



PLANNING BOARD

TOWN OF BELMONT, NH

Monday, February 28, 2022
Belmont Mill, Tioga Room and Zoom
Belmont, New Hampshire

Present: Chairman Peter Harris; Members Michael LeClair, Gary Grant, Kevin Sturgeon, Richard Pickwick, and Jon Pike, Ex-Officio; Alternate Members Dennis Grimes and Rick Segalini, Jr.
Absent: Vice Chair Ward Peterson
Staff: Sarah Whearty, Rick Ball, and Colleen Akerman.
Zoom: Ward Peterson; Jeff Merritt (Aranosian Oil Co.); Stephanie (Vault Motor Storage); Angelo Palmer of 66 Diane Drive; Peter Palmer of 66 Diane Drive; and Kathleen Dube of 52 Old Ladd Hill Road.

The Chairman opened the meeting at 6:00 pm and welcomed those in attendance.

W. Peterson recused himself for this application. He also stated he will be leaving the meeting after this case is concluded.

Alternate Member R. Segalini was appointed as a voting member.

- 1. Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Ward Peterson:** Request for Site Plan approval for a Contractor's Yard. Property is located at 661 Province Road, Tax Lot 226-074-000-000 in the "R" Zone. PB #0222P.

Mr. Ward Peterson was present for this application only via Zoom.

The Chairman read the lot history from the Staff Report: The lot is developed with a conforming single-family use and structure, a single-family accessory structure that is preexisting nonconforming to Province Road setbacks, a motor vehicle/machine shop conforming uses (Special Exception), and a motor vehicle/machine shop structure preexisting, nonconforming to Rogers Road setback; three-lot subdivision approved for 3.04 acre commercial lot, 5.08 acre residential lot and 17 acre vacant lot; NHDOT driveway permitted and NHDES Subdivision approval for the commercial lot; and this proposal was reviewed by the Application Review Committee 01/27/2022.

MOTION: K. Sturgeon moved that the proposal qualifies as a "minor project" under Site Plan Review Section 5.G as the following criteria are believed to be satisfied:

- a. all structure construction or reconstruction does not exceed 600sf - for the purposes of this section, reconstruction is defined as any work for which a building permit is required and/or converting the use of a structure from primary or accessory residential use to non-residential use; and

- b. all disturbed area does not exceed 20,000sf; and
- c. no significant off-site impacts are generated

The motion was seconded by R. Pickwick and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman noted there were a number of waiver requests for the completeness of this application: Building Plans, Landscape Plan, Quality Assurance, Parking, ADA Requirements, Landscaping, Screening, and Waste.

MOTION: J. Pike moved to grant the following waiver requests:

- a. Building Plans (Section 5.D.2) because this request does not propose any new construction.
- b. Landscape Plan (Section 5.D.9) because no site changes are proposed.
- c. Quality Assurance (Section 5.D.3) because no site changes are proposed.
- d. Parking calculations, Parking, Handicap Parking/Access (Section 9.E) because no new public access to the site will result from the change of tenant.
- e. ADA Requirements (Section 9.F) because no new public access to the site will result from the change of tenant.
- f. Landscaping (9.G.1) because no site changes are proposed.
- g. Screening (9.G.2) because no physical changes are proposed.
- h. Waste (Section 9.H) because there is an existing dumpster onsite.

J. Pike asked about the Peterson's Gun & Sporting use listed on the original application. Mr. Peterson responded that it is a pre-existing home occupation approved a long time ago. There is no signage and it exists inside the home. J. Pike said he wanted to be sure a note was made in the minutes in case the property is sold, to maintain a consistent record of previous uses.

The motion was seconded by G. Grant and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: J. Pike moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/22 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by R. Pickwick and carried. (7-0)

J. Pike stated there is already a business there. P. Harris commented there is already a Special Exception. The impact of a tree service is less than a body shop in the neighborhood.

The Chairman stated the following definition will be used to determine if the applications before the Board tonight have a regional impact. He explained that in order to provide timely notice, provide opportunities for input and consider the interests of other municipalities, the Board shall act to determine if the development has a potential regional impact as defined by RSA 36:55. Impacts may include, but are not limited to: relative size or number of dwelling units as compared with existing stock; proximity to the borders of a neighboring community; transportation networks; anticipated emissions such as light, noise, smoke, odors, or particles; proximity to aquifers or surface waters which transcend municipal boundaries;

shared facilities such as schools and solid waste disposal facilities.

MOTION: K. Sturgeon moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by G. Grant and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The Chairman noted there were no responses or “no concerns” from Departments.

Mr. Peterson read from his application narrative to explain the proposal for a tree service to use the space for vehicles and equipment. A 2,160sf 3-bay motor vehicle use garage with existing office that currently houses Stephen’s Frame & Collision would be used for a Contractor’s Yard, approved by Special Exception. The remaining motor vehicle commercial use, Peterson’s Machining, will remain housed in the 1,570sf north end of the commercial building. There is no construction, disturbance, or building proposed for the change of use. The tree service would use the interior heated storage for vehicles and equipment related to the tree service, and use the existing shared exterior parking and storage areas for vehicles and equipment as well. Unlike the previous business, the tree service will not have normal public traffic. Employees will park their personal vehicles and leave with a work vehicle. Normal work hours are 7am to 7pm Monday through Friday and 7am to 12pm Saturdays. Emergency hours during storm events may occasionally occur. The tree service does not use fertilizers or pesticides. They may store small quantities of fuel and oils for chain saws and equipment inside. There will not be any chips or trees on site except what is temporarily on a truck prior to disposal. There will be no service or maintenance of vehicles on site. There will be a building-mounted sign in the same location as the Stephen’s Frame sign. The two commercial units share a restroom connected to the onsite well and commercial septic system, and the units also share an onsite commercial dumpster.

