



TOWN OF HUDSON

Planning Board



Vincent Russo, Chairman

Rick Maddox, Selectmen Liaison

12 School Street • Hudson, New Hampshire 03051 • Tel: 603-886-6000 • Fax: 603-594-1142

-- FILE COPY --

HUDSON PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES September 22, 2010

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Russo called this Planning Board meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. on Wednesday, September 22, 2010, in the Community Development meeting room in the Hudson Town Hall basement.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Russo asked Selectman Maddox to lead the assembly in pledging allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

III. ROLL CALL

Chairman Russo asked Secretary van der Veen to call the roll. Those persons present, along with various applicants, representatives, and interested citizens, were as follows:

Members

Present: James Barnes, George Hall, Tim Malley, Vincent Russo, Ed van der Veen, and Richard Maddox (Selectmen's Representative).

Members

Absent: Suellen Quinlan.

Alternates

Present: Stuart Schneiderman.

Alternates

Absent: Ken Massey (Selectmen's Representative Alternate, excused).

Staff

Present: Town Planner John Cashell.

-- FILE COPY --

Recorder: None. (Transcribed from DVD copy of HCTV broadcast.)

IV. SEATING OF ALTERNATES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Russo seated Mr. Schneiderman in place of Ms. Quinlan.

V. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING(S)

Chairman Russo addressed the minutes of the 07-28-10 and 08-11-10 meetings, as distributed in the 09-08-10 packet, asking if there were any changes or corrections.

Mr. Barnes addressed the 08-11-10 meeting minutes, asking for the following changes:

- Mr. van der Veen's name was misspelled throughout.
- Page 6 contained three typographical errors:
 - Third paragraph, 6th line — the word "sated" should be "stated."
 - 4th paragraph, 7th line — the name "Rodger's" should be "Roger's."
 - Last paragraph, 6h line—the word "tuck" should be "truck."

No further changes or corrections being brought forward, Mr. Barnes moved to accept the minutes as amended; Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (7-0).

Chairman Russo asked that the members be prepared to address the 07-28-10 minutes at the next meeting, along with the 09-09-10- minutes, as distributed in this week's packet.

VI. CASES REQUESTED FOR DEFERRAL

No cases had been requested for deferral for this meeting.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Russo noted that items of correspondence received in tonight's handouts would be taken up in conjunction with the associated cases, with any remaining items being taken up under **Other Business** at the end of the meeting.

XII. NEW BUSINESS/PUBLIC HEARINGS

**A. C & M Machine Products (Additions)
SP# 08-10**

**Map 221/Lot 002
25 Flagstone Drive**

Purpose of plan: To construct additions to the existing building and alter paved parking and maneuvering areas. Application Acceptance & Hearing.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said the application was ready for Application Acceptance. Chairman Russo asked for a motion for Application Acceptance. Selectman Maddox so moved; Mr. Schneiderman seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Town Planner Cashell said he had nothing to add to his staff report at this time.

Mr. Richard Maynard, Professional Engineer, of Maynard & Paquette, Engineering Associates, LLC, appearing before the Board as the engineering representative of the applicant, identified the plans mounted on the wall as two of the drawings from the site plan set, entitled Site Plan , Map 221, Lot 2, 22 Flagstone Drive, Hudson, New Hampshire, dated August 2, 2010, last revised 09-08-10, Drawing 1, together with Drawing 2, Lighting and Landscape Plan, with the same date and revision date.

Mr. Maynard discussed details of the proposed project, to expand the building, noting that the bumpout at the front would be replaced by one addition (Addition A), with a two-story addition to the existing building (Addition B) on the south side and rear, and with another small addition at the rear (Addition C). He said these were not phases, as called out in Mr. Cashell's staff report. He displayed a rendering, saying the architecture would be similar to that of the machine shop down the road, saying it would have Town water and sewer and a private drainage system. He described the walking easements along the river bank, noting that they had been recorded. He said the property was subject to the DES Shoreline Protection act, having three elements, as identified on the plan: the 50-foot no-cut/no-disturb buffer, the 150-foot line (with building allowed up to 50% impervious), and review-type jurisdiction as far as 250 feet away from the river.

