to not provide the location and description of
104 existing buildings, easements, private or public trails, the name and location of parks and open
105 spaces, location of existing roads, scenic roads or driveways, location of existing septic system
106 leach fields, existing utilities and existing water supply all within either 100 or 200 feet of the
107 development as noted in the checklist.
- 108 2. Part II, Section 2.01.15 to not provide roadway details of existing streets.
- 109 3. Part II, Section 2.01.23, to not provide information on the area within 200 feet of the property.
- 110 4. Part II, Section 2.02.10 to not provide soils information as no earthwork activities are being pro-
111 posed at this time.

112

113 ***M. Somers motioned to grant a waiver from the Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, to not***
114 ***comply with the following sections of the Subdivision Checklist: 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31 & 32 as***
115 ***after review of the waiver request, the Board finds that strict conformity to the regulations would***
116 ***pose an unnecessary hardship to the applicant, and the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and***
117 ***intent of the regulations. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-***
118 **0.**

119

120 ***M. Somers motioned to grant a waiver from the Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, Part II,***
121 ***Section 2.01.15 to not provide roadway details of existing streets;***
122 ***Section 2.10.23 to not provide information on the area within 200 feet of the property***
123 ***Section 2.02.10 to not provide soils information as no earthwork activities are proposed at this time. After***
124 ***review of the waiver requests, the Board finds that strict conformity to the regulations would pose an***
125 ***unnecessary hardship to the applicant, and the waivers will properly carry out the spirit and intent of***
126 ***the regulations.***

127

128 ***Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

129

130 S. Gilbert: Is there already an existing building?

131

132 M. Routhier: Yes.

133

134 Close public hearing.

135

136 ***M. Somers motioned to approve the plan for the Subdivision & Development Regulations Waivers for***
137 ***Wickasee Properties, LLC represented by TFMORAN, INC. 6 Leonard Avenue***
138 ***Map 41 Lot 93. Seconded by D. Winterton.***

139

140 ***D. Winterton withdrew his second.***

141
142 **Findings of Fact**

143 The Board finds the plan as presented meets provisions and standards provided in Part I of the
144 Development Regulations, by means of details on the plan, the granting of a waiver, or will be presented
145 as a condition of approval.

146 The plan provides safe and efficient vehicular/pedestrian access and the design and construction proposed
147 are adequate to accommodate the anticipated volume of traffic proposed by the development.

148 The Board finds the stormwater management plan as proposed is designed to control the post develop-
149 ment run off so that it does not predevelopment runoff, or the stormwater plan adequately mitigates the
150 increase.

151
152 The Board finds the utility construction standards are met.

153 ***M. Somers motioned to agree with the above noted findings of fact. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously 7-0.***

154
155
156 ***After review and deliberation of the application before the Board for the subdivision & development***
157 ***regulations waivers for Wickasee Properties, LLC represented by TFMoran, Inc., 6 Leonard Ave-***
158 ***nue, Map 41 Lot 93 the Board finds the application has satisfied the general requirements of the***
159 ***Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, or in cases where the regulation could not be met, has***
160 ***satisfied the waiver requirements. Therefore, M. Somers motioned to approve the plan, pursuant to***
161 ***RSA 676:4, I, Completed Application and D. Winterton seconded with the following conditions:***

162
163 ***Conditional Items Prior to Signed Plans:***

- 164 1. ***All review fees are paid in full.***
- 165 2. ***A single (22" x 34") mylar, 6 paper copies (22" x 34"), 1 paper copy (11' x 17"), and 1 digital***
166 ***PDF copy (CD, email, or flash drive), of the final plan are submitted to the Office of the Town***
167 ***Planner within the Community Development Department. If the applicant wishes to retain a***
168 ***signed copy, include additional copies. The above-mentioned copies shall be retained for Town***
169 ***records.***
- 170 3. ***All granted waivers shall be noted on the plan.***
- 171 4. ***All outstanding comments from the Town Engineer shall be addressed to the Town Engineer's***
172 ***satisfaction.***
- 173 5. ***All outstanding State and local permits shall be received and noted on the plan.***
- 174 6. ***The addition of the Time Limits for Fulfilling Conditions notes shall be placed on the cover***
175 ***sheet of the plan set.***

176
177 ***Conditional Items Prior to Construction***

- 178 1. ***Applicant agrees to remit payment of all sureties/bonds and escrow fees in full. These sure-***
179 ***ties/bonds and escrow fees may be determined after the Notice of Decision has been issued. All***
180 ***sureties/bonds will be professionally calculated by the Town Engineer, and the applicant will***
181 ***be notified in writing of the required bond amount.***
- 182 2. ***Hooksett Conservation Commission review and comments in writing shall be provided for any***
183 ***wetland crossings.***
- 184 3. ***Confirmation from the applicable Water Precinct and the Hooksett Wastewater Department***
185 ***shall be provided indicating that final utility print submissions have been reviewed and ap-***
186 ***proved by their respective commissions and/or consulting engineers.***

- 187 4. *Copies of any outstanding permits required by NH DOT, NH DES or other State agencies shall*
188 *be forwarded to the Office of the Town Planner, if applicable.*
189 5. *The applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after*
190 *a. All sureties are submitted and approved,*
191 *b. Site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agreement is*
192 *signed and submitted.*
193 *c. The plans are signed and recorded*
194 *d. Contractor's schedule of work is submitted.*
195 6. *All permits required by Code Enforcement.*
196 7. *Applicant agrees to compliance and construction monitoring by authorized Town Officials.*
197