Mr. Peterson said Site Plan and Special Exception approvals were obtained in 1988 for the two existing motor vehicle uses. The site is in compliance with those approvals and conditions and has successful annual aquifer inspections. There will be a reduced impact on the neighborhood because there are no proposed exterior changes to the building, parking, or storage areas. The tree service use will reduce or eliminate public traffic to the site and will also reduce the type and quantity of regulated substances used, stored, and disposed of from the site.

M. LeClair asked how many vehicles are currently stored on the property in view of the street. Mr. Peterson stated it easily holds 20 vehicles. M. LeClair asked if those vehicles will be going away. Mr. Peterson said yes. Employee parking for the tree service will take up the space. There will be fewer vehicles than there has been previously.

Mr. John Marrone, an abutter at 24 Rogers Road, had some questions. He asked if the tree service will block or use the road to the right-of-way. Mr. Peterson said no they will not. Mr. Marrone asked if parking will be done so that he can get in and out. Mr. Peterson answered yes, it will be just as it is now.

The Chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: J. Pike moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions (precedent) to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and decision recorded.

1. This action is based on a plan or plan set received 2/1/2022.
2. Payment of decision recording fee (\$20.60); check made payable to Belknap County Registry of Deeds.
3. Conditions precedent shall be completed no later than 2/28/23. Active and Substantial development of the approved improvements shall occur no later than 2/28/24 and improvements shall be substantially completed by 2/28/27.
4. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.

APPLICANT SHALL TAKE SPECIAL NOTICE: NO USE/WORK MAY COMMENCE UNTIL ALL PRE-CONDITIONS ABOVE HAVE BEEN SATISFIED. CONTACT THE LAND USE OFFICE WITH ANY QUESTIONS. COMMENCING WORK OR USE PRIOR TO TOWN AUTHORIZATION SUBJECTS THIS APPROVAL TO REVOCATION, AND OTHER ENFORCEMENT ACTION AND DAILY FINES.

General conditions to be complied with subsequent to plan being signed and decision recorded:

5. Approved uses include: Contractor's Yard.
6. Certificate of occupancy/use required for building and exterior use (Fire Department and Building Official).
7. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
8. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
9. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
10. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation, and changes in the Ordinances. This conditional approval shall expire on 2/28/23 unless all conditions are met or an extension is applied for and granted in accordance with the Regulations. Notice to the applicant and/or a public hearing are not required for the Board to determine that a conditional approval has expired. Reapplication in the case of an expired conditional approval requires a new application meeting all applicable Regulations.
11. Where there is a conflict within the information submitted by the applicant, the town shall determine the correct information to be applied.

The motion was seconded by M. LeClair and carried. (7-0)

W. Peterson left the meeting.

2. **Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Aranisian Oil Company:** Request for a one-year extension (2/22/23) of a previously approved Site Plan for a gas station, convenience store, and food

drive-thru window/lane. Property is located at 93 Daniel Webster Highway, Tax Lot 201-093-000-000 in the "C" Zone. PB #0422P.

Mr. Jeff Merritt was present for this application through Zoom.

P. Harris commented that the Board and staff worked hard on this application. Everyone knows they are having a hard time with some of the access. There are no waiver requests.

Mr. Merritt said he appreciated the consideration for an extension. Hard work is being done at the local level with planning staff and at the state level as well. He said if the Board approves an extension, they anticipate starting the project this spring.

J. Pike asked about the previous approval for this project. S. Whearty explained this is only an extension of the approval that was granted last year.

MOTION: J. Pike moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/2022 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by M. LeClair and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

M. LeClair asked if there have been any changes at all to the original application. R. Ball stated there was some pavement widening on Ladd Hill Road for the turn lanes required by the State, but nothing on the site has changed.

The Chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: J. Pike moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and decision recorded.

1. This action is based on a plan or plan set dated February 1, 2021.
2. All conditions of the original approval remain in effect.
3. The extension is to 2/22/2023. Active and Substantial development of the approved improvements shall occur no later than 2/22/24 and improvements shall be substantially

- completed by 2/22/27 or shall be in accordance with the approved buildout schedule.
4. Compliance hearing shall be held by Board as necessary.
 5. Construction shall be monitored and certified by a consultant appointed by the Board at the applicant's expense. The funds shall be escrowed before any construction begins.
 6. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
 7. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
 8. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
 9. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation, and changes in the Ordinances. This conditional approval shall expire on 2/22/2023 unless all conditions are met or an extension is applied for and granted in accordance with the Regulations. Reapplication in the case of an expired conditional approval requires a new application meeting all applicable Regulations.
 10. Where there is a conflict within the information submitted by the applicant, the Town shall determine the correct information to be applied.

The motion was seconded by K. Sturgeon and carried. (7-0)

3. **Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Matthew & Heather Gault:** Request for Site Plan approval for Contractor's Yard, storage of equipment trailers, aluminum frames, and pressure treated lumber. Property is located at 682 Laconia Road, Tax Lot 230-043-000-000 in the "C" Zone. PB #0822P.

Mr. Tom Selling was present for this application.

The Chairman read the lot history from the Staff Report: Extensive residential history; 2014 - the current owner purchased the lot and received an NHDOT driveway permit for multi-family dwelling use; 2015 - a building permit was issued for interior renovations with conditions that there be no more than 2 units and no more than 6 bedrooms; 2018 - a new 8-bedroom septic was added; 2019 - the applicant attended the Application Review Committee meeting to establish a welding shop and Contractor's Yard in the detached garage and was directed to obtain a Special Exception and Site Plan approval; 2021-assessment card shows a duplex with 8 bedrooms and a detached garage; 2021 – complaint about non-residential use in garage; 2021 – violation for operating welding shop and Contractor's Yard in detached garage – Special Exception and Site Plan approval needed; 10/2021 – application for Special Exception received; 10/27/2021 – applicant requested continuance to provide a more complete application; 01/2022 – Zoning Board approval for a Special Exception for a Contractor's Yard in the Commercial Zone.