Mr. Maynard described the private drainage system as being conducted through a 24-inch pipe discharging into an existing swale and eventually running to the Merrimack River. He said no easements had been found with respect to the pipe, despite exhaustive research, adding that it appeared that it might go further up inland, but no further connections had been found, so it apparently only served this property and an adjoining one. He discussed the roof drainage, as detailed on Sheets 3 and 4, connecting to that pipe—saying the parking lot drainage would be handled by an underground system, which could hold normal storms, but a major storm would

overflow to the 24-inch drain pipe. He noted there would be a reinforced turf system at the rear, and he referenced Note 23 pertaining to the need to maintain emergency access to the rear in all seasons.

Mr. Maynard said this would be a sprinklered building, with a new second sprinkler system being installed in the northeast corner of the building.

He said the traffic islands were designed for one-way in, for vehicles and tractor trailers going to the loading docks, which were both external and partially inside the building. He said there were three low-grade loading docks, noting that nine were required by the ordinance, which he described as overkill. He said the cost of the project would be over \$5,000,000, adding that the resulting building would provide work for up to 60 to 70 employees, noting the CAP fee was \$50,206.88.

He then noted that four waivers were being requested, saying they were also asking for a landscape waiver as there was existing landscaping with over 45% green space, so he felt it met the spirit and intent of the regulations.

Chairman Russo opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor or opposition. No one coming forward to provide input, despite two requests by the chairman for comment for or against, Chairman Russo declared the matter before the Board and asked if any members of the Board had any questions.

Town Planner Cashell said Town Engineer Gary Webster and CLD had been researching the drain line, saying CLD was not in agreement with placing Phase B of this project over the drain line. He then distributed copies of a plan pertaining to that pipe line. Mr. Cashell placed a full-size copy of the plan on the wall, noting it was a 1980 site plan for 25 Flagstone Drive, and saying it did not appear to have been recorded. He said the drain easement appeared to be right behind 25 Flagstone, behind the abutting property, and then went down to a stream bed, so that the outfall flowed into the Merrimack River. He said the pipe line actually extended to the abutting property to the north, but no further documentation had been found or recorded. He said Town Engineer Webster had been out to the site with a camera but it was dry weather conditions, saying Heidi Marshall, the CLD consultant, was adamant about not building on the drain line and wanted the additions to be built next to it. He added that the Town Attorney had not yet gotten back to him with respect to any possible liability. He noted that there was very little water through the past couple decades, and it was unknown at this time if it were even in use.

Mr. Maynard said Mr. Cashell classified it as "elusive": but there was nothing, with no easement on record for the other properties, and no evidence whatsoever for any tributaries to this line. He said putting a camera up to the end would see connections, and there should not be any need to wait for a rainstorm. He said the line had no public status and was totally private, under the control of his client and on his property. He expressed a belief that Heidi Marshall's experience with regard to pipes was extremely limited, saying there was nothing wrong with running a pipe under a building, particularly when there was a manhole available. He said this would probably be reviewed at the next meeting, as it would not be approved tonight. He then said Heidi Marshall was not paying attention, as the other choice was to run another pipe line. He said this was a fragile river bank, recalling that previous contractors had blown out the

bank to the river and it was not a good idea to put a new line to the river. He said they had every legal right to cut the line and put their own line in but it was not a proper way to design something.

Selectman Maddox said Mr. Maynard had repeatedly told the Planning Board that this industrial park had been master-planned for drainage, all the way up to Lowell Road. He asked why the Board should not think this was part of that system. Mr. Maynard said the master plan was done by CLD in the late 1970s or early 1980s, noting that he himself had not come back to New Hampshire until 1982. He said the master planning involved doubling up on the roadway, with a line behind Demoulas down to the river, adding that there was another drain line; he then placed a design drawing on the wall, saying it showed the line from 25 Flagstone and also another drain line to the former Lowell Shoe facility. He said all of those had been opened, and it was all tributary to the line, but nothing had been found that would contribute to the pipe in question. He said the Nash-Tamoposi families, who had owned the properties, occasionally installed their own private lines. He said neither he nor Gary Webster had found where the line connected to, but this pipe had nothing to do with the municipal master plan system.