198 **Conditional Items Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy**

- 199 1. *Impact fees assessed per the Town Impact Fee Ordinance received by Certified check no later*
200 *than 10 business days prior to requesting a Certificate of Occupancy. For a breakdown of the*
201 *calculation of this fee, please contact the Office of the Town Planner.*
202 2. *All property taxes due are paid.*
203 3. *Final site inspection by Fire personnel, Code Enforcement and the Town Engineer.*
204 4. *Two copies of As Builts are forwarded to Code Enforcement.*
205

206 *Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*
207

- 208 5. **CUMMINGS PRINTING represented by KEACH-NORDSTROM ASSOC., INC.**
209 **4 Peters Brook Road**
210 **Map 24 Lot 35-6**
211 **Amended Industrial Site Plan**
212

213 *D. Winterton motioned to find the plan for an amended industrial site plan for Cummings Printing*
214 *represented by Keach-Nordstrom Assoc., Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6 complete as*
215 *revised. Seconded by J. Sullivan. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.*
216

217 E. Robidoux: The proposal is a proposed expansion of the existing building to be completed in two
218 phases. Phase I will provide 2,975 SF of storage space, and Phase II will provide 6,125 SF of shipping
219 and receiving space at some point in the future. The proposal includes modification of the stormwater
220 management provisions.
221

222 J. Sullivan: Is this still 25' from another property line?
223

224 D. Pendergast: Yes.
225

226 *D. Winterton motioned to find the application for an amended industrial site plan for Cummings*
227 *Printing represented by Keach-Nordstrom Assoc., Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6 has*
228 *regional impact. Seconded by M. Somers.*
229

230 **Roll Call**

231 **J. Sullivan - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

232 **D. Winterton - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

233 **P. Scarpetti - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

234 **M. Somers - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

235 **S. Gilbert - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

236 **D. Pichette Volk - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

237 **C. Stelmach - No. This does not meet the criteria for regional impact.**

238
239 **Motion fails with a vote of 7-0.**

240
241 Open public hearing.

242 No public comments.

243 Close public comment.

244
245 P. Scarpetti: The picture of the back of building looks like it needs a painter. What are the plans for the
246 back?

247
248 Jason Lopez showed additional photos and stated the mechanical equipment was not going to be
249 moved.

250
251 Mark Morse was in attendance.

252
253 P. Scarpetti: The back looks fine in a different photo.

254
255 ***M. Somers motioned to close the public hearing for an amended industrial site plan for Cummings***
256 ***Printing represented by Keach-Nordstrom Assoc., Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6. Se-***
257 ***conded by P. Scarpetti. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

258
259 A waiver is requested from Part I, Section 16.04 (2), Lighting Plans for the following reason: The
260 property received site plan approval in 1998 on which the two subject wall mounted lights were ap-
261 proved. This application seeks to remove the existing security lights on the rear of the building and
262 “slide” them out 35 feet, the width of the additions. The two replacement lights are noted to be LED
263 and dark sky compliant.

264
265 ***M. Somers motioned to grant a waiver for Cummings Printing represented by Keach-Nordstrom As-***
266 ***soc., Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6 from the Town of Hooksett Development Regula-***
267 ***tions, Part I, Section 16.04 (2), Lighting Plan Requirement to not submit a lighting plan with this***
268 ***application. The proposed additions are to the rear of the existing building, no new light poles are***
269 ***proposed, and the light levels will not change at the rear property line. After reviewing the waiver***
270 ***request, the Board finds that strict conformity to the regulations would pose an unnecessary hard-***
271 ***ship to the applicant, and the waiver will properly carry out the spirit and intent of the regulations.***
272 ***Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

273
274 **Findings of Fact**

275
276 The Board finds the plan as presented meets provisions and standards provided in Part I of the Develop-
277 ment Regulations, by means of details on the plan, the granting of a waiver, or will be presented as a
278 condition of approval.

279

280 The plan provides safe and efficient vehicular/pedestrian access and the design and construction proposed
281 are adequate to accommodate the anticipated volume of traffic proposed by the development.

282
283 The Board finds the plan provides adequate parking for the site and meets the parking density require-
284 ments for the use.

285
286 The Board finds the submission of a landscape plan is not required as no changes are proposed to the
287 existing landscaping.

288
289 The Board finds the stormwater management plan as proposed is designed to control the post develop-
290 ment run off so that it does not exceed predevelopment runoff, or the stormwater plan adequately miti-
291 gates the increase.

292
293 The Board finds the utility construction standards are met.

294
295 The Board finds the exterior lighting, solid waste storage and snow storage provisions, are adequate for
296 the proposed development, or a waiver has been granted.

297
298 The Board finds the erosion and sediment control plan meets the Town regulations and requirements.

299
300 The Board finds the architectural design requirements have been met after review of the rendering pro-
301 vided by the applicant.

302
303 ***M. Somers motioned to agree with the above noted findings of fact for Cummings Printing repre-***
304 ***sented by Keach-Nordstrom Assoc., Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6. Seconded by D.***
305 ***Pichette Volk. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

306
307 After review and deliberation of the application before the Board for Cummings Printing (Owner Laco
308 Corporation), Map 24 Lot 35-6 located at 4 Peters Brook Drive, the Board finds the application has sat-
309 isfied the general requirements of the Town of Hooksett Development Regulations, or in cases where
310 the regulation could not be met, has satisfied the waiver requirements.