The Chairman noted there were a number of waiver requests for this application: Existing/Proposed Lighting Plan, Soils & Map Report, Aquifer Plan, Utilities/Fire Protection Plan, Stormwater Management Plan, Stormwater Management Report, Roads/Sidewalks, Landscape Plan, and Screening.

M. LeClair confirmed with Staff that they have no issues with the waivers for completeness of the application.

MOTION: R. Pickwick moved to grant the following waiver requests:

- a. Existing/Proposed Lighting Plan (Section 5.D.1.J) because the proposed lighting is located a reasonable distance from abutting properties.
- b. Soils Map & Report (Section 5.D.3) because no significant change in impervious area is proposed.
- c. Aquifer Plan (Section 5.D.5) because no hazardous chemicals will be stored outside and floor drains will be decommissioned in accordance with NHDES regulations.
- d. Utilities Fire Protection (Section 5.D.4-6) because the Fire Department had no comments or concerns.
- e. Stormwater Management Plan (Section 5.D.7) for completeness only because no new impervious area is proposed.
- f. Stormwater Management Report (Section 5.D.7) for completeness only because no new impervious area is proposed.
- g. Roads/Sidewalks (Section 5.D.8) because no roads or sidewalks are proposed and details have been provided for the proposed driveway upgrades.
- h. Landscape Plan (Section 5.D.9) because no significant changes to the property are proposed. However, design changes (screening) might need to be shown on the final plan, but not necessarily a separate landscape plan.

The motion was seconded by G. Grant and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: K. Sturgeon moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/22 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

J. Pike questioned the regional impact of using a driveway off Seavey Road to access a commercial building.

Mr. Selling asked the Chairman if he could address the Board. He explained that the lot is not creating a regional impact according to the regulation. J. Pike was concerned about the area affected by making a “cut through” from Route 106 to Seavey Road. S. Whearty suggested these concerns were more appropriate to address under the merits of the application as they don’t apply to the statute’s definition of regional impact. P. Harris noted this statute refers to “other municipalities”.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Selling described the business as unique and explained they make floating golf greens, which take time to fabricate. It is a niche market. The business produces multiple greens which would leave the facility 3-4 times per year. Every green is custom-built. They are floating rafts with a hole in the middle. They get elaborate with the shapes and colors and skirting around the greens. This is a specialty contractor

in a limited market. There is no retail store and clients do not come to the location to make purchases. The greens are designed in the office and fabrication is completed inside the existing 30' x 84' garage. He personally saw one floor drain in the garage and it will be completely sealed. This property is in the aquifer so this will be resolved up front. Storage of materials such as wood, aluminum framing, floats and rafts need to occur outside. All of the fabrication is completed indoors. On occasion, a test fit of particularly large units (such as a 180' guitar) will need to be completed outside to ensure all of the units connect properly. They are then unbolted and loaded for shipment. Occasionally there will be temporary erections of the units but they will be disassembled for shipment. DOT has been consulted and input has been received from Town staff. The best access to the commercial part of the lot and garage is from Seavey Road. This road is part of the original road between Belmont and Laconia. It is a stable road with a great base and two cross-culverts placed in 3-6" of gravel. The driveway profile is proposed at 125' long and a 10.5% grade. Based on NFPA recommendations they will tweak the profile and work with Staff to get to grade.

Mr. Selling addressed the comments in the Staff Report regarding the yards. Mr. Gault uses a track-mounted ATV to move equipment and materials to and from the proposed yards. They have found a happy balance between potential impacts to wetlands and the need for storage by having the primary yard, which is already graveled, near the building. The north yard is not graveled. It is used to store frames and floats and other materials. The second yard, approved by the ZBA last month, is going to be more long-term storage of equipment and fabricated products prior to shipment. They are taken out of the building, transported with the ATV to the yard and stored for months, then assembled temporarily and loaded for transport out of the new driveway. DOT concurred with Mr. Gault to not use the existing paved driveway for business use. There will be no signage on Laconia Road or Seavey Road. He is not trying to attract the public. Advertising is done by word of mouth and a 22-year track record.

M. LeClair asked if there is a sign near the street. Mr. Selling said there are no signs on any road. Mr. Gault does not want to attract retail customers or the general public.

M. LeClair questioned the lot history, particularly the 2019 ARC meeting and violations and complaints. Mr. Selling said he did not represent the applicant at that time. M. LeClair was concerned that Mr. Gault did not do what the ARC committee told him needed to be done. R. Ball stated that he was present at that meeting and Mr. Gault was told what needed to be done and he did not do it. Mr. Selling said they are here now to correct it. Mr. Gault has issues with the Town and he needs to get back on track.

M. LeClair was concerned about issues with tractor trailers. Mr. Selling said it is not shown on the plan, but it has been calculated into the plan. M. LeClair reminded Mr. Selling that his testimony becomes part of the conditions for the application. Mr. Selling said that Mr. Gault told him he can turn around an 18-wheeler on his own property. Mr. Selling explained that NFPA only requires one access for this size lot. Mr. Selling further explained that the site will be designed to allow transport trucks and fire department apparatuses to enter the site, turn around, and exit on Seavey Road. He stated that delivery trucks will not be allowed to enter via Seavey Road, drive through the site, and exit via Laconia Road. Mr. Selling related that Mr. Bailey brought his equipment to the site for a test pit and was nearly hit by an 18-wheeler despite using his blinker within ½ mile of the turn. The 55-mph traffic on Route 106 is the reason for the driveway location on Seavey Road. After the driveway permit was issued, they looked into the accident reports and across Route 106 is a common rear-end accident location. They were applauded by DOT for relocating the business driveway to Seavey Road. P. Harris had concerns that there is no turn lane and there is not enough radius for turning a truck without crossing the center line. Mr. Selling responded that they have applied for a driveway permit for Seavey Road and are waiting for DPW to

approve it. The Board discussed the fact that the number of “trips” can’t be regulated but there could be regulations for big trucks. Mr. Selling said that DOT thinks it is better for trucks to turn at Seavey Road with the guard rail than to turn into the existing driveway on Route 106. The Board was concerned that currently there are 3-4 trips per year, however the next property owner may have 20 trips per year. P. Harris asked how many feet of road would be graveled and Mr. Selling answered approximately 700’. P. Harris said if the owner can show the big truck turns on his own property it should be shown on the plan. R. Ball confirmed that the plan does not currently show tractor trailer turning radius. M. LeClair asked that it be added to the plan and Mr. Selling agreed.