Selectman Maddox said he thought Mr. Maynard had told them a number of times that the industrial park was designed with a master plan. Mr. Maynard said he did not think he had ever said that. Selectman Maddox asked why anyone would put a 24-inch pipe through the property for no reason, and he also asked why the Town should not protect it. Mr. Maynard said it might be part of an abandoned system, saying this was not unusual. Selectman Maddox expressed concern about protecting the Town if there were a problem uphill. Mr. Maynard said the Town had no liability for this, as it was not a municipal drain line.

Mr. Hall asked about another building, asking if the rendering shown were for the other building. Mr. Maynard concurred, saying they had been in the building for a couple years. Mr. Hall asked if there were a site plan for the lot to the north. Mr. Maynard said there was none. Town Planner Cashell said they had not been able to identify a site plan on file for 25 Flagstone. Mr. Maynard said site plan regs did not come in until 1980s. Mr. Hall said he would like to see what was available for site plans for lots to the north. Town Planner Cashell said a lot of time had been put into that effort, but they had run out of time, but CLD wanted the Planning Board to know about this issue and how serious it was—adding that CLD's concern was that, if this line were interrupted, it could affect the drain path upstairs, so that other property owners to the north would have to reroute lines on their properties. He said there had been a flooding event back in the 1950s which had created a lot of erosion, and this system had been built to curtail that so that it would not happen again. He said the initial system had proven to be inadequate, so it had been reconstructed, adding that it was needed in the park. He said putting the building over the drain line was an issue, as the future capacity was not known, adding that Town Engineer Webster did not want the Town to have to monitor this pipe. He said Atty. Buckley was looking into possible legal liabilities.

Mr. Hall asked if there were a site plan for the lot to the north. Town Planner Cashell said there was, but that it was not that simple, saying he did not want the Board to

torture itself tonight trying to determine the history of this line, when none of the experts were on the same page. Mr. Hall said it did not appear to him that this project was ready for application acceptance. If no one could find an easement, and the Town could not find recorded plans, he continued, he did not see how anyone, much less the Town or the Planning Board, could have any liability—which should be up to the engineer doing this. He then asked why Town Planner Cashell had said this plan was ready for application acceptance. Mr. Cashell said the checklist items had been completed, but there were always things that could pop up. He said Mr. Hall might consider it overly cautious, but other people did not, and the best way to resolve it would be to reroute the drain line—but the Town should make sure it was done properly.

Mr. Hall said he did not know when the last time was that time was spent deciding what pipes went under buildings, saying that was a Building Code issue, and there were pipes under every building in the town. He said this was none of the Planning Board's business, noting that it would be subject to legal review and engineering review, and it was not a Planning Board issue, as the Planning Board's concern should be whether the building was handled properly. He said T-Bones had the same thing.

Mr. Hall asked where the drainage for the existing parking lot went. Mr. Maynard said it drained to a catch basin in the rear; he showed the path on the wall-mounted plan, saying there were no other catch basins. Mr. Hall said they were making the existing parking lot smaller and handling the storm drainage with a system dug in sand; Mr. Maynard concurred, and he described details of the line and how it was protected, with an oil-water trap and a truck guard.

Mr. Hall asked about the roofline. Mr. Maynard said it would be the same as the existing building, with the additions designed to match.

Mr. Hall asked if the Fire Department were satisfied. Mr. Maynard said the Fire Department had not responded as yet, saying the representative had said he was inclined to say okay but had wanted to see the details. Town Planner Cashell said the Fire Department had a copy of the plan.

Mr. Hall asked where the two-story addition would go; Mr. Maynard identified details on the wall-mounted plan, describing the uses on the floors of the building.

Mr. Maynard said everything Mr. Cashell had said was pure speculation, and that there was not one bit of evidence to back it up, saying there were no easements, no plans, no evidence in the field, and no cameras. He then expressed a hope that this issue would be resolved by the next meeting.

Mr. Barnes noted that there had been a note saying there had been no response from LMRLAC (Lower Merrimack River Local Advisory Committee); he said he thought the August 10th submission of the plans by Mr. Maynard had not reached that group before the August meeting, which was cancelled because there was nothing on the agenda.