311
312 ***J. Sullivan motioned to approve the plan for Cummings Printing represented by Keach-Nordstrom Assoc.,***
313 ***Inc., 4 Peters Brook Road, Map 24 Lot 35-6, pursuant to RSA 676:4, I, Completed Application, with the***
314 ***following conditions:***

315
316 ***Conditional Items Prior to Signed Plans:***

- 317 1. ***All review fees are paid in full.***
- 318 2. ***A single (22" x 34") mylar, 6 paper copies (22" x 34"), 1 paper copy (11' x 17"), and 1 digital***
319 ***PDF copy (CD, email, or flash drive), of the final plan are submitted to the Office of the Town***
320 ***Planner within the Community Development Department. If the applicant wishes to retain a***
321 ***signed copy, include additional copies. The above-mentioned copies shall be retained for Town***
322 ***records.***
- 323 3. ***All granted waivers shall be noted on the plan.***
- 324 4. ***All outstanding checklist and regulatory items noted in the September 14, 2023 completeness***
325 ***review memo prepared by the Town Planner shall be added to the plan.***

- 326 5. *All outstanding comments from the Town Engineer shall be addressed to the Town Engineer's*
327 *satisfaction.*

328
329 ***Conditional Items Prior to Construction***

- 330 1. *Applicant agrees to remit payment of all sureties/bonds and escrow fees in full. These sure-*
331 *ties/bonds and escrow fees may be determined after the Notice of Decision has been issued. All*
332 *sureties/bonds will be professionally calculated by the Town Engineer, and the applicant will*
333 *be notified in writing of the required bond amount.*
- 334 2. *Copies of any outstanding permits required by NH DOT, NH DES or other State agencies shall*
335 *be forwarded to the Office of the Town Planner, if applicable.*
- 336 3. *The applicant agrees to attend a required pre-construction meeting after*
337 *a. All sureties are submitted and approved,*
338 *b. Site plan compliance monitoring escrow is in place and the Inspection Funding Agree-*
339 *ment is signed and submitted.*
340 *c. The plans are signed and recorded*
341 *d. Contractor's schedule of work is submitted.*
- 342 4. *All permits required by Code Enforcement.*
- 343 5. *All building plans will adhere to the Town of Hooksett Commercial Architectural Design Re-*
344 *quirements in the Development Regulations.*
- 345 6. *Applicant agrees to site plan compliance and construction monitoring by authorized Town Of-*
346 *ficials.*

347
348 ***Conditional Items Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy***

- 349 1. *Impact fees, if applicable, assessed per the Town Impact Fee Ordinance shall be received by*
350 *Certified check no later than 10 business days prior to requesting a Certificate of Occupancy.*
351 *For a breakdown of the calculation of this fee, please contact the Office of the Town Planner.*
- 352 2. *All property taxes due are paid.*
- 353 3. *Final site inspection by Fire personnel, Code Enforcement, and the Town Engineer.*
- 354 4. *Two copies of As Builts are forwarded to Code Enforcement.*

355
356 ***Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-0.***

357
358 **PUBLIC HEARING & BOARD DISCUSSION (CONTINUED)**

- 359
360 **6. RIDGEBACK SELF STORAGE, LLC represented by THE DUBAY GROUP, INC.**
361 **1461 Hooksett Road**
362 **Map 18 Lot 49-D**
363 **Amended Commercial Site Plan**

364
365 J. Sullivan will be abstaining from any discussion, participation, or voting on the Ridgeback Self-Storage
366 matter as he is an abutter.

367
368 A. Garron: On August 21 the Planning Board held a meeting with regard to Ridgeback and directed me
369 to conduct and present proposals to study emissions and noise. We received three responses. One
370 company, Aires, will only do emissions. The scope of the study was discussed with the applicant. I sent
371 the study of the scope to the applicant on July 31 with no feedback. At the August 21 meeting there was
372 discussion about the scope of the study and how the proposal submitted by HMMH was expansive. The

373 applicant requested this to be more in line with a third party study than an independent study.
374 Discussion ensued regarding submitting additional information to HMMH to see if that would have any
375 impact on the price of the study. On September 7 I called Mr. McGuire to see if he had anything to add
376 to the HMMH submission and followed up on September 11 via email. The study that the Planning
377 Board requested was developed back in July and responses have been submitted. We selected HMMH
378 to do the work. No additional information was submitted by the applicant for HMMH but the applicant
379 provided a new proposal to be submitted to Aires. No information was submitted by the applicant for
380 consideration to alter the HMMH proposal. Would the Planning Board like to go with what we
381 currently have to be submitted to HMMS for noise and emissions or the new proposal to Aires
382 submitted by Ridgeback for the third party review.
383

384 D. MacGuire (The Dubai Group): The applicant's attorney is here to explain the background as to
385 why we submitted the third party review appraisal. We did not have a lot of information to submit. We
386 were looking for them to have an understanding of what we submitted thus far. A plan set and the emis-
387 sions information was provided by First Student. Most importantly in the scope to HMMH there was
388 no reference made to the actual zoning ordinance. I mentioned that in my email to Andre. I would like
389 that addressed in the supplemental study. Referring to the noise ordinance without the ordinance they
390 would have to do additional work to understand the baseline and if it would be louder than that. The
391 zoning ordinance is clear. We reached out to Aires with that scope in mind and obtained an updated
392 scope for your review.
393