Mr. Selling acknowledged that Staff has stated the Contractor’s Yards need to be gravel but he does not concur with that finding because the storage yards are not used on a daily basis. Mr. Selling commented that Mr. Gault utilizes track-mounted equipment that can navigate the site without gravel. He said the State has groundwater and stormwater quality and wetlands impact laws and they will come down on him if there are problems. J. Pike responded that the State does not have the money to control things, so if there was a complaint the Town would have no teeth. They are overworked and underpaid.

Mr. Selling indicated that the gravel driveway from Seavey Road would require a surface of 12,600sf, and the gravel drive to the second storage yard would be 260’ and 12’ wide. There will be one lane in and out for loading vehicles. There is a 0.6-acre disturbance so it is a 1.6% disturbance. There is minimal impact and it does not need full-blown drainage and engineering reports. He hopes the Board will agree.

D. Grimes asked how the line of sight is on Seavey Road. Mr. Selling said it is more than 400’.

P. Harris asked what specs were used when the road was upgraded. He had concerns that the roadway was not designed to be a commercial road. Mr. Selling explained that he talked to an engineer who verified the depth of gravel. Mr. Selling stated that he has looked at the truck-turning radius for a WB-40 vehicle. He commented that school buses use Seavey Road so it should be adequate for a WB-40 vehicle since the turning radiuses are similar.

J. Pike stated that a tractor trailer turning 90 degrees to go out to Route 106 is not like a school bus. They would need to widen the mouth and come out on a different angle. It is almost as bad as coming out onto Route 106. He explained that he previously owned property at the corner of Route 106 and Seavey Road and was offered a driveway permit from Route 106 but he declined because it is dangerous below Seavey Road. They need to make the turn without 90 degrees. People use Bean Hill Road as a highway and Seavey Road is a main thoroughfare from the high school. The Town just spent \$900,000 fixing Seavey Road near the high school. A 90-degree turn with a triaxle will tear up the road and may require a bond. R. Segalini suggested waiting for more information from DPW Director Craig Clairmont. J. Pike was concerned that the road has recently been fixed and we can’t have it torn up. He recommended tabling the application.

Mr. Selling said he will defer to the experts at DOT and they explained in detail that there is no recommendation to upgrade the intersection. His client is not hauling gravel. They are aluminum frames, pressure treated wood, and plastic floats. There was discussion about what the road condition would be in July and problems with the asphalt. The Board would like to wait for DPW Director Craig Clairmont to be present. Mr. Selling stated that he is looking for conditional approval but will still need a driveway permit from the road agent.

The Chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

R. Ball addressed the gravel for the Contractor's Yards and storage areas. He noted that he has not seen a waiver granted for that as long as he has been with the Town. It is in the middle of a 23-acre parcel and it has a 500' perimeter 50' uphill from a wetland. It needs to be stabilized. J. Pike asserted that the Board does not go against the recommendations of their experts.

MOTION: J. Pike moved to deny the following waiver requests:

- a. Screening (Section 5.D.9) because Staff requested additional information regarding whether items can be seen from Laconia Road; specifically for the Contractor's Yard closest to Laconia Road.
- b. Stormwater Management (Section 5.D.7) because Staff recommends graveling the Contractor's Yards (pavement is required by Site Plan Regulations) and therefore recommend a Stormwater Management Plan and Report.
- c. Stormwater Report (Section 5.D.7) because Staff recommends graveling the Contractor's Yards (pavement is required by Site Plan Regulations) and therefore recommend a Stormwater Management Plan and Report.

R. Ball noted that the regulations require pavement but gravel would be acceptable to Staff. A waiver will need to be requested for the pavement.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: J. Pike moved to table the Public Hearing on the application of Matthew Gault for Site Plan approval for Contractor's Yard, storage of equipment trailers, aluminum frames and pressure treated lumber at 682 Laconia Road, Tax Lot 230-043-000-000 to 6 pm, March 28, 2022, at this location; due to design considerations.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

- 4. Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Route 106 Realty Trust:** Request to amend a previously approved Site Plan to include a Conditional Use Permit for a subordinate dwelling unit. Property is located at 26 & 36 Laconia Road, Tax Lots 205-050-000-000, 205-052-000-000 & 205-054-000-000 in the "C" Zone. PB #0322P.

The Chairman noted the lot history from the Staff Report: 2021 approval for a site plan application for self-storage units and this proposal was presented to the Application Review Committee on 01/27/2022. He stated there were no waiver requests.

MOTION: R. Segalini moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/22 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by M. LeClair and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing and noted there were no responses or “no concerns” from Departments.

Mr. Jon Rokeh was present for this application via Zoom.

Mr. Rokeh reminded the Board that this proposal was discussed last year, but they agreed to come back later for the manager’s quarters. R. Segalini questioned if anything else had changed from the original plan. Mr. Rokeh said nothing has changed. At the 2021 meeting the manager’s quarters were not included in the Staff Report and the Board thought this needed to go through the official process.

R. Segalini commented that at that point the customer wasn’t sure there was going to be a need. Mr. Rokeh remarked that there was a need, but the process hadn’t been done properly and when it was added to the application late, the Board asked them to come back. M. LeClair stated the building layout changed last time. Mr. Rokeh explained that there is an office and they are adding manager’s quarters, which will be the same as the other Belmont Self Storage location. M. LeClair asked if they are still going forward with the commercial building in the front. Mr. Rokeh responded that the self-storage units are Phase 1. It is still possible to add a stand-alone commercial building but it may be modified to storage in the future. Nothing new is proposed right now.