Mr. Barnes asked about the geoblock roadway, asking if it were purely for emergency access. Mr. Maynard concurred. Mr. Barnes asked about maintenance. Mr. Maynard said there should not be any reason for anyone to go back there. Mr.

Barnes asked how the geoblock would be constructed. Mr. Maynard said it was a surface system, going down six to eight inches. He said he did not want to put a pipe behind the building, because there was a zone of influence, with the weight of the footing possibly pushing out the bank, which is why this building was well away from the river. Introducing a pipeline would change that influence, he said, and he did not want to risk it. He said there was a tendency for water to want to follow the outside of the pipe, which was what he thought had caused the blowout back in the 1980s, adding that it had been poorly designed, with the pipe extending through a sluiceway. Mr. Barnes said he was just asking how the geoblock would be constructed; Mr. Maynard said it would be granular material underneath, with a grid system, for reinforcement, with grass growing on top. Mr. Maynard asked that Town Planner Cashell distribute copies of the geoblock plan for the next meeting; Mr. Cashell said the faxed copy had not been legible enough.

Mr. Barnes asked if they had gone to NH-DES. Mr. Maynard said the application was pending, but DES was swamped. Mr. Barnes said he felt DES would have some serious concerns with this. Mr. Maynard demurred, saying taking away the existing pavement in the rear meant they would be providing less impervious surface than existed today. Mr. Barnes said it appeared that more building area was being added than pavement removed. Mr. Maynard said some waivers were allowed by DES, saying this was why they were putting in a significant drainage system, adding that there was a balancing issue involved.

Mr. Malley noted that the parking regulations said one space for each 600 ft², but the plan showed one per 1,000 ft². Mr. Maynard said they had used one-per-thousand for the past few years, saying it was the standard. Mr. Malley asked if it did not require a waiver. Mr. Maynard said it had not in the past but he would apply for one if it were needed.

Mr. Schneiderman said the site plan showed an existing drainage easement, where the 24-inch pipe was; he asked why that easement was there and who owned it and who had rights to it. Mr. Maynard said there was no recorded easement on this site, saying this property owned it—noting that the two lots had been owned by the same owner at that time, and Town Planner Cashell had copies of that in the documentation he had provided.

Mr. Hall asked if Nash-Tamposi had been the owners of all three lots. Mr. Maynard said he did not know about the lot to the north. Mr. Hall noted that the plan said they did, which was probably why no easement was shown. Mr. Maynard said a covenant should have been done. Mr. Hall said that probably was not done in those days. Mr. Maynard said he could not see that the pipe was ever used, and he contended that an easement could not be created 30 years later when no easement had existed in the first place.

Town Planner Cashell said this was the outstanding issue, saying the waiver requests were all reasonable. He said the building would not be allowed to be built by DES unless it was legal; Mr. Maynard expressed agreement. Mr. Cashell said this was a successful company trying to expand; he then noted that he had included draft motions for acceptance of the waivers.

Selectman Maddox said he did not disagree. He then referenced Note 18, pertaining to blasting, and he suggested that Mr. Maynard put in that note that this was a private drain system for the use of this lot and that the owner was responsible for maintenance of the drain pipe, saying the Board could then move on, and there would be something for future reference. He said the waivers could be approved but it was premature for conditional approval while waiting for inputs from NH-DES and the Fire Department. Town Planner Cashell said the building could not move forward without Fire Department approval. He then referenced his proposed stipulation 10, saying the applicant would have to do that, anyway.

Mr. Hall said he had no issues, as Mr. Maynard would have to come back if the Shoreline Protection required any changes, and he did not know if the Planning Board had to worry about it if the Fire Department had not raised any issues.

Mr. Hall asked if there were room for a vehicle to get back there and turn around. Town Planner Cashell said it could be backed out. Mr. Maynard said there was a little room to turn around, saying Mr. Buxton had asked for details. Mr. Maynard said he would change the note 18 as outlined by Selectman Maddox, agreeing that he would have to come back if NH-DES made him change the plan.