394 Attorney Fredrich Moeckel (Tarbell and Brodich): The statute authorizes this board to commission a
395 study. The limitation is that authority is in a situation where the site plan review regulations has a fac-
396 tual requirement the applicant has not satisfied. For example, will the project have a negative impact on
397 traffic. If Ridgeback had failed to supply a traffic study then this board's jurisdiction allows it to have
398 the board commission the study to move forward. Traffic is not an issue here because Ridgeback sup-
399 plied a study. Third party review is to assist this board in determining the facts that are before them and
400 determine if the objective and criteria in the regulations are met. Ridgeback supplied this board with
401 the information regarding the noise level of the buses and the mitigation elements. Third party review
402 is the appropriate remedy to test Ridgeback's mitigation proposals against your ordinance. Your ordi-
403 nance has a clear mandate. It cannot be louder than 75 decibels. Because your ordinance has an objec-
404 tive number and objective evidence has been supplied you do not need to hire someone to go out and
405 reinvent the wheel. That is beyond the statutory scope. Ridgeback supplied the information on the
406 emissions. With respect to the nuisance odors your ordinance states if the odor or emission is "a known
407 health risk or danger". Third party review can tell you if this is a known health risk or danger. You al-
408 ready know what is coming out of the tailpipes based on the information First Student supplied. You do
409 not have to do a base line to figure out the air quality before and expensive modeling which in mine
410 and Ridgeback's opinion is completely unnecessary. The standard is in your ordinance. We have sup-
411 plied the information. Third party review is the remedy. The statute give this board the discretion to ac-
412 cept Aires as the third party reviewer. The applicant is allowed to move this board and say to do a third
413 party review and please use the one that we have promoted. Look at the statute. If there is anything in-
414 appropriate there are repercussions. Reinventing the wheel is not what third party review is about. The
415 proposal Ridgeback set forth in the motion is the legally proper route to that end. The town manager
416 made comments that Ridgeback was not responding. The difficulty there was it seems like something
417 was lost in translation. What came from the board and what was ultimately requested was a lot different
418 than to take a look at the information Ridgeback has supplied to the board.
419

420 D. Winterton: I want to be clear you are referring to our town zoning ordinances for noise and health
421 reasons?

422
423 Attorney Moeckel: I am referring to Article 10a (i) (2) and (5). (2) is performance standards related to
424 noise and (5) is performance standards related to nuisance odors. Those are the two that apply to this
425 project in this zone. If one were to go to the town's general ordinance it is not a zoning ordinance. It is
426 an ordinance relative to sound. There is no objective criteria there. HMMH did not even think you had
427 a zoning ordinance relating to sound.

428
429 D. Winterton: Dana, without having the PZ in front of me, by memory I am referencing health and
430 noise issues. Are those decibel numbers included in that zoning ordinance or does the board have the
431 discretion, because it is in the PZ, to use those numbers or establish new ones.

432
433 D. Pendergast: I do not know if you can establish new ones. You can give relief from the current ones
434 listed. Under the noise ordinance in the PZ 75 decibels cannot be exceeded beyond the property bound-
435 aries. There is no number as far as the performance standard for nuisance odors. It says the use shall
436 not produce continuous regular frequent odors or emissions detectible beyond the property line. It
437 speaks about known health risks. It also states if the code official judges the emission to be harmful to
438 the right of others enjoyment of the properties. It gives myself or you the authority to look at it and
439 make a determination.

440
441 D. Pichette Volk: Was the First Student submission, with the Tier 1 emissions standards, intended to
442 satisfy the question of whether emissions as described in this scenario, 15 or so buses backing up to 15
443 or so homes, your intention to satisfy that question?

444
445 Attorney Moeckel: In part but I do not want it to be overlooked that your ordinance is worded very
446 carefully. You can have things in this town and you can approve things that produce continuous regular
447 or frequent odors and emissions, even those that are detectible beyond the property boundaries. The
448 question is if the odor or emission is a known health risk or danger. That is the standard. Is the emission
449 a known health risk or danger. If it is that is where the other issues come into play. The third party re-
450 view is what is coming out of the tail pipes. Is what is coming out of the tail pipes a known health risk
451 or danger.

452
453 A. Garron: The initial scope of work was predicated on information the board deemed it did not have.
454 We had two months of input from the applicant and abutters. When I put together the scope of work
455 there was no pushback with regard to the content of that scope of work. I spoke to each one of the con-
456 sulting groups, Aires being one of them, with regard to the scope of work and the ability of them to
457 achieve the scope of work. Aires indicated they would be able to do the emissions but not the noise and
458 stated in an email that is not their area of expertise. The proposed third party review is for both studies
459 and Aires does not feel comfortable with one of them but yet they are going to include that in their
460 scope of work. With regard to the third party review, if the board had this information (a traffic study,
461 emissions study, and noise study) a third party review would probably be the logical way to go. We do
462 not have that information and there was added concern of those two items with regard to this project
463 moving forward. That is the reason we moved forward with the independent studies. The third party
464 review is something the board was not comfortable moving forward with.

465

466 M. Somers: The board felt what we had received from the applicant was not robust enough and that is
467 the reason we asked for more information.

468
469 S. Gilbert: I agree with that.

470
471 P. Scarpetti: We have been here since July. Andre has been in touch with the applicant. Now it is a
472 whole different game again. We asked for emissions and noise. The applicant knew about it. We are
473 wasting everyone's time. Either you are going to do it or not going to do it and that is it. We were
474 pretty clear. Andre has been wasting his time talking to all of these people getting the proposals to us.

475
476 C. Stelmach: Is there anybody here from First Student here to verify the study we were given today?
477 Student Transportation of America is also mentioned in the book of the study. Is this a boiler plate ob-
478 servation. Who is the author? Does this go out to every bus company with a different name?