P. Harris commented that this type of proposal has been granted before and works nicely for property protection.

S. Whearty read from the Staff Report: “The conditions of the 4/26/21 approval should be completed, including finalization of the merger and submission of final plans. As a reminder, the approval will expire 4/26/22 if an extension is not requested or all conditions of approval have not been met.”

J. Pike asked where do we stand. J. Rokeh concluded that most things have been done. Parts of the merger are done and he is working on plans. Lots 52 and 54 need to be merged and he will be submitting a request for extension. R. Segalini asked about bathroom facilities because he does not see them on the plans. R. Ball answered that sewer and water will come from Laconia. There was general discussion about the sewer and water limitations in that location due to Laconia not allowing an extension of their sewer.

The Chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the application be granted Final, conditional approval as it appears to meet all of the technical requirements of the Ordinances and Regulations of the Town of Belmont with the following conditions:

Conditions (precedent) to be complied with or secured (as appropriate) prior to plan being signed and decision recorded. No site improvements or approved uses shall commence and no building permit shall be issued until plan is signed and decision recorded.

1. This action is based on a plan dated 8/1/19.
2. Submission of building plans, approved by Building Inspector and Fire Department; shall comply with all applicable building, fire, health, and life safety codes.
3. Property owner shall install all required traffic control and fire and life safety facilities and systems required by the Board and/or by other applicable Codes and Regulations.

General conditions to be complied with subsequent to plan being signed and decision recorded:

4. Occupancy/use of improvements requires submission of 2 paper original record (as-built) site plans including structures, utilities, roads, drainage and other site improvements. Plans shall be reproducible in black/white, e.g. through the use of differentiating graphics (pre/post contours dashed/solid), identifying notes, etc.
5. Approved uses include interior self-storage with manager's quarters.
6. Sewer approval shall be obtained for each new use or expansion of use.
7. The property owner shall be responsible to inspect, maintain and make immediate repairs to stormwater management features to assure they function in the manner intended and protect water quality.
8. All representations made by the applicant during the public hearing are incorporated as a condition of this approval.
9. Landscaping shall be maintained, shall be kept in a sightly manner and not allowed to deteriorate.
10. Permits must be obtained for all signage, and signs for inactive, closed or abandoned uses shall be removed within 30 days.
11. No changes shall be made to the approved plans unless application is made in writing to the Town.
12. The Planning Board shall have the power to modify or amend its approval upon its own motion to do so.
13. Approval is subject to expiration, revocation and changes in the Ordinances. This conditional approval shall expire on 2/28/23 unless all conditions are met or an extension is applied for and granted in accordance with the Regulations. Notice to the applicant and/or a public hearing are not required for the Board to determine that a conditional approval has expired. Reapplication in the case of an expired conditional approval requires a new application meeting all applicable Regulations.
14. Where there is a conflict within the information submitted by the applicant, the town shall determine the correct information to be applied.
15. Operational conditions of the Town and other agencies shall be met.

The motion was seconded by K. Sturgeon and carried. (7-0)

5. **Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Route 106 Realty Trust:** Request for Site Plan approval for a Contractor's Yard (limo service) and a Conditional Use Permit for a subordinate dwelling unit. Property is located on Laconia Road, Tax Lot 217-108-000-000 in the "C" Zone. PB #0522P.

The Chairman stated there were no waiver requests.

MOTION: K. Sturgeon moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of

proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/22 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by R. Pickwick and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by K. Sturgeon and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

The Chairman noted the only Department response was from the Building Inspector, who will require stamped plans by an RDP.

Mr. Jon Rokeh was present for this application via Zoom.

Mr. Rokeh informed the Board this site has lots of history and has had a curb cut on Route 106 “forever”. There is a huge gravel storage yard. The proposal is for a commercial building for a limo service with manager’s quarters. The parking spaces are for limos to be stored outside. Eventually they want to have it all be inside. The whole place will be paved. The drainage will be redesigned. There will be a rip rap swale and a detention pond and the drainage will be upgraded. The existing well is located at the back of the property. A pumped septic system is at the northerly end of the lot. He received correspondence from DOT that the driveway needs to be upgraded and widened. They do not have an issue with the proposal. An AoT permit is not required; only the driveway permit and local approvals. If the proposal is approved, Mr. Mitchell plans to build it right away this spring.

M. LeClair questioned the Staff Report items 1 through 16. Mr. Rokeh reported that he already spoke with the Town Planner about these items. Everything presented can be addressed as a condition of approval, or if the Board wants a cleaner approval, they can come back next month.

M. LeClair asked how many businesses are proposed. Mr. Rokeh said one at this location.

J. Pike stated there is new development with the entrance and there is building office space and garage space for a single user, but he does not see the dwelling unit. It is mentioned in the application that was turned in but it is not shown on the plan. Mr. Rokeh stated that is correct. The Conditional Use Permit has been submitted but there is no building layout yet for the residential or commercial space. He will make sure everything is put together and bring it back to the Board next month.

There was discussion about moving forward with the approval or tabling it to next month. R. Segalini suggested tabling to allow for everything to be shown on paper and not set a precedent. He would like to see the number of bedrooms and the septic shown on the plan. R. Segalini said let’s get some answers that Staff is comfortable with and narrow things down to a few conditions for approval.

P. Harris identified that a Special Exception is still needed. Mr. Rokeh agreed and mentioned the next application will require one as well. P. Harris suggested that would be important to get through before the rest of this. S. Whearty remarked that the limo service did not fit into a specific use category

so it was not determined until review of the Planning Board application that the extra requirement was found. P. Harris stated the Zoning Board should not be pressured to approve the Special Exception.

The Chairman asked if anyone in the audience had any questions or comments. There being none, he closed the public hearing.