Mr. Hall moved to grant the requested waiver HTC 275-9 B, *Traffic Study*, citing as his reason that this project was expected to create minimal traffic increase within the affected roadway system, and as such the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Barnes seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hall moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirement of HTC 275-9 C, *Noise Study*, citing as his reason that such a study was unnecessary, taking into consideration the proposed use had operated at 32 Executive Drive, located within the same industrial park with no noise violations having occurred since 1997, and as such the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. van der Veen seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hall moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirement of HTC 275-9 D, *Fiscal Impact Study*, citing as his reason that said study, in addition to the submitted plans, CAP fee and other submitted application materials, was not necessary to evaluate the fiscal impact of this development, and as such the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Malley seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hall moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirements of HTC 275-8 (30) A, *Loading Zone*, citing as his reason that the required number of loading bays would not be used, and as such, the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Barnes seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hall moved to grant the requested waiver of the requirement of HTC 275-8 B (31), *Landscaping*, citing as his reason that the applicant would plant sufficient landscaping within the perimeter areas of the site, thereby supplanting the need to landscape within the parking and loading areas, and as such the granting of this waiver was not contrary to the spirit and intent of the Site Plan regulations.

Mr. Malley seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Hall said he would almost be ready to approve the plan but it would be preferable, if the applicant did not have a burning need, to get Fire Department input about access to the back, with the note changed on the plan, as well as giving everyone another two weeks to look into the pipe issue. Mr. Maynard said they had a burning need, as he wanted to get the work started before winter, but he understood the concerns.

Mr. Hall moved to defer further review of the Site Plan for 25 Flagstone Drive, date specific, to the October 6, 2010, Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Maddox seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Selectman Maddox asked Town Planner Cashell to draft a motion for the next meeting concerning the parking lot,

**B. Robinson Road Self Storage
SP# 09-10**

**Map 105/Lot 017
Robinson & Derry Roads**

Purpose of plan: To construct 53,085 sq. ft. of self-storage along with a shared access driveway between lots 17, 18, 19 & 20 as was previously approved by the Town of Hudson. Application Acceptance & Hearing.

Chairman Russo read aloud the published notice, as repeated above.

Town Planner Cashell said the plan was ready for Application Acceptance. Mr. Barnes moved to grant Application Acceptance; Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Paul Chisholm, from the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appearing before the Board as the engineering representative of the property owner, noted that he was accompanied by Atty. J. Bradford Westgate, of the firm of Winer and Bennett, LLP, 111 Concord Street, Nashua NH, legal representative for the applicant.

Mr. Chisholm reviewed details of the full-size copy of the plan mounted on the meeting room wall, noting that the wetlands had been identified by Robert Shokoff. He then referenced a colored view of the proposed layout, commenting on the roadways, saying the facility would be a 53,085 ft², storage facility, with a private well and a private septic system, in the corner. He identified the parking spaces (five plus one handicapped), noting that a lighting plan and a landscaping plan were being provided with the plan set. He then discussed the drainage, saying 260 ft² of wetland and 260 ft², of buffer would be disturbed temporarily, noting that the runoff would be treated prior to discharge off site in accordance with regulations. He noted that the Zoning Board of Adjustment had granted a Wetlands Special Exception in June, adding that he was in the process of getting a permit from NH-DES. He said the existing house would be removed to make way for the access drive, noting that four waivers were being requested (Off-Street Parking Spaces, Designated Off-Street Parking Spaces, Noise Study, and Fiscal & Environmental Impact Study), and they would need State permits for the wetlands, but they already had driveway permits. He said they had received comments from CLD but had not yet had time to respond to them. He identified the drawings on the wall as *Master Site Plan, Robinson Road Self Storage* (Map 105, Lot 17), Sheet 1 of 20, dated August 2010, no revision, and *Existing Conditions and Removal Plan, Robinson Road Self Storage* (Map 105, Lot 17), Sheet 2 of 20, dated August 2010, last revised in August 2010, together with Presentation Plan, Robinson Road, also dated August 2010.