479
480 D. MacGuire: This was put together by First Student. They are not here tonight. That information is
481 not new. It was submitted as part of my initial presentation of this work. I made a presentation on be-
482 half of the applicant and talked about emissions and noise and supplied information. There were no
483 comments or questions by the board beyond what I submitted. There were initial comments of which I
484 brought that information forward and that was what was discussed. There was a butter discussion ad-
485 dressing those items. We submitted some substantial improvements to buffering and sound attenuation
486 and information on the emissions as part of the request from concerns raised by the board and abutters.
487 Then this board elected to close the public meeting. You did not ask us to provide you with additional
488 information regarding noise or emissions or to commission an additional study. The impression I got
489 was you were satisfied with those items because of the improvements we made to the site plan. When
490 you came back out of non-public and asked for

491
492 D. Winterton: There has been no non-public discussion about this case.

493
494 Attorney Moeckel: I believe Mr. MacGuire meant public hearing, not non-public. The public hearing
495 was closed.

496
497 D. MacGuire: My apologies about that misunderstanding. When you directed Andre and it was not
498 open to the public for discussion purposes, you were looking for additional understanding as to how
499 this application affected noise and emissions. I was under the impression that there are noise and odor
500 sections in the ordinance specifically within the PZ. We want to make sure the information they have
501 provided is in line with those standards that are in the ordinance. You are asking for a third party re-
502 view of the information we provided. If there was a determination that we did not meet one of those
503 standards or that additional buffering or improvements needed to be made or if something could not be
504 addressed that would come forward and be part of your evaluation and you would share that with us
505 and we could make changes. The initial scope that Andre put together asked for that but it was open
506 enough that it left a lot of room for interpretation as to what could be received back. HMMH in a very
507 different direction modeling base line conditions that don't have anything to do with your ordinance.
508 We are not trying to waste anyone's time. The whole process made sense to us and I thought you were
509 asking for a review of our submitted information. If you wanted a study on something specific you
510 should have given us an opportunity to provide you with additional information before trying to com-
511 mission an independent study of that exact work. I think there would be benefit to having a third party
512 evaluate the work that we have presented thus far. If they determine additional information is necessary

513 we can then provide that additional information to satisfy their concerns. When that scope came back
514 and we reviewed it, it did not make reference to anything we presented. Without referencing the two
515 sections of the PZ ordinance, it left it open to interpretation of what was needed. I never worked with
516 Aires. They are an independent consultant that does work in these areas. When we put together the pro-
517 posal for Aires all that we adjusted is that asked them to write a proposal that addresses the PZ criteria
518 regarding emissions and noise and our application as it stands with the information we provided. If they
519 determine there is not enough information we should have an opportunity to provide that. I was not
520 able to weigh in on some of these items until the public hearing was reopened.

521
522 M. Somers: At the last meeting we instructed Andre to work with you to include the zoning infor-
523 mation and mitigation you provided was going to be put into the proposal requests. Andre just told us
524 you were never in touch. It sounds like you were in touch with Aires trying to preselect who was going
525 to do the study and that seems inappropriate to me. I believe it should have gone to Andre, Andre
526 should have shared it with the three companies, the three companies should have modified the pro-
527 posals, and it should have been brought back to the town for further consideration. That as my under-
528 standing after the last meeting.

529
530 A. Garron: I could not have said it better. That was my understanding.

531
532 D. MacGuire: What I just heard was the scope should be modified to include the PZ standards. Most of
533 my email was written about the PZ. If we want to have HMMH reconfigure their proposal to reference
534 not the noise ordinance or background information but to specifically evaluate based on the noise and
535 emissions information of the PZ ordinance we are in agreement with that.

536
537 A. Garron: I called Mr. MacGuire on the 7th to inquire if there was any additional information to be
538 submitted. I followed up with an email reiterating that. On the 11th he submitted an email to me. One
539 aspect was with regard to having the third party review. The towns development review regulations, as
540 well as the RSA, gives the Planning Board the authority to request special investigative studies. This
541 would be one of them. Mr. MacGuire understood these sections were specifically drafted for the project
542 located in this zone any third party review of the submitted project should be evaluated in compliance
543 with this section of the ordinance. I understood the board agreed with this at the hearing. In the email I
544 said: “thank you for getting back to me yesterday with the new material from First Student and Aires. I
545 disagree that the Planning Board agreed to your course of action. It was my understanding that the ap-
546 plicant had the information regarding noise or emissions that could be submitted by the applicant and
547 those items would be passed along to HMMH for consideration and possible impact on the price of the
548 studies.” That was my understanding when I left the August 21 meeting.

549
550 D. MacGuire: Do you agree that this study/review should be referring to the zoning ordinance in the
551 PZ?

552
553 M. Somers: We agreed to that at the last meeting. Yes.

554
555 D. MacGuire: That information was not conveyed to HMMH.

556
557 M. Somers: We also agreed that in the course of their study they should look at what the applicant sub-
558 mitted and they could include any kind of mitigation that would be an offset. We are not experts in this

559 subject matter and we do not feel like the information you provided is robust enough to answer the
560 questions we are asking and that is why we are asking for more information.

561
562 A. Garron: The applicant and Attorney Moeckel have been clear about referring to the ordinance. The
563 impression I get is the applicant wants the study to be limited to just the ordinance. My understanding
564 is that the board want these studies to include not just the ordinance but the impact, noise, and emis-
565 sions impacts. The scope of work that was included by HMMH and the methodology they are going to
566 be utilizing to conduct these studies is still what we are prepared to move forward with. The ordinance
567 and additional emissions or noise information that they want to submit will also be considered in the
568 study. It may or may not have an impact on the price. In their response they asked for a digital copy of
569 the drawing to be submitted. The majority of the studies they are referring to are improvements they
570 made to their plan such as the noise mitigation. HMMH would have had that information to consider to
571 begin with. We plan to give them the ordinance along with everything they would need with regard to
572 the review of this application.