MOTION: J. Pike moved to table the Public Hearing on the application of Route 106 Realty Trust approval for a Contractor's Yard (limo service) and a Conditional Use Permit for a subordinate dwelling unit located on Laconia Road, Tax Lot 217-108-000-000, to 6 pm, March 28, 2022, at this location.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

6. Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing –Route 106 Realty Trust: Request for Site Plan approval for Contractor's Yard, commercial building (motor vehicle & trailer service, professional offices, light manufacturing, retail stores and service business), and a Conditional Use Permit for a subordinate dwelling unit. Property is located on Laconia Road & 28 Corriveau Way, Tax Lot 217-114-000-000 in the "C" Zone. PB #0622P.

Mr. Jon Rokeh was present for this application via Zoom.

S. Whearty asked the Board how they would like to proceed with this application. Staff recommended the application was incomplete based on the information available at the closing date. One of the items was access. DOT has provided information today to clarify that they do have access. If the Board wants to entertain the information provided today by DOT, it is suggested to use the revised Staff Report.

Mr. Rokeh said when the road was relocated Corriveau Way was the access point for Route 106. After submitting additional paperwork to DOT, they realized they made a mistake in their initial review. He has worked a lot with DOT but Staff only got the information this afternoon.

The Chairman stated there were no waiver requests.

MOTION: J. Pike moved that the application be accepted as complete for the purposes of proceeding with consideration and making an informed decision. However, additional information shall be requested as necessary and must be submitted in a timely manner to complete review and act on the application. The Board shall act on this proposal by 5/4/22 subject to extension or waiver.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

MOTION: P. Harris moved that the proposal does not have a potential regional impact.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried. (7-0)

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Rokeh said he will give an overview of the project tonight and get questions the Board would like answered. He will ask for this application to be tabled after finding out if there are specific concerns.

Mr. Rokeh stated an infiltration basin has been designed and they will do a test pit to verify that it works. The septic is proposed under the parking lot and they will do a test pit to make sure it will work. He went back and forth with S. Whearty to determine if the septic needs to be designed ahead of time or not. But a test pit would allow everyone to know that the design would work in the end and that is the direction they want to go in. They can do the final permits and septic design after they have their ZBA approval.

Mr. Rokeh revealed that this proposal is for a commercial building with 4 units. Each will have an office entrance with garage bays in the rear. It will be similar to the Belmont Business Park. A dumpster was added in the back on a paved area. There is drainage down to a shallow swale into a ditch and detention pond in the back. A drainage analysis has been done, and a soil survey, but they need to do a test pit. There are handicapped parking spaces, landscaping in front, and lighting on the building. The rear of the building will be lit up as well. There will be paved access with a gate on Corriveau Way. That access will only be used for emergencies, such as Fire Department access. The main entrance will be from Route 106.

D. Grimes was concerned about the existing well being paved over and how they will access it. Mr. Rokeh explained that well will get a manhole cover. D. Grimes asked about making sure nothing could drain into it. Mr. Rokeh said they will use a sealed lid.

R. Segalini asked about a permit for the discharge from the detention pond. Mr. Rokeh replied that it is part of the driveway permit. S. Whearty confirmed the Land Use Office received an email about the driveway access today. Mr. Rokeh stated they will work on the driveway permit and drainage with the State. There is no other place to put the pond unless they alter the entire site and the alterations would put water near Corriveau Way.

J. Pike asked if the lighting at the rear of the building will be downcast. Mr. Rokeh said it will be dark sky compliant. J. Pike had concerns for the homes behind and beside the building.

Mr. Rokeh noted there is a green area by the exit with a gate. The lot is thinned out. There was discussion about trees or fencing to block the view of the dumpster and keep the privacy that Corriveau Way has.

P. Harris inquired if this will be a single-story building. Mr. Rokeh said he thinks it is a two-story. There was discussion about needing final building plans for this application.

The Chairman asked if the public had any questions.

Abutter Mr. Brad Corriveau asked how big the lot is. Mr. Rokeh answered that it is 1.07 acres.

Abutter Mr. Arthur Perron stated Corriveau Way is a dirt road and if used for emergency access it would be fine, but even garbage trucks have left it as a washboard. Mr. Rokeh confirmed the back entrance would never see traffic unless it is an emergency; even during construction.

Once construction has started, everything will be accessed from Route 106. R. Segalini asked Mr. Rokeh to include that in the plan notes.

Mr. Perron said he has a lot next door to this location and there are signs on the road about children. Mr. Rokeh declared that all access will be from Route 106.

Mr. Corriveau said it would be important to maintain the rural aspect and the green space between the commercial space as J. Pike mentioned.

MOTION: R. Segalini moved to table the Public Hearing on the application of Route 106 Realty Trust approval for a Contractor's Yard, commercial building (motor vehicle & trailer service, professional offices, light manufacturing, retail stores and service business), and a Conditional Use Permit for a subordinate dwelling unit located on Laconia Road & 28 Corriveau Way, Tax Lot 217-114-000-000, to 6 pm, March 28, 2022, at this location.

The motion was seconded by M. LeClair and carried. (7-0)

7. Plan Submission Meeting and Public Hearing – Vault Motor Storage: Request for Site Plan approval for a 2-story, self-storage facility with an accessory structure. Property is located at 1213 Laconia Road, Tax Lot 241-006-000-000 in the "I" Zone. PB #0922P.

The Chairman said there is a Conditional Use Permit required for this application for the lot coverage.

Mr. Jon Rokeh, Mr. Bernie Temple, Mr. Charlie Morgan, and Ms. Stephanie Avron were present for this application via Zoom.

J. Rokeh informed the Board that an AoT permit is required and S. Whearty confirmed it is in motion. A driveway permit is also required from the State and septic approval is needed. Mr. Rokeh did not realize that he needed a Conditional Use Permit. He will address the Staff Report items before the next meeting.

There were no abutters present for this application.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the application is not complete because a Conditional Use Permit is required but no Conditional Use Permit application has been submitted. Resubmission is subject to review by Land Use staff for completeness. This application will be tabled until 6 pm, Monday, March 28, 2022 to give the applicant time to submit additional required information.