Chairman Russo opened the meeting for public input and comment, in favor or opposition. No one coming forward to provide input, despite two requests by the chairman for comment for or against, Chairman Russo declared the matter before the Board and asked if any members of the Board had any questions.

Mr. Barnes expressed concern about the access onto Route 102, and he asked how wide the driveway was. Mr. Tony Basso, of the firm of Keach-Nordstrom Associates, Inc., Bedford, New Hampshire, appearing before the Board as an engineering representative of the property owner, said it was 24 feet wide with 12-foot lanes. Mr. Barnes said it was designed for right-turn-in and right-turn-out only, and signed for no left turn in, but the size of the islands would not prevent west-bound traffic on Route 102 from turning into the site if they wanted to do so. Mr. Basso said CLD had commented on that, so they were prepared to sharpen it and make it more challenging, noting that it would be signed for no left turns. Mr. Barnes said he did not think there would be much traffic there but things could change if a Dunkin Donuts or something of that nature were placed on one of the other lots. Mr. Basso said they would look at making that turn as difficult as possible. Selectman Maddox expressed concurrence, saying he saw no need to have this access onto Route 102, adding that he could not vote for the plan if that access were there.

Mr. van der Veen commented about the Continental trucks coming through the intersection and up the truck lane, saying this would undo the work of smoothing out that traffic pattern. Mr. Basso said the NH-DOT did not have those concerns, as the NH-DOT had reviewed the traffic study and said further development would require further review. He said NH-DOT looked on this "truck lane" as an acceleration lane. Mr. van der Veen said the whole road had been a mess before it was widened but now worked pretty well; he agreed that this site would not generate a lot of traffic but development of the other lots would change that. Mr. Basso said NH-DOT did not see it as a problem for this development, noting that nothing was being proposed for the other lots at this time.

Mr. van der Veen asked about a turnaround. Mr. Basso said a curb cut was being proposed because Mr. Noury, the owner, had always envisioned a road coming through, but they had not known about a turnaround possibility until the INR meeting, when the Fire Department had said a turnaround was needed. He said he would have to talk to the Fire Department about that, but they were not trying to avoid a turnaround.

Chairman Russo asked what the grade on Route 102 would be at that driveway. Mr. Basso said it was about 8.5% or 9%, noting that they could go to 10% under the Town rules, as it was a private driveway. He pointed out grade and cuts on the colored demonstration drawing on the wall. He then said the slope at the curbcut was actually gentle, but the hill was further back

Mr. Hall asked Mr. Basso to explain why the curbcut connection to Route 102 was needed for a self-service storage yard, saying all he saw was an invitation for people to try to bypass the traffic light. Mr. Basso said they were providing an alternate means to get out of the site and to get in, as the office would be at that end, as well as to provide access to the other lots. Mr. Hall said he could not agree to that connection in good conscience, saying he did not see a need but all he could see was a safety concern, as there was perfectly good access off Robinson Road.

Chairman Russo expressed a belief that this was the general consensus of the Board, noting that truck traffic from Continental and two other companies would be involved.

Town Planner Cashell said the Town had done an excellent job of limiting access on Route 102, especially eastbound from Robinson Road, making that stretch of road a lot safer. He noted that there was a severe slope going down to the curbcut intersection, and that the thing to avoid would be to suggest that people could turn in there. He said all the Town had envisioned for this parcel was access off Robinson Road, adding that the Town had not been invited to a meeting with the NH-DOT or he would have made these concerns known. Mr. Basso said there was no meeting, saying NH-DOT allowed curbcut for a driveway depending on frontage, and he had filed a driveway request that had been granted, with no public meeting being held. He said he had wanted to be here tonight for a meaningful discussion about this driveway, saying he would take this matter up with his client.

Chairman Russo suggested taking a break; Mr. Hall expressed a belief this discussion would not continue long, and other members concurred.

Selectman Maddox asked if there would be a resident manager. Mr. Basso answered in negative, saying it would just be an office.

Mr. Hall said he did not see any other problem beyond the access to Route 102, which he felt was the only issue.

Mr. Barnes asked what the buildings would look like. Mr. Basso said he had not discussed that and would have to have something for the next meeting. Mr. Barnes explained that he was concerned because it was such a prominent location.