573
574 D. MacGuire: I do not know if the board read into the details of the HMMH proposal. There are mate-
575 rial changes that would happen to their assumptions if they were elected to be referencing those other
576 ordinances. I am trying to make that point specifically with regard to noise. They determined they were
577 going to measure background noise because there was no regulatory limit on decibel level within the
578 town's noise ordinance. They were not aware that there are regulatory limits within the PZ. For them to
579 say they have to do this background modeling to determine whether or not this use is going to create a
580 10 decibel level above ambient background and if it does they are going to evaluate what changes
581 could be done to bring that down to a 5 decibel differential. They are getting very specific and tech-
582 nical. If you break down what the study is asking they have to do that to draw conclusions. That does
583 not have to be done. They can model the project as proposed to determine if the decibel levels would
584 exceed 75 decibel levels at the property line and, if so, whether or not improvements, such as some of
585 the ones we have proposed would mitigate those values. That would revise the scope and make it a lot
586 simpler, from a cost standpoint, if they do not have to model the information in the background when
587 they already have a set limit they are looking to conclude on. The goal is to see if this project meets the
588 regulations within the PZ and if it does not how it can be mitigated and if it does you can move forward
589 with decisions. The study can be done without having to model background and set up microphones.
590 Adding this information will change the study potentially substantially. This isn't as complicated as it
591 may have been made to look in the proposal because they do not have a set number. We are trying to
592 create a situation that can be evaluated.

593
594 C. Stelmach: The simplest way to create the situation is to bring 30 buses into the lot, put them up to
595 the fence, and go measure decibel levels on the back street.

596
597 D. MacGuire: If you have specific information and First Student can provide exactly whatever infor-
598 mation any third party would have to use in their information such as where the alarm is located within
599 the bus and what the idling volumes are. We submitted a lot of this information; decibel levels, peak
600 idling upon cold start. We gave that information during our testimony and can give specifics. I am sure
601 they even have sound diagrams of the perceived decibel levels as you get away from a bus. I know
602 some of these buses are close to the property line. That would all be factored in. Whatever information
603 they are given they can use that modeling software within their study to plug all that data in and if they
604 need additional parameters that we can provide we are happy to provide that to come to that without
605 having to do this substantial background modeling at a substantial cost. We are trying to evaluate the

606 condition as proposed directly, not this independent study whether it is here or not. We are trying to
607 evaluate the busses and whether or not this is an issue.

608
609 A. Garron: What I heard is the information that has been submitted and the ordinance and everything
610 associated with the emissions and noise will be given to our consultant for review and see what impact
611 that may or may have one the cost of the study. Other than traffic we do not have any studies that have
612 been submitted. The board has reviewed the impacts of the traffic study and has not determined where
613 it wants to go with that. This is about noise and emissions. That testimony was submitted verbally.
614 There is no study I can go to in the file. If we can identify and isolate that part of the testimony that
615 deals with decibel level on paper to give to HMMH we can do that. The new information and idling
616 best practices will be submitted with that information along with our ordinance. That is what we have
617 to work with. It may or may not have an impact on the results of the study. What is the direction of the
618 Planning Board with regard to that.

619
620 D. Winterton: At the last meeting as stated in the minutes I said: “In a proposal of this magnitude I
621 think the study should be done and the cost is the cost. I am not comfortable with cutting any corners.”
622

623 D. MacGuire: You are suggesting that their development of a background noise level and they were
624 doing that because they were not aware of any maximum decibel requirement within the regulations.
625 Because there is not maximum we have to do this background information and check to see if the mod-
626 eled development is within 10 decibels of that number. If they were aware they just need to determine
627 if it is higher or lower than the 75 decibels and if mitigation is needed you are saying by omitting that is
628 now cutting a corner?
629

630 D. Winterton: Not at all. You might as well be talking in ancient Greek to me about decibels and noise.
631 I am here as an independent volunteer in this town that wants to make sure that any project that we ap-
632 prove does not impact the people of Hooksett in a negative manner. The only way we can find this out
633 is to have this done independently. If we are asking for too much I’m sorry. I want to make sure we get
634 as much as we need.
635

636 Attorney Moeckel: I understand the dilemma the board is in. The developmental regulations exist to
637 put applicants on notice of what the town’s criteria are so the applicant can make the best effort to meet
638 the criteria. The two criteria at issue are clear, unambiguous, and objective. Above or below 75 deci-
639 bels. With respect to odors is it a harmful human effect. That’s it. The information has already been
640 supplied. No one wants to cut a corner but the applicant has been put on notice as to what the require-
641 ments are. The applicant put that data before the board. What concerns the applicant has is having to
642 pay for something that is not part of the ordinance requirements. I understand you may have a broader
643 concern but the requirement are what they are. The Planning Board has the discretion to proposed
644 amendments to this zoning ordinance if it wants to create more discretion, but this application came in
645 as the ordinance existed at the time.
646

647 M. Somers: I do not think you have given us studies on either of those issues and that is what we are
648 asking for.
649

650 Attorney Moeckel: It’s the data. The facts have been supplied to the board. We are struggling with if
651 the board wanting a study is appropriate, necessary, or permissible.
652

653 M. Somers: I respectfully disagree.

654

655 Attorney Moeckel: Ridgeback can disagree.

656

657 D. Pichette Volk: I can see your points. I am looking for black and white. Modeling doesn't help me. If
658 someone said put 30 buses in the parking lot and see what the emissions are that would help me. Even
659 if you do a study and get answers there is still going to be dancing around.

660

661 S. Gilbert: We know diesel and gasoline are known health risks so why do we need a study? Do we
662 even need to move forward? Do we need the noise piece of information? There is no information other
663 than decibels beyond the line. If I start my car I am going to smell it 20' away.

664

665 D. Pichette Volk: I drove by the site the other day and saw a large sign that said available. It looked
666 like a for sale sign. I did not know how to interpret that.

667

668 Attorney Moeckel: First Student would only lease one or two of the bays. The other bays will now or
669 soon be used for the prior approval. I assume that relates to non-bus.

670

671 D. Pichette Volk: I would have thought the same thing but it appeared to be placed to the entrance of
672 where the buses would be placed.

673

674 Attorney Moeckel: The applicant is not planning on changing its approach and is not selling. If the
675 sign is misplaced maybe it is a marketing approach.

676

677 D. Pendergast: I asked about the sign. The contractor said the sign was pulled out of the ground and
678 placed there. It is not anything other than that is where they left it.

679

680 M. Somers: We were going to find out the details of the study and from there make a date certain to
681 continue.

682

683 A. Garron: We have the details for the HMMH study with emissions and noise. We can go back into
684 the minutes to identify the sections where the applicant identified the decibel level and add those items
685 to the scope to see if that has an impact on the cost of the study. If it adds cost do you want me to bring
686 that back? If there is no measurable impact on the price is the applicant prepared to move forward with
687 this? Before we move forward we have to establish an escrow.

688

689 M. Somers: I think we conceded we would allow the contractor to include the components for the
690 zoning and anything else applicable. It is between you and the applicant as to whether they are prepared
691 to move forward.

692

693 D. MacGuire: Can we tighten the scope and direct HMMH that you are looking for the independent
694 study to evaluate this as it pertains to those sections of the ordinance?

695

696 P. Scarpetti: All the ordinances that we have and anything that pertains to our ordinances needs to be
697 looked at. Not just for noise and emissions.

698

699 S. Gilbert: I hesitate to agree strictly to that. I want to know what the base line change is.

700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746

P. Scarpetti: That is why I said other ordinances as well. Adverse impact to abutting properties is also in the ordinance.

A. Garron: I hear the board saying that you do not want just the parameters for the ordinances and you want HMMH to do the broader study.

S. Gilbert: Yes. They are both relevant.

D. Pichette Volk: I can live with the methodology for the noise but do not agree with the methodology for the air quality section. For that reason I am on the verge of saying I do not support moving forward with HMMH for air quality and noise as instructed here. I do not agree with mobile source analysis. They are going to measure as things are moving around. I do not necessarily think more information for its own sake is necessarily better. If you vote to proceed I will be voting no.

S. Gilbert motioned to have Andre Garron move forward with the study with HMMH including what this would be modeled like to the ordinances specific to the PZ and removing the section related to movement and instead having stationary data. Seconded by P. Scarpetti.

M. Somers: You want to take out mobile modeling? It will be stationary modeling? I think Andre wants that clarity.

Roll Call

D. Winterton - No

P. Scarpetti - Yes

M. Somers - Yes

S. Gilbert - Yes

D. Pichette Volk - No

C. Stelmach - Yes

J. Sullivan - Abstained

Motion carries with a vote of 4-2.

A. Garron: Once we have the cost would you like me to bring that back to the board?

D. Winterton: I would be fine with the applicant and Andre discussing if the applicant wants to move forward. If the applicant says yes go for it. If the applicant say no come back here.

*M. Somers motioned to continue Ridgeback Self Storage, LLC 1461 Hooksett Road, Map 18 Lot 49-D to the October 2, 2023 meeting. Seconded by P. Scarpetti. **Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 6-0.***

Break 7:14 pm

Reconvene 7:25 pm

747 **CONCEPTUAL PLAN DISCUSSION**

748 **7. KATIE WEISS with BEDFORD DESIGN CONSULTANTS, INC.**
749 **10 Eastpoint Drive**
750 **Map 49 Lot 4**
751 **Proposed Industrial Site Plan**
752

753 Katie Weiss: This was previously approved for a 3000 sq. ft. freezer warehouse. There was approval
754 from DOT for a right hand turn lane on 28 by pass. This would be a phased project. Durable Trailers is
755 the tenant. They manufacture the trailers themselves. They are currently located in Merrimack and need
756 to expand. This would include two buildings that are 60,000 sq. ft. and one building that is 96,000 sq.
757 ft.

758
759 K. Weiss showed a close up view of the proposed project.
760

761 K. Weiss: This would be a phased project. There would be loading docks on left side. The 2nd phase
762 will be outdoor not covered storage. With each phase of the project, the outdoor storage will move to
763 the next phase. At some point the building on the top right would be leased to someone else. Test pits
764 have been done. Drainage will be addressed with underground storage infiltration basins. In the middle
765 of the site, the darker areas shown on the plan are wetlands that we would be looking to fill which is
766 half of what was originally going to be filled for the freezer warehouse. In 2006, DES had the previous
767 applicant write a check to the town in the amount of \$214,000 which was intended for the Clay Pond
768 Fund. They are meeting with wetlands bureau, which will have a site walk with them, and they will dis-
769 cuss what will be done the money that has already been paid.
770

771 D. Winterton: I would like to see the turn lane on by-pass.
772

773 K. Weiss showed the right turn lane/deceleration lane.
774

775 D. Winterton: That is assuming most of your traffic is coming that way. What about a left turn lane?
776

777 K. Weiss: Most traffic will be coming from that direction. We did a traffic study on this and will be
778 submitting that.
779

780 D. Winterton: This goes almost straight across from the new housing development?
781

782 K. Weiss: There was another road put in recently.
783

784 P. Scarpetti: Please go over the phasing again.
785

786 K. Weiss: The 1st phase will have 60,000 sq. ft with outdoor storage. The 2nd has an additional 60,000
787 sq. ft and the outdoor storage would be moved to the 3rd phase area. The 3rd phase would be the larger
788 building with some additional outdoor storage.
789

790 C. Stelmach: What are the time frames between each?
791

792 K. Weiss: I am not sure.
793

794 P. Scarpetti: How many employees would there be?
795
796 K. Weiss: We are hoping for 50.
797
798 J. Sullivan: What is the sq. footage of the outdoor storage.
799
800 K. Weiss: 60,000 sq. ft.
801
802 J. Sullivan: When you build that it will move?
803
804 K. Weiss: Yes. To the next section.
805
806 J. Sullivan: Is the road into the building to Eastpoint?
807
808 K. Weiss: When this original subdivision was done there it was thought it would loop around and back
809 to 28 but that was never done. We followed that a little bit. There is no plan to put a road on the top but
810 we have not gone through the site plan process.
811
812 J. Sullivan: Could the light green area further down be used for another development?
813
814 K. Weiss: Not really, it is very steep. The elevation would not allow for it.
815
816 M. Somers: Will there be a retail component?
817
818 K. Weiss: No. There will be no customers.
819
820 M. Somers: Will the entire onsite work be completed during the 1st phase?
821
822 K. Weiss: No, that would be too expensive.
823
824 Bob Baskerville (Bedford Design Consultants): There is town water but no sewer. Nothing but bath-
825 rooms will go to septic.
826
827 J. Sullivan: Will they need to come back for approval for each phase?
828
829 K. Weiss: We are planning that process now and are not sure how it will be phased.
830
831 J. Sullivan: We can approve it all at once or in phases?
832
833 C. Stelmach: Yes.
834
835 M. Somers: I think it is a nice project to bring to Hooksett.
836
837 S. Gilbert: For the funds previously paid in lieu of fees, the application has expired. Can we confirm
838 what has happened with those funds?
839

840 K. Weiss: DES has us send it to you and it went to the Clay Pond fund. We are asking to get credit for
841 the money we already paid. We are not sure if we can get credit for those funds.

842
843 E. Robidoux: DES might credit them or say they want additional funds.

844
845 S. Gilbert: I think this is a great project. Thank you for bringing industrial to the industrial area.

846
847 B. Baskerville: This was complicate because you have the old state permits, 15 years go by and here
848 we are. There is no set policy. we still have the easement for the turning lane. We have to talk to the
849 agency because things change.

850
851 P. Scarpetti: There is no sunset clause when it comes to DOT?

852
853 B. Baskerville: This is DES. They have a spreadsheet based on what you fill. They have not officially
854 said we can have a credit for the entire amount.

855
856 **OTHER BUSINESS**

857
858 E. Robidoux: The owner of the new car wash and dog wash on Hooksett Road has asked to not con-
859 struct the dog wash at this time. We are going to hold escrow for construction and landscaping. They
860 are hoping to get the CO this week to open the car wash. I made the decision to let them phase the pro-
861 ject.

862
863 C. Stelmach: What is the status of the pad site?

864
865 D. Pendergast: The site is all set. Water, drainage, and electric was brought out there. The building and
866 landscaping is lacking for the dog wash. He is trying to get the car wash open.

867
868 C. Stelmach: When is he planning to open?

869
870 D. Pendergast: Last Friday. Everything is done and we are just ironing out the escrow money.

871
872 S. Gilbert: Is his intention is to finish in the next few months?

873
874 E. Robidoux: Yes.

875
876 E. Robidoux: We received a request from Carolyn Cronin to ask the Board to have her property re-
877 zoned from mixed-use to MDR. This is more in keeping with the other residences in the area. They are
878 trying to protect the house from being torn down in the future. If the Board wants we can move forward
879 with getting that on the warrant.

880
881 D. Winterton: I am in favor of the zoning change.

882
883 P. Scarpetti: I am in favor.

884
885 It was a Board consensus supporting the zoning change.

886

887 J. Sullivan: How are the two houses further down on the left zoned?

888

889 E. Robidoux: We can look at those.

890

891 D. Pendergast: The school owned it and scheduled to demolish it. Carolyn and Matt purchased the
892 house to save it. To protect it in the future they want to move it to MDR.

893

894 E. Robidoux: With regard to the Master Plan, SNHPC provided the town with a quote to update demo-
895 graphic numbers. Along with that is a list of topics to update and text revisions.

896

897 ***D. Pichette Volk motioned that the Planning Board thank Dana for his fill in efforts while trying to***
898 ***hire a new town planner. Seconded by D. Winterton. Motion carried unanimously with a vote of 7-***
899 **0.**

900

901 Discussion ensued regarding topics to be discussed at the September 25, 2023 Planning Board work-
902 shop.

903

904 **ADJOURNMENT**

905

906 ***M. Somers motioned to adjourn at 8:18 pm. Seconded by S. Gilbert. Motion carried unanimously***
907 **with a vote of 7-0.**

908

909 **The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Board will be held October 2, 2023 at 6:00**
910 **pm.**

911

912 **Respectfully submitted by,**

913

914 **/s/ AnnMarie Scott**

915

916 **AnnMarie Scott**

917 **Recording Clerk**