The motion was seconded by R. Segalini and carried. (7-0)

8. OTHER BUSINESS:

A. Design Review – Lakeview at Belmont, LLC: Discussion only of a request for ten, 2- bedroom detached condominium units in an Open Space Subdivision with 20'-wide driveway with a Town hammerhead turnaround. Four single-family, residential lots, common area, and convertible area while maintaining the golf course. Property is located at 89 Ladd Hill Road, Tax Lots 201-066-000-000 & 201-067-000-000 in the "R" Zone. PB #0722P.

Mr. Craig Francisco of Bedford Design and Mr. Bill Ferren, owner, were present for this design review. It was noted that this is a discussion only.

Mr. Francisco directed members to page 2 of the plan set. A private road is proposed off Ladd Hill Road with ten 2-family condominiums and a shared well. It is not a community well.

J. Pike expressed concerns about problems with community wells that have come to the Town. Not everyone in an association wanted to pay fees for their community well. The Town did help them secure a grant. D. Grimes was concerned about the wells, water being used for the golf course, if it could affect other wells, and if there is enough capacity. Mr. Francisco said there is an irrigation pond that is filled from a well and used to water the golf course. Mr. Francisco stated any shared well problem could be addressed in condo documents. J. Pike said the Town didn't know anything about the other community system until they had a problem and people needed water and no one wanted to pay. Does the Town have a responsibility? It is not a Town well. The Town helped the community to find some grants for funding and they put in a new well house. They got a loan through the Town to get financing. J. Pike re-iterated that this is a concern.

Mr. Francisco outlined the plan for four single-family houses between the clubhouse and the lots to the south. The golf course remains active. Hole 9 is being redone. They went to the ARC Committee last week and there were some questions about maximum road radius and the road entrance, which will need to be moved for better sight distance. The ground is approximately 10.5% but they would like to see the driveway at 12%. J. Pike recommended consulting the road agent and Fire Department. J. Pike asked about the width and depth of the lots and the frontage. They are 150' wide and 400' long. R. Ball verified they are not over the 4:1 ratio.

R. Ball noted that lots 1-4 have a problem as regulations state all lots must access from interior roads for an Open Space Subdivision. They will need to apply for a Variance. R. Ball emphasized that an Open Space Subdivision requires all lots be accessed by an interior road, but there is road frontage proposed. There is also an issue with the composition of the Open Space. Up to 20% of the proposed Open Space can be for recreational use, however this design shows 100% recreational.

R. Ball explained that the proposed frontage is not off an interior road. There will be four driveways off Ladd Hill Road. Mr. Francisco said sight distance is the main issue. R. Ball countered that rural character is an issue. There is not much with the golf course. There was a discussion about density regarding the 9 units that would be allowed for 29 acres, but the proposal includes 14 homes plus the clubhouse. Mr. Francisco is hoping the Planning Board will give a 20% density bonus for preserving more open farmland than what is required.

M. LeClair asked about the convertible area. R. Ball explained that it is the right to develop in the future. Mr. Francisco said it is not viable and the owner will not be pursuing it. M. LeClair asked for confirmation that the location will still operate as a golf course. Mr. Ferren said yes. M. LeClair asked where the shared well will be. Mr. Francisco said at the end of the hammerhead road out past the ten condominium units. R. Pickwick was concerned about the location compared to abutting residences. There was a discussion about grading and drainage. Mr. Francisco said there is a well they haven't found yet. Mr. Francisco commented that they have not completed test pits yet. The leach field will be in the front yard. There are six units against the golf course that will have walkout basements. Hopefully they can slide the units back.

M. LeClair asked what questions do the presenters have for the Board. They asked about a waiver for the road. S. Whearty stated that NFPA-1141 standard requires a 10% maximum grade for fire trucks.

Mr. Francisco asked if the Board would consider the density bonus. S. Whearty reminded members that tonight's discussion is non-binding. There will be no action taken tonight.

R. Ball explained that the density bonus could be provided if there is more Open Space than required by the ordinance. 50% is required to be permanently open, or 60% for the density bonus, and it has to meet specific criteria in the ordinance. 20% of the 50% can be used for recreational use. It is Staff's opinion that more than 20% is being used for recreation. The land has already been altered and does not meet the definition of Open Space. M. LeClair said the applicant is looking for more recreational space than Open Space. Staff stated a Variance will be needed, as well as a Variance for the lots off Ladd Hill Road.

There was discussion about lots 1-4. They will be subdivided as single-family lots, with a size of about 1 acre and 150' of frontage. D. Grimes stated this is a rural zone so the requirements are 3 acres and 180' of frontage. R. Ball noted that Open Space lots can be reduced. P. Harris commented that in the past this type of trade off did not work well. There were people congested in the lot. The view of the Zoning Board is that you should be able to build without needing Variances. The Town is very forgiving for property to build on, but when you trade one thing for another the Town loses.

M. LeClair asked about the common area for the lots, because there is going to be an operating golf course. He does not understand the four standalone lots in the middle and why there are waivers for the driveways but not the lot sizes. D. Grimes asked if this property is currently two lots or three, where is the open land, and would the golf course expand out there. Mr. Ferren does not foresee going in that direction. The golf course would not be smaller, but the Par 3 will be displaced and the first hole would be shortened. One of the holes on the other side would be elongated so they don't lose the distance. Mr. Ferren fully plans to maintain the yardage and take one of the weaker holes and make it better.

J. Pike asked where golfers will park their cars. Mr. Ferren said the neighbor across the street is going to afford him some parking. There was discussion about the plans for the lots and the location of the road.

M. LeClair asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak and said it was awesome to have so many people attend and see what the Board does. He asked that everyone state their name before speaking. He also said that the Board are firm believers that people can do what they want within the guidelines. Personal opinions are not taken into factor as long as things follow the letter of the law. This is an opportunity for abutters to give their thoughts on what they would and would not like to see. There are some people on Zoom as well.

M. LeClair asked how long Mr. Ferren has owned the golf course. Mr. Ferren answered less than one year.

Ms. Kathleen Dube, abutter at 52 Old Ladd Hill Road, asked how many wells are currently on the property. Mr. Francisco stated there is one near the clubhouse and one at the irrigation pond. If there are four house lots there will be four more, plus one for the condos. P. Harris asked if they will still draw water from the pond. Mr. Ferren replied yes. Ms. Dube asked if the pond is filled from a well. Mr. Ferren said yes.

P. Harris suggested that the closer applications stick to the rules, the better things go. There is plenty to work with. C. Francisco stated they can't work with the Open Space. There is 140 acres on the other side of Ladd Hill Road and they would be amenable to creating additional Open Space. There was discussion about whether that would meet regulations and how that would work. S. Whearty reminded everyone that the zoning regulations talk about types of ownership for this type of space.

It was noted that no additional abutters wished to speak. The Chairman told the abutters that they will get new notifications if the applicants make a formal application for this project. He thanked the abutters for coming out for the meeting and wished the developers success with their project.

B. Approval of Minutes 01/24/2022:

MOTION: M. LeClair moved to approve the minutes of January 24, 2022 as written.

The motion was seconded by K. Sturgeon and carried. (7-0)

C. Staff Report:

Amendment Certification Form:

The Board signed the Subdivision and Site Plan amendments.

Consultant Discussion:

S. Whearty asked the Board to consider submitting an RFQ (Request for Qualifications) to obtain three on-call consultants to assist with advanced technical review such as traffic studies or intense drainage, and/or construction inspections if necessary. This request does not obligate the Board or the Town to spend any money. Planning Board applicants would provide the funding for consultants on their applications/cases. Having consultants as a resource would be important for review of items that do not fall within the expertise of the Town's Staff. Other departments could also utilize these consultants. When Staff needs an answer or an inspection to be done quickly, having a task order contract in place with consultants in advance could be critical to prevent projects from being stopped/held up. The Town's current consultant has had some delays providing assistance and that is difficult when an answer is needed quickly. With three consultants in rotation, one of them should be able to assist if the others are busy.

P. Harris said Staff should have consultants available for these purposes and it is not going to cost the Land Use Department any money. S. Whearty explained that applicants would be given upfront information during the review process that a third-party consultant may be required and that it would be their responsibility to pay the costs based on an estimate. Estimates would be provided to the applicants so that there are no surprises. D. Grimes commented that this could help the department from being overwhelmed, especially seeing the applications that have been coming in. S. Whearty said we are losing R. Ball and there is no immediate replacement. She can do inspections, but if she is out of the office, she is not able to be reviewing applications. Staff needs some other options. One example is the Aranorian project. The Ladd Hill Road construction will need eyes on it full-time to make sure it is done well. DPW and Land Use do not have the resources to do that. The applicant was presented with an estimate from Underwood Engineering to cover those costs. The funds will be collected before construction starts. If all of the funds aren't used, they will be returned to the developer.

S. Whearty informed the Board that the RFQ process would include reviewing resumes and references from other towns. The request would be noticed by newspaper and the website. There was clarification about RFP (Request for Proposal) versus RFQ (Request for Qualifications) and that there is no need for a bidding process as no funds will be spent. M. LeClair was concerned about the estimates

and if costs come in higher than anticipated. S. Whearty said there will be a process for that, and there will be good communication. The general idea is that if there are leftover funds, developers will receive them back. If the developer does things wrong, or makes changes to the project, it will cost more money. They will have to stop construction until they cover the increased estimate.

R. Ball mentioned the current problems with Wild Acres Road and Grimstone Road. Road construction costs have increased and the road has deteriorated a lot. Now, the Town does not have adequate funds secured to complete the road.

S. Whearty stated that these consultants are to help protect the Town and its infrastructure. Nitpicky details are not necessary because they don't affect the Town but they cost way more money. It is important to balance things to protect the Town but not make development impossible.

G. Grant questioned what will happen if developer's and Town's consultants have different conclusions or disagree. S. Whearty informed the Board that engineering is guided by regulations and codes. There could be disagreements, but it will all boil down to the regulations and standards that need to be met. Staff will work with the consultants to reach a solution agreeable to all parties that protects Town interests.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the Land Use Department obtain RFQs for three third-party consultants who would be available to provide any needed expertise on applications and projects.

The motion was seconded by P. Harris and carried. (7-0)

S. Whearty said she hopes the consultants will be a shared resource for all Town departments.

Land Use Technician Update:

A memo was provided to the Board with a proposal for R. Ball to stay on part-time until a replacement is hired. There was discussion about who has the authority to approve the proposal. J. Pike said he will take this to the Board of Selectmen but the Planning Board should also show their support. This has worked with Candace Daigle and it is a savings because the full-time salary was already built into the budget.

MOTION: M. LeClair moved that the Planning Board support the proposal for R. Ball to remain on Staff part-time to provide coverage and training services for the new Land Use Technician.

The motion was seconded by J. Pike and carried. (7-0)

S. Whearty said four applications have been received. One applicant has been interviewed and another is scheduled for tomorrow.

Zoom:

The Board of Selectmen has lifted the mask mandate and each board must determine if they wish to continue offering Zoom access to meetings. There was discussion that this is a minimal cost item and allows remote participation for those who are still uncomfortable in public spaces. It was the consensus of the Planning Board to continue offering Zoom access for future Planning Board meetings as it improves communication and services the Town offers.

D. New Business:**ConvenientMD – 77 Daniel Webster Highway – Tax Lot 201-029-001-000:**

The Board discussed the failed slope behind the building and requested that Staff bring them back before the Board before the planting season. R. Ball agreed that the slope has failed and been fixed multiple times but has still failed.

Adjournment:

MOTION: M. LeClair moved to adjourn at 9:10 pm.

The motion was seconded by R. Pickwick and carried. (7-0)

Respectfully submitted:

Colleen Akerman
Building & Land Use Clerk