Mr. Hall moved to defer further review of the Site Plan application for the Robinson Road Self-Storage Facility, Map 105/Lot 017, date specific, to the Nov. 10, 2010, Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Malley seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried unanimously (7-0).

XIII. CONCEPTUAL REVIEW ONLY

No **Conceptual Review Only** items were addressed this evening.

XIV. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Electronic Signs

Mr. Barnes asked if the owner of the electronic changing sign at the intersection of Flagstone Drive and Lowell Road had been informed that it needed to be turned off at night. He described it as a very dynamic sign, saying it kept flickering and changing colors, reiterating that it needed to be turned off—and then removed. Town Planner Cashell said he did not know anything about this sign and would have to discuss it with

zoning enforcement officials, saying these signs were under the jurisdiction of the Building Department. Chairman Russo suggested Mr. Barnes fill out an investigation form at the Community Development office.

B. New Conference Desk System for the Community Development Conference Room.

Selectman Maddox noted that derogatory comments had been made by many parties about the wires hanging below the tables and the ceiling, saying Town Planner Cashell had determined that a wooden conference desk system could be obtained from the State penitentiary. He asked that the Planning Board consider endorsing the Board of Selectmen to release \$5,094 funding from its discretionary fund to purchase the desk assembly. He said the desks would be uniform, of wood construction. Chairman Russo noted that the rounded-off corners would deprive Selectman Maddox working space; Town Planner Cashell commented that it would allow more seating. Chairman Russo said he would prefer to see it squared off, perhaps with the corner rounded, saying he did not see the need for extra seating.

Mr. Hall so moved.

Town Planner Cashell said that installation and a new podium would also be included. Chairman Russo noted that the corners should be squared off; Mr. Hall concurred.

Mr. Schneiderman asked how this table would change the functionality. Town Planner Cashell said it would bring things to code, by getting the wires out of the way. Selectman Maddox said it was a safety issue, referring to the State audit.

Mr. Hall reiterated his motion, moving to favorably recommend to the Board of Selectmen the expenditure of up to \$6,000.00 from the Planning Board's Expenditure Account, and for said sum to be used for the exclusive purpose of ordering a new conference desk system for the Community Development Conference Room at Town Hall.

VOTE: Chairman Russo then called for a hand vote on the motion. All members present voted in favor except for Selectman Maddox, who voted in opposition, and Chairman Russo declared the motion to have carried (6-1).

Chairman Russo repeated his expectation that the corners would be rounded off. Mr. Hall said that had been the intent of his motion.

C. Selectman Maddox noted that the Selectmen had spoken to several people at the election preparation; he urged members of the viewing audience to consider volunteering to serve on the various boards.

-- FILE COPY --

D. Chairman Russo expressed condolences with respect to Ms. Quinlan concerning the family health issues that were preventing her from attending. Selectman Maddox concurred, expressing a hope to see the missing member back in the future.

E. Town Planner Cashell referenced Board training being provided by NRPC, in addition to the upcoming law lecture series. Chairman Russo suggested any member of the Board who was interested in attending should let Mr. Cashell know.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

All scheduled items having been addressed, Mr. Hall moved to adjourn; Mr. Barnes seconded the motion.

VOTE: Chairman Russo called for a verbal vote on the motion. All members voted in favor.

Chairman Russo then declared the meeting to be adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Date: November 15, 2010

Vincent Russo, Chairman

J. Bradford Seabury, Recorder

Edward van der Veen, Secretary

These minutes were accepted as amended following review at the 09-07-11 Planning Board meeting.

-- FILE COPY --

The following changes were made in accordance with the Board's review of these minutes at its September 7, 2011, meeting:

Page 6, 1st full paragraph, 2nd line — corrected mistyping of “master-panned” so that the phrase now reads “had been master-planned for drainage.”

Page 6, 3rd full paragraph, 5th line — mistyped “site pan” was corrected to read “site plan” in two places.

Page 6, 4th full paragraph, 1st line — mistyped “site pan” was corrected to read “site plan.”

Page 8, 2nd full paragraph, 2nd line — mistyped “pan” was corrected to read “plan